ORIGINAL PAPER

Association of macroinvertebrate assemblages with dissolved oxygen concentration and wood surface area in selected subtropical streams of the southeastern USA

Michael D. Kaller · William E. Kelso

Received: 23 August 2005/Accepted: 13 April 2006/Published online: 6 October 2006 © Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2006

Abstract Woody debris (CWD) is an important habitat component in northern Gulf of Mexico coastal plain streams, where low gradients and low flows allow accumulation of CWD and promote low dissolved oxygen (DO) concentrations. We tested the influences of CWD and DO on stream macroinvertebrates experimentally by placing two surface area CWD treatments each in three concentrations of ambient DO in two streams in Louisiana, USA, with macroinvertebrates collected from ambient woody debris used as a control. We also sampled macroinvertebrates in benthic and woody debris habitats in three streams twice yearly over 2 years to examine the applicability of the experimental results. Total abundance, richness (generic), and Shannon-Wiener diversity were all higher in lower DO conditions during the experiment, and total abundance was higher in the larger CWD treatment. Stream sampling corroborated the relationship between higher diversity and low DO in both benthic and woody debris habitats, but the relationship between richness and low DO only was supported in benthic habitats. Few taxa cor-

M. D. Kaller (🖂) · W. E. Kelso

related with DO or CWD in the experiment (5 of 21 taxa) or stream survey (2 of 54 taxa). Whereas most taxa were uncorrelated with experimentally manipulated and in-stream measured variables, we suggest these taxa respond as generalists to stream habitat and physicochemistry. Based on this experiment and stream sampling, we believe the majority of macroinvertebrates in these streams are tolerant of seasonally low DO conditions.

Keywords Woody debris · Coastal plain · Dissolved oxygen

Abbreviations

- CWD woody debris
- DO dissolved oxygen
- BOD biochemical oxygen demand
- DOC dissolved organic carbon

Introduction

Woody debris is an important stream habitat component (Benke and Wallace 2003) that can provide food (Anderson et al. 1978), cover and foraging habitat (Barr and Chapin 1981; Dudley and Anderson 1982), and aestivation sites for resident macroinvertebrates (Roeding and Smock 1989). The diversity and abundance of many

School of Renewable Natural Resources, Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station, LSU Agricultural Center, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA e-mail: mkallel@lsu.edu

macroinvertebrate taxa are often higher in woody debris than in surrounding habitats (Benke et al. 1984; Drury and Kelso 2000; Burcher and Smock 2002), and some taxa are exclusively epixylic (Wood and Sites 2002; Johnson et al. 2003). Woody debris provides a relatively stable and persistent habitat (Benke and Wallace 1990) that maybe an important substrate in low gradient, sand and silt-dominated coastal plain streams along the northern Gulf of Mexico (Gulf). In Gulf streams, when other hard substrates are unavailable, woody debris macroinvertebrate assemblages exhibit little taxonomic overlap with soft substrate benthic habitats (Kaller 2005). Further, when other hard substrates, such as sand, gravel, and bedrock, are available, woody debris still exhibits higher density and diversity than hard benthic habitats (Drury and Kelso 2000; Johnson and Kennedy 2003; Phillips 2003). Because of episodic high storm flows and erosive soils in southern Louisiana, fallen trees typically are quickly buried in the stream channel or deposited on the stream periphery (Brown and Matthews 1995). As a result, the majority of available woody substrate consists of small diameter debris (<15 cm; CWD) that may be more spatially and temporally ephemeral but is regularly replaced from the riparian canopy.

Stream gradients are generally low in the north-central Gulf coastal plain, and unlike other central North American stream systems (Brown and Matthews 1995), flow is primarily driven by precipitation (Welch 1942; Holland et al. 1952), High organic matter inputs from long growing seasons result in large amounts of CWD, as well as low dissolved oxygen (DO) levels characteristic of this region (Connor and Suttkus 1986; Ice and Sugden 2003). Separating the effects of CWD, which is the dominant hard substrate in these streams (Johnson and Kennedy 2003; Phillips 2003), and DO, which may drop below 1 mg l^{-1} (approx. 10% saturation) during the summer, on macroinvertebrate community structure is difficult because both factors are highly influenced by the low gradients in these systems (Kaller 2005; Williams et al. 2005).

Considerable research into the effects of low DO on fishes has led to a $5.0 \text{ mg } \text{l}^{-1}$ minimum standard for streams in the USA (United States

Environmental Protection Agency 1986 and references therein). However, little consensus exists concerning low DO criteria for stream macroinvertebrates, and tolerances to hypoxic conditions are taxonomically specific. Some taxa, such as molluscs, appear to be sensitive to DO levels below 6.0 mg l^{-1} (Fuller 1974). However, other taxa, including Hirudinea, Decapoda, *Hyallela azteca*, *Gammarus lacustris*, and many aquatic insects (with the exception of the Plecoptera; Roback 1974) tolerate DO levels below 1.0 mg l^{-1} (Hobbs and Hall 1974; Sawyer 1974; Nedbecker 1972; Nebecker et al. 1992).

Ephemeropterans vary widely in DO tolerance, with LC50 values ranging from 49.5% (*Rhithrogena iridina*; approx. 5.3 mg l^{-1} as calculated from data provided) to 0.3% (Ephemera *vulgate*; approx 0.03 mg l^{-1} as calculated from data provided) saturation (Jacob and Walther 1981; Jacob et al. 1984). Across assemblages. macroinvertebrate community responses to low DO vary from depauperate communities in Gulf coastal streams at or below 2 mg l^{-1} (approx. 26%) saturation as calculated from data provided; Didonato et al. 2003) to high tolerance in upland and lowland Australian streams (DO levels of 1.0 mg l^{-1} (10% saturation) for 5 days). Upland Ephemeroptera and lowland Chironomidae were the most and least sensitive taxa, respectively, in Australia (Connolly et al. 2004). Finally, some assemblages have responded both positively and negatively to low DO (Ruse 1996).

Because CWD and DO may have both independent and interactive effects on macroinvertebrate community structure, we designed a two part study comprising: (1) a field experiment in two streams testing the effects of CWD surface area (2 levels), DO concentration (3 concentrations), and the interaction of the two variables on macroinvertebrate colonization; and (2) sample collections from three streams to examine the ability of the experimental results to predict the relative influence of CWD and DO on macroinvertebrate community structure. Based on our experiences in similar streams, we hypothesized macroinvertebrate communities would be most diverse and numerically abundant on the larger surface area CWD treatment within each DO concentration because of increased foraging and predation avoidance opportunities and, given equivalent woody debris surface areas, in the highest DO concentrations available.

Methods

We conducted the experiment in Mill Creek and West Fork of Six Mile Creek (Six Mile Creek), both 2nd order bottomland streams in southwestern Louisiana. Both streams incise the flat and poorly drained Pleistocene terrace, which was formed from alluvial deposits of sand and silt from the fluctuating shoreline of the Gulf and the wandering delta of the Mississippi River, until their confluence with the Calcasieu River (Welch 1942; Holland et al. 1952). Riparian forests of both streams are southern hardwood tree species [mostly oak (Quercus nigra) and sweetgum, (Liquidambar styraciflua)] with pine forests [mostly longleaf pine (Pinus palustris)] dominating upland areas. For stream sampling, we added a third stream. Big Brushy Creek, which was intermediate in gradient, DO, and CWD amount between Six Mile and Mill creeks. Although within a 21 km radius of each other, the streams differ substantially in gradient, flow, and DO levels. The Mill Creek watershed is managed in silvicultural rotations jointly by Boise Cascade Holdings LLC, Roy O. Martin Lumber Company, and the Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries, whereas Six Mile and Big Brushy Creeks are managed by the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service as safety zones for United States Army Fort Polk. Although military training could potentially confound the results (e.g., Phillips and Perry 2002), Williams et al. (2005) concluded military training had little influence on aquatic biota in Ft. Polk streams.

Field experiment

In June 2003, we collected CWD from randomly selected debris piles on the floodplain of each creek, and sterilized the CWD in an autoclave at 120°C for 45 min to eliminate microbial and fungal colonies that could influence macroinvertebrate colonization patterns during the experiment (Dudley and Anderson 1982). We divided the CWD into groups of 10 pieces of CWD of similar length and width into two treatment groups, larger CWD (>10 mm in diameter; mean surface area 1,743.1 mm²) and smaller CWD (\geq 1 mm and \leq 5 mm in diameter; mean surface area 856.2 mm²).

In July 2003, we placed CWD treatments into cylindrical plastic mesh enclosures (490 mm in length × 88 mm in diameter, 12 mm mesh openings; CWD enclosures) that retained the CWD but allowed access by macroinvertebrates. We returned the CWD enclosures to the collection stream to reduce colonization avoidance from "unfamiliar" wood types. Pairs of larger and smaller treatments were secured to a 1-m length of rebar inserted into the stream bottom to maintain CWD enclosure positions. In each stream, a 50-m long site was selected that exhibited a range of DO concentrations in close proximity to each other (high, medium, and low concentrations based on relative values for each stream), and each DO group received 10 plastic enclosures of each CWD treatment, yielding a total of 120 experimental units (2 streams \times 3 DO concentrations \times 2 CWD treatments \times 10 enclosures of each CWD type). CWD enclosures remained in the stream for 5 weeks, which we believed based on O'Connor (1991) and Drury and Kelso (2000) would allow sufficient time for colonization for many macroinvertebrates.

In August 2003, we removed the CWD enclosures from the streams by quickly surrounding the enclosure with a 250 µm diameter mesh bag, removing the bag and enclosure from the stream, washing the woody debris and macroinvertebrates into plastic bags, and preserving the wood and macroinvertebrates with 95% ethanol on site. Because CWD enclosure placements differed slightly in physicochemistry, we recorded temperature, DO, specific conductance, and water velocity with YSI model 85 handheld probe and a Sontek velocity probe (both Yellow Springs Inc., Yellow Springs, OH) at the beginning of the experiment, and weekly thereafter until the enclosures were harvested. We believed that 24-h DO measurements were unnecessary because of little observed diel variation in DO in nearby forested streams(Bryan et al. 1995). We also collected two samples of naturally occurring CWD in a 0.25 mm mesh bag (472 mm \times 127 mm \times 127 mm) at each site to assess natural colonization patterns as an experimental control.

Stream sampling

We sampled benthic and woody debris habitats in three streams four times from 2002 to 2004. Beginning in August 2002, we selected three 100 m sampling reaches in each stream and in each reach collected nine benthic substrate samples with a modified Hess sampler $(0.0182 \text{ m}^2, 250 \mu\text{m} \text{ mesh})$, and nine woody debris samples that each consisted of 10 sticks ranging in diameter from 10 to 50 mm in diameter collected from spatially isolated woodpiles within the sampling reach, which were placed in a 250 µm mesh bag. Hess samples were collected near each sampled woodpile. All 648 samples(4 sampling periods $\times 3$ streams $\times 3$ sites 9 Hess samples and 9 woody debris samples) were preserved in 70% ethanol on site. At each site, we also collected two 1 l mid-water column samples for determination of fecal coliform counts as an index of agricultural and animal disturbance, and heterotrophic plate counts as an index of biofilm development and for interpretation of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD), following collection protocols outlined by the American Public Health Association (1998). At the same time, we collected a 11 water sample for analyses of BOD, total carbon, inorganic carbon, total organic carbon, dissolved organic carbon (DOC), and total nitrogen. At each reach in each stream, we also measured DO, specific conductance, and temperature with a handheld YSI Model 95 probe (YSI Incorporated, Yellow Springs, Ohio, USA). We measured depth, flow (Sontek velocity meter, YSI Incorporated), number, size, orientation, and complexity (single or multiple pieces) of woody debris, canopy cover, habitat type, and presence of benthic fine organic detritus at three points along 10 transects located at approximately 10 m intervals along the 100 m stream reach, with transect length determining wetted stream width. These streams were deeply incised; therefore, wetted width generally corresponded to total width. Because we were interested in macroinvertebrate DO tolerance and CWD use in periods of greatest stress, we collected our data in August 2002 and 2003 when summer flows were low and temperatures were high, and in April 2003 and 2004 following episodic and torrential high water events from winter tropical storms and Hurricane Lili, which directly struck the Mill Creek watershed in October 2002.

Lab processing

Macroinvertebrates were identified to the lowest practical taxon, occasionally species, but more often genus under low power (15× magnification). However, members of Chironomidae, Ceratopogonidae, Tipulidae, and all Annelida were mounted on glass microscope slides with CMC-10 (Master's Chemical Company, Elk Grove, Illinois, USA) following protocols outlined by Epler (2001) and identified to the lowest practical taxon, occasionally species, but more often sub-family, under 60× magnification. A small percentage of samples were set aside for identification quality control, and remaining samples were placed in 95% ethanol for submission as vouchers to the Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station (128 RNR Building, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA).

Water samples collected for chemical analyses were stored on ice and split into carbon samples, BOD samples, and microbial samples. Carbon samples were analyzed with a Shimadzu TOC-V Combustion Analyzer (Shimadzu North America, Columbia, Maryland, USA) via Method 5310.B (American Public Health Association 1998). Laboratory procedures for 5 and 20 day BOD readings and estimation of fecal coliform and heterotrophic plate counts followed protocols of the American Public Heath Association (1998), with Millipore HC fecal coliform testing filters and media (Millipore Incorporated, Billerica, Maine, USA), and R2A media (DIFCO, BD Diagnostics, Franklin Lakes, New Jersey, USA) for HPC estimation. FC counts and HPC were made under magnification with a darkfield Quebec colony counter (Leica Microsystems, Buffalo, New York, USA).

Statistical analyses

For both studies, we calculated total abundance, taxa (genus) richness, and Shannon-Wiener diversity (H') for each experimental unit and stream sample using all taxa collected during the experiment and all taxa collected during the stream sampling. For each study, we performed backward selection analysis of covariance (AN-COVA; Stevens 2002; Dowdy et al. 2004; PROCs MIXED and REG, SAS, Version 9.0, Cary, North Carolina, USA), with a priori comparisons based on our hypotheses among CWD treatments and DO concentrations with flow, specific conductance, and temperature as covariates to enhance interpretation and account for subtle differences among enclosure and sampling locations. Additional physical and chemical parameters measured during the stream sampling were added to the ANCOVA of the stream sampling data. Variable selection by general linear test followed Agresti (1996).

Macroinvertebrate data presented a problem for analyses of specific taxa, as we identified a large number of taxa (77 in the experiment and 145 in the stream survey) and a relatively low number of individuals (7,564 in the experiment and 26,209 in the stream survey) yielding violations of the assumptions of normality and equality of variances. Therefore, to facilitate these assumptions for statistical analyses, we reduced the number of taxa for subsequent analyses to taxa found in greater than 10% of the experimental units (21 taxa in the experimental subset; Table 1) and, because we could add taxa due to a larger sample size, 1% of the stream sampling samples (54 taxa in the stream sampling subset; Table 1).

To avoid analytical artifacts that may have been the result of using multiple techniques, we chose ordination to examine relationships among taxa and explanatory variables for both studies. Following standardization to a common surface area (500 mm²), we performed canonical correlation analysis (CCorA; Gittens 1985; Stevens 2002; PROC CANCORR, SAS vers. 9.0 as above) on each subset to test the relationships between: (1) macroinvertebrate taxa and the experimental surface area treatments and DO concentrations; and (2) macroinvertebrate taxa and stream characteristics. We chose CCorA because a wide variety of data can be compared in both exploratory and predictive fashion (Leurgans et al. 1993; Johnson and Wichern 2002; Anderson and Willis 2003). Secondly, CCorA is an established technique for macroinvertebrate community analyses (e.g., Rempel et al. 2000). Finally, we believed unimodal ordination, such as canonical correspondence analysis, was inappropriate because ordination axes appeared monotonic (standard deviations less than 2; ter Braak 1995), and a large number of empty cells in our data set precluded the use of chi-square analysis (Lepš and Šmilauer 2003). Criteria for interpreting correlation significance followed Stevens (2002). Stream sampling data was split for CCorA into woody debris and benthic samples to reduce bias from the use of woody debris collection bags and a Hess sampler. Relationships among taxa and potential explanatory variables were visually displayed with correlation matrix-based, symmetric principal component biplots (Johnson and Wichern 2002; Canoco for Windows 4.5 and CanoDraw for Windows 4.12, Microcomputer Power, Ithaca, New York, USA).

Results

Field experiment

None of the covariates (Table 2) included in the ANCOVA of the experimental data were significant (all p>0.05) and thus were not used in interpretation. Interactions of stream with DO and CWD were significant in all models; therefore, we relied on our *a priori* comparisons within DO concentration and CWD treatment for interpretation. Total macroinvertebrate abundance was significantly higher in the larger CWD treatment in the Mill Creek low DO concentration enclosures compared to Six Mile high DO concentration enclosures ($F_{1,54} = 36.99, P < 0.001$) and in Mill Creek low DO concentration enclosures compared to the other Mill Creek DO concentration enclosures (low versus high $F_{1,54} = 25.48$, P < 0.001; low versus medium $F_{1.54} = 27.28$, P < 0.001). In the smaller CWD

Annelida	Trichoptera	Pedicia spp. STR
Rhychobdellida	Cheumatopsyche spp. EXP, STR	Simuliidae STR
Helobdella spp. EXP, STR	Chimarra spp. STR	Tanypodinae EXP, STR
Oligochaeta	Macrostenum spp. STR	Unidentifiable Chironomidae STR
Lumbricidae EXP, STR	Polycentropus spp. STR	Malacostraca
Insecta	Wormaldia spp. STR	Decapoda
Ephemeroptera	Coleoptera	Procambarus spp. EXP, STR
Baetidae EXP, STR	Ancyronyx spp. STR	Amphipoda
Caenis hilaris Say EXP, STR	Dubiraphia spp. EXP, STR	Crangonyx spp. EXP, STR
Leptophlebiidae STR	Ectopria spp. STR	Isopoda
Stenacron floridense EXP, STR	Gonielmis spp. STR	Lirceus spp. EXP STR
Stenacron interpunctatum Say STR	Macronychus glabratus EXP STR	Mollusca
Stenonema spp. EXP STR	Promoresia spp. STR	Bivalvia
Odonata	Stenelmis spp. EXP, STR	Corbicula fluminea EXP, STR
Argia spp. STR	Unidentifiable Coleoptera STR	Sphaeridae STR
Dromogomophus spp. STR	Unidentifiable Elmidae STR	Unionidae STR
Plecoptera	Megaloptera	Unidentifiable Pelecypoda STR
Agnetina spp. STR	Sialis spp. STR	Gastropoda
Eccopteura spp. STR	Diptera	Laevepex spp. EXP, STR
Leuctra spp. STR	Atherix spp. EXP, STR	Physidae STR
Other Leuctridae STR	<i>Bezzia</i> spp. STR	Planorbidae STR
Neoperla spp. STR	Ceratopogonidae EXP. STR	Pomacea spp. EXP, STR
Perlesta spp. STR	Chironominae EXP, STR	
Perlinella spp. STR	Corynoneura spp. EXP, STR	
Undentifiable Perlidae STR	Forcipomia spp. STR	

 Table 1
 Taxa found in greater than 10% of experimental samples ("EXP"), and taxa found in greater than 1% of stream samples ("STR") in Big Brushy, Mill, and Six Mile creeks, Louisiana, USA

treatments, Mill Creek low DO concentration enclosures yielded significantly greater total macroinvertebrate abundances than Six Mile Creek sites in DO concentration-to-DO concentration comparisons ($F_{1,54} = 29.64$, P < 0.001), and the Mill Creek low DO concentration enclosures were also higher in total macroinvertebrate abundance than the other two Mill Creek DO groups (low versus high $F_{1,54} = 39.16$, P < 0.001; low versus medium $F_{1,54} = 54.04$, P < 0.001). Taxa richness(generic level) did not depend on CWD treatment but was significantly higher in the low DO concentration enclosures in Mill Creek $(F_{1,51} = 15.5, P < 0.001; 14.1 \pm 0.58$ SE taxa per enclosure) than in the high DO concentration enclosures in Six Mile Creek $(F_{1,51} = 39.75, P < 0.001; 9.4 \pm 0.86$ SE taxa per enclosure). In DO concentration-to-DO concentration comparisons, Mill Creek (an average of 12.5 ± 0.99 SE taxa per enclosure), had significantly higher taxa richness $(F_{1,51} = 46.5, P < 0.001)$ than Six Mile Creek (mean 6.5 ± 0.78 SE taxa overall per enclosure). However, despite higher taxa richness per enclosure in Mill Creek, the overall number of taxa

Table 2	Mean	physicochemical	characteristics	$(\pm SE)$	over the	5-week	experiment	at eacl	n site	in M	ll and	l Six	Mile	creeks
---------	------	-----------------	-----------------	------------	----------	--------	------------	---------	--------	------	--------	-------	------	--------

Stream	DO Level	Flow (cm s ⁻¹)	Specific conductance (µS-cm)	Temperature (°C)	DO (mg l ⁻¹)	DO saturation (%)
Mill	High	1.5 (1.1)	85.6 (36.1)	25.2 (0.8)	3.1 (0.7)*	37
Mill	Medium	0.6(0.3)	86.7 (36.9)	25.4 (0.9)	2.8 (0.9)*	34
Mill	Low	2.6 (1.0)	31.1 (17.2)	25.3(1.0)	2.7 (0.8)*	33
Six Mile	High	21.2(1.3)	22.0 (0.4)	23.8 (0.8)	7.3 (0.08)	86
Six Mile	Medium	14.9 (1.5)	21.7 (0.5)	23.4 (0.8)	6.9 (0.03)	81
Six Mile	Low	0	17.2 (2.3)	24.6 (1.2)	3.4 (0.6)*	42

Asterisks indicate sites that would not have met Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality dissolved oxygen (DO) standards for supporting fish and wildlife

identified was similar in Six Mile Creek (57 taxa with 26 taxa restricted to Six Mile Creek) compared to Mill Creek (54 taxa with 22 taxa restricted to Mill Creek) with 33 taxa shared between the streams. Finally, Shannon-Wiener diversity was significantly higher ($F_{1,111} = 12.38$, P < 0.001) in the larger CWD treatments in the Six Mile Creek low DO concentration enclosures. Within treatment groups, diversity was higher in the Mill Creek high ($F_{1.54} = 10.72$, P=0.001) DO concentration enclosures relative to medium DO concentrations. and higher in medium $(F_{1.54} = 13.36, P < 0.001)$ than low DO concentrations. Medium $(F_{1,54} = 19.21, P < 0.001)$ and high $(F_{1,54} = 82.7, P < 0.001)$ DO concentration enclosures in Mill Creek were higher in diversity than in all three DO concentration enclosures in Six Mile Creek $(1.9\pm0.16 \text{ SE})$.

The experimental CCorA produced three significant canonical variates (82% variation; $F_{126,616.7} = 2.69$, P < 0.001), which we interpreted as a stream variate (43%; CV1), a CWD variate (25%; CV2), and a DO variate (14%; CV3), and indicated that 18 colonizing taxa (86% of 21 taxa) demonstrated substantial (r > 0.40) correlations to stream, DO, or CWD (Table 3). Of the 18 taxa, four were positively correlated with higher DO, three were positively correlated with larger CWD, and the remaining 11 were correlated with the study streams (Fig. 1).

Stream sampling

Relationships between CWD, DO, macroinvertebrates, and covariates (Table 4) in the stream sampling data differed somewhat from the experimental data (Table 5). Woody debris and benthic samples both were higher in total abundance in Mill Creek in the stream survey; however, unlike the experiment, no relationships were detected with DO or CWD and total abundance. Richness also differed from the experiment with no relationship detected for DO in the woody debris sample; however, similar to the experiment, a negative relationship was detected between DO and richness in benthic samples. Shannon-Wiener diversity was similar between the experiment and stream sampling studies for both woody debris and benthic samples regarding greater diversity in lower DO, but unlike the experiment, woody debris samples were less diverse in Big Brushy Creek, and benthic samples were more diverse in Six Mile Creek.

Analysis of macroinvertebrates found in woody debris collected during stream sampling revealed six canonical variates (66% of variation; $F_{1196,5318.2} = 1.87$, P < 0.001; Table 3), which we interpreted as a Mill Creek variate (19%; CV1), DO variate(14%; CV2), temporal variate (10%; CV3), fecal coliform and heterotrophic plate count variate (9%; CV4), Big Brushy Creek variate (8%; CV5), and a Six Mile Creek variate (7%; CV6). The CCorA of the woody debris samples revealed a similar number of taxa correlating with the study streams (12), higher DO (2), and lower DO (2; Fig. 2).

For the benthic samples, the CCorA produced eight canonical variates (74% of variation; $F_{1196,5444,5}$ =2.09, P < 0.001; Table 3), which we interpreted as a Mill Creek variate (15%; CV1), a temperature variate (14%; CV2), a temporal variate (10%; CV3), a riffle variate (9%; CV4), a Six Mile variate (8%; CV5), a total nitrogen variate (6%; CV6), a fecal coliform count variate (6%; CV7), and a heterotrophic plate count variate (5%; CV8). Ten taxa demonstrated correlations with the study streams, and although no taxa were correlated with DO or CWD, correlations were evident between specific macroinvertebrates and time of year (4 taxa), heterotrophic plate count (2 taxa), fecal conform count (3 taxa), and temperature (1 taxon).

Discussion

Field experiment

Results of the experiment revealed complex interactions among CWD, DO, and stream influences on macroinvertebrate distributions. Generally, macroinvertebrate colonization patterns did not support our hypothesis regarding woody debris size. Although *Atherix* spp. (Athericidae: Diptera) and *Corynoneura* spp. (Chironomidae: Diptera) were more abundant in larger CWD (Table 3; Figs. 1 and 2), overall species richness, and Shannon–Wiener diversity were not related

trata Experiment Experiment Careris hildris Mill Creek (CV1) Temporal (CV3) Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) <i>Consummars</i> sp. Mill Creek (CV1) Temporal (CV3) Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) <i>Consummars</i> sp. Mill Creek (CV1) Temporal (CV3) None None None <i>Consummars</i> sp. Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) None		Dynaminant	Danthia complee	Wood samples
Carris hilaris Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) <th>dXd</th> <th>схреннісні</th> <th>Denuine samples</th> <th></th>	dXd	схреннісні	Denuine samples	
Crangoyx spp. Mill Creek (CV1) Temporal (CV3) Mill Creek (CV1) Lircuss spp. Mill Creek (CV1) Lareverset (CV1) None Low DO (CV2), Tem Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Lircuss (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Lavvepras spp. Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Debringhia spp. Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Dubringhia spp. Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Dubringhia spp. Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1)	aenis hilaris	Mill Creek (CV1)	Mill Creek (CV1)	Mill Creek (CV1); Temporal (CV3)
Lireeus spp. Mill Creek (CV1) Large CWD (CV2) None None Low DO (CV2) HPE (CV1) HI Corynoneura spp. Mill Creek (CV1) High DO (CV2) None Mill Creek (CV1) H Corynoneura spp. Mill Creek (CV1) High DO (CV3) None Mill Creek (CV1) H Tanypodinae Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Tanypodinae Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Laevopras spp. Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Corbinaphia spp. Mill Creek (CV1) None Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) Dubinaphia spp. Mill Creek (CV1) None None None Mill Creek (CV1) Seconoma spp. Mill Creek (CV1) None None None None Seconoma spp. Mill Creek (CV1) None None None None <t< td=""><td>rangovy spb.</td><td>Mill Creek (CV1)</td><td>Temporal (CV3)</td><td>Mill Creek (CV1)</td></t<>	rangovy spb.	Mill Creek (CV1)	Temporal (CV3)	Mill Creek (CV1)
Corynometra sp.Mill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV2)NoneLow DO (CV2); TemMacronychus glabratusMill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV3)NoneLow DO (CV2); Not BMarconychus glabratusMill Creek (CV1)NoneLow DO (CV2); Not BTanypodinaeMill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)Stenacon floridenseMill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1)Stenacon floridenseMill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1)Larevpex spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneLarevpex spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneDubingohia spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneMill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneStantidaeMill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneMill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneStantidaeNoneNoneNoneStantidaeNoneNoneNoneMill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneStantidaeNoneNoneNoneStantidaeNoneNoneNoneStantidaeNoneNoneNoneStantidaeNoneNoneNoneStantidaeNoneNoneNoneSta	irceus spp.	Mill Creek (CV1)	Not Six Mile Creek (CV6)	None
MacronychusMill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV3)NoneMill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV3)NoneTanypodinaeMill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)TanypodiaeMill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1)Stenacron floaterseMill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1)Stenacron floaterseMill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1)CaratopogonidaeMill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1)CaratopogonidaeMill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1)Corbicula spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneDubraphia spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneMill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneMill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneStantasp.NoneNoneNoneStantasp.NoneNoneNoneMill Creek (orvnoneura spb.	Mill Creek (CVI): Large CWD (CV2)	None	Low DO (CV2): Temporal (CV3)
Tarypodinae Mill Creek (CV1) Tarypodinae Mill Creek (CV1) Lumbricidae Mill Creek (CV1) Lumbricidae Mill Creek (CV1) Lumverex spp. Mill Creek (CV1) Larvepex spp. Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) None Larvepex spp. Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) None Hebelda spp. Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) None Hebelda spp. Mill Creek (CV1) Mill Creek (CV1) None Maenia spp. None Mill Creek (CV1) None Maenia spp. None Maenia spp. None Maenia spp. None Maenia spp. None	dacronychus glabratus	Mill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV3)	None	Mill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV2);
TanypodinaeMill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1)LawpricialeMill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1)NoneLawprex spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneFC (CV4); Not Six MLawprex spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneFC (CV4); Not Six MLawprex spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneFC (CV4); Not Six MHelobdella spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneFC (CV4); NoneHelobdella spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneFC (CV4); NoneHelobdella spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneHelobdella spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneHelobdella spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneHelobdella spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneHelobdella spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneMill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneStenorena spp.Mill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV2)NoneNoneStenorena spp.Mill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV2)NoneNoneStenorena spp.Mill Creek (CV1); Mill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV2)NoneNoneStenorena spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneStenorena spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneStenorena spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneStenorena spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneStenorena spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneStenorena spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneStenorena spp.NoneNone <t< td=""><td>)</td><td></td><td></td><td>HPC (CV4); Not Big Brushy (CV5)</td></t<>)			HPC (CV4); Not Big Brushy (CV5)
Stenacron floridenseMill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)LuLaeropex spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1)EC (CV4); Not SixLaeropogonidaeMill Creek (CV1)NoneFC (CV4); Not SixLaeropogonidaeMill Creek (CV1)NoneFC (CV4); Not SixMill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1)Corbicula spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneCorbicula spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneDubraphia spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneStenorena spp.Mill Creek (CV1); Large CV1); TeNoneNoneStenorena spp.Mill Creek (CV1); Large CV1); Large CV1); TeNoneNoneStenorena spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneStenorena spp.None </td <td>anypodinae</td> <td>Mill Creek (CV1)</td> <td>None</td> <td>Mill Creek (CV1)</td>	anypodinae	Mill Creek (CV1)	None	Mill Creek (CV1)
LumbricidaeMill Creek (CV1)NoneFC (CV4); Not Six MLaevepex spp.Mill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1); LoNoneFC (CV4); Not Six MLaevepex spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneFC (CV4); Not Six MNoneCorbicula spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneFC (CV4); Not Six MMill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneCorbicula spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneCorbicula spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneMill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneNoneMill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneNoneMerix spp.Mill Creek (CV1); Large CWD (CV3)NoneNoneMenix spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneMill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneNoneMill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneNoneBactidae-unidentifiedHigh DO (CV2)NoneNoneSialls spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneSialls spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneBezzia spp.Not includedNoneNoneNonePresca spp.Not includedNoneNoneNoneBezzia spp.Not includedNoneNoneNonePresca spp.Not includedNoneNoneNonePresca spp.Not includedNoneNoneNonePresca spp.Not includedNoneNonePresca	tenacron floridense	Mill Creek (CV1)	Mill Creek (CV1)	Mill Creek (CV1)
Laevepex spp.Mill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)NoneHelobalda spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneMill Creek (CV1)NoneCorbicala spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneMill Creek (CV1)Poinacca spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneCorbicala spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNonePoinacca spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneDubiraphia spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneStenonema spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneAtherix spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneStenonema spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneAtherix spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneAtherix spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneSialis spp.Not includedNoneNoneNoneChironomidaeNot includedNoneNoneNonePoincama spp.Not includedNoneNoneNonePoinca spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneStatis spp.Not includedNoneNoneNonePoincandaeNoneNoneNoneNoneStatis spp.Not includedNoneNoneNonePoinca spp.Not includedNoneNonePoincek (CV1)Poinca spp.Not includedNoneNoneNone <trr>Poinca spp.<!--</td--><td>umbricidae</td><td>Mill Creek (CV1)</td><td>None</td><td>FC (CV4), Not Six Mile Creek (CV6)</td></trr>	umbricidae	Mill Creek (CV1)	None	FC (CV4), Not Six Mile Creek (CV6)
CeratopogonidaeMill Creek (CV1)Low FC (CV4)NoneHelobdella spp.Mill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)HPC (CV4); Not SixHelobdella spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1); TePonucca spp.Mill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV3)NoneNoneDubiraphia spp.Mill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV3)NoneNoneNoneMill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV3)NoneNoneStenorena spp.Mill Creek (CV1); Large CWD (CV3)NoneNoneStenorena spp.Mill Creek (CV1); Large CWD (CV3)NoneNoneStenetnis spp.Mill Creek (CV1); Large CWD (CV3)NoneNoneStenetnis spp.NoneNoneNoneStenetnis spp.NoneNoneNoneStenetnis spp.Not includedNoneNoneStenetnis spp.Not includedNot includedNoneBezzia spp.Not includedNot includedNonePerlesta spp.Not includedNoneNonePerlesta spp.Not includedNoneNonePerlesta spp.Not includedNoneNonePerlesta spp.NoneNoneNonePerlesta spp.NoneNoneNonePerlesta spp.NoneNoneNonePerlesta spp.Not includedNoneNonePerlesta spp.Not includedNoneNonePerlesta spp.Not includedNoneNonePerlesta spp.NoneNoneNonePerl	aevepex spp.	Mill Creek (CV1)	Mill Creek (CV1)	Mill Creek (CV1); Low DO (CV2)
Helobdella sp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1) $Corbicula spp.Mill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1)HPC (CV4); Not SixPomacea spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1); TeDubiraphia spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneDubiraphia spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneDubiraphia spp.Mill Creek (CV1); Large CWD (CV3)NoneNoneDubiraphia spp.Six Mile Creek (CV1); Large CWD (CV3)NoneNoneStenomena spp.Six Mile Creek (CV1); Large CWD (CV3)NoneNoneStenomena spp.Six Mile Creek (CV1); Large CWD (CV3)NoneNoneStenomena spp.NoneNoneNoneStenomena spp.NoneNoneNoneStenomena spp.NoneNoneNoneStenomena spp.NoneNoneNoneStenomena spp.NoneNoneNoneStenomena spp.Not includedSix Mile Creek (CV1)NoneStenomena spp.Not includedNoneNoneStrata spp.Not includedNoneNonePerlesta spp.Not includedNoneNonePerlesta spp.NoneNoneNonePerlesta spp.NoneNoneNonePerlesta spp.NoneNoneNonePerlesta spp.NoneNoneNonePortinatra spp.NoneNoneNonePortinatra spp.NoneNoneNonePortinatra spp.$	teratopogonidae	Mill Creek (CV1)	Low FC (CV4)	None
Corbicula spp.Mill Creek (CV1)Mill Creek (CV1); TePomacea spp.Mill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV3)NoneMill Creek (CV1); TeDubiraphia spp.Mill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV3)NoneNoneDubiraphia spp.Mill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV3)NoneNoneStenonema spp.Mill Creek (CV1); Large CWD (CV3)NoneNoneStenonema spp.Nill Creek (CV1); Large CWD (CV3)NoneNoneStenonema spp.NoneNoneNoneStenonema spp.NoneNoneNoneStenonema spp.NoneNoneNoneStenonema spp.NoneNoneNoneStenelmis spp.NoneNoneNoneStatis spp.Not includedSix Mile Creek (CV1)NoneBezzia spp.Not includedNot Six Mile Creek (CV1)NonePresta spp.Not includedNoneNoneNonePresta spp.NoneNoneNoneFC (CV4) Six Mile Creek (CV1)Ancyronyx spp.Not includedNoneNoneFC (CV4) Six Mile Creek (CV1)Ancyronyx spp.NoneNoneNoneFC (CV4) Six Mile Creek (CV1)Ancyronyx spp.NoneNoneNoneFC (CV4) Six Mile Creek (CV1)Ancyronyx spp.NoneNoneFC (CV4) Six Mile Creek	lelobdella spp.	Mill Creek (CV1)	None	Mill Creek (CV1)
Pomacea spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneMill Creek (CV1); TeDubiraphia spp.Mill Creek (CV1)High DO (CV3)NoneMill Creek (CV1); TeStenonema spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneStenonema spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneStenonema spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneStenonema spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneStendenzi spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneStendenzi spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneStendenzi spp.Not includedNoneNoneNoneStendenzi spp.Not includedNoneNoneNoneStatis spp.Not includedNot Six Mile Creek (CV1)NoneNoneBezzia spp.Not includedNot Six Mile Creek (CV6)NoneNonePertexta spp.Not includedNoneNoneHigh DO (CV2); TenAncyronyx spp.NoneNoneNoneHigh	orbicula spp.	Mill Creek (CV1)	Mill Creek (CV1)	HPC (CV4); Not Six Mile Creek (CV6)
Dubiraphia spp.Mill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV3)NoneNoneNoneStenonema spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneNoneStenonema spp.Mill Creek (CV1); Large CWD (CV3)NoneNoneNoneBaetidae-unidentifiedHigh DO (CV2)NoneNoneNoneStenelmis spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneStenelmis spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneStenelmis spp.Not includedNoneNoneNoneStatis spp.Not includedNot includedNot Six Mile Creek (CV1); HiBezzia spp.Not includedNot Six Mile Creek (CV1)NoneBezzia spp.Not includedNot Six Mile Creek (CV6)NonePerlexta spp.Not includedNoneNoneHigh DO (CV2); TenAncyronyx spp.NoneNoneNoneHigh DO (CV2); TenIllidae -unidentifiedNot includedNoneNoneFC (CV4); Six Mile Creek (CV6)Ancyronyx spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneAncyronyx spp.NoneNoneNoneFC (CV4); Six Mile Creek (CV6)Unidarae -unidentifiedNoneNoneNoneNoneUnidationNoneNoneNoneNoneUnidationNoneNoneNoneNoneUnidationNoneNoneNoneNoneUnidationNoneNoneNoneNoneUnidationNoneNoneNoneNoneUnidationNoneNone	omacea spp.	Mill Creek (CV1)	None	Mill Creek (CV1); Temporal (CV3)
Stenonema spp.Mill Creek (CV1)NoneNoneAtherix spp.Six Mile Creek (CV1); Large CWD (CV3)NoneSix Mile Creek (CV6)Baetidae—unidentifiedHigh DO (CV2)NoneNoneStenelmis spp.NoneNoneNoneStenelmis spp.NoneNoneNoneStenelmis spp.Not includedNoneNoneStenelmis spp.Not includedNoneNoneStenelmis spp.Not includedSix Mile Creek (CV1)Not Six Mile Creek (CV1); HiDezzia spp.Not includedNot includedNoneNonePerlesta spp.Not includedNot Six Mile Creek (CV6)NoneAncyronyx spp.Not includedNoneHigh DO (CV2); TenAncyronyx spp.Not includedNoneHigh DO (CV2); TenAncyronyx spp.NoneNoneFC (CV4); Six Mile Creek (CV6)UnionariaNoneNoneSix Mile Creek (CV6)Ancyronyx spp.NoneNoneFC (CV4); Six Mile Creek (CV6)UnionariaNoneNoneNoneHigh Do (CV2); TenNoneNoneUnionariaNone<	Jubiraphia spp.	Mill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV3)	None	None
Atherix spp.Six Mile Creek (CV1); Large CWD (CV3)NoneSix Mile Creek (CV6)Baetidae—unidentifiedHigh DO (CV2)NoneNoneNoneStenelmis spp.NoneNoneNoneNoneStenelmis spp.Not includedSix Mile Creek (CV1); HiNot Six Mile Creek (CV1); HiSialis spp.Not includedSix Mile Creek (CV1)Not Six Mile Creek (CV1); HiBezzia spp.Not includedNot six Mile Creek (CV1)NoneBezzia spp.Not includedNot six Mile Creek (CV1)NonePerlesta spp.Not includedNoneNoneAncyronyx spp.Not includedNoneHigh DO (CV2); TenAncyronyx spp.Not includedNoneHigh DO (CV2); TenIllidae —unidentifiedNot includedNoneFC (CV4); Six Mile Creek (CV6)Uniarra = unidentifiedNot includedNoneSix Mile Creek (CV6)Uniarra app.NoneNoneNoneNoneNoneNoneNot six Mile Creek (CV6)NoneNoneNoneNoneNoneNoneNoneNot six Mile Creek (CV6)	tenonema spp.	Mill Creek (CV1)	None	None
Baetidae—unidentifiedHigh DO (CV2)NoneNoneStenelmis spp.High DO (CV2)NoneMill Creek (CV1); HiStatis spp.Not includedSix Mile Creek (CV1)Not Six Mile Creek (CV1);Statis spp.Not includedSix Mile Creek (CV1)NoneBezzia spp.Not includedSix Mile Creek (CV6)NonePerlesta spp.Not includedNot six Mile Creek (CV6)NoneAncyronyx spp.Not includedNoneHigh DO (CV2); TenAncyronyx spp.Not includedNoneFC (CV4) Six Mile Creek (CV6)Chinarra spp.Not includedNoneFC (CV4) Six Mile Creek (CV6)Unionara spp.Not includedNoneFC (CV4) Six Mile Creek (CV6)Unionara spp.Not includedNoneFC (CV4) Six Mile Creek (CV6)	therix spp.	Six Mile Creek (CV1); Large CWD (CV3)	None	Six Mile Creek (CV6)
Stenelmis spp.High DO (CV2)NoneMill Creek (CV1); HiSialis spp.Not includedNot six Mile Creek (CV1)Not Six Mile Creek (CV1)Bezzia spp.Not includedSix Mile Creek (CV6)NoneBezzia spp.Not includedNot Six Mile Creek (CV6)NonePerlesta spp.Not includedNot Six Mile Creek (CV6)NoneAncyronyx spp.Not includedNoneHigh DO (CV2); TenElmidae—unidentifiedNot includedNoneFC (CV4) Six Mile Creek (CV6)Universa spp.Not includedNoneSix Mile Creek (CV6)	aetidae—unidentified	High DO (CV2)	None	None
Sialis spp.Not includedMill Creek (CV1)Not Six Mile Creek (CBezzia spp.Not includedSix Mile Creek (CV6)NoneChironomidaeNot includedNot Six Mile Creek (CV6)NonePerlesta spp.Not includedNot Six Mile Creek (CV6)NoneAncyronyx spp.Not includedNoneHigh DO (CV2); TenElmidae-unidentifiedNot includedNoneFC (CV4) Six Mile Creek (CV6)Chimara spp.Not includedNoneFC (CV4) Six Mile Creek (CV6)Unionara spp.Not includedNoneFC (CV4) Six Mile Creek (CV6)Unionara spp.Not includedNoneFC (CV4) Six Mile Creek (CV6)	tenelmis spp.	High DO (CV2)	None	Mill Creek (CV1); High DO (CV2)
Bezzia spp. Not included Six Mile Creek (CV6) None Chironomidae Not six Mile Creek (CV6) None Chironomidae Not included Not Six Mile Creek (CV6) None Perlesta spp. Not included None High DO (CV2); Ten Ancyronyx spp. Not included None High DO (CV2); Ten Elmidae-unidentified Not included None FC (CV4); Six Mile Creek (CV6) Universe spp. Not included None FC (CV4); Six Mile Creek (CV6)	ialis spp.	Not included	Mill Creek (CV1)	Not Six Mile Creek (CV6)
ChironomidaeNot includedNot Six Mile Creek (CV6)NonePerlexta spp.Not includedNoneHigh DO (CV2); TenAncyronyx spp.Not includedNoneHigh DO (CV2); TenElmidae—unidentifiedNot includedNoneFC (CV4); Six Mile Creek (CV6)Chimarra spp.Not includedNoneFC (CV4); Six Mile Creek (CV6)Unionaria spp.Not includedNoneSix Mile Creek (CV6)	lezzia spp.	Not included	Six Mile Creek (CV6)	None
Perlexa spp.Not includedNoneMill Creek (CV1)Ancyronyx spp.Not includedNoneHigh DO (CV2); TenElmidae—unidentifiedNot includedNoneFC (CV4); Six Mile CChimara spp.Not includedNoneSix Mile Creek (CV6)UniversitiendNot includedNoneNoneUniversitiendNot includedNone <td>[hironomidae]</td> <td>Not included</td> <td>Not Six Mile Creek (CV6)</td> <td>None</td>	[hironomidae]	Not included	Not Six Mile Creek (CV6)	None
Ancyronyx spp.Not includedNoneHigh DO (CV2); TenElmidae—unidentifiedNot includedFC (CV4); Six Mile CChimarra spp.NoneSix Mile Creek (CV6)UnisoridaeNone <t< td=""><td>erlesta spp.</td><td>Not included</td><td>None</td><td>Mill Creek (CV1)</td></t<>	erlesta spp.	Not included	None	Mill Creek (CV1)
Elmidae—unidentified Not included Not included None FC (CV4); Six Mile C Chimara spp. None Six Mile Creek (CV6) Universition unidentified Not included Not six Mile Creek (CV6)	<i>incyronyx</i> spp.	Not included	None	High DO (CV2); Temporal (CV3)
Chimarra spp. Not included Not included Not included Note Six Mile Creek (CV6)	lmidae—unidentified	Not included	None	FC (CV4); Six Mile Creek (CV6)
Iluionidoa midantifad - Nat indudad - Nata Craab (himarra spp.	Not included	None	Six Mile Creek (CV6)
	Jnionidae—unidentified	Not included	None	Not Six Mile Creek (CV6)

102



Fig. 1 Ordination of the experimental data with a principal component biplot demonstrated a stronger association of taxa to the streams than to dissolved oxygen (DO) or woody debris surface area (CWD). Triangles represent the scores of individual taxa. Arrows indicate explanatory variables. DO concentration is represented as, "high," "medium," and, "low." CWD treatment is represented as, "control," "large," and, "small"

to debris size (Table 5). The importance of CWD as macroinvertebrate habitat varies among taxa ecosystems (e.g., Northwestern and USA: Anderson et al. 1978; Southeastern USA: Rinella and Feminella 2005), and studies have reported greater macroinvertebrate abundance on larger, more complex CWD (O'Conner 1991), and on smaller, less complex CWD (Mathooko and Otieno 2002). Although larger CWD would appear to provide greater opportunities for xylophagy, epixylic grazing, and predatory cover for macroinvertebrates (O'Conner 1991), the usefulness of CWD habitat for many taxa in Mill and Six Mile creeks appears not to be based solely on available surface area; rather, similar to Rinella (2002), colonization appeared to be a response to the introduction of hard substrates.

Although colonization patterns of several taxa supported our hypothesis that macroinvertebrates would be most abundant and diverse at higher DO levels regardless of woody debris size, abundances of a larger number of taxa suggest that this prediction was not correct for the assemblages as a whole. We selected our study sites based on appreciable measured differences in DO within each stream. However, during our experimental time period, DO differences did not establish themselves as substantially as we anticipated. Regardless, we did detect some relationships with DO. Total macroinvertebrate abundances in both treatment groups were higher in lower DO within Mill Creek, and higher in the generally lower DO Mill Creek compared to Six Mile Creek. Taxa richness was greatest at the lowest DO enclosures in each creek, and the lower DO stream, Mill Creek, yielded higher mean numbers of taxa per enclosure than Six Mile Creek. However, Shannon-Wiener diversity was higher in higher DO enclosures within Mill Creek and in comparisons between streams. However, when we examined correlations between specific taxa with DO and CWD, we found few taxa correlating directly with CWD or DO. Instead, of the most common taxa found in the experiment, 18 of 21 taxa were more strongly correlated with the study streams rather than DO or CWD (Table 3; Fig. 1). Interestingly, a majority (11 of 18) of the positive correlations detected were with the typically lower DO, but higher CWD stream, Mill Creek. Most of the other organisms included in the CCorA are considered somewhat to very tolerant of reduced water quality (Barbour et al. 1999); although Mill Creek is not substantially impacted by anthropogenic sources of pollution, it is an oxygen-depressed system due to high organic enrichment and elevated microbial populations from feral and domestic animal activity within the watershed (Kaller and Kelso 2003). Potentially, organic enrichment enhanced the macroinvertebrate assemblage in Mill Creek. However, we do not believe the nutrient enrichment was a positive factor because the organic enrichment, as evidenced by higher BOD and DOC levels (Table 3), was a result of pig activity, which was detrimental to some macroinvertebrates (Kaller and Kelso 2006). These environmentally tolerant organisms, relative to their abundances in a high dissolved oxygen stream, appear to be thriving despite the low DO conditions in Mill Creek.

Most research into the relationships between DO levels and macroinvertebrate community structure has focused on lethal and sub-lethal tolerances (e.g., Nebecker et al. 1992; Connolly et al. 2004) and the relationships between macroinvertebrates and environmental characteristics

Table 4 creeks	The addition of	Big Brushy Creek ((BB) provided measurements	of potential explar	ıatory variables ^a ir	ntermediate between S	six Mile (Six) ar	d Mill (Mill)
Stream	DO (mg l ⁻¹)	Temperature (°C)	Specific conductance (μs^{-1})	BOD (mg l ⁻¹)	TOC (mg l ⁻¹)	IC (mg l ⁻¹)	DOC (mg l ⁻¹)	TN (mg l^{-1})
Six	7.82 (0.06)	20.0 (0.24)	19.1 (0.13)	3.78 (0.04)	8.80 (0.13)	0.88 (0.003) 1 20 (0.008)	8.36 (0.12)	0.36 (0.004)
IliM	2.69(0.08)	20.7 (0.26)	27.1 (0.20) 124.3 (6.10)	10.67 (0.08)	14.67 (0.11)	12.93 (0.30)	13.45 (0.14)	(200.0) (0.017) (0.017)
Stream	FC (# 100 ml ⁻¹)	HPC (# 1 ml ⁻¹)	$\frac{\text{Discharge}}{(\text{m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1})}$	CWD (# sampling point ⁻¹)	Wood Volume (m ³ transect ⁻¹)	Wood Surface Area (m ² transect ⁻¹)	Gradient (m k	m ⁻¹)
Six	83.3 (5.7)	7,182.0 (780.9)	0.15(0.01)	1.1(0.1)	89.8 (28.9)	80.2 (15.8)	1.1	
BB	433.4 (51.2)	12,659.8 (1.195.6)	0.10(0.01)	0.3(0.1)	949.9 (410.8)	332.5 (118.7)	0.9	
Mill	365.6 (32.8)	32,266.8 (4,064.5)	0.06(0.01)	1.4(0.1)	5,082.3 (3,036.3)	860.6 (412.3)	0.6	
Mean vi (1942) a	alues over the cound the det al.	rse of stream sampli (1952)	ing, 2002–2004, are listed belo	w with standard er	rors in parentheses	S. Gradient values from	n geological surv	eys of Welch
^a "DO" =	= dissolved oxyge total nitrogen. ''I	n, ''BOD'' = bioche FC'' = fecal coliform	smical oxygen demand, "TOC n, "HPC" = heterotrophic pla	The second and the second of the second and the sec	arbon. ''IC'' = ino D'' = coarse wood	rganic carbon, "DOC' ly debris	" = dissolved or	ganic carbon,

Springer

at the collection locations (e.g., Ruse 1996). Connolly et al. (2004) reported that DO concentrations under 10% (1.0 mg l^{-1}) saturation were lethal to all insects, and they suggested DO concentrations of 25–35% (2.5–3.3 mg l^{-1}) and 10– 20% (1.0–2.0 mg l^{-1}) saturation could have detrimental effects on emergence and survival, respectively, over long periods of time. In this study, DO saturation levels in Mill Creek ranged from 33–37% (2.7–3.1 mg l^{-1}), with much lower values, down to 11% (0.78 mg l^{-1}), recorded from field observations from 2002 to 2004 (Michael D. Kaller, unpublished data), indicating a high tolerance of resident macroinvertebrates to seasonally hypoxic conditions. Leeches (Sawyer 1974) and gastropods (Harman 1974) are often abundant under low DO conditions, and, although generally less tolerant as a group, certain aquatic insects can tolerate DO levels below 5 ppm [51 of 300 taxa listed in Roback (1974)] and even 3 ppm (11 of those 51 taxa) for extended periods of time. We found 22 of 77 macroinvertebrate taxa exclusively in low DO sites $(2.7-3.1 \text{ mg l}^{-1})$ and 26 of 77 taxa exclusively in high DO sites (all above 3.5 mg l^{-1}), and we believe that observed colonization patterns during the experiment ultimately reflected the DO sensitivity of the underlying populations in these streams.

The taxonomic composition of the macroinvertebrate assemblages in Mill Creek supports previous studies of DO tolerance among macroinvertebrate taxa. For example, philopotamids (Trichoptera), which have been reported to inhabit waters exhibiting DO levels of at least 6 mg l^{-1} (Roback 1974) and greater than 0.87 mg l^{-1} (8% saturation; Connolly et al. 2004), were not found at DO levels below 3.5 mg l^{-1} (42% saturation), which occurred only in Mill Creek. Twenty six taxa were only found in high DO sites in Six Mile Creek, also suggesting intolerance to hypoxia. However, the most abundant taxa exhibited few statistical differences in abundance among DO concentrations, which is evidence of substantial tolerance to reduced DO concentrations. Davis et al. (2003) also reported few differences between macroinvertebrate assemblages inhabiting reference and lower DO in agriculturally impacted sites, which they attributed to natural fluctuations in water quality

Metric	Experiment results	Sampling results-wood	Sampling results—benthic
Total abundance	Greater in Mill Creek; greater in low DO; greater in larger CWD	Greater in Mill Creek ($F_{2,325}$ =13.51, $P < 0.001$); greater in lower DOC* ($F_{1,325}$ =4.85, P =0.03	Greater in Mill Creek $(F_{2,325}=13.51, P < 0.001);$ greater in higher SPC* $(F_{1,325}=12.85, P < 0.001);$ greater in higher HPC* $(F_{1,325}=18.17, P < 0.001);$ greater in higher BOD* $(F_{1,325}=6.73, P=0.01);$ greater in higher DOC* $(F_{1,325}=4.52, P=0.03);$ greater in higher TOC* $(F_{1,325}=6.42, P=0.01);$ greater in lower discharge* $(F_{1,325}=4.87, P=0.03)$
Generic level richness	Greater in Mill Creek; greater in low DO	Greater in Mill Creek ($F_{2,325}$ =15.44, $P < 0.001$); greater in higher DOC* ($F_{1,325}$ =15.26, P =0.002)	Lesser in Big Brushy Creek $(F_{2,325}=6.53, P=0.003);$ greater in lower DO $(F_{1,325}=4.90, P=0.03);$ greater in higher HPC* $(F_{1,325}=12.43, P<0.001);$ greater in lower BOD* $(F_{1,325}=21.05, P<0.001);$ greater in higher DOC* $(F_{1,325}=20.17, P<0.001);$ greater in lower TOC* $(F_{1,325}=8.66, P=0.004)$
Shannon–Wiener diversity	Greater in Mill Creek; greater in low DO	Lower in Big Brushy Creek $(F_{2,325}=15.26, P < 0.001);$ greater in lower DO $(F_{1.325}=5.67, P=0.02);$ greater in higher DOC* $F_{1,325}=15.84, P < 0.001);$ greater in lower TOC* $(F_{1,325}=4.02, P=0.04)$	Greater in Six Mile Creek $(F_{2,325}=7.42, P < 0.001);$ greater with time* $(F_{1,325}=8.36, P=0.005);$ greater in lower DO $(F_{1,325}=10.31, P=0.002);$ greater in higher HPC* $(F_{1,325}=9.02, P=0.004);$ greater in lower BOD* $(F_{1,325}=24.38, P < 0.001);$ greater in higher DOC* $(F_{1,325}=26.75, P < 0.001);$ greater in lower TOC* $(F_{1,325}=13.88, P=0.004)$

Table 5 Relationships among CWD, DO, and macroinvertebrates^a differed somewhat between the stream sampling study and the experiment, with fewer relationships to DO and no relationships with CWD

P < 0.05 used to retain variables and co-variables (*)

^a"DO" = Dissolved oxygen, "CWD" = woody debris treatment, "DOC" dissolved organic carbon, "TOC" = total organic carbon, "SPC" = specific conductance, "HPC" = heterotrophic plate count, and "BOD" = biochemical oxygen demand

that selected for high macroinvertebrate tolerance of reduced water quality during low flow periods.

Particularly interesting were the 22 taxa exclusive to Mill Creek, which included 12 insects, five gastropods, three pelecypods (including *Corbicula fluminea*), and two crustaceans. In lotic systems, many of these taxa have been reported

to be relatively intolerant of hypoxia, including *C. fluminea* (Johnson and McMahon 1998; Saloom and Duncan 2005); *Dubiraphia* spp. (Elmidae; Coleoptera; Sinclair 1964; Barbour et al. 1999); and gastropods in the families Ancyclidae, Planorbidae, and Physidae (Ellis 1931; Smith 2001). However, our data suggest that these general statements of DO sensitivity may be too

simplified, particularly in low-energy, coastal streams. Assemblages in these streams may include numerous lentic-associated taxa, such as *Dubiraphia* spp. (Sinclair 1964) and *Pyganodon* grandis (Chen et al. 2001),that may be able to regulate internal oxygen levels and exploit the typically low flow conditions characteristic of Mill Creek. However, Mill Creek still supports many taxa, such as *Caenis hilaris* (Caenidae: Ephemeroptera) (Berner and Pescador 1988) and *Cheumatopsyche* spp. (Wiggins 1998), which are characteristic of lotic systems.

Stream sampling

Stream sampling data generally corroborated the experimental results. Both woody debris and benthic samples were similar to the experimental data, with higher total abundance, richness, and diversity in lower DO sites. Analyses of the stream sampling data also did not uncover detectable relationships between total abundance, richness, or diversity with CWD. Further, the CCorA on individual taxa also suggested generalist strategies similar to those indicated by the experiment. In the southern U.S., a wide variety of stream habitats and physicochemical characteristics offers the potential for a high diversity of aquatic macroinvertebrates (Lydeard and Mayden 1995; Cushing and Allen 2001). Indeed, collecting 145 taxa appears to support this contention. However, many taxa (91) were uncommon, and a large number of taxa, as well as large proportions of sample taxonomic richness were not shared among wood and benthic habitats, suggesting some limitations in the applicability of the experimental data to all stream taxa. Further, it was difficult to identify environmental parameters that contributed to macroinvertebrate community structure of the remaining 54 taxa despite numerous differences in habitat and physicochemistry among sampling sites. Surprisingly, considering the dissimilarities among streams, only 26 taxa, which included all 18 experimental taxa whose abundance was



Benthic samples



Fig. 2 Ordination of the woody debris and benthic stream sampling data with a principal component biplot demonstrated the strong influence of stream on the data and highlighted association between environmental characteristics and taxa with streams. Explanatory variables, dissolved oxygen (DO), heterotrophic plate count (HPC), fecal coliform (FC), benthic organic matter

(FOD), total nitrogen (TN), total carbon (TC), total organic carbon (TOC), dissolved organic carbon (DOC), and inorganic carbon (IC), are represented by arrows. Triangles represent scores for individual taxa. For clarity, labels of some taxa and variables, which were clustered in the center of the plot, were omitted

significantly related to stream, DO, or CWD, demonstrated notable correlations with stream characteristics, including DO and CWD.

The differences between responses of macroinvertebrates in the experiment and stream sampling may also have been due to Hurricane Lili. Comparisons of habitat and macroinvertebrate assemblages before and after the storm illustrate few lasting effects, as evidenced by the lack of association with sampling date, which includes data before and after the storm (Fig. 2). Therefore, despite the temptation to attribute stream sampling assemblage response differences to the hurricane, we believe the effects of the hurricane were transitory and had little influence on macroinvertebrate response in our study.

Tolerance and evolution

We believe the results of our study indicate that macroinvertebrate communities in these streams are composed of a high proportion of habitat and water quality (specifically DO) generalists as a result of habitat instability, and that selection for generalist macroinvertebrate communities occurred historically during development of the Gulf coast region. Macroinvertebrates have been shown to be functionally plastic with regard to food source (Dangles 2002) and phenotypic response to environmental risks (Peckarsky et al. 2005), and can exhibit increased diversity in unstable habitats (Death and Winterbourn 1995). Similarly, Johnson and Kennedy (2003) and Williams et al. (2005) reported few strong habitatmacroinvertebrate relationships in Gulf streams, and suggested the most numerous macroinvertebrates, and hence most influential in analyses, may be generalists in these systems. Adams et al. (2004) suggested that continual habitat fluctuations kept coastal plain stream fishes in 'colonizing assemblages.' Presumably, because fish and stream macroinvertebrates share distribution restrictions, habitat flux may also be selecting for particular generalist/colonizing macroinvertebrate communities that are responding to seasonal variation in flow, habitat structure, and water quality.

Macroinvertebrates have been reliable ecological indicators of many types of perturbation (e.g., Waters 1995; Hartman et al. 2005), even with some seasonal influences (e.g., Kaller and Hartman, 2004). Our difficulty in detecting relationships between macroinvertebrates and stream characteristics may reflect prior selection of macroinvertebrates in this region by evolutionary processes, Mathooko and Otieno (2002) and Johnson and Kennedy (2003) suggested that invertebrate colonization of woody debris may be taxon-specific and related to evolutionary history in streams that exhibited little evidence of historic woody debris accumulation. Substantial evidence suggests plants (Rebertus et al. 1993; Glitzenstein et al. 1995), terrestrial insects (Noonan 1988), and fishes (Mayden 1985, 1988; Connor and Suttkus 1986) in the southeastern United States evolved in highly stochastic ecosystems with a dynamic landscape in a mosaic of successional stages from fire and Weather-related disturbances, glacial isolation events, fluctuating sea levels, and the wandering delta of the Mississippi River. By analogy, macroinvertebrates may have evolved a generalist response to habitat and water quality because of constant disturbances in these relatively new environments [see Bink (1957), Stewart et al. (1976), and Barr and Chapin (1981)] for hypothesized colonization patterns]. Macroinvertebrates colonizing the coastal plain from their ancestral upland habitats as the Gulf retreated would have needed broad tolerances to variations in flow, dissolved oxygen, and riparian disturbance [see Connor and Suttkus (1986) for description]. Potentially, past selection may have acted as a filter for present taxonomic diversity yielding communities with a relic tolerance of DO changes related to historic colonization.

Conclusions

In summary, colonization patterns of macroinvertebrates inhabiting Mill and Six Mile creeks provided some support for our hypothesis that more taxa colonized larger than smaller woody debris treatments, although substantial variability among taxa was evident. However, abundances of many individual taxa, as well as greater total abundance, taxa richness, and Shannon–Wiener diversity suggest our prediction of more diverse and abundant colonization in higher DO habitats was incorrect. Based on this experiment and concurrent stream sampling, we believe macroinvertebrates in these bottomland, coastal streams are highly tolerant of seasonally low DO conditions. In fact, these streams support a much more diverse and abundant assemblage than we would have predicted from assessments of stream physicochemistry. If aquatic macroinvertebrates are to be used in coastal bottomland stream assessments, we suggest further research in these systems is needed to identify the important community structuring factors, particularly the role of physicochemical tolerance in determining community composition.

Acknowledgements We thank our cooperators: Boise Cascade Holdings, LLC; Roy O. Martin Lumber Company; Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries; United States Forest Service; and United States Army Ft. Polk. Specifically, we thank James D. Hudson III and Dick Myers for assistance and insights. We thank D. Allen Rutherford, James P. Geaghan, John W. Fleeger, Sammy L. King, Frank C. Rohwer, and John W. Day for constructive advice. We thank Rebecca Sweany, Rachel Walley, Melinda Ragsdale, Deb Kelly, Adam Piehler, Jaimie (Thompson) David, Jonathan Fisher, Matt Engel, Tory Mason, Nicole Salvi, Seema Ahmed, Tahn Nguyen, Aaron Podey, Chad Thomas, Jón Einar Jónsson, Checo Colon-Gaud, Mike Krumrine, Aimee (Bourgeouis) Fortier, and B. Thorpe Halloran for assistance. This manuscript was approved for publication by the Director of the Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station as manuscript 04-400-0702.

References

- Adams SB, Warren ML Jr, Haag WR (2004) Spatial and temporal patterns in fish assemblages of upper coastal plain streams, Mississippi, USA. Hydrobiologia 528:45–61
- Agresti A (1996) An introduction to categorical data analysis. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York
- American Public Health Association (1998) Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater, 20th edn. American Public Health Association. Washington, District of Columbia
- Anderson MJ, Willis TJ (2003) Canonical analysis of principal coordinates: a useful method of constrained ordination for ecology. Ecology 84:511–525
- Anderson NH, Sedell JR, Roberts LM, Trisha FJ (1978) The role of aquatic invertebrates in processing of wood debris in coniferous forest streams. Am Midl Nat 100:64–82

- Barbour MT, Gerritsen J, Snyder BD, Stribling JB (1999)
 Rapid Bioassessment Protocols for Use in Streams and Wadeable Rivers: Periphyton, Benthic Macroinvertebrates and Fish, Second Edition. EPA 841-B-99-002. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Office of Water; Washington, District of Columbia
- Barr CB, Chapin JB (1981) The aquatic Dryopoidea of Louisiana (Coleoptera: Psephenidae, Dryopidae, Elmidae). Tulane Stud Zool Bot 26:91–164
- Benke AC, Van Ardsall TC, Gillespie DM, Parrish FK (1984) Invertebrate productivity in a subtropical blackwater river: the importance of habitat and life history. Ecol Monogr 54:25–63
- Benke AC, Wallace JB (1990) Wood dynamics in coastal blackwater streams. Can J Fish Aquat Sci 47:92–99
- Benke AC, Wallace JB (2003) Influence of wood on invertebrate communities in streams and rivers. In: Gregory S, Boyer K, Gurnell A (eds) The ecology and management of wood in world rivers. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland, pp 149–177 American Fisheries Society Symposium 37
- Berner L, Pescador ML (1988) The Mayflies of Florida. University of Florida Press, Gainesville, Florida
- Bink GH (1957) The Odonata of Louisiana. Tulane Stud Zool 5:71–135
- Brown AV, Matthews MJ (1995) Stream ecosystems of the central United States. In: Cushing CE, Cummins KW, Minshall GW (eds) River and stream ecosystems. Ecosystems of the World 22. Elsevier, The Netherlands, pp 89–116
- Bryan CF, Kelso WE, Rutherford DA, Walker-Bryan B, Monzyk FR, Kelly DG, Noguera JH (1995) Effects of forest management practices on water quality, drifting and benthic macroinvertebrates and fishes in streams in Louisiana. Final Report to Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Baton Rouge, Louisiana
- Burcher CL, Smock LA (2002) Habitat distribution, dietary composition and life history characteristics of odonate nymphs in a blackwater coastal plain stream. Am Midl Nat 148:75–89
- Chen LY, Heath AG, Neves RJ (2001) Comparisons of oxygen consumption in freshwater mussels (Unionidae) from different habitats during declining dissolved oxygen concentrations. Hydrobiologia 450:209–214
- Conner JV, Suttkus RD (1986) Zoogeography of freshwater fishes of the western Gulf Slope of North America. In: Hocutt CH, Wiley EO (eds) The zoogeography of North American freshwater fishes. John Wiley and Sons, New York, New York, pp 413–456
- Connolly NM, Crossland MR, Pearson RG (2004) Effect of low dissolved oxygen on survival, emergence, and drift of tropical stream macroinvertebrates. J N Am Benthol Soc 23:251–270
- Cushing CE, Allan JD (2001) Streams: their ecology and life. Academic Press, Hong Kong, China
- Dangles O (2002) Functional plasticity of benthic macroinvertebrates: implications for trophic dynamics in acid streams. Can J Fish Aquat Sci 59:1562–1573

- Davis S, Golladay SW, Vellidis G, Pringle CM (2003) Macroinvertebrate biomonitoring in intermittent coastal plain streams impacted by animal agriculture. J Environ Qual 32:1036–1043
- Death RG, Winterbourn MJ (1995) Diversity patterns in stream benthic invertebrate communities: the influence of habitat stability. Ecology 76:1446– 1460
- Didonato GT, Summers JK, Roush TH (2003) Assessing the ecological condition of a coastal plain watershed using a probabilistic survey design. Environ Monit Assess 85:1–21
- Dowdy S, Wearden S, Chilko D (2004) Statistics for research, 3rd edn. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, New York
- Drury DM, Kelso WE (2000) Invertebrate colonization of woody debris in coastal plain streams. Hydrobiologia 434:63–72
- Dudley T, Anderson NH (1982) A survey of invertebrates associated with wood debris in aquatic habitats. Melandria 39:5–21
- Ellis MM (1931) Some factors affecting the replacement of the commercial fresh-water mussels. US Bur Fish Bull 22:365–347
- Epler JH (2001) Identification Manual for the Larval Chironomidae (Diptera) of North and South Carolina. A Guide to the Taxonomy of the Midges of the Southeastern United States, including Florida. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources and St. Johns River Water Management District. Raleigh, North Carolina
- Fuller SLH (1974) Clams and mussels (Mollusca: Bivalvia). In: Hart CW, Fuller SLH (eds) Pollution ecology of freshwater invertebrates. Academic Press, Inc., New York, New York, pp 215–274
- Glitzenstein JS, Platt WJ, Streng DR (1995) Effects of fire regime and habitat on tree dynamics in north Florida longleaf pine savannas. Ecol Monog 65:441–476
- Gittens R (1985) Canonical analysis: a review with applications in ecology. Springer Verlag, Berlin, Germany
- Harman WN (1974) Snails (Mollusca: Gastropoda). In: Hart CW, Fuller SLH (eds) Pollution ecology of freshwater invertebrates. Academic Press, Inc., New York, New York, pp 275–313
- Hartman KH, Faller MD, Howell JW (2005) How much do valley fills influence streams. Hydrobiologia 523:91–102
- Hobbs HH, Hall ET (1974) Crayfishes (Decapoda: Astacidae). In: Hart CW, Fuller SLH (eds) Pollution ecology of freshwater invertebrates. Academic Press, Inc., New York, New York, pp 195–214
- Holland WC, Hough LW, Murray GE (1952) Geology of Beauregard and Allen Parishes. Geological Bulletin No. 27. Louisiana Geological Survey, Baton Rouge, Louisiana
- Ice G, Sugden B (2003) Summer dissolved oxygen concentrations in forested streams of northern Louisiana. S J Appl Forestry 27:92–99
- Jacob U, Walther H (1981) Aquatic insect larvae as indicators of limiting minimal contents of dissolved oxygen. Aquat Insect 3:219–224

- Jacob U, Walther H, Klenke R (1984) Aquatic insect larvae as indicators of limiting minimal contents of dissolved oxygen—Part II. Aquat Insect 6:185–190
- Johnson LB, Breneman DH, Richards C (2003) Macroinvertebrate community structure and function associated with large wood in low gradient streams. River Res Appl 19:199–218
- Johnson PD, McMahon RF (1998) Effects of temperature and chronic hypoxia on survivorship of the zebra mussel (*Dreissena polymorpha*) and Asian clam (*Corbicula fulminea*). Can J Fish Aquat Sci 55:1564–1572
- Johnson RA, Wichern DW (2002) Applied multivariate statistical analysis, 5th edn. Prentice Hall, New York, New York
- Johnson ZB, Kennedy JH (2003) Macroinvertebrate assemblages of submerged woody debris in the Elm Fork of the Trinity River, Texas. J Freshwater Ecol 18:187–197
- Kaller MD (2005) Macroinvertebrate community ecology of lowland, subtropical streams in Louisiana. Ph.D. Dissertation, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
- Kaller MD, Hartman KJ (2004) Evidence of a threshold level of fine sediment accumulation for altering benthic macroinvertebrate communities. Hydrobiologia 518:95–104
- Kaller MD, Kelso WE (2006) Swine activity alters invertebrate and microbial communities in a coastal watershed. Am Midl Nat 156:165–179
- Kaller MD, Kelso WE (2003) Effects of feral swine on water quality in a coastal bottomland stream. P Annu Conf Southeastern Assoc Fish Wildl Agencies 57:291–298
- Lepš J, Šmilauer P (2003) Multivariate analysis of ecological data using CANOCO. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom
- Leurgans SE, Moyeed RA, Silverman BW (1993) Canonical correlation analysis when the data are curves. J Roy Stat Soc B 55:725–740
- Lydeard C, Mayden RL (1995) A diverse and endangered aquatic ecosystem of the southeast United States. Consery Biol 9:800–805
- Mathooko JM, Otieno CO (2002) Does surface textural complexity of woody debris in lotic ecosystems influence their colonization by aquatic invertebrates. Hydrobiologia 489:11–20
- Mayden RL (1985) Biogeography of Ouachita Highland fishes. Southwest Nat 30:195–211
- Mayden RL (1988) Vicariance biogeography, parsimony, and evolution in North American freshwater fishes. Syst Zool 37:329–355
- Nebecker AV (1972) Effect of low oxygen concentration on survival and emergence of aquatic insects. Trans Am Fish Soc 4:675–679
- Nebecker AV, Onjukka ST, Stevens DG, Chapman GA, Dominguez SE (1992) Effects of low dissolved oxygen on survival, growth, and reproduction of *Daphnia*, *Hyalella*, and *Gammarus*. Environ Toxicol Chem 11:373–379
- Noonan GR (1988) Biogeography of North American and Mexican insects, and a Critique of vicariance biogeography. Syst Zool 37:366–384

- O'Connor NA (1991) The effects of habitat complexity on the macroinvertebrates colonizing wood substrates in a lowland stream. Oecologia 85:504–512
- Peckarsky BL, Hughes JM, Mather PB, Hillyer M, Encalda AC (2005) Are populations of mayflies living in adjacent fish and fishless streams genetically differentiated? Freshwater Biol 50:42–51
- Phillips EC (2003) Habitat preference of aquatic macroinvertebrates in an east Texas sandy stream. J Freshwater Ecol 18:1–11
- Phillips L, Perry B (2002) Assessment of potential environmental health risks of residue of high-explosive munitions on military test ranges—comparison in a humid and arid climate. Federal Facilities Environ J 13:7–25
- Rebertus AJ, Williamson GB, Platt WJ (1993) Impact of temporal variation in fire regime on savanna oaks and pines. P Tall Timbers Fire Ecol Conf 18:215– 225
- Rempel LL, Richardson JS, Healey MC (2000) Macroinvertebrate community structure along gradients of hydraulic and sedimentary conditions in a large gravel-bed river. Freshwater Biol 45:57–73
- Rinella DJ (2002) Influence of coarse woody debris on macroinvertebrate assemblages in Alabama coastal plains streams. M.S. Thesis, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama
- Rinella DJ, Feminella JW (2005) Comparison of benthic macroinvertebrates colonizing sand, wood, and artificial substrates in a low-gradient stream. J Freshwater Ecol 20:209–220
- Roback SS (1974) Insects (Arthropoda: Insecta). In: Hart CW Jr, Fuller SLH (eds) Pollution ecology of freshwater invertebrates. Academic Press, Inc., New York, New York, pp 314–376
- Roeding CE, Smock LA (1989) Ecology of macroinvertebrate shredders in a low-gradient sandy-bottomed stream. J N Am Benthol Soc 8:149–161
- Ruse LP (1996) Multivariate techniques relating macroinvertebrate and environmental data from a river catchment. Water Res 30:3017–3024
- Saloom ME, Duncan RS (2005) Low dissolved oxygen levels reduce anti-predation behaviours of the freshwater clam *Corbicula fulminea*. Freshwater Biol 50:1233–1238

- Sawyer RT (1974) Leeches (Annelida: Hirudinea). In: Hart CW Jr, Fuller SLH (eds) Pollution ecology of freshwater invertebrates. Academic Press, Inc., New York, New York, pp 82–142
- Sinclair RM (1964) Water quality requirements of the family Elmidae (Coleoptera) (with keys to the larvae and adults of the eastern genera). Tennessee Stream Pollution Control Board, Tennessee Department of Public Health, Nashville, Tennessee
- Smith DG (2001) Pennak's freshwater invertebrates of the United States: Porifera to Crustacea. Wiley and Sons Inc., New York, New York
- Stewart KW, Stark BP, Higgins TG (1976) The Stoneflies (Plecoptera) of Louisiana. Great Basin Nat 36:366– 384
- Stevens JP (2002) Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences, 4th edn. Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers, New Jersey
- ter Braak CJF (1995) Ordination. In: Jongman RHG, ter Braak CJF, Van Tongeren OFR (eds) Data analysis in community and landscape ecology. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, pp 91–173
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (1986) Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Dissolved Oxygen. EPA. 440/5-86-003. Criteria and Standards Division. US Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, District of Columbia
- Waters TF (1995) Sediment in streams: Sources, biological effects, and controls. American Fisheries Society Monograph 7, American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland
- Welch RN (1942) Geology of Vernon Parish, Geological Bulletin No. 22. Louisiana Geological Survey, Baton Rouge, Louisiana
- Wiggins GB (1998) Larvae of the North American Caddisfly Genera (Trichoptera), 2nd edn. University of Toronto Press, Toronto, Canada
- Williams LR, Bonner TH, Hudson JD, III, Williams MG, Leavy TR, Williams CS (2005) Interactive effects of environmental variability and military training on stream biota of three headwater drainages in western Louisiana. Trans Am Fish Soc 134:192–206
- Wood DL, Sites RW (2002) Submerged rootmats: a mesohabitat harboring a distinct insect community in Ozark streams. J Freshwater Ecol 17:431–440