

The influence of stream corridor parameters on fish species richness in the Clearwater River (Idaho, USA)

Ahmed N. Bdour *, Ziyad S. Tarawneh Ezeh^{1*}

Civil Engineering Department, College of Engineering, Hashemite University, Zarqa, Jordan

* Corresponding author e-mail: bdour@hu.edu.jo

ARTICLE INFO

Received 2/3/2019; received in revised form 10/9/2019; accepted 16/9/2019.

DOI: [10.6092/issn.2281-4485/9147](https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2281-4485/9147)

© 2019 The Authors.

Abstract

This paper presents the results of a statistical analysis performed at the micro scale (stream corridor) level in the South Fork of the Clearwater River (SFCR) watershed, which is located in North central Idaho. Using multivariate techniques along with factor analysis, relationships between Fish Indicators and man-made disturbances, watershed landscape, water discharge and geometry, channel morphology, river water depth, and temperature were established. At the micro scale level, this analysis was performed for 4 tributaries of the SFCR, namely, Newsome, Crooked, American, and Red River, where a significant amount of recent data existed. Results show that data at the micro scale level were more important for establishing quantitative relations between sediment and channel morphology parameters with Fish Indicators than at the watershed wide level. The findings of this investigation clearly illustrates that micro scale analyses should be considered in modeling habitat restoration techniques. It allows the development of more refined relationships between Fish Indicators and stream corridor parameters occurring at different life stages of fish populations.

Keywords

watershed wide parameters, stream corridor parameters, Fish Indicators, factor and redundancy statistical analysis, South Fork Clearwater

Introduction

In response to fish decline in the inland Northwest, many federal and state agencies (e.g., National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), United States Bureau Reclamation (USBR), United States Forest Service (USFS), Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW), United States Geological Survey (USGS), Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission (CRITFC), Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), and United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)) have employed management plans in the last twenty to thirty years to augment stream habitat population (Papanicolau et al., 2002). Most of the restoration efforts have focused on the impairment of the stream corridors to restore habitat variables (e.g., pool-riffle sequence, depth, shade) and river geomorphologic characteristics (e.g., sinuosity and slope) within a stream corridor (microscale),

without considering the overall effects of watershed wide (macroscale) parameters on the stream-corridor parameters over a period (Von Schiller et al., 2017; Richardson et al., 2011). Lack of understanding of the complex interaction between watershed-wide parameters with stream corridor parameters has caused in some cases the unsuccessful implementation of these management plans in forest, rangeland, urban, and agriculture (cropland) areas to adequately improve habitat ecosystems (*Upstream: Salmon and Society in the Pacific Northwest*, NRC 1996).

Recent work in watershed and stream ecology (Wollheim, 2016; Lake et al., 2017) has raised the question of the effect of scale (microscale vs. macroscale) in the overall performance of different monitoring and restoration approaches. It was concluded that monitoring approaches based on limited spatial information could

DOI: [10.6092/issn.2281-4485/9147](https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2281-4485/9147)

hinder restoration efforts by over-or under-estimating the impact of different variables on the productivity of fish populations and yield to inconclusive results (*Upstream: Salmon and Society in the Pacific Northwest*, NRC 1996). While a well-developed body of literature describes qualitatively the hierarchy of the watershed wide and stream corridor parameters, as they relate to the productivity of fish populations, there are very few studies that assess the influence of these parameters on fish populations operating at different temporal and spatial scales (Al Espinosa et al., 1997; Li et al., 2001; Jeremy and Cooper, 2008; Limburg et al., 2013). The objective of this research is to develop expressions that quantitatively describe Fish Indicators as a function of stream corridor parameters and account for the interdependence of these parameters with macro scale parameters. For this purpose, multivariate techniques such as factor analysis and multiple regression, were employed first to quantitatively relate stream corridor parameters to different Fish Indicators for the South Fork of the Clearwater River (SFCR) watershed.

At present, there are two schools of thought in habitat modeling: 1) The first, believes that macroscale approaches are the most appropriate for examining the interdependence of fish populations (or assemblages) with various watershed-wide parameters such as land use, canopy and human-made disturbances (e.g., Barbour et al., 1992; Richard et al., 1996; Wang et al., 1997, 2000). 2) The second school believes that microscale approaches should be considered, since any river management and planning of restoration actions require a detailed analysis of stream conditions (Harderson et al., 2018), which strictly focus on the modeling of the stream corridor parameters as it relates to fish assemblage (e.g., Jagger et al., 1997; Slaughter et al., 2000).

Nowadays, with the great advancement in retrieved data tools as GIS, flow, sediment instrumentations, and digital maps as well as the presence of generally acceptable Index of Biological Indicator (IBI- Index of Biotic Integrity), a new interests have been generated to improve the undergoing efforts to focus on integrated approaches that combine fine and coarse scales (EPA, 2012).

Objectives

Literature review survey showed lack of good understanding of the physical processes involving the in-stream habitat and watershed parameters. Most of the conducted field (measurements) approaches more focused on management practices, than rigorous, consistent repeatable data collection. Although, site-

specific studies were only considered the watershed parameters in which few parameters were measured, data inconsistency in terms of duration of records and the measured parameters. To date, there is no standard integrated method of measurement tackle all variable that affect fish and habitat ecosystems.

The present study aimed to:

1. develop a sound hypothesis that is/are a relation among fish density, habitat variable, flow, and geomorphological parameters;
2. demonstrate the limitations of these approaches that are focused safely on large-scale watershed parameters by combining these approaches against some statistical based approaches developed on a finer scale data;
3. present an integral approach for in-stream habitat assessment.

Fish biologists and environmentalists focused mainly on the significant parameters that have tremendous effects on fish ecosystems during 1960s and 70s. Various restoration plans to improve fish habitat were proposed basically to reduced/eliminate the man made activities within watershed and stream corridor. This paper attempts to assess the various significant variables affecting fish ecosystems in this respect.

Methods

For the purpose of this study, data that were provided by several agencies for the South Fork of Clearwater have been assembled and analyzed in order to: (1) demonstrate the influence of micro scale parameters on Fish Indicators, (2) develop empirical prediction models for fish species using the multivariate analysis approach by identifying stream corridor parameters that are strong predictors for Fish Indicators and (3) qualitatively address the issue of integration of micro- and macroscale models in order to provide a complete picture of the parameters affecting Fish Indicators. Next, a description of the study area, available data, design and statistical analysis of data for the SFCR and Newsome, Crooked, American, and Red Rivers is provided.

Study Area

The South Fork Clearwater River subwatershed is located in North central Idaho encompassing an area of approximately 1175 square miles (Figure 1: South Fork Clearwater River Basin, USDA, 1989a). The sub-basin extends from the headwaters above Elk City and Red River to the confluence with the middle fork of the Clearwater River at Kooskia. The soils, landforms, and streams in the South Fork Clearwater subbasin are the

DOI: [10.6092/issn.2281-4485/9147](https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2281-4485/9147)

result of geologic and climatic events including several episodes of glaciation and climatic change. Soil types are silt and clay loams that are shallow to deep, and can have low to high rock fragment content (USDA, 1989a). The annual precipitation is between 25-50 inches, the

dominant land use is forested, and elevation is moderate to high. The dominant anthropogenic disturbances are timber harvest, roads, mining, and grazing. (Cheng et al., 2016; USDA, 1998b).



Figure 1. South Fork Clearwater River Basin, Idaho, USA.
Geographical coordinates 46.1457273°N 115.9823633°W

Included in the area are 14 major subunits. The subunits of the American River, Red River, Crooked River, and Newsome Creek are considered here since these rivers are major tributaries in the upper reaches of the South Fork Clearwater (hereafter, these tributaries are referred as ARCN). ARCN rivers contain substrate of gravel and cobble and are historically associated with some of the highest potential anadromous spawning and rearing habitat in the South Fork of Clearwater as it is shown in. ARCN rivers have a runoff regime very similar to the mainstem of the South Fork of Clearwater. They each drain a large area of rolling upland terrain. Because of the elevation of ARCN, climate, relatively deep soils, and moderate topography, they typically do not have a flashy response to storms.

Red River, Crooked River (the upper part only of the river), and Newsome Creek have been historically found with high productivity to Spring Chinook Species and they are known as “Strongholds”. These areas still support Spring Chinook Species and still would rank as moderate to high in existing habitat capability. However, the population resilience, and potential of this area as population source for the subbasin, is believed to

have been significantly reduced.

Finally, fine sediments are typically derived from upland contributing watersheds (macroscale effects) as well as from lower-elevation streamside zones and banks (microscale effects). The increased fine sediments found in channels have reduced riffle and pool frequencies (e.g. Red River), increased water temperature, and reduced base flows causing a deterioration of the instream water quality (Alberto et al., 2018). Current sediment yield within the Red River subunit has exceeded by 20% the natural base sediment yield for this subunit while for the other three subunits it is found to be within 5-10% higher than the natural based sediment yield.

Data Sets

The set of data contains information on twenty-two microscale variables for the ARCN subunits including Fish Indicators for Steelhead and Chinook at different life stages, in-stream hydraulics parameters, habitat substrate, sediment, and temperature during the period of 1985-1997. Table 1 provides the definitions for the microscale variables employed in the statistical analysis.

Variable	Definition	Stream Corridor Property
Sthd_012	Density for Steelhead, ages 0, 1 and 2 years old	
Sthd_0	Density for Steelhead, age 0 years old	
Sthd_12	Density for Steelhead, ages 1 and 2 years old	
Chin_01	Density for Chinook, ages 0 and 1 years old	
Chin_0	Density for Chinook, age 0 years old	
Chin_1	Density for Chinook, age 1 years old	
Total_FD	Total fish density	
temp	Water temperature	water quality
length	length of river reach	stream geometry
width	Mean width	stream geometry
area	SEC area	stream geometry
gradient	Gradient	stream geometry
depth	Mean depth	stream hydrology
Q	Discharge	stream hydrology
pool	Percentage of area within river reach that is pool	stream habitat
run	Percentage of area within river reach that is run	stream habitat
pocket	Percentage of area within river reach that is pocket	stream habitat
riffle	Percentage of area within river reach that is riffle	stream habitat
backw	Percentage of area within river reach that is backwater	stream habitat
sand	Percentage of area within river reach that is sand	stream sediment
gravel	Percentage of area within river reach that is gravel	stream sediment
rubble	Percentage of area within river reach that is rubble	stream sediment
boulder	Percentage of area within river reach that is boulder	stream sediment
bedrock	Percentage of area within river reach that is bedrock	stream sediment

Table 1. Variables used in the micro scale analysis, their definitions, and the corresponding stream corridor property for those variables that are potential fish density predictors.

Study Design

Fish indicators for the micro scale analysis. In the present study biological indicators such as Fish assemblages or Fish indicators are adopted to quantitatively describe the biotic integrity, abundance of fish, as an indication of the hygiene of the fish ecosystem. As such, well-established Fish indicators have been employed to describe the temporal and spatial distributions of Fish populations throughout the SFCR subbasin in terms of historic and current ontogeny, population density, and hydraulic and physical habitat characteristics. These indicators have been developed based on the hypothesis that fish density or habitat use are similar (McCain, 1992; Lee et al., 1996). To quantitatively describe species richness and abundance, different multimetric Indices have been introduced in the literature.

The Fish density parameter is employed to represent the fish population along the stream corridors. The Fish density parameter in the present study is defined as the number of fish species in stream reach per 100 squared meter of a stream area. An alternative definition for fish density is the number of fish species per km or ha, however, the latter definition is useful when fish

surveying occurs only within a stream of a constant width. In this study, the fish density data provided by the Department of Fisheries of the Nez Perce Tribe were available in the form of number of fish species in stream reach per 100 squared meter.

Predicting fish density using micro-scale variables as predictors.

Besides the general environmental factors that were studied in the previous sections, fish populations are known to exhibit habitat preferences based on the local characteristics of a stream reach. The water temperature may vary from one reach of the same stream to another, by as much as 11 degrees Celsius, making certain reaches more favorite to fish than others, especially at different stages of the fish life cycle. The presence of sand or gravel at the stream sediment may have an effect on making a stream desirable as a fish habitat. Extremely high stream discharge may create turbulence, which disturbs the sediment, making the particular reach less favorite for egg-laying purposes. Figure 2 shows the conceptual model that defined the purpose of this particular study: to examine and attempt to establish statistically significant relationships among

DOI: [10.6092/issn.2281-4485/9147](https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2281-4485/9147)

various stream characteristics as predictors for the density of fish population. Such stream characteristics include water quality, stream hydrology, stream habitat,

and stream sediment.




Figure 2. Conceptual model for the micro-scale (stream-wide) environmental characteristics that influence fish density.

In order to study the effects of such micro-scale stream properties on fish population density, we sampled fish density data from four small streams that are part of the South Fork of the Clearwater River, Idaho. The selected streams were American River, Crooked River, Newsome Creek, and Red River. American River was divided into 8 reaches, Crooked River into 23, Newsome Creek into 15, and Red River into 17. For all these reaches, data on the 17 micro-scale variables shown on Table 5 were obtained from the GPM Physical Habitat Data, 1985-1994, made available by the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (Gove et al., 2001). These micro-scale variables were related to corresponding fish densities for

Steelheads and Chinooks separated by age, as shown on Table 1, for the same reaches.

Results and Discussions

In order to investigate the effects of the micro-scale variables on the fish densities, we fitted 28 linear multiple regression models, using the seven variables, Sthd_012, Sthd_0, Sthd_12, Chin_01, Chin_0, Chin_1, and Total_FD, as response variables for all four streams. Table 2 summarizes the findings. For each of the 28 models, the significant predictor variables are listed, together with the corresponding significance levels (p-values).

	Sthd_012	Sthd_0	Sthd_12	Chin_01	Chin_0	Chin_1	Total_FD
American River	(+)temp**	(+)temp**	(-)gravel**				(+)rubble***
	(-)run**	(-)run**	(+)riffle*				(+)gravel***
	(-)gravel**	(-)boulder**	(+)temp				(-)riffle**
	(-)boulder**	(-)gravel*	(-)boulder				
<i>Rsq, Rsq-adj</i>	<i>0.93, 0.84</i>	<i>0.92, 0.82</i>	<i>0.81, 0.56</i>	<i>(no model)</i>	<i>(no model)</i>	<i>(no model)</i>	<i>0.87, 0.77</i>
Crooked River	(-)boulder**	(+)gravel*	(-)boulder**	(+)backw***	(+)backw***		(+)temp***
	(-)pool**	(-)pocket	(+)pocket**	(+)temp***	(+)temp***		(+)backw***
	(-)rubble*	(-)pool		(-)riffle***	(-)riffle***		(+)pocket**
				(-)run**	(-)run**		(+)pool*
<i>Rsq, Rsq-adj</i>	<i>0.47, 0.38</i>	<i>0.25, 0.13</i>	<i>0.34, 0.28</i>	<i>0.65, 0.55</i>	<i>0.65, 0.56</i>	<i>(no model)</i>	<i>0.66, 0.52</i>
Newsome Creek	(-)riffle*	(-)riffle	(+)pocket***	(+)gravel***			(-)riffle*
	(+)gravel	(-)temp	(-)depth***	(-)backw**			(-)backw*
	(-)backw		(+)pool***	(-)riffle**			(+)gravel
			(+)rubble***	(-)temp			
<i>Rsq, Rsq-adj</i>	<i>0.34, 0.16</i>	<i>0.35, 0.22</i>	<i>0.98, 0.96</i>	<i>0.68, 0.52</i>	<i>(no model)</i>	<i>(no model)</i>	<i>0.40, 0.22</i>

DOI: [10.6092/issn.2281-4485/9147](https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2281-4485/9147)

Red River	(-)boulder**	(-)run	(-)boulder***	(+)temp**	(+)temp**	(-)sand***	(+)temp**
	(-)gravel**	(+)pool	(-)gravel***	(-)rubble*	(+)	(-)	(-)rubble
	(-)sand**	(-)gravel	(+)riffle***	(+)depth*	(+)depth**	(-)rubble**	(+)depth
	(-)rubble*		(-)rubble***	(-)gravel	(+)sand*	(-)	(-)gravel
	(+)riffle*		(+)run**			(+)pool**	
		(-)sand**			(+)temp		
<i>Rsq, Rsq-adj</i>	0.54, 0.33	0.56, 0.46	0.75, 0.61	0.43, 0.24	0.51, 0.35	0.72, 0.55	0.44, 0.25
Legend: 0.10<p-value<0.20 [no asterisk] - 0.05<p-value<0.10 * - 0.01<p-value<0.05 ** - p-value<0.01 ***							

Table 2. Predictor variables for Fish Density at various life stages of Summer Steelhead and Spring Chinook with their corresponding significance, as indicated by their p-values (refer to Table 1 for definitions of the variables).

As explained in the Table 2 legend, three asterisks (***) indicate a highly significant predictor, with a p-value less than 0.01, whereas no asterisk indicates a low significance, a p-value between 0.10 and Fish Density (various species and life stages), Water quality (Temperature), Stream habitat (Riff, Run), Stream sediment (Rubble, Gravel, Boulder), Stream hydrology (Depth, Discharge) 0.20. Next to each predictor variable, Table 2 also shows the sign of the regression coefficient associated with that variable, indicated as positive (+) or negative (-). For example, a positive sign for temperature would imply that higher temperature results in a higher fish density.

For each of the 28 models, the regression coefficient of determination (R-squared) is listed on Table 2. This is the amount of fish density variability explained by each model. The R-squared values are typically around 50 percent, with some of them as small as 25 percent and some as large as 98 percent. The corresponding

adjusted R-squared (Rsq-adj) values are also listed for each model. These are adjusted for the number of predictors, i.e., if a regression model has a large explained variability (Rsq) but, in order to achieve that, uses a large number of predictors, some of which are not worth the added model complexity, the Rsq-adj value will be much smaller than the corresponding Rsq. In most of the cases, Rsq and Rsq-adj have a good correspondence (are quite similar). In some others, the Rsq-adj seems much smaller. This is mainly because we decided to include in Table 1 variables with small significance, since our main purpose was to explore the fish density predictors. All 28 regression models exhibited a reasonably satisfactory statistical behavior, with the usual regression assumptions to either hold or show mild and unimportant violations. Figure 3 summarizes the relationships between fish densities and stream-wide characteristics that were established with our statistical analysis.




Figure 3. Stream properties that affect fish density of a river at the micro-scale. The dashed lines show those variables that could not be established as significant predictors for any of the fish density-related variables.

DOI: [10.6092/issn.2281-4485/9147](https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2281-4485/9147)

According to Slaughter et al. (2000) in-stream parameters were better predictors of fish assemblages than watershed-wide land use practices. On the other hand, Roth et al. (1996) found that watershed-wide land use practices are a strong predictor of fish assemblages than local in-stream parameters. There are several reasons for the latter discrepancy with the most prominent one being the absence of a well-defined methodology that incorporates both micro-and macroscale approaches.

As a result, micro scale approaches have strictly focused on the hydraulic and/or channel bed stability variables without examining the effects of watershed-wide variables on habitat variables and in-stream living organisms. At the most, river channel restoration has focused on the development of buffer zones (to minimize sediment delivery from the watershed within the stream) based on empirical rules without knowing the interrelationship between several watershed-wide parameters with stream-side parameters. On the other hand, while watershed-wide land use patterns (macroscale approaches) work better than riparian (micro scale) scale parameters for coarser scales, macroscale approaches cannot provide consistent predictions of the interdependence between fish assemblage and watershed-wide parameters due to different spatial and temporal scales (Jeremy and Cooper, 2008).

Conclusions

The above differences highlight the fact that scale (spatial and temporal) of study significantly affects the predictive ability of models and an integrated methodology should be developed based on statistical sound methods that links the macroscale and microscale approaches. Such methodology will utilize the strengths of both methods and will help us to establish quantitative expressions between several watershed-wide and stream corridor parameters, which in turn can be used to assess the relation between the productivity of fish populations with these parameters.

The findings of this investigation clearly illustrates that micro scale analyses should be considered in modeling habitat restoration techniques. It is concluded that the scale of a study (spatial and temporal) significantly affects the predictive ability of such models and an integrated methodology should be developed in the future that links the macroscale and microscale approaches. It is expected that such methodology will utilize the strengths of both methods and will help us to establish the missing links between several watershed-wide and stream corridor parameters, which in turn can

be used to assess the relation between the productivity of fish populations with these parameters.

This analysis will not only generate valuable predictive tools of statistical significance but it will assist the field watershed managers to focus only on the collection of those parameters that have adverse effects on fish habitats. When the microscale studies are not only focused on river restoration work from the engineering point of view but incorporate stream water quality as well biological integrity they can become a powerful tool for guiding channel “habitat restoration” work in the future.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the Nez Perce Tribe National Forest, Idaho, and the Center of Environmental Education of Washington State University for their support and assistance during the course of this study.

References

- AL ESPINOSA F. JR., RHODES J.J., McCULLOUGH D.A. (1997) The Failure of Existing Plans to Protect Salmon Habitat in The Clearwater National Forest in Idaho. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 49:205-230.
- BARBOUR M. T., PLAFKIN J.L., BRADLEY B.P., GRAVES C.G., WISSEMAN R.W. (1992) Evaluation of EPA's Rapid Bioassessment Benthic Metrics - Metric Redundancy and Variability among Reference Stream Sites. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry*, 11:437-449.
- CHENG S-T., HERRICKS E.E., TSAI W-P., CHANG F-J. (2016). Assessing the natural and anthropogenic influences on basin-wide fish species richness, *Science of The Total Environment*, 572:825-836. Doi: [10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.07.120](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.07.120)
- DORETTO A., PIANO E., BONA F., FENOGLIO S. (2018) How to assess the impact of fine sediments on the macroinvertebrate communities of alpine streams? A selection of the best metrics, *Ecological Indicators*, 84:60-69.
- EPA (2012). *Identifying and Protecting Healthy Watersheds: Concepts, Assessments, and Management Approaches*. Washington, DC, EPA 841-B-11-002.
- GOLFIERI B., SURIAN N., HARDERSEN S. (2018) Towards a more comprehensive assessment of river corridor conditions: A comparison between the Morphological Quality Index and three biotic indices. *Ecological Indicators* Volume 84:525-534. Doi:[10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.09.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.09.011)

DOI: [10.6092/issn.2281-4485/9147](https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.2281-4485/9147)

- GOVE N., EDWARDS R., CONQUEST L. (2001). Effects of scale on land use and water quality relationships: a longitudinal basin-wide perspective. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, 37(6):1721-1734.
- JAGGER H., CARDWELL H., SALE M., BEVELHIMER M., COUTANT C., WINKLE W. (1997). Modeling the linkage between flow management and salmon recruitment in rivers. *Ecological Modeling*, 103:171-190.
- JEREMYR, COOPER J. (2008) Linkages among watersheds, stream reaches, and riparian vegetation in dryland ephemeral stream networks, *Journal of Hydrology*, 350:68–82. Doi:[10.1016/j.jhydrol.2007.11.030](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2007.11.030)
- LAKE P.S., BOND N., L REICH P. (2017) Restoration ecology of intermittent rivers and ephemeral streams, In: *Intermittent rivers and ephemeral streams*, Editor(s): Detry T., Bonada N., Boulton A., Academic Press, Chapter 5.4, Pages 509-533. ISBN 9780128038352.
- LI J., HERLIHY A., GERTH W., KAUFMANN P.H., GREGORY S., URQUHART S., LARSEN D. (2001) Variability in Stream Macroinvertebrate at Multiple Spatial Scales. *Journal of Freshwater Biology*, 46: 87-97.
- LIMBURG K.E., SWANEY D.P., STRAYER D.L. (2013) River Ecosystems. In: *Encyclopedia of Biodiversity*, Editor(s): Levin S.A. (Second Edition), Academic Press, Pages 469-484, ISBN 9780123847201.
- MCCAIN M. (1992) Comparison of Habitat Use and Availability for Juvenile Fall Chinook Salmon in a Tributary of the Smith River, CA R-5 Fish Habitat Relationship Technical Bulletin, No. 7.
- NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL (1996) *Upstream Salmon Society in the Pacific Northwest*. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.
- PAPANICOLAOU N., EVAGGELOPOULOS N., BDOUR A. (2002) Watershed Impacts on the Fish Population in the Clearwater River, ID. Ninth International Conference on Urban Drainage (9ICUD).
- ROTH N. E., ALLAN J.D., ERICKSON D.L. (1996) Landscape Influences on Stream Biotic Integrity Assessed at Multiple Spatial Scales. *Landscape Ecology*, 11(3):141-156.
- RICHARDS C., JOHNSON L. B., HOST G.E. (1996) Landscape-scale Influences on Stream Habitats and Biota. *Canadian Journal of Fish and Aquatic Science*. 53:295-31.
- RICHARDSON C.J., FLANAGAN N.E., HO M., PAHL J.W. (2011) Integrated stream and wetland restoration: A watershed approach to improved water quality on the landscape *Ecological Engineering* 37: 25–39, doi: [10.1016/j.ecoleng.2010.09.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2010.09.005)
- SLAUGHTER C.W., GOODWIN P., MARBURY R. (2000) Watershed Considerations for Integrated Stream Modeling. *International Journal of Sediment Research*, 15(1):42-50.
- USDA - United States Department of Agriculture (1998a) *South Fork Clearwater River Landscape Assessment*. Forest Service. Vol. I-Narrative.
- USDA - United States Department of Agriculture (1998b) *South Fork Clearwater River Landscape Assessment*. Forest Service. Vol. II-Map.
- USDA - United States Department of Agriculture (2000) *An assessment of ecosystem components in the interior Columbia basin and portions of the Klamath and great basins*. General Technical Report. Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station. Portland, OR.
- Von SCHILLER D., ACUÑA V., ARISTI I., ARROITA M., BASAGUREN A., BELLIN A., BOYERO L., BUTTURINI A., GINEBRED A., KALOGIANNI E., LARRAÑAGA A., MAJONE B., MARTÍNEZ A., MONROY S., MUÑOZ I., PAUNOVIĆ M., PEREDA O., PETROVIC M., POZO J., RODRÍGUEZ-MOZAZ S., RIVAS D., SABATER S., SABATER F., SKOULIKIDIS N., SOLAGAISTUA L., VARDAKAS L., ELOSEGI A. (2017) River ecosystem processes: A synthesis of approaches, criteria of use and sensitivity to environmental stressors, *Science of The Total Environment*, 596–597:465-480, ISSN 0048-9697.
- WANG, L., LYONS J., KANEHL P., GATTI R. (1997). Influences of Watershed Land Use on Habitat Quality and Biotic Integrity in Wisconsin Streams. *Fisheries* 22(6).
- WANG L., LYONS J., KANEHL P., BANNERMAN R., EMMONS E. (2000). Watershed Urbanization and Changes in Fish Communities in Southern Wisconsin Streams. *Journal of American Water Resources Association*, 36(5):1173-1189.
- WOLLHEIM W.M. (2016) From Headwaters to Rivers to River Networks: Scaling in Stream Ecology. In: *Stream Ecosystems in a Changing Environment*, Editor(s): Jones J.B. and Stanley E.H., Chapter 8, Academic Press, Pg 349-388. ISBN 9780124058903.