

Great Lakes Coastal Wetlands Monitoring Plan

*Developed by the
Great Lakes Coastal Wetlands Consortium,
A project of the Great Lakes Commission*

*Funded by the
United States Environmental Protection Agency
Great Lakes National Program Office*



March 2008

This page intentionally blank.

Table of Contents

Editors	8
Authors	8
Acknowledgments	10
Executive Summary	12
Statistical Design.....	13
Chemical/Physical and Land Use/Cover Measurements.....	13
Vegetation Community Indicators	14
Invertebrate Community Indicators	14
Fish Community Indicators.....	15
Amphibian and Bird Community Indicators	15
Landscape-Based Indicators.....	16
Cost Analysis for Sampling Great Lakes Coastal Wetlands.....	17
Data Management System.....	18
Partnerships for Implementation.....	18
Final Summary Recommendations.....	19
Chapter 1 Statistical Design	20
Sampling design	21
Sample Size Considerations and Ability to Detect Change.....	27
Recommendations.....	28
References.....	30
Chapter 2 Chemical/Physical and Land Use/Cover Measurements	31
General Interpretation of Covariates	32
References.....	33
Chapter 3 Vegetation Community Indicators	34
Introduction.....	35
Materials and Methods.....	40
Interpretation of results.....	51
Data handling and storage	51
References.....	52
Chapter 4 Invertebrate Community Indicators	61
Introduction.....	62
Materials and Methods.....	63
Limitations and Applicability of the IBI	64
Discussion.....	70
Synopsis – Current recommendations and future work.....	71
References.....	75
Chapter 5 Fish Community Indicators	79
Introduction.....	80
Materials and Methods.....	81
Worksheet for Calculating IBI Scores.....	85
Limitations and alternate analyses	89
References.....	90
Chapter 6 Amphibian Community Indicators	94
Introduction.....	95
Materials and Methods.....	96
Interpretation of Results	98
Data Handling and Storage	104
Limitations	104
References.....	105
Chapter 7 Bird Community Indicators	118
Introduction.....	119

Materials and Methods	120
Interpretation of Results	123
Data Handling and Storage	128
Limitations	128
References.....	129
Chapter 8 Landscape-Based Indicators	145
Introduction.....	135
Existing Landscape Indicators.....	136
Other Applications of Coastal Wetlands Landscape Monitoring Protocols.....	141
Wetlands and Landscape Mapping Programs.....	143
Spatial and Temporal Monitoring Considerations.....	143
Remote Sensing and Ancillary Data Sources	145
Innovative Remote Sensing Methods.....	152
GLEI Stressor Gradient	157
Recommended Long-Term Landscape Monitoring Protocols	160
Implementation Approaches	164
Chapter 9 Cost Analysis for Sampling of Great Lakes Coastal Wetlands	172
Introduction.....	173
Objectives and background.....	173
Methods	174
Assumptions and limitations.....	183
Results	184
Case studies	185
Summary	189
References.....	190
Chapter 10 Data Management System	192
Introduction.....	193
System Design.....	194
System Inputs and Outputs	194
Chapter 11 Partnerships for Implementation	203
Partnerships for Implementation.....	204
The Need for Partnership	204
Existing and Historical Great Lakes Coastal Wetland Monitoring.....	205
Framework for Implementation.....	210
Implementation Strategy	226
References.....	22632
Monitoring Great Lakes Coastal Wetlands: Summary Recommendations	234
Introduction.....	235
An Overview of the Monitoring Program	235
Recommended Indicators and Procedures	237
Appendix A. Great Lakes Coastal Wetlands Classification	240
Appendix B. Validation and Performance of an Invertebrate Index of Biotic Integrity for Lakes Huron and Michigan Fringing Wetlands During a Period of Lake Level Decline	24047
Appendix C. Fish Habitat Use Within and Across Wetland Classes in Coastal Wetlands of the Five Great Lakes: Development of a Fish-based Index of Biotic Integrity	24068

Tables and Figures

Figure 1-1. Conceptual illustration of terms used to describe various units associated with sampling a population of interest. Each square represents a different wetland within the sampling region of interest.	22
Table 1-1. Tabular organization of response values, averages and slopes (Urquhart et al. 1998). Note that in the context of Consortium: sampling unit = wetland.	24
Figure 1-2. Examples of four different revisit designs, beginning with the simplest, in which a single panel or set of sampling units are visited on every sampling occasion, and ending with a complex partially augmented serially alternating design (Urquhart et al. 1998).	25
Figure 1-3. Partitioning of each panel into subpanels for Design 4 (Urquhart, N.S., and Kincaid, T.M. 1999).	26
Table 1-2. Tabular organization of response values, averages and slopes (Sokal , et al. 1981).	28
Table 3-1. Floristic Quality Assessment output for Mackinac Bay, Lake Huron.	39
Table 3-2. Comparison of Native Mean C and Total Mean C scores for three Great Lakes Marshes on lakes Huron and Erie.	40
Figure 3-1. This aerial photo view of a wetland along northern Lake Huron shows the location of three transects, each beginning at the upland edge of the wetland and continuing south across the meadow zone (white) and the emergent/submergent zone (dark). The transects end at the edge of the emergent zone, even though there may be continued vegetation in a more open submergent zone. This open vegetation cannot typically be seen easily on aerial photos. Photo A shows 15 sampling points in each of the two zones. Photo insert B shows that if a narrow portion of this wetland, or a wetland that was narrow along its entire length, were being sampled, that the transects would need to be configured at an angle to the wetland’s slope to allow for all 30 points to be placed. Locating the points along transects allows for more rapid sampling than the random sampling shown in Figure 3-2.	41
Figure 3-2. Random sampling of the wetland shown in figure 1. Random sampling can be configured utilizing GIS software, or by physically (or electronically) placing a grid over the photo and randomly choosing sampling points.	42
Table 3-3. Wetland quality based on aquatic macrophyte sampling.	45
Table 3-4. Mean Conservatism Scores for each regional marsh type.	47
Table 3-5. Flow chart for determining quality rating of submergent marsh zone or submergent component of an emergent marsh zone.	49
Table 3-6. Species tolerant of nutrient enrichment, sedimentation, or increased turbidity.	50
Table 3-7. Combined standardized score from Table 3.3, Rows A-I and Table 3.5.	50
Table 3-8. Examples of Combined Standardized Scores for five riverine wetlands.	50
Table 4-1. Summary of the status of invertebrate assessment metrics developed or in development for Great Lakes coastal wetlands by some key research groups. (Definitions provided on next page.)	66
Figure 4-1. Consortium invertebrate sampling locations relative to the “Sum_Rel” overall landscape stressor scores.	72
Table 4-2. Wet Meadow Zone: Dominated by Carex and Calamagrostis.	73
Table 4-3. Inner Scirpus Zone: Often dense Scirpus mixed with Pontedaria and submergents, protected from wave action.	73
Table 4-4. Outer Scirpus Zone: Sometimes relatively sparse, usually monodominant stands, subject to direct wave action.	74
Figure 5-1. Mean values per net-night for Schoenoplectus zones. For further reference, see Appendix C (Uzarski, et al. 2003) at the end of this document.	86
Figure 5-2. The IBI of Uzarski et al. 2005 recommend by the GLCWC. Data are collected using fyke nets. For further reference, see Appendix C (Uzarski, et al. 2003) at the end of this document.	87
Table 5-1. Recommended Landscape and Water Quality Parameters to Record During Field Surveys.	88
Table 6-1. Checklist of supplies needed for the MMP amphibian monitoring protocols.	98
Table 6-2. The approximate number of sites required to detect a difference in IBIs within an area of interest (e.g., Great Lakes basin, lake basin, state, region). IBIs are expressed out of 100 with higher scores indicating amphibian communities in better condition.	98
Table 6-3. Classification of Great Lakes amphibian species into community guilds.	99
Table 6-4. A description of metric codes used in the amphibian-based coastal wetland IBI.	99
Table 6-5. Amphibian community based coastal wetland IBIs (out of 100) for a subset of sites sampled south of the Canadian Shield by MMP surveyors from 1995-2003. Higher scores indicate amphibian communities in better biotic condition.	101
Table 7-1. Checklists.	122
Table 7-2. The approximate number of sites required to detect a difference in IBIs within an area of interest (e.g., Great Lakes basin, lake basin, State, Region). IBIs are expressed out of 100 with higher scores indicating marsh bird communities in better condition.	122

Table 7-3. A description of metric codes used in the marsh bird IBI.....	123
Figure 7-1. Illustration of marsh user categories for bird species based on marsh use.....	124
Table 7-4. Coastal wetland marsh bird IBIs (out of 100) for a subset of sites sampled in Ecoregion 8 by MMP surveyors from 1995-2003. Higher scores indicate marsh bird communities in better biotic condition.....	126
Figure 8-1. Mean wetland connectivity, a measure of landscape fragmentation, in a one-kilometer coastal region of the entire Great Lakes basin. Because these analyses use two differing land cover data sets, results for (a) U.S. and (b) Canada may not be directly comparable (from Lopez et al., 2005).	138
Figure 8-2. Percentage of perforated wetland, a measure of wetland connectivity, in a one-kilometer coastal region of the Great Lakes basin. Because these analyses use two differing land cover data sets, results for (a) U.S. and (b) Canada may not be directly comparable (from Lopez et al., 2005).	139
Figure 8-3. Mean minimum distance to closest like-type wetland patch (i.e., emergent-to-emergent, forested-to-forested, and scrub/shrub-to-scrub/shrub) within each hydrologic unit. Because these analyses use two differing land-cover data sets, results for (a) U.S. and (b) Canada may not be directly comparable (from Lopez et al., 2005).	139
Figure 8-4. The Shannon-Wiener Index is one of several ways to measure the diversity of land-cover types within a specific area of the landscape. The Shannon-Wiener values increase as the number of land-cover/land-use types within the reporting unit increases. Because these analyses use differing land-cover data sets, results for the U.S. and Canada are not directly comparable (from Lopez et al., 2005).	140
Figure 8-5. Simpson's Index is a measure of the evenness of the distribution of land-cover classes within a specific area of the landscape. Because these analyses use differing land-cover data sets, results for the U.S. and Canada are not directly comparable (from Lopez et al., 2005).	141
Table 8-1. Listing of available landscape maps from historical and ongoing mapping programs.	143
Table 8-2. List of current and historical sensor data available, the spectral regions in which they work, spatial resolution, swath size and revisit time, period of operation, approximate cost and a link to further information on each sensor and where the data can be obtained.	148
Figure 8-12. Watersheds (3,591) delineated for the U.S. side of the Great Lakes basin. (2007).	157
Figure 8-14. Integrated Sum-Rel score for the 3,590 U.S./Canadian Great Lakes watersheds (T. Hollenhorst, NRRI, University of Minnesota et al. in prep).	159
Table 8-3. List of datasets suitable for ecological monitoring efforts.....	162
Table 8-4. List of selected landscape metrics used in environmental indicator and assessment work.	163
Table 9-1. Cost estimates of equipment needed for the sampling of wetland water chemistry.....	175
Table 9-2. Cost estimates of equipment needed for the sampling of wetland plants	176
Table 9-3. Cost estimates of equipment needed for the sampling of wetland invertebrates	176
Table 9-4. Cost estimates of equipment needed for the sampling of wetland fish	176
Table 9-5. Cost estimates of equipment needed for the sampling of wetland amphibians.....	177
Table 9-6. Cost estimates of equipment needed for the sampling of wetland birds.....	177
Table 9-7. Cost estimates of equipment needed for the sampling of wetland landscape attributes	177
Table 9-8. Cost estimates of equipment needed for general wetland sampling. These costs are shared by all indicators.	178
Table 9-9. Estimates of total costs and consumables for equipment to sample each indicator	179
Table 9-10. Estimates of costs for equipment possibly owned by agencies	179
Table 9-11. Estimates of the sampling time, training time and training cost for wetland indicator sampling ..	180
Figure 9-1. Example of the Cost Estimator Tool in Excel.....	182
Table 9-12. Estimates of startup, per wetland and total costs for the sampling of each indicator at one site and ten sites all ten miles away.	184
Figure 9-2. Cost estimate for the minimalist scenario	186
Figure 9-3. Cost estimate for the no-expense-spared scenario	187
Figure 9-4. Cost estimate for the middle-ground scenario	188
Table 11-1. Results from Consortium Phone Survey: Current Agency Monitoring Efforts and Partnerships.	213
Table 11-2. Results from Consortium Phone Survey – State agency staffing and available equipment for each Consortium indicator and anticipated training needs.	215
Table 11-3. Current coastal wetland monitoring efforts and partnerships among potential Canadian Consortium partners who responded to information inquiries.....	222
Table 11-4. Expertise and equipment availability, and training requirements for each Consortium indicator, among potential Canadian Consortium partners who responded to information inquiries.....	224
Figure 11-1. Framework for Adaptive Management	230

Editors

Thomas M. Burton, Michigan State University
John C. Brazner, Inland Waters Institute
Jan J.H. Ciborowski, University of Windsor
Greg P. Grabas, Environment Canada
John Hummer, Great Lakes Commission
John Schneider, U.S. EPA Great Lakes National Program Office
Donald G. Uzarski, Central Michigan University

Authors

Chapter 1 – Statistical Design

Donald G. Uzarski, Central Michigan University
Sango Otieno, Grand Valley State University

Chapter 2 – Chemical/Physical and Land Use/Cover Measurements

Donald G. Uzarski, Central Michigan University
Thomas M. Burton, Michigan State University
Jan J.H. Ciborowski, University of Windsor

Chapter 3 – Vegetation Community Indicators

Dennis A. Albert, Michigan State University Extension –
Michigan Natural Features Inventory

Chapter 4 – Invertebrate Community Indicators

Donald G. Uzarski, Central Michigan University
Thomas M. Burton, Michigan State University
John C. Brazner, Inland Waters Institute
Jan J.H. Ciborowski, University of Windsor

Chapter 5 – Fish Community Indicators

Donald G. Uzarski, Central Michigan University
Thomas M. Burton, Michigan State University
John C. Brazner, Inland Waters Institute
Jan J.H. Ciborowski, University of Windsor

Chapter 6 – Amphibian Community Indicators

Steven T. A. Timmermans, Bird Studies Canada
Tara L. Crewe, Bird Studies Canada
Greg P. Grabas, Environment Canada –
Canadian Wildlife Service

Chapter 7 – Bird Community Indicators

Greg P. Grabas, Environment Canada –
Canadian Wildlife Service
Tara L. Crewe, Bird Studies Canada

Steven T. A. Timmermans, Bird Studies Canada

Chapter 8 – Landscape-Based Indicators

Laura L. Bourgeau-Chavez, Michigan Tech Research
Institute
Ricardo D. Lopez, U.S. EPA – Office of Research and
Development
Anett Trebitz, U.S. EPA, Mid-Continent Ecology Division
Thomas Hollenhorst, University of Minnesota Duluth –
Natural Resources Research Institute
George E. Host, University of Minnesota Duluth –
Natural Resources Research Institute
Brian Huberty, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service –
R-3 Ecological Services
Roger L. Gauthier, Great Lakes Commission
John Hummer, Great Lakes Commission

Chapter 9 – Cost Analysis for Sampling Great Lakes Coastal Wetlands

Marci Meixler, Cornell University

Chapter 10 – Data Management System

Stuart Eddy, Great Lakes Commission
Richard D. Garcia, Great Lakes Commission

Chapter 11 – Partnerships for Implementation

Tracy L. Collin, Michigan Department of Environmental
Quality
John Hummer, Great Lakes Commission
Krista Holmes, Environment Canada –
Canadian Wildlife Service
Ryan W. Archer, Bird Studies Canada

Monitoring Great Lakes Coastal Wetlands: Summary Recommendations

Thomas M. Burton, Michigan State University

Acknowledgments

The authors and editors of this document gratefully acknowledge the following individuals and their organizations for their contributions to this document:

Chapter 3 – Vegetation Community Indicators

Greg P. Grabas, Environment Canada –
Canadian Wildlife Service
Carol A. Johnston, South Dakota State University
John J. Mack, Cleveland Metroparks
Douglas A. Wilcox, U.S. Geological Survey –
Great Lakes Science Center

Chapter 8 – Landscape-Based Indicators

Dennis A. Albert, Michigan State University
Extension – Michigan Natural Features Inventory
Nancy French, Michigan Tech Research Institute
Marcelle Grenier, Environment Canada
Krista Holmes, Environment Canada –
Canadian Wildlife Service
Laura Simonson, U.S. Geological Survey

Chapter 10 – Data Management System

Valerie J. Brady, University of Minnesota Duluth –
Natural Resources Research Institute
Krista Holmes, Environment Canada –
Canadian Wildlife Service
Denis Lepage, Bird Studies Canada
Marci Meixler, Cornell University

Chapter 11 - Partnerships for Implementation

Peg Bostwick, Michigan Department of
Environmental Quality

The following individuals and organizations are gratefully acknowledged for their contributions to this project:

Mark Bain, Cornell University
Peg Bostwick, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality
Ferenc A. De Szalay, Kent State University
Kim Fernie, Environment Canada – Canadian Wildlife Service
Robert W. Howe, University of Wisconsin – Green Bay
Joel W. Ingram, (formerly) Environment Canada – Canadian Wildlife Service
Lucinda B. Johnson, University of Minnesota Duluth – Natural Resources Research Institute
Ric Lawson, (formerly) Great Lakes Commission
Greg Mayne, Environment Canada – Canadian Wildlife Service
Mary F. Moffett, U.S. EPA, Mid-Continent Ecology Division
Gerald J. Niemi, University of Minnesota Duluth – Natural Resources Research Institute
Thomas Rayburn, (formerly) Great Lakes Commission
Karen Rodriguez, U.S. EPA – Great Lakes National Program Office
Julie Wagemakers, (formerly) Great Lakes Commission

Environment Canada – Canadian Wildlife Service gratefully acknowledges contributions to the Great Lakes Coastal Wetlands Consortium by:

Managerial Support

Joel Ingram, Lesley Dunn, Graham Bryan, Nancy Patterson, Donna Stewart, and Simon Llewellyn

Field Staff and Project Support

David Praskey, Carrie Sadowski, Barb Crosbie, Lenny Shirose, Maggie Galloway, Rob Read, Shawn Meyer, Paul Watton, Brian Potter, Tamara Gomer, Nicholas Stow, Richard “Woody” Hamel, Jon Gorniak, Kristina Kostuk, and Kate Gee, Satu Peranen, and Ian Kelsey

The Durham Region Coastal Wetland Monitoring Project (DRCWMP) was initiated in 2001 and has contributed to the GLCWC process through Environment Canada – Canadian Wildlife Service. The following contributors and partners of the DRCWMP are acknowledged for their role in advancing coastal wetland science:

Central Lake Ontario Conservation Authority
Toronto and Region Conservation Authority
Ganaraska Region Conservation Authority
University of Toronto
University of Windsor
Regional Municipality of Durham
Ontario Power Generation

Editorial and Design Support – Great Lakes Commission

Christine Manninen, Kirk Haverkamp, Elizabeth Schmidt

Photo Credits

Cover (top left to bottom right): Ohio wetland with sedges; courtesy USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, Romy Myszka. Canoe and dock, Lake Superior Bark Bay, Wisconsin; courtesy Karen Rodriguez, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. Lake Ontario near Syracuse, N.Y.; courtesy John Hummer, Great Lakes Commission. Wetland within Illinois Beach State Park, Illinois; courtesy David Riecks, Illinois-Indiana Sea Grant. Lakeview Wildlife Management Area, Lake Ontario Eastern Basin; courtesy M. Knutson, The Nature Conservancy, Central and Western New York Chapter. East Bay Marshes, Lake Ontario New York; courtesy New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. Wetland within Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Lake Michigan, Indiana; courtesy David Riecks, Illinois- Indiana Sea Grant. Wetland pasture, Ontario, Canada; courtesy USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, Romy Myszka. Lotus-in situ, Michigan; courtesy National Park Service, Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.