

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	ii
Acknowledgments.....	v
Acronyms.....	vi
List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	ix
1 Background.....	1
2 Data Compilation and Preparation.....	2
2.1 Macroinvertebrates	2
2.1.1 Dataset.....	2
2.1.2 Collection method.....	4
2.1.3 Taxa attributes.....	6
2.2 Habitat and water quality	8
2.3 Landscape-scale Information (GIS-based).....	11
3 Site Disturbance Characterization.....	13
3.1 Purpose.....	13
3.2 Approach.....	13
4 Classification.....	20
4.1 Exploratory Classification Analysis.....	21
4.2 Classification Summary	21
5 Index Development.....	22
5.1 Metric scoring	22
5.2 Metric selection.....	25
5.3 Index compilation and performance	29
5.4 Final index selection and performance	33
5.5 Index verification	36
6 Exploration of assessment thresholds	45
7 Applications	52
8 References.....	54

Appendix A Major macroinvertebrate habitat types (MassDEP-SNEP crosswalk)

Appendix B Taxa tolerance analysis

Appendix C Macroinvertebrate metrics

Appendix D Characterization of reference vs. stressed sites

Appendix E Site Classification Analysis

Appendix F Metric response mechanisms

Attachment A – Taxonomic data quality control report

Attachment B – Low gradient taxa attribute table

Attachment C – List of sites and samples in the IBI dataset

List of Tables

Table 1. Distribution of the 109 sites across states and Level 3 and 4 ecoregions (U.S. EPA 2011).	2
Table 2. Summary of the protocol elements for the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) and Southeast New England Program (SNEP) low gradient macroinvertebrate methods.	5
Table 3. Five sets of traits were included in the taxa attribute table for the low gradient SNEP dataset.	7
Table 4. Habitat variables that were collected by MassDEP and Tetra Tech field crews at the time of the biological sampling events.	9
Table 5. Seven disturbance variables were used to assign sites to preliminary disturbance categories. Information on variable selection can be found in the MassDEP 100-count riffle habitat IBI report (Jessup and Stamp 2020).	14
Table 6. Metric scoring thresholds and combination rules that were used to assign sites to preliminary disturbance categories.	16
Table 7. Minimum and maximum values for selected characteristics of reference (Ref) and highly stressed (Strs) site groups and in all sites (All).	20
Table 8. Candidate metrics considered for inclusion in index development.	27
Table 9. Spearman rho correlation among candidate metrics.	28
Table 10. Reviewer screening and exclusion criteria for narrowing the list of index alternatives.	30
Table 11. The nine best model alternatives (selected by the working group).	32
Table 12. Metric codes and names for the index selected by Mass DEP (6_13784).	32
Table 13. Performance statistics for the two versions of the selected model (NumTaxaIBI vs. PctTaxaIBI).	33
Table 14. Metrics in the low gradient IBI, with scoring formulae, DE values, and trend.	34
Table 15. Correlation coefficients (Spearman rank rho) for the IBI input metrics, based on the SNEP dataset.	34
Table 16. Low gradient IBI distribution statistics for the index calculated after trait revisions.	47
Table 17. Threshold ranges and recommended SNEP IBI values for indication of biological conditions in low gradient streams.	50