

Quantifying Impacts of an Environmental Intervention Using Environmental DNA

Elizabeth Andruszkiewicz Allan, Ryan P. Kelly, Erin D’Agnese,
Maya Garber-Yonts, Megan Shaffer, Zachary Gold, Andrew O. Shelton

2022

[Draft for *Ecological Applications*, Fall 2022]

Abstract

Environmental laws around the world require some version of an environmental impact assessment surrounding construction projects and other discrete instances of human development. Information requirements for these assessments vary by jurisdiction, but nearly all require an analysis of the living elements of affected ecosystems. Because it is possible to sample and amplify the genetic material of many species present in those environments, amplicon-sequencing — also called metabarcoding or environmental DNA (eDNA) analysis — is a tractable, powerful, and increasingly common way of doing environmental impact analysis for development projects. Here, we analyze a 12-month time-series of water samples taken before, during, and after a construction project in a salmonid-bearing freshwater stream. We use an asymmetrical Before-After-Control-Intervention (BACI) design with multiple control streams to develop a robust background expectation against which to evaluate the impact of this discrete human intervention in the treatment stream. We generate calibrated, quantitative metabarcoding data from amplifying a fragment of the 12s mtDNA gene and complementary qPCR data to yield multi-species estimates of absolute eDNA abundance across time, creeks, and sampling stations. We then use a hierarchical Bayesian time-series model to reveal patterns of eDNA concentrations over time, and to estimate the effects of the culvert removal on salmonids in the treatment creek. We focus our analysis on four common salmonid species in the data: cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkii*), coho trout (*O. kisutch*), rainbow trout (*O. mykiss*), and sockeye salmon (*O. nerka*). After accounting for temporal variability common to the sampled creeks, we find only transient effects on these species during the several months after

construction. In the context of billions of dollars of court-mandated road culvert replacements taking place in Washington State, USA, our results suggest that culvert replacement can be conducted with only minimal impact to key species of management concern. More broadly, we demonstrate a rigorous, quantitative method for environmental impact reporting using eDNA that is widely applicable in environments worldwide.

Introduction

At present, it is difficult or impossible to measure the environmental impacts of discrete human activities, despite such assessment often being required by law. Within the United States, both state and federal laws often require a form of environmental-impact assessment for medium- to large-scale projects (i.e., those that might have a significant impact on the environment) (Morgan 2012). Outside the US, many nations have their own versions of these same laws. Specifically when measuring impacts on aquatic ecosystems, assessments generally continue to rely on literature reviews or field measurements of a few key species, selected beforehand (Rubin et al. 2017). These traditional methods are often expensive, rely on just a few species, and are extremely limited in spatial and temporal coverage (Martin et al. 2012). Moreover, they often lack pre- or post-project monitoring, or sufficient post-project sampling, given that the goals of a development project normally focus on construction itself and funding is often extremely limited. For example, a recent literature review of stream restoration projects cites that more than half of projects (62%) had no pre-project monitoring and only sampled once per year (Rubin et al. 2017).

All methods of environmental sampling are biased, in the sense that they capture a selective portion of the biodiversity present (Rubin et al. 2017). Net samples for fish, for example, fail to capture species too small or too large to be caught in the net; bacterial cultures capture only those species that can be cultured on available media, and so forth. Despite the pleasing simplicity of the idea, there is no one way to survey the world and just “see what is there.” Environmental DNA, however, comes as close to this goal as any method yet developed: a sample of water, soil, or even air, contains the genetic traces of many thousands of species, from microbes to whales. Sequencing environmental DNA (eDNA) is means of surveying many species in a consistent and scaleable way (Taberlet et al. 2012, Thomsen and Willerslev 2015). Sampling water to collect eDNA before, during, and after a development project would be a new and powerful way of assessing that project’s impacts on the local biological communities, and conceivably could become the standard way to do such impact assessment (Hinz et al. 2022). Environmental assessments have begun to make use of eDNA for such work around the world (Muha et al. 2017, Duda et al. 2021, Klein et al. 2022, Maasri et al. 2022, Moss et al. 2022), but are not yet common practice.

Surveying the natural world by amplifying and sequencing DNA from environmental sources such as water, air, or soil has long been commonplace in microbial ecology (Ogram et al. 1987, Rondon et al. 2000, Turnbaugh et al. 2007), but has recently become popular for characterizing ecological communities of eukaryotes (Taberlet et al. 2012, Kelly et al. 2014, De Vargas et al. 2015, Port et al. 2015, Valentini et al. 2016, Stat et al. 2017). Because the source of samples is the environment itself (e.g., water) rather than specific target organisms, the data resulting from such studies have become known as environmental DNA (eDNA); the ultimate source of genetic material in the environment may be living or waste cells or extracellular DNA (Taberlet et al. 2012). Techniques that take advantage of such data may include non-PCR-based methods such as hybridization, but generally include an amplification step such as quantitative PCR, digital or digital-droplet PCR, or traditional PCR from mixed templates followed by high-throughput sequencing (Ruppert et al. 2019). This last technique is known as metabarcoding, eDNA amplicon-sequencing, or more generally, marker-gene analysis.

In a metabarcoding approach, broad-spectrum PCR primers capture many taxa across a very wide diversity of the tree of the life (e.g., Leray et al. (2013)), but nevertheless the absence of a taxon from a sequenced sample does not indicate the absence of that taxon from the environment (Shelton et al. 2016, Kelly et al. 2019, Buxton et al. 2021). Instead, the unsampled species simply may not have been susceptible to that set of PCR primers, and so failed to amplify. The result is often a dataset that represents hundreds or thousands of taxa, but these taxa are a fraction of a larger (and perhaps taxonomically broad) pool of species present. Using multiple, independent primer sets increases taxonomic scope by drawing from overlapping pools of taxa (Kelly et al. 2017), maximizing the likelihood of detecting any given taxon present. In virtually all comparisons, metabarcoding recovers far more taxa from an area than any other sampling method (Port et al. 2015, Kelly et al. 2017, Seymour et al. 2021).

However, we expect results from metabarcoding to differ dramatically from non-PCR based sampling methods due to the fundamental differences in sampling for genetic waste as opposed to whole organisms. Furthermore, eDNA analyses rely on several laboratory processes, including PCR amplification, all of which contribute to complicating the interpretation of results (see Shelton et al. (2016) and Kelly et al. (2019) for more information). Specifically, the PCR amplification process is an exponential process for which the efficiency varies across species. By understanding these process differences, we can correct for taxon-specific biases in amplification efficiency to yield quantitative estimates of the community composition prior to PCR (McLaren et al. 2019, Shelton et al. 2022).

The resulting metabarcoding dataset is compositional, revealing the proportions of each species' DNA present in each sample, but importantly, contains no information about the absolute abundance of DNA present. We

can tie these proportional estimates to absolute abundances using additional data such as a qPCR assay for one of the taxa present. Thus, we can use qPCR and metabarcoding together to maximize the information gleaned from the same samples by obtaining information about many species through metabarcoding, and then grounding the compositional dataset to quantifications provided from the results of a qPCR assay for a single species that is also detected in the metabarcoding approach. Together, we can use these data to assess changes in eDNA concentrations of species over time, and due to environmental impacts such as replacing a culvert under a road.

As a result of a federal court ruling (Martinez 2013), Washington State is under a court order to replace hundreds of culverts that allow water to pass under roads and highways. The culverts that need to be replaced, at present, collectively prevent or hinder anadromous salmon species from using hundreds of miles of habitat, which in turn violates the treaty rights of the region’s indigenous tribes. Because replacing culverts can require substantial intervention – for example, diverting the water from a creek segment and rebuilding the road with a redesigned culvert – they require environmental impact assessments. Furthermore, because these replacements occur serially according to a schedule, they present an attractive experimental design to use eDNA to assess environmental impacts.

Here, we report the results of a yearlong eDNA sampling effort before, during, and after a small construction project in our experimental creek, assessing the impact of that project on the salmonid species present. We do so using a combination of metabarcoding (12s mtDNA) and qPCR to yield quantitative estimates of the concentrations of DNA present at each time point, and we use parallel samples from an additional four control creeks to develop a causal analysis of changes in these concentrations. A clear opportunity for policy-relevant eDNA work is in using its power to survey many species at a time to improve the way we assess the impacts of human activities. We demonstrate the utility of eDNA for such assessments.

Methods

We used an asymmetrical BACI (Before-After-Control-Impact) study design to measure the environmental impact of a construction project replacing the under-road culvert in the treatment creek using eDNA (Underwood 1992, 1994, Benedetti-Cecchi 2001). We sampled four control creeks in addition to the treatment creek (Figure 1) at monthly intervals, both upstream and downstream of each creek’s culvert. Because salmonids are the primary species of management concern in these creeks, we focus the present analysis on the four salmonid species most common in our data: *Oncorhynchus clarkii* (cutthroat trout), *O. kisutch* (coho salmon), *O. mykiss* (rainbow and steelhead trout), and *O. nerka* (sockeye and kokanee salmon). As

further described below, we surveyed the salmonid DNA present in each creek via eDNA metabarcoding (targeting a region of the 12s mtDNA gene) and complementary quantitative PCR (qPCR; targeting a region of the CytB gene) for a reference species (*O. clarkii*), which in combination yielded quantitative estimates for each fish species throughout the study area.

Construction to replace the culvert in our treatment creek occurred midway through our year-long survey. We were then able to quantify the effect of the culvert replacement itself – controlling for temporal trends, background environmental variability, and sampling variability – using a Bayesian time-series model to jointly model salmon eDNA abundances across creeks, time points, sampling stations, and species.

Water Sampling

We collected water samples monthly between March 2021 and February 2022 in each of five salmonid-bearing creeks in northwest Washington State, USA (Figure 1). We sampled each stream above and below under-road culverts, each of with a different degree of expected fish passibility as determined by the Washington Department of Transportation (Supplemental Text 1) (Fish and Wildlife 2019). The culvert in the treatment creek (Padden) was suspected to be impassible and thus was removed and replaced during the course of the study; two of the four creeks had culverts allowing fish passibility (Portage and Squalicum), and two had culverts blocking fish passage (Barnes and Chuckanut).




Figure 1: Map of sampling locations near Bellingham, Washington.

At each sampling station ($N=2$, upstream and downstream of a culvert) at each creek ($N = 5$) in each month ($N = 12$), we collected three 2-liter water samples, for a total of 360 samples. Water samples were collected using Smith Root’s eDNA Backpack (Thomas et al. 2018), a portable pumping-and-filtering device

set to filter at 1 L/min at 82.7 kPa (12 psi). In some months, less than 2 L of water was filtered due to clogging (Supplemental Table 1). Water samples were filtered through 5 μ m self-preserving filters (Smith Root, Vancouver, WA) using single-use inlet tubes, which were then dried, and kept at room temperature until DNA extraction within 1 month of collection (Thomas et al. 2019).

Water discharge varied throughout the year, with lowest discharge in summer months and highest discharge in winter months (Figure 2). Flow gauges maintained by USGS were used for Padden Creek, Chuckanut Creek, and Squalicum Creek (U. S. Geological Survey 1994). During the year of sampling, the flow gauges at Chuckanut Creek and Squalicum Creek stopped metering after a major flooding event. To find discharge rates for each creek to correct eDNA concentrations by discharge, five years of historical data (2015-2020) of the three creeks were used to generate a monthly averaged correction factor based on Padden Creek. For the year of sampling (2021-2022), the discharge rates used at Chuckanut and Squalicum Creeks were estimated based on the correction factor from Padden Creek (Supplemental Figure 1). No discharge data was available for Portage Creek or Barnes Creek. Based on field sampling conditions, the discharge from Padden Creek was used as a proxy for both Portage and Barnes as they were similar sizes and flow rates. Though in the year of sampling, the discharge in Padden Creek ranged from no metered flow to 23 m³/s, the discharge on the dates of sampling only reached a maximum of 1.3 m³/s.




Figure 2: Discharge (m³/s) in Padden, Chuckanut, and Squalicum Creeks over the course of sampling. Open circles show the days when sampling occurred. Gauges at Chuckanut and Squalicum Creek went offline in November 2021 after a major storm event.

Additionally, in the creek of interest, Padden Creek, *O. mykiss* (rainbow trout) were stocked in Lake Padden, approximately 1.5 km upstream of the sampling sites. Occasionally, cutthroat trout (*O. clarkii*) and kokanee salmon (*O. nerka*) have been stocked in the past as well. During the course of the study, a total of 10,000

rainbow trout were stocked in April and May 2021, 30,000 kokanee salmon were stocked in May 2021, and 10,000 cutthroat trout were stocked in January 2021 (Supplemental Figure 2).

DNA Extraction, Amplification, Sequencing

All molecular work was performed at the University of Washington. Benchtops were cleaned with 10% bleach for 10 minutes and then wiped with 70% ethanol. Molecular work was separated onto pre- and post-PCR benches; all DNA extractions and PCR preparation was conducted on a bench where no PCR product was handled. DNA was extracted from half of each filter using a Qiashreder column (Qiagen, USA) and the DNEasy Blood and Tissue Kit (Qiagen, USA) with an overnight incubation (Supplemental Text 1, Thomas et al. (2019)), such that the effective filtering effort was 1 L/sample; the remaining half of each filter was archived at -20°C. Extracts were eluted in 100 μ L of molecular grade water, quantified via Qubit (Invitrogen, USA) and stored at -20°C until PCR amplification within 2 months of extraction.

For metabarcoding, we targeted a ~170 bp hypervariable region of the mitochondrial DNA 12S rRNA gene for PCR amplification (MiFish; Miya et al. 2015), but using modified primer sequences as given in Praebel and Wangenstein [cite] and including the Illumina Nextera overhang sequences for subsequent indexing. The primers used were as follows: F 5' *TCGTCGGCAGCGTCAGATGTGTATAAGAGACAGGCCGGTAAACTCGTGCCAGC* 3', R 5' *GTCTCGTGGGCTCGGAGATGTGTATAAGAGACAGCATAGTGGGGTATCTAATCCCAGTTTG* 3' (*italics* indicate Nextera overhang). The final reaction recipe and cycling conditions can be found in Supplemental Text 1. Each month of samples was amplified on a single plate with the addition of a no template control (NTC; molecular grade water in lieu of template) and a positive control (genomic DNA from kangaroo). After PCR amplification, PCR products were visualized on a 1-2% gel. If no band was present for a given sample, a new amplification was attempted with extracts diluted 1:10 iteratively until a band was detected. PCR products were size-selected and cleaned using MagBind Beads (Omega Biotek, USA) at a sample:beads ratio of 1.2. Bead-cleaned PCR products were eluted in 30 μ L of molecular grade water and quantified via Qubit (Invitrogen, USA).

A indexing PCR reaction added a unique index to each sample using Nextera indices (Illumina, USA) to allow pooling multiple samples onto the same sequencing run (See Supplemental Text 1 for details). Indexed PCR products were also size-selected and purified using MagBind Beads (Omega Biotek, USA) at a sample:beads ratio of 0.8. Bead-cleaned PCR products were eluted in 30 μ L of molecular grade water and quantified via Qubit. Indexed and bead-cleaned products were normalized before pooling into libraries, which were subsequently quantified via Qubit and visualized on a Bioanalyzer (Agilent, USA) before sequencing. Samples

were randomized in 3-month blocks and each block split across 3 sequencing runs, for a total of 12 MiSeq runs. The loading concentration of each library was 4-8 pM and 5-20% PhiX was included depending on the composition of the run (Supplemental Table 2).

Bioinformatics

After sequencing, bioinformatic analyses were conducted in R (R Core Team 2017). Information about the bioinformatics pipeline is included in the supplement (Supplemental Text 1). Briefly, primer sequences were removed using Cutadapt (Version 1.18) (Martin 2011) before dada2 (Callahan et al. 2016) trimmed, filtered, merged paired end reads, and generated amplicon sequence variants (ASVs). Taxonomic assignment was conducted via the insect package (Wilkinson et al. 2018) using a tree generated by the developers for the MiFish primers that was last updated in November 2018. Only species level assignments from insect were retained and ASVs not annotated or not annotated to species level were then checked against the NCBI nucleotide database using BLAST+ (Camacho et al. 2009). Query sequences that matched a single species at >95% identity were retained.

In total, sequencing runs generated ~42 million reads across all environmental samples (12 months x 2 stations x 5 creeks x 3 biological replicates = 360 filters) and 27 mock community samples (3 communities x 9 replicates [6 even, 3 skewed proportions]) for calibration (see below). After quality-filtering and merging all runs, ~33 million reads remained from ~21,000 amplicon sequence variants (ASVs) in the environmental samples, of which ~81% of reads and ~2% of ASVs were annotated to species level (per sample: mean = 78%, median = 88%, min = 0%, max = 99.99% of reads annotated). We only focus on the metabarcoding data from four salmonids for the remainder of this paper. The four salmonids represent ~55% of all environmental reads and ~68% of the annotated reads found in environmental samples.

In the mock community samples, 98.65% of the ~5 million reads after quality filtering were annotated to species level. Importantly, the particular target salmonid ASVs in the mock communities were found in environmental samples, unambiguously linking the taxa in calibration samples with those in environmental samples. The most common salmonid species found in the environmental samples was *O. clarkii* (cutthroat trout), which was found in ~90% of samples, followed by *O. kisutch* found in ~60% of samples, then *O. mykiss* found in ~40% of samples, and finally *O. nerka* found in ~5% of samples. Not only was *O. clarkii* found in the majority of environmental samples, but also ~63% of samples across all times, creeks, and stations had at least 50% of reads assigned to *O. clarkii*.

Quantitative PCR and Inhibition Testing

We quantified cutthroat trout (*O. clarkii*) DNA in each sample, targeting a 114 bp fragment of the cytochrome b gene with a qPCR assay (Duda et al. 2021). The primer/probe sequences were: F 5' CCGCTACAGTCCTTCACCTTCTA 3', R 5' GATCTTTGTATGAGAAGTAAGGATGGAA 3', P 5' 6FAM-TGAGACAGGATCCAAC-MGB-NFQ 3'. The qPCR assay was multiplexed with TaqMan Exogenous Internal Positive Control Reagents (EXO-IPC) (Applied Biosystems, USA) to check for the presence of PCR inhibitors (Duda et al. 2021). The EXO-IPC mix includes the primers and probe for the EXI-IPC DNA, with the probe having a VIC reporter, allowing it to be multiplexed with the *O. clarkii* assay, which has a FAM reporter. Each DNA sample was run in triplicate; the final recipe and thermocycling conditions can be found in Supplemental Text 1. All qPCRs were conducted on an Applied Biosystems StepOnePlus thermocycler.

Each plate included a 8-point standard curve created using synthetic DNA (gBlocks) at the following concentrations: 100,000 copies/ μ L, 10,000 copies/ μ L, 1,000 copies/ μ L, 100 copies/ μ L, 10 copies/ μ L, 5 copies/ μ L, 3 copies/ μ L, 1 copy/ μ L. Additionally, six no template controls (NTCs) were included on each plate: 3 with the IPC DNA mix and 3 with molecular grade water instead of template or IPC DNA mix. Plates were re-run if efficiency as determined by the standard curve was outside of the range of 90-110%.

To check for inhibition, the cycle threshold (Ct) value determined for the EXO-IPC assay from the NTC was compared to the Ct value for the EXO-IPC assay in each of the environmental samples. If the Ct value was >0.5 Ct values from the mean Ct for the NTCs, the sample was deemed inhibited and diluted 1:10 and re-assayed until the Ct value fell within the accepted range. The majority of environmental samples (65%) were inhibited and accordingly diluted for analysis. In 75% of inhibited samples, a 1:10 dilution remedied the inhibition, but some samples required dilution by a factor of up to 1000.

All qPCR data was processed in R using Stan (Stan Development Team 2022), relating environmental samples to the standard curve via a linear model (Figure 3, blue boxes). We amended the standard linear regression model to more realistically capture the behavior of qPCR observations, accommodating non-detections as a function of underlying DNA concentration, and letting the standard deviation vary with the mean (lower-concentration samples had more uncertainty). See McCall et al. (2014) and Shelton et al. (2019) for similar models; see Supplemental Text 2 for full statistical details. Subsequent analysis corrected for sample-specific dilution if found inhibited and corrected for any variation in water-volume filtered during sample collection.

Quantitative Metabarcoding

Here, we used a mock community to determine the species-specific amplification efficiencies for each salmonid in the study. Briefly, we constructed three communities with known proportions of starting DNA from different species (total DNA as measured by Qubit). Each community was constructed with an even proportion of each species and a skewed proportion. We sequenced these communities using the same metabarcoding primers and thermocycling conditions above and then can determine the species-specific amplification rates given the discrepancy between the known starting proportion and the proportion of reads after sequencing. These mock community data are then used to correct the sequencing reads from the environmental samples to estimate the starting DNA proportions of each species in environmental samples, which is the metric of interest (Figure 3, green boxes). See Shelton et al. (2022) and Supplemental Text 2 for more information. The intercalibration of the mock community samples demonstrates the rank order of amplification efficiencies for salmonids (Supplemental Figures 3 and 4). *O. clarkii* and *O. nerka* had similar amplification efficiencies, both of which were higher than *O. mykiss* and *O. kisutch*, which had the lowest amplification efficiency. Calibrated metabarcoding analysis yielded quantitative estimates of the proportions of species' DNA in environmental samples prior to PCR. We then converted these proportions into absolute abundances by expansion, using the qPCR results for our reference species, *O. clarkii*. We estimated the total amplifiable salmonid DNA in environmental sample i as $DNA_{salmonid_i} = \frac{[qPCR_{reference_i}]}{Proportion_{reference_i}}$, and then expanded species' proportions into absolute concentrations by multiplying these sample-specific total concentrations by individual species' proportions, such that for species j in sample i , $DNA_{i,j} = DNA_{salmonid_i} * Proportion_{i,j}$. Finally, we convert from DNA concentration [copies/L] to a mass flow rate [copies/s] after multiplying by the discharge of each creek [m^3/s] (Figure 3, solid purple boxes).

Estimating the Effects of Culvert Replacement and of Culverts Themselves

Consistent with the asymmetrical BACI study design, we generated data from our four control creeks as context against which to compare the observations in Padden Creek, our treatment creek. Recognizing that these observations are autocorrelated in time, we use an AR(1) autocorrelation model, implemented in Stan via R, to capture the observed temporal trends. At time t , the expected log-DNA concentration for species j in creek i at station d is a linear function of the DNA concentration for the same species/creek/station at $t - 1$ (Equation 1). We add an index r to distinguish samples from creeks and time-points that had not undergone culvert replacement (controls; $r = 1$) from those samples in the treatment creek during and post-replacement (treatment; $r = 2$).




Figure 3: Conceptual figure of different datasets and models used for analyses.

$$Y_{i,t,d,j} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{i,t,d,j}, \sigma^2)$$

$$\mu_{i,t,d,j} = \alpha_{i,t,j} + \beta_j \mu_{i,t-1,d,j} + \gamma_{t,j,r} + \eta_{i,t,d,j} \quad (1)$$

The model shares information across creeks and time-points via a species-specific slope term β_j , which reflects characteristic degrees of autocorrelation for each species. Intercept α varies by time, creek, and species, capturing creek-level deviations from the previous time-step.

The γ term explicitly captures the effect of culvert replacement at time t for species j . We define $\gamma_{r=1} = 0$, such that the parameter estimates for samples during and after replacement, $\gamma_{r=2}$, capture the effect of culvert replacement relative to a baseline of zero.

Finally, for a given time/creek/species, the difference in log-DNA concentration between upstream and downstream stations is calculated as the difference between the parameter values of η for the two stations. All samples share a species-specific observation-variance term, σ_j .

We fitted this model in a Bayesian framework using moderately informative priors on all parameters, and confirmed model convergence ($\hat{R} < 1.01$) across 3 chains and 2500 model iterations. See statistical supplement (Supplemental Text 2) for prior values, diagnostics, and full model details.

Results

Metabarcoding and Quantitative PCR

After calibrating metabarcoding data using mock communities, we estimated the salmonid composition across time points, creeks, and stations (Figure 4). The culvert in one control creek (Barnes) appeared to be nearly a total barrier to salmonid passage, with salmonid eDNA detected upstream of the culvert at only three time points, in contrast to being detected at every time point in the downstream station of the same creek. The other four creeks had no such pattern associated with the culverts, suggesting that fish passage may have been possible in each case.

All environmental samples were quantified for absolute concentrations of cutthroat trout DNA across 30 plates, resulting in 280 samples (~80%) with a positive detection in at least 1 of 3 technical replicates. The




Figure 4: Compositions of salmonid DNA as determined by metabarcoding after correction for amplification bias. Note that no sampling occurred in September 2021 at Squalicum Creek because the creek was dry. The empty bars in the Barnes upstream sites indicate that no salmonid DNA was found at those time points.

modeled output of cutthroat trout DNA concentrations, ranged from 10 copies/L to 1,377,656 copies/L, with a mean value of 57,529 copies/L (Figure 5).

We combined compositional information from metabarcoding with absolute concentrations for our reference species, *O. clarkii*, from the qPCR to estimate the total concentration of DNA for each species.

Trends in Abundance

The joint time-series model shared information across stations and creeks; consequently, data from one of the control creeks (Barnes) could not be included because of the total absence of salmonids upstream of its culvert. However, data from the remaining creeks characterized trends in the other four target species well (Figure 6).

Effects of Culverts

Before considering the effect of construction, the difference in abundance trends between upstream and downstream stations (Figure 6 demonstrate that the culverts themselves have some effect, but not a large effect on the salmonid species surveyed. Summarizing over all species, all creeks, the effect was largest during the dry periods of summer (July, August, and September), when flows were at a minimum and the connectivity between upstream and downstream was low (Figure 7). Salmonid species were higher upstream than downstream during this period, with mean upstream DNA about 10% higher concentration than downstream DNA. Individual species' patterns were similar, indicating that there is not a species-specific




Figure 5: Absolute concentration (copies/L of water) of *O. clarkii* (cutthroat trout) as measured by qPCR.




Figure 6: Trends across creeks and across time for each of three salmonid species as estimated by eDNA analysis. Light-colored dots are posterior means derived by expanding the calibrated metabarcoding proportions as described in the main text; darker-colored dots are posterior means for the time-series model of the same. Colors indicate station upstream or downstream of an under-road culvert. 75% and 95% posterior CI plotted for each time point. Grey shading indicates the time period in which the culvert in the treatment creek (Padden Creek) was replaced.

effect where culverts block the passage of some salmon but not others (Supplemental Figure 5). A notable exception is *O. kisutch* in Chuckanut Creek, at some point reaching over 50% higher concentration upstream than downstream. Padden Creek and Squalicum Creek had the lowest percent difference over the course of the year.




Figure 7: The effect of culvert on salmonid abundance summed across all species and creeks by time. The y-axis shows the difference between upstream and downstream concentrations, normalized by downstream concentration. The box boundaries correspond to the 25th and 75th percentiles; the whiskers correspond to 1.5 times the interquartile range.

Effects of Culvert Removal

The effects of the culvert removal operation appear to have been transient and fairly minor for the four salmonid species surveyed. After the beginning of construction in September 2021 through the end of sampling in February 2022, we see fluctuations in the percent changes of salmonid DNA due to the culvert removal (Figure 8). *O. clarkii* is the least impacted species of the construction and *O. nerka* and *O. mykiss* were the most impacted species, likely due to their already low concentrations in the creek. For all species, a very slight drop in concentration occurs in September and October (ca. 5-20% depending on the species), followed by an clear increase in November (ca. 20-50% depending on the species), and then a stabilization of the concentration in December through February.

Of note, fish were exluded from Padden Creek on August 30th, 2021 in preparation for the stream to be diverted on September 9th, 2021 and the diversion was removed October 7th, 2021. Water sampling occurred on September 10th, 2021, the day after the diversion, and on October 12, 2021, just 5 days after reconnecting the stream (Supplemental Table 1).




Figure 8: Effect of Construction on DNA Concentrations in Padden Creek. Error bars show 95% confidence intervals.

Discussion

Environmental DNA can provide quantitative measurements of environmental impacts

A clear seasonal pattern occurred for all the salmonids detected in the study. The time series model uses shared information across creeks to include the change in eDNA concentrations due to time, whether a sample was collected below or above a barrier (i.e., culvert), and whether or not there was construction occurring. Thus, we could isolate the changes in eDNA concentrations as a result of the intervention (i.e., construction) while accounting for the variance due to time and station (i.e., season and culvert).

Furthermore, we can use just one qPCR assay in combination with metabarcoding data to get information about many more species without running n qPCR assays for n species detected in metabarcoding data

(which is also particularly helpful for species that don't have a previously published assay). Metabarcoding data alone only gives compositional data, which cannot be used in a time series to quantify environmental impacts because there is no information about absolute eDNA concentrations. However, by anchoring or grounding proportions using a single qPCR assay, the proportional data can be turned into quantitative data. The species for which to run the qPCR assay can be determined after the metabarcoding is completed; the most commonly found species with a robust qPCR assay should be used to glean the most information.

This analysis also requires correcting metabarcoding data for different species having different amplification efficiencies for a given primer set and thermocycling conditions. For many years it has been acknowledged that amplification bias occurs as demonstrated by the disagreement between starting proportions of DNA before PCR with the resulting proportions of sequencing reads (see Port et al. (2015); Andruszkiewicz et al. (2017) and others for empirical data and Kelly et al. (2019) for simulated data). Because PCR amplification is an exponential process, even very slight differences in how well species are amplified can result in large changes in sequencing reads (Shelton et al. 2022). Here, we emphasize the importance of correcting metabarcoding data for differences in amplification efficiencies when using eDNA metabarcoding data for analysis that requires quantitative data such as environmental impact assessments.

A few other studies have used eDNA to measure environmental impacts in rivers and streams. Duda et al. (2021) used 11 species-specific qPCR assays to document the distribution of resident and migratory fish after a large dam removal (Elwah Dam in Port Angeles, Washington). No eDNA sampling was conducted before the dam removal, but the study provided a wealth of information about species returning after the dam removal. Similarly, Muha et al. (2017) sampled three locations upstream and three locations downstream before and after the removal of a weir that was thought to be a barrier to salmonid migrations. The authors only sampled once before and twice after the removal, spanning about a year, and used eDNA metabarcoding to look at the presence/absence of species detected. They found that in fact the before sample demonstrated that the weir was not preventing fish passage (similar to the results found in this study) and furthermore documented a slight increase in alpha diversity in the first time point after the barrier removal and then a return to a similar alpha diversity in the second time point after the removal (similar results found in this study using eDNA concentrations rather than diversity). Here, we used both eDNA metabarcoding and a single qPCR assay on higher temporal resolution samples with control creeks to more rigorously quantify both the effect of culverts and the impact of construction on salmonids.

Not all culverts are barriers to salmonids

By measuring DNA concentrations of salmonid species above and below culverts on a small spatial scale, we were able to determine how much of a barrier each culvert was (or was not) to fish passage. We found that four of the five creeks sampled did not seem to be major barriers to fish passage. The only creek that was determined to be a barrier to fish passage was Barnes Creek, as we only found salmonid DNA in three months of the twelve months of sampling, and those three months had very low concentration of salmonid DNA relative to the other creeks.

Of the creeks where salmonid DNA was consistently found, Chuckanut Creek had the largest discrepancies between DNA concentrations found below and above the barrier at each time point. The culvert in Chuckanut Creek is suspected to be a barrier to fish passage and the State of Washington's Department of Transportation is planning to replace it in the near future. The culverts at Portage Creek and Squalicum Creek were more recently installed as compared to Padden, Chuckanut, and Barnes Creeks. They also were not designated as blocking fish passage. Squalicum Creek had the lowest difference between upstream and downstream concentrations across all the surveyed creeks, which corresponds well with the classification that the culvert does not block fish passage. Also, Squalicum Creek is the only creek sampled that has baffles inside the culvert of the five sampled, which should help fish passage.

Here, we demonstrate that collecting water samples for eDNA analysis might help to prioritize restoration of culverts suspected to be barriers to salmonids. Presently, the prioritization process conducted by the Washington Department of Transportation is a protocol provided by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, which includes factors such as the amount of habitat blocked by the barrier, the types of species blocked by the barrier, and estimated cost of repair, among other things (Fish and Wildlife 2019). However, data on fish presence upstream of barriers is rare and often not included in assessments. Using eDNA as a proxy for fish presence could provide another important type of data for project prioritization and increase efficiency in making prioritization decisions.

Furthermore, the post-restoration monitoring efforts also focus primarily on physical measurements (channel width, stream-bed material, hydraulic drops, etc.) but surveys of fish are not required despite the large costs associated with making culverts fish passable. Sampling water for eDNA analysis could be done at the same time as the physical measurements post-restoration by the same technicians conducting the evaluation and provide valuable information on if the restoration efforts did in fact allow for fish passage.

Salmonids can survive a bulldozer in a creek

The intervention (i.e., construction) in Padden Creek occurred over about two months and included the “de-watering” of the creek, removal of the existing culvert, installation of the new culvert, and then the “re-watering” of the creek from late August 2021 to October 2021. The impact of the construction itself on salmonid species demonstrates an initial decrease in DNA concentrations in September and October, followed by a large increase in DNA concentration in November, and then a stabilization and return to nearly baseline concentrations from December to February. This pattern remarkably demonstrates an expected response to a large intervention. During the actual construction, we found less eDNA from salmonids, but after the completion of the installing a new culvert, concentrations increased and then returned to baseline or near baseline, depending on the species.

The overall pattern of this effect was similar for the four species of salmonids, but the species of which we found higher eDNA concentrations seemed to have a dampened effect compared to the rarer species (i.e., *O. clarkii* and *O. kisutch* as compared to *O. mykiss* and *O. nerka*). This also corresponds to species with different life histories and behaviors, and it might be that our most commonly and abundant species, *O. clarkii*, was more robust to the intervention because it has both migrating and non-migrating subspecies (see below).

Fish ecology and expected patterns

Not all four salmonids are expected to be found in all five of the creeks sampled. As documented by WA Department of Fish and Wildlife SalmonScape (<http://apps.wdfw.wa.gov/salmonscape/map.html>), all creeks contain cutthroat trout, steelhead trout, and coho salmon. Barnes Creek is the only creek documented to have kokanee salmon. However, local spawner surveys conducted by the City of Bellingham from 2015-2020 in Padden Creek document kokanee salmon as well as the other three species and importantly, several unknown live and dead fish and redds (nests dug by fish in gravel to deposit eggs).

The four salmonid species in this study have different ecologies and behaviors that would impact when fish (and therefore eDNA concentrations) occur in the creeks. For these four migratory salmonids, the run timings vary for each species in the study area (Bellingham, WA). Coastal cutthroat (*O. clarkii*) are documented to run throughout the entire year, whereas coho salmon (*O. kisutch*) run from September to December, kokanee salmon (*O. nerka*) run from October to December, and steelhead trout (*O. mykiss*) run from November to June.

Furthermore, three of the four species in this study have both migrating and non-migrating subspecies that are not able to be distinguished genetically. Cutthroat trout (*O. clarkii*) encompasses both non-migrating, resident trout in the creeks and coastal run cutthroat that migrate into Padden Creek from Bellingham Bay. Similarly, *O. nerka* includes both anadromous sockeye salmon and non-migrating kokanee salmon and *O. mykiss* includes both anadromous steelhead trout and non-migrating rainbow trout. Using eDNA, we cannot distinguish between the migrating and non-migrating subspecies of *O. clarkii*, *O. nerka*, and *O. mykiss*. Therefore, our eDNA concentrations might reflect contributions from both migrating and non-migrating individuals at any given time point in the dataset.

Despite the mix of migrating and non-migrating populations and various run timings, our metabarcoding data demonstrates that in Padden Creek, there was a clear signal of *O. nerka* both upstream and downstream only in November 2021-2022 (and only upstream in March 2021). This signal corresponds well with the documented run timing of October to December. In contrast, *O. clarkii* and *O. kisutch* were found nearly year-round in Padden Creek. The persistent signal from *O. clarkii* could be explained by resident cutthroat trout. However, *O. kisutch* does not have a resident subspecies and the run timing is only documented from September to December. This could potentially be due to juveniles maturing and migrating in the creeks after adults migrate during the run time up the creeks to spawn. Visual surveys are conducted rarely and even if they were conducted, it might be difficult to identify juveniles to species level. Though *O. kisutch* eDNA was found year round, the highest concentrations were found near the expected run timing. Finally, though the lowest concentrations on average, *O. mykiss* was also found nearly year-round in Padden Creek, which could be contributions from migrating steelhead (November to June), juveniles maturing and migrating, or from residential rainbow trout. Though the *O. mykiss* signal is found year-round, the highest concentrations do seem to correspond with the steelhead run timing.

Decoupling of eDNA from fish

By capturing residual eDNA from water samples, we are measuring a different signal than counting how many fish are in the creek at each time of sampling. We should not expect the eDNA concentration for each salmonid to match the number of fish in the creek at the time of sampling, especially as we often did not visually see any fish when we took water samples. Shelton et al. (2019) provides a paired eDNA sampling and seine netting analysis demonstrating that eDNA concentrations provide a smoothed biological signal over space and time. We acknowledge this smoothing effect and emphasize that in the context of using eDNA for environmental impact assessments, it is preferable to use a survey technique such as eDNA that represents a larger spatial and temporal scale.

Many previous papers have commented on the “ecology” of eDNA and the various processes that contribute to eDNA concentrations in environmental samples (e.g., shedding rates, decay rates, transport). For example, higher concentrations of eDNA could be the result of a greater number (or biomass) of fish present, or increased shedding rates, or decreased decay. Many review papers document the nuances of interpreting eDNA data and we recommend reviewing them for a deeper understanding (see Andruszkiewicz et al. (2020) for a review on shedding and decay rates and Harrison et al. (2019) for a review on transport).

In this study, to assess the impact of a culvert on fish passage, we compare eDNA concentrations upstream and downstream at the same time point in a given creek. The distance between the upstream and downstream sampling was minimal (~60-300 m, average distance of ~150 m). Therefore, we assume that the small differences in spatial and temporal scale between sampling locations is minimal such that the impacts of these various processes will affect the downstream and upstream concentrations equally.

For assessing the impact of construction, we needed to account for differences within the same creek over time (i.e., before and after construction). Because the sampling occurred over a whole year, transport and persistence times may have varied. However, the time series model uses information from the control creeks to understand seasonal trends in eDNA concentrations without needing to link eDNA concentrations to fish abundance. The impact of construction in Padden Creek can be measured by comparing the measured eDNA concentration during the time of construction to the expected eDNA concentration in the absence of construction by using information shared from the four other creeks that are not undergoing construction. However, we did correct eDNA concentrations [mass/volume] by discharge [volume/time] and use a mass flow rate [mass/time] for the time series model (see below) given the wide range of discharge over the course of the year.

Accounting for flow with eDNA concentrations

Over the course of the year of sampling, water discharge varied from very low to no flow in summer months to high flow in winter months. When considering eDNA concentrations at a site, we need to account for the large difference in water volume over the course of the time series. In other words, given the same number of fish and a constant eDNA shedding rate, we would expect to see higher concentrations of DNA in summer months and lower concentrations in winter months due to dilution of eDNA in higher water volumes just from the difference in flow. Other eDNA time series datasets also correct for discharge to present eDNA data as a mass flow rate [mass/time] (Tillotson et al. 2018, Thalinger et al. 2019).

Though eDNA can move downstream with water flow, here, we were measuring if culverts were barriers to

fish moving upstream, as we were focused on the impact of culverts on migratory salmon. In our case, we were comparing if downstream stations had higher DNA concentrations than upstream stations as a result of fish being unable to get upstream. This is of course complicated as a result of non-migratory fish, which may be up or downstream and not attempting to pass through the culverts. However, the limited spatial scale between upstream and downstream is such that we can assume the transport would affect upstream and downstream locations in the same way. That is, in the upstream station, some amount of eDNA is coming from upstream of that location into the sampling station and leaving at the same time — in the same way that eDNA would be both entering and exiting the downstream station. Therefore, the relative change between upstream and downstream stations should be the same in terms of eDNA transport.

Other studies have documented the relative importance of eDNA transport. Most notably, Tillotson et al. (2018) measured eDNA at four sites with similar discharge rates to the creeks here and specifically addressed spatial and temporal resolutions, finding that eDNA concentrations reflect short time- (and therefore length-) scales by comparing peaks in eDNA concentrations to counts of salmon and accumulation by measuring both upstream and downstream sites. The authors found that the sampling site furthest downstream did not accumulate eDNA and that two tributaries feeding into a main channel were additive (Tillotson et al. 2018). For more general models and empirical data documenting transport distances in streams, see Wilcox et al. (2016), Jane et al. (2014), Jerde et al. (2016), Shogren et al. (2016), and Civade et al. (2016).

Finally, it should be noted that Lake Padden, about 1.5 km upstream from the sampling sites, was stocked with cutthroat trout in January 2021, rainbow trout in April and May 2021, and kokanee salmon in May 2021. Given that no sequencing reads in the metabarcoding data are found for *O. nerka* in May, the potential transport of eDNA downstream from Lake Padden to the location of eDNA sampling is expected to be negligible. Furthermore, Lake Padden is open for recreational fishing for all of these species and managers have reported that most of the stocked fish are caught soon after stocking. Given the transport distances documented in the literature and flow rates in Lake Padden, we do not expect the stocking in Lake Padden to affect eDNA concentrations at the sampling locations.

Conclusion

It is notoriously difficult to quantify the environmental impact of discrete human impacts on ecosystems and species. Surveying species and communities by eDNA provides an opportunity for monitoring before, during, and after impacts in a scaleable and cost-effective way. Here, we demonstrate that monthly eDNA sampling before, during, and after an intervention alongside control sites for one year can quantify the environmental

impact of replacing a road culvert. We also provide a framework in which compositional metabarcoding data can be linked with qPCR data to obtain quantitative estimates of eDNA concentrations of many species. This provides a scaleable way to utilize the large amount of information from metabarcoding data without needing a unique qPCR assay for every species of interest. Environmental DNA is moving into practice and this study demonstrates how eDNA can be broadly used for environmental impact assessments for a wide range of species and environments.

References

- Andruszkiewicz Allan, E., W. G. Zhang, A. Lavery, and A. Govindarajan. 2020. Environmental DNA shedding and decay rates from diverse animal forms and thermal regimes. *Environmental DNA*:edn3.141.
- Andruszkiewicz, E. A., H. A. Starks, F. P. Chavez, L. M. Sassoubre, B. A. Block, and A. B. Boehm. 2017. Biomonitoring of marine vertebrates in monterey bay using eDNA metabarcoding. *PLOS ONE* 12:e017634320.
- Benedetti-Cecchi, L. 2001. Beyond Baci: Optimization of Environmental Sampling Designs Through Monitoring and Simulation. *Ecological Applications* 11:783–799.
- Buxton, A., E. Matechou, J. Griffin, A. Diana, and R. A. Griffiths. 2021. Optimising sampling and analysis protocols in environmental DNA studies. *Scientific Reports* 11:11637.
- Callahan, B. J., P. J. McMurdie, M. J. Rosen, A. W. Han, A. J. A. Johnson, and S. P. Holmes. 2016. DADA2: High resolution sample inference from illumina amplicon data. *Nature methods* 13:581–583.
- Camacho, C., G. Coulouris, V. Avagyan, N. Ma, J. Papadopoulos, K. Bealer, and T. L. Madden. 2009. BLAST+: Architecture and applications. *BMC Bioinformatics* 10:4219.
- Civade, R. I., T. Dejean, A. Valentini, N. Roset, J.-C. Raymond, A. Bonin, P. Taberlet, and D. Pont. 2016. Spatial representativeness of environmental DNA metabarcoding signal for fish biodiversity assessment in a natural freshwater system. *PLOS ONE* 11:e015736619.
- De Vargas, C., S. Audie, N. Henry, J. Decelle, F. Mahe, R. Logares, E. Lara, C. Berney, N. Le Bescot, I. Probert, M. Carmichael, J. Poulain, S. Romac, S. Colin, J.-M. Aury, L. Bittner, S. Chaffron, M. Dunthorn, S. Engelen, O. Flegontova, L. Guidi, A. Horak, O. Jaillon, G. Lima-Mendez, J. Lukes, S. Malviya, R. Morard, M. Mulo, E. Scalco, R. Siano, F. Vincent, A. Zingone, C. Dimier, M. Picheral, S. Searson, S. Kandels-Lewis, T. O. coordinators, S. G. Acinas, P. Bork, C. Bowler, G. Gorsky, N. Grimsley, P. Hingamp, D. Iudicone, F. Not, H. Ogata, S. Pesant, J. Raes, M. E. Sieracki, S. Speich, L. Stemann, S. Sunagawa, J. Weissenbach, P. Wincker, and E. Karsenti. 2015. Eukaryotic plankton diversity in the sunlit ocean. *Science* 348:112.

- Duda, J. J., M. S. Hoy, D. M. Chase, G. R. Pess, S. J. Brenkman, M. M. McHenry, and C. O. Ostberg. 2021. Environmental DNA is an effective tool to track recolonizing migratory fish following large-scale dam removal. *Environmental DNA* 3:121–141.
- Fish, W. D. of, and Wildlife. 2019. Fish passage inventory, assessment, and prioritization manual.
- Harrison, J. B., J. M. Sunday, and S. M. Rogers. 2019. Predicting the fate of eDNA in the environment and implications for studying biodiversity. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 286:20191409.
- Hinz, S., J. Coston-Guarini, M. Marnane, and J.-M. Guarini. 2022. Evaluating eDNA for Use within Marine Environmental Impact Assessments. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering* 10:375.
- Jane, S. F., T. M. Wilcox, K. S. McKelvey, M. K. Young, M. K. Schwartz, W. H. Lowe, B. H. Letcher, and A. R. Whiteley. 2014. Distance, flow and PCR inhibition: eDNA dynamics in two headwater streams. *Molecular Ecology Resources* 15:216227.
- Jerde, C. L., B. P. Olds, A. J. Shogren, E. A. Andruszkiewicz, A. R. Mahon, D. Bolster, and J. L. Tank. 2016. Influence of stream bottom substrate on retention and transport of vertebrate environmental DNA. *Environmental Science & Technology* 50:87708779.
- Kelly, R. P., C. J. Closek, J. L. O'Donnell, J. E. Kralj, A. O. Shelton, and J. F. Samhouri. 2017. Genetic and manual survey methods yield different and complementary views of an ecosystem. *Frontiers in Marine Science* 3:73511.
- Kelly, R. P., J. A. Port, K. M. Yamahara, and L. B. Crowder. 2014. Using environmental DNA to census marine fishes in a large mesocosm. *PLOS ONE* 9:e8617511.
- Kelly, R. P., A. O. Shelton, and R. Gallego. 2019. Understanding PCR Processes to Draw Meaningful Conclusions from Environmental DNA Studies. *Scientific Reports* 9:12133.
- Klein, S. G., N. R. Geraldi, A. Anton, S. Schmidt-Roach, M. Ziegler, M. J. Czielski, C. Martin, N. Räder, T. L. Frölicher, P. J. Mumby, J. M. Pandolfi, D. J. Suggett, C. R. Voolstra, M. Aranda, and Carlos. M. Duarte. 2022. Projecting coral responses to intensifying marine heatwaves under ocean acidification. *Global Change Biology* 28:1753–1765.
- Leray, M., J. Y. Yang, C. P. Meyer, S. C. Mills, N. Agudelo, V. Ranwez, J. T. Boehm, and R. J. Machida. 2013. A new versatile primer set targeting a short fragment of the mitochondrial COI region for metabarcoding metazoan diversity: Application for characterizing coral reef fish gut contents. *Frontiers in Zoology* 10:114.
- Maasri, A., S. C. Jähnig, M. C. Adamescu, R. Adrian, C. Baigun, D. J. Baird, A. Batista-Morales, N. Bonada, L. E. Brown, Q. Cai, J. V. Campos-Silva, V. Clausnitzer, T. Contreras-MacBeath, S. J. Cooke, T. Datry, G. Delacámara, L. De Meester, K.-D. B. Dijkstra, V. T. Do, S. Domisch, D. Dudgeon, T. Erös, H. Freitag, J. Freyhof, J. Friedrich, M. Friedrichs-Manthey, J. Geist, M. O. Gessner, P. Goethals, M. Gollock, C.

Gordon, H.-P. Grossart, G. Gulembuga, P. E. Gutiérrez-Fonseca, P. Haase, D. Hering, H. J. Hahn, C. P. Hawkins, F. He, J. Heino, V. Hermoso, Z. Hogan, F. Hölker, J. M. Jeschke, M. Jiang, R. K. Johnson, G. Kalinkat, B. K. Karimov, A. Kasangaki, I. A. Kimirei, B. Kohlmann, M. Kuemmerlen, J. J. Kuiper, B. Kupilas, S. D. Langhans, R. Lansdown, F. Leese, F. S. Magbanua, S. S. Matsuzaki, M. T. Monaghan, L. Mumladze, J. Muzon, P. A. Mvogo Ndongo, J. C. Nejstgaard, O. Nikitina, C. Ochs, O. N. Odume, J. J. Opperman, H. Patricio, S. U. Pauls, R. Raghavan, A. Ramírez, B. Rashni, V. Ross-Gillespie, M. J. Samways, R. B. Schäfer, A. Schmidt-Kloiber, O. Seehausen, D. N. Shah, S. Sharma, J. Soininen, N. Sommerwerk, J. D. Stockwell, F. Suhling, R. D. Tachamo Shah, R. E. Tharme, J. H. Thorp, D. Tickner, K. Tickner, J. D. Tonkin, M. Valle, J. Vitule, M. Volk, D. Wang, C. Wolter, and S. Worischka. 2022. A global agenda for advancing freshwater biodiversity research. *Ecology Letters* 25:255–263.

Martin, C. J. B., B. J. Allen, and C. G. Lowe. 2012. Environmental impact assessment: Detecting changes in fish community structure in response to disturbance with an asymmetric multivariate BACI sampling design. *Bulletin, Southern California Academy of Sciences* 111:119–131.

Martin, M. 2011. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads. *EMBnet.journal* 17:10.

Martinez, R. 2013. United states v. washington.

McCall, M. N., H. R. McMurray, H. Land, and A. Almudevar. 2014. On non-detects in qPCR data. *Bioinformatics* 30:2310–2316.

McLaren, M. R., A. D. Willis, and B. J. Callahan. 2019. Consistent and correctable bias in metagenomic sequencing experiments. *eLife* 8:e46923.

Morgan, R. K. 2012. Environmental impact assessment: The state of the art. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal* 30:5–14.

Moss, W. E., L. R. Harper, M. A. Davis, C. S. Goldberg, M. M. Smith, and P. T. J. Johnson. 2022. Navigating the trade-offs between environmental DNA and conventional field surveys for improved amphibian monitoring. *Ecosphere* 13:e3941.

Muha, T. P., M. Rodríguez-Rey, M. Rolla, and E. Tricarico. 2017. Using environmental DNA to improve species distribution models for freshwater invaders. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 5:143957.

Ogram, A., G. Sayler, and T. Barkay. 1987. The extraction and purification of microbial DNA from sediments. *Journal of Microbiological Methods* 7:5766.

Port, J. A., J. L. O'Donnell, O. C. Romero-Maraccini, P. R. Leary, S. Y. Litvin, K. J. Nickols, K. M. Yamahara, and R. P. Kelly. 2015. Assessing vertebrate biodiversity in a kelp forest ecosystem using environmental DNA. *Molecular Ecology* 25:527541.

R Core Team. 2017. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical

Computing.

- Rondon, M. R., P. R. August, A. D. Bettermann, S. F. Brady, T. H. Grossman, M. R. Liles, K. A. Loiacono, B. A. Lynch, I. A. MacNeil, C. Minor, C. L. Tiong, M. Gilman, M. S. Osburne, J. Clardy, J. Handelsman, and R. M. Goodman. 2000. Cloning the soil metagenome: a strategy for accessing the genetic and functional diversity of uncultured microorganisms. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 66:2541–2547.
- Rubin, Z., G. M. Kondolf, and B. Rios-Touma. 2017. Evaluating Stream Restoration Projects: What Do We Learn from Monitoring? *Water* 9:174.
- Ruppert, K. M., R. J. Kline, and M. S. Rahman. 2019. Past, present, and future perspectives of environmental DNA (eDNA) metabarcoding: A systematic review in methods, monitoring, and applications of global eDNA. *Global Ecology and Conservation* 17:e00547.
- Seymour, M., F. K. Edwards, B. J. Cosby, I. Bista, P. M. Scarlett, F. L. Brailsford, H. C. Glanville, M. de Bruyn, G. R. Carvalho, and S. Creer. 2021. Environmental DNA provides higher resolution assessment of riverine biodiversity and ecosystem function via spatio-temporal nestedness and turnover partitioning. *Communications Biology* 4:1–12.
- Shelton, A. O., Z. J. Gold, A. J. Jensen, E. D’Agnese, E. Andruszkiewicz Allan, A. Van Cise, R. Gallego, A. Ramón-Laca, M. Garber-Yonts, K. Parsons, and R. P. Kelly. 2022. Toward quantitative metabarcoding. *Ecology* n/a:e3906.
- Shelton, A. O., R. P. Kelly, J. L. O’Donnell, L. Park, P. Schwenke, C. Greene, R. A. Henderson, and E. M. Beamer. 2019. Environmental DNA provides quantitative estimates of a threatened salmon species. *Biological Conservation* 237:383–391.
- Shelton, A. O., J. L. O’Donnell, J. F. Samhour, N. C. Lowell, G. D. Williams, and R. P. Kelly. 2016. A framework for inferring biological communities from environmental DNA:115.
- Shogren, A. J., J. L. Tank, E. A. Andruszkiewicz, B. P. Olds, C. L. Jerde, and D. Bolster. 2016. Modelling the transport of environmental DNA through a porous substrate using continuous flow-through column experiments. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface* 13:2016029011.
- Stan Development Team. 2022. RStan: The r interface to stan.
- Stat, M., M. J. Huggett, R. Bernasconi, J. D. DiBattista, T. E. Berry, S. J. Newman, E. S. Harvey, and M. Bunce. 2017. Ecosystem biomonitoring with eDNA: Metabarcoding across the tree of life in a tropical marine environment. *Scientific Reports*:111.
- Taberlet, P., E. Coissac, M. Hajibabaei, and L. H. Rieseberg. 2012. Environmental DNA. *Molecular Ecology* 21:17891793.
- Thalinger, B., E. Wolf, M. Traugott, and J. Wanzenböck. 2019. Monitoring spawning migrations of potamodromous fish species via eDNA. *Scientific Reports* 9:15388.

- Thomas, A. C., J. Howard, P. L. Nguyen, T. A. Seimon, and C. S. Goldberg. 2018. ANDe TM: A fully integrated environmental DNA sampling system. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 9:13791385.
- Thomas, A. C., P. L. Nguyen, J. Howard, and C. S. Goldberg. 2019. A self-preserving, partially biodegradable eDNA filter. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 10:1136–1141.
- Thomsen, P. F., and E. Willerslev. 2015. Environmental DNA: An emerging tool in conservation for monitoring past and present biodiversity. *Biological Conservation* 183:418.
- Tillotson, M. D., R. P. Kelly, J. J. Duda, M. Hoy, J. Kralj, and T. P. Quinn. 2018. Concentrations of environmental DNA (eDNA) reflect spawning salmon abundance at fine spatial and temporal scales. *Biological Conservation* 220:111.
- Turnbaugh, P. J., R. E. Ley, M. Hamady, C. M. Fraser-Liggett, R. Knight, and J. I. Gordon. 2007. The Human Microbiome Project. *Nature* 449:804–810.
- U. S. Geological Survey. 1994. USGS water data for the nation.
- Underwood, A. J. 1992. Beyond BACI: the detection of environmental impacts on populations in the real, but variable, world. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 161:145–178.
- Underwood, A. J. 1994. On Beyond BACI: Sampling Designs that Might Reliably Detect Environmental Disturbances. *Ecological Applications* 4:3–15.
- Valentini, A., P. Taberlet, C. Miaud, R. l. Civade, J. E. Herder, P. F. Thomsen, E. Bellemain, A. Besnard, E. Coissac, F. Boyer, C. Gaboriaud, P. Jean, N. Poulet, N. Roset, G. H. Copp, P. Geniez, D. Pont, C. Argillier, J.-M. Baudoin, T. Peroux, A. J. Crivelli, A. Olivier, M. Acqueberge, M. Le Brun, P. R. Moller, E. Willerslev, and T. Dejean. 2016. Next-generation monitoring of aquatic biodiversity using environmental DNA metabarcoding. *Molecular Ecology* 25:929942.
- Wilcox, T. M., K. S. McKelvey, M. K. Young, A. J. Sepulveda, B. B. Shepard, S. F. Jane, A. R. Whiteley, W. H. Lowe, and M. K. Schwartz. 2016. Understanding environmental DNA detection probabilities: A case study using a stream-dwelling char *salvelinus fontinalis*. *Biological Conservation* 194:209216.
- Wilkinson, S. P., S. K. Davy, M. Bunce, and M. Stat. 2018. Taxonomic identification of environmental DNA with informatic sequence classification trees.