NORTHLAND MACROINVERTEBRATE MONITORING PROGRAMME

2011 Monitoring Report

Prepared by Stephen R Pohe

Pohe Environmental

For: Northland Regional Council, June 2011.

Cover photo:

State of the Environment reference site in the Pukenui Forest, Whangarei.

Synopsis

This report presents results of the 2011 round of the Northland Macroinvertebrate Monitoring Programme, carried out by Pohe Environmental for the Northland Regional Council (NRC). This report also compares the 2011 results with results of previous monitoring undertaken from 1997 (biannual 1997–2002, annual thereafter), looking at trends in the main biotic indices. Thirty-seven State of Environment (SoE) sites and four Resource Consent (RC) locations (upstream and downstream sites) were assessed throughout Northland for 2011.

Forty-four benthic samples were taken using the sampling protocols developed by the New Zealand Macroinvertebrate Working Group (Stark *et al.* 2001). These methods outline separate protocols for semi-quantitative sampling of hard-bottomed and soft-bottomed streams, therefore acknowledging the inherent differences in community composition found within. Both hard-bottomed and soft-bottomed streams were sampled during the 2011 monitoring programme using corresponding sampling protocols in approximately equal proportions (24 using C1, 20 using C2).

Data were analysed using the biotic indices taxonomic richness, percentage EPT*, MCI, and SQMCI in order to describe and compare the community assemblages, and consequently report on water quality at each site. Trends were presented using scatterplots with Lowess fitted lines, produced in the statistical package Statistica 8.0.

Five sites, being Waipoua @ SH12 Rest Area, Pukenui Stream u/s Ridge Track crossing, Ruakaka @ Flyger Road, Mangahahuru @ end of Main Rd and Waipapa @ Forest Ranger recorded clean water this year based on MCI and/or SQMCI results. However, declining trends are observed for several of these.

Twenty of the SoE sites (54.1%) recorded SQMCI scores of less than 4.00, which is interpreted as water of probable 'severe pollution'. However, a further nine sites (24.3%) were recorded in the 'moderate pollution' interpretation (a total of 78.4% sites in poorly polluted categories).

The worst of the SoE sites for 2011, based on SQMCI results were (worst sites in **bold**):

- **Wairua @ Purua**	- Waiotu @ SH1 Bridge
- **Waiarohia @ Kamo Tributary**	- **Waitangi @ Watea**
- **Manganui @ Mitaitai Rd**	- Awanui u/s Waihue Channel

These 'bottom six' regularly feature at/near the bottom of the invertebrate monitoring programme and for most part, the reasons will be related to difficulties of sampling due to their large size combined with the nature of their position in their river continuum, effectively receiving nutrients from large catchments.

One particular concern is the **Kamo Tributary Culvert site** on the Waiarohia Stream which has had poor biological scores since monitoring began however the surrounding habitat, in-stream habitat, as well as physical water parameters, all appear excellent. With regard to the consented activities (RC sites), SQMCI differences between upstream and downstream sites didn't indicate major changes in the invertebrate communities, although most were impaired (the exception being the Quarry activity). The worst of the RC sites, based on SQMCI differences, was the damming activity, which is most likely due to the retention of sediment at the downstream site.

Inspection of collective MCI and SQMCI index trends, for SoE sites, indicated that 9 of the 22 sites (40.9%) showed little ecological change. A further 10 sites (45.5%) indicated a reduction in their biotic index and 3 sites (13.6%) indicated an increase in their biotic index, over time. When looking at the averaged trend results of MCI and SQMCI collectively, and loosely fitting them into water quality classes presented in Boothroyd & Stark (2000), 77.3% of sites can be interpreted as 'probable moderate' or 'probable severe pollution', 13.6% of sites as 'mild pollution' and 9.1% as clean water.

Contents

1.   Introduction

This report presents results of the 2011 round of the Northland Macroinvertebrate Monitoring Programme, carried out by Pohe Environmental for the Northland Regional Council (NRC). This report also compares the 2011 results with results of previous monitoring undertaken from 1997 (biannual 1997–2002, annual thereafter), looking at trends in the main biotic indices. Thirty-seven State of Environment (SoE) sites and four Resource Consent (RC) locations (upstream and downstream sites) were assessed throughout Northland for 2011 (Fig. 1).


Figure 1. Location of the 44 sites visited during the 2011 Macroinvertebrate Monitoring Programme. Note that several sampling points are hidden by other sampling points.

The data collected during this annual monitoring programme allows the NRC to report on the current water quality of Northland's waterways, and combined with physico-chemical data (collected either concurrently with macroinvertebrate sampling or during River Water Quality Monitoring Network sampling), provides a picture of the condition of Northland's aquatic environment. This data will also be added to the NRC's Freshwater Ecosystems Database, increasing the knowledge of Northland's (and New Zealand's) aquatic ecosystems.

Resource Consent monitoring is required by a number of activities e.g., damming operations, quarries, and companies discharging storm-water or effluent, as a condition of consent, and are monitored upstream and downstream of the consented activity.

Monitoring is undertaken to detect any changes in the aquatic macroinvertebrate communities resulting from human-induced stresses e.g. contaminants entering the waterway. Macroinvertebrates are normally abundant in lotic (running water) ecosystems, and are commonly used in the assessment of water quality as their diverse communities provide varied responses to changing environmental conditions (Boothroyd & Stark 2000). They are good indicators of local conditions because they tend to be limited in their in-stream movements, thus are affected by the environmental conditions over an extended period of time, unlike water quality measurements, which are snapshots of the waterway at that point, at that moment. Initial macroinvertebrate monitoring in New Zealand was carried out following the procedures of Stark (1985), and have been revised several times (Stark 1993, Stark 1998 & Stark *et al.* 2001). More recent publications added revised tolerance scores for taxa collected from soft-bottomed sites (Stark & Maxted 2004, 2007a); the resulting MCI and SQMCI scores being labelled MCI-sb and SQMCI-sb. The Northland Regional Council has acknowledged the usefulness of these publications and has partially adopted the protocol. Rather than using MCI tolerance scores for hard-bottomed sites, and MCI-sb tolerance scores for soft-bottomed sites, NRC have indicated they wish to only use soft-bottomed tolerance scores for naturally occurring soft-bottomed sites. All soft-bottomed sites that are deemed to be 'human induced' are calculated using the conventional MCI i.e., derived from hard-bottomed tolerance scores.

2.   Methods
2.1   Sampling protocol
2.1.1   Macroinvertebrate sampling

Forty-four benthic samples were taken using the sampling protocols developed by the New Zealand Macroinvertebrate Working Group (Stark *et al.* 2001). These methods outline separate protocols for semi-quantitative sampling of hard-bottomed and soft-bottomed streams, therefore acknowledging the inherent differences in community composition found within. Both hard-bottomed and soft-bottomed streams were sampled during the 2011 monitoring programme using corresponding sampling protocols in approximately equal proportions (24 using C1, 20 using C2).

Hard-bottomed sites were characterised by having substrate dominated (>50% by area) by any combination of bedrock, gravel (2.1–16mm), pebbles (16.1–64mm), cobbles (64.1–256mm), or boulders (>256mm in diameter). These sites were sampled using Protocol C1 (hard-bottomed, semi-quantitative), which recommends sampling in riffle habitats and requires each sample to be taken by foot-kick method (Frost *et al.* 1971) using a handheld net (Cuffney *et al.* 1993). Riffle sections were sampled using a handheld triangular net, ~300mm at the base with 500-micron mesh (500mm deep), and each sample was collected from an area totalling 1m^2 (composed of ten sub-samples of 0.1m^2). Sub-samples were collected while moving progressively upstream, from a range of habitats and flow regimes. Sampling effort was of consistent kicking intensity and duration (seven seconds) and concentrated within the main substrate sizes to a depth of ~100mm (where possible), in proportion to their occurrence along 50–100m stream reaches.

Soft-bottomed sites were characterised as being dominated by sand (0.063–2mm) or silt (<0.063mm) substrates, often with in-stream macrophytes present. These sites were sampled using Protocol C2 (soft-bottomed, semi-quantitative), which is designed to maximise invertebrate collection in streams that have 'muddy' bottoms, with in-stream macrophytes and woody debris. Stark *et al.* (2001) state that "Woody debris is considered the soft-bottomed stream equivalent to productive riffle habitat targeted for sampling in hard-bottomed streams", and are thus an important component to sample, along with stream bank margins and in-stream macrophytes. Soft-bottomed sites were sampled using the same handheld triangular net as hard-bottomed sites. Each sample was collected from an area totalling 3m^2 (composed of ten sub-samples of 0.3m^2) while moving progressively upstream. Sampling effort was of consistent intensity and duration (seven seconds) and was concentrated within the main habitat types, in proportion to their occurrence along 50–100m stream reaches. Hard substrates and man-made in-stream items (e.g. concrete) were not sampled.

Bank margins were sampled by jabbing the net into the bank for a distance of 1m, followed by 2–3 cleaning sweeps, to catch any displaced organisms. A similar technique was used for sampling macrophytes which involved moving the net through a 1m stretch of submerged plants (when possible), followed by two cleaning sweeps. Care was taken in both these cases, to avoid collecting excess silt or algae, but this was not always possible.

Submerged woody debris was sampled by holding the wood over the mouth of the net or a buckey, and carefully brushing the surface by hand while washing with stream water to dislodge any invertebrates. Woody debris ranged from 50–150mm in diameter, and each lineal metre represented one unit collection effort (0.3m^2 sub-sample).

All sub-samples were transferred into a white plastic bucket and any pebbles or large organic items i.e., sticks, leaves, macrophytes were carefully rinsed and removed. The sample was gently washed through a 500-micron Endecotts Sieve before being transferred into a plastic container and preserved with 80% ethanol, ready for processing. Each sample was labelled with waterproof paper inside, and the container was labelled externally with pencil. Details of the proportion of different substrate types sampled were also recorded.

Sample processing followed the Protocol P1 (Coded-abundance) as outlined in Stark *et al.* (2001). All samples were rinsed through a 500-micron Endecotts Sieve and processed using a 3-Diopter magnifying light (22W circular). All organisms and their relative numbers were recorded as they were observed in the sorting tray. Each taxon was assigned one of five coded-abundance scores as follows:

R = **R**are (1–4 individuals);
C = **C**ommon (5–19 individuals);
A = **A**bundant (20–99 individuals);
VA = **V**ery **A**bundant (100–499 individuals);
XA = e**X**tra **A**bundant (500+ individuals).

A selection of representatives of each taxon were removed from each sample to confirm identification by microscopic examination (in some cases e.g., Leptophlebiidae and Hydrobiosidae all were checked), and stored in vials, as voucher specimens. Macroinvertebrates were identified to the taxonomic level of Stark *et al.* (2001, Appendix B, p. 57), along with several unlisted taxa. The addition of the dipteran subfamily Chironominae replaced lower level taxon, and MCI tolerance scores (hard-bottomed 2.5, soft-bottomed 4.7) were assigned from means of the lower level taxa scores. Identification followed the taxonomic keys and descriptions of Winterbourn *et al.* (2006), Smith & Ward (unpublished), Towns & Peters (1996), Chapman & Lewis (1976), and Winterbourn (1973). The preserved sample residue of all samples, in their original plastic containers, together with voucher specimen vials, were returned to NRC.

2.1.2   Quality Control (QC)

Quality Control of 11.4% of samples was carried out by an independent taxonomist following the QC1 protocol of Stark *et al.* (2001). A report of quality controlled sample results is presented in Appendix A. Minor differences were recorded with values being well within the accepted ranges outlined by the protocol. Voucher vials with recorded differences were rechecked by Pohe Environmental; we agree with most QC results and have incorporated agreed 'new taxa' into the results.

2.1.3   Habitat assessments and periphyton (P) analysis

Site habitat assessments for River Water Quality Monitoring Network sites (not consent sites) were completed during 2009/10 summer by NRC. The next habitat assessments will be carried out during 2011/12 summer. Periphyton samples (five replicates instead of ten as suggested in the method) were collected following the Quantitative method 1b of Biggs & Kilroy (2000) from 16 hard-bottomed sites selected by NRC (see Table 1, periphyton collection sites indicated with a 'P'). A summary of results are presented in Appendix B (Table 3, Figure 18). Analyses are beyond the scope of this report.

2.1.4   Physico-chemical measurements

Physico-chemical water measurements were taken concurrently with macroinvertebrate sampling, using a YSI Model 85 multiparameter handheld meter that recorded water temperature (°C), dissolved oxygen concentration (mg/L), dissolved oxygen saturation (% air), salinity (ppt) and temperature compensated conductivity (25°C) (µS/cm). All physico-chemical water measurements are presented in Appendix C (Tables 4, 5).

2.2   Sampling locations

One new site (Pukenui Stream u/s of Ridge Track crossing) was added to the SoE programme this year, as a reference site, and one site (Ngunguru @ Waipoka Rd) was removed as it was affected by monthly high tides. One RC location was removed (Oxidation Pond B, ds & us) and one (Farm catchment, ds & us) will be monitored every second year i.e., 2010, 2012. One SoE site (Kaeo River @ Dip Road) was of a different streambed composition to that encountered in 2010 (but same as 2009) however its index calculation remains the same (hard-bottomed). Tables 1 and 2 present the locations and details of the 37 SoE and 4 RC locations, respectively. Each of the RC locations had an upstream and downstream sampling site. Also, one RC site (Meatworks u/s) was included as a SoE site (as Waiharakeke Stream @ Stringers Road Bridge) i.e., a total of 44 samples collected, 45 results reported.

Table 1. Locations and details of the 37 State of the Environment sites throughout Northland (u/s = upstream, d/s = downstream, (P) = Periphyton sample taken).

NRC Site No.	Site name	GPS Coordinates (NZ Transverse Mercator)		Sampling protocol and index calculation
		Easting	**Northing**	
100363	Awanui River @ FNDC watertake (P)	1625095	6113439	C1, MCI
100370	Awanui River u/s of Waihue Channel	1620713	6114952	C2, MCI-sb
109021	Hakaru River @ Topuni Creek Farm (P)	1734330	5992416	C1, MCI
100194	Hatea River u/s Mair Park Bridge (P)	1720284	6047290	C1, MCI
102674	Kaeo River @ Dip Road	1670326	6115833	C1, MCI
102256	Kaihu River @ gorge (P)	1661946	6042161	C1, MCI
101530	Kerikeri River @ stone store bridge (P)	1687631	6102447	C1, MCI
100281	Mangahahuru Stream @ Apotu Road Bridge	1714117	6057720	C2, MCI-sb
100237	Mangahahuru Stream @ end of Main Road	1718886	6055192	C1, MCI
101038	Mangakahia River @ Titoki Bridge	1694999	6045028	C2, MCI-sb
109096	Mangakahia River d/s of Twin Bridges (P)	1677333	6056762	C1, MCI
108978	Mangamuka River @ Iwiatua Road Bridge (P)	1649247	6103622	C1, MCI
102257	Manganui River @ Mitaitai Road	1700359	6019751	C2, MCI-sb
101625	Mangere Stream @ Knight Road	1703586	6048948	C2, MCI-sb
102258	Opouteke River @ suspension bridge (P)	1678503	6049460	C1, MCI
108979	Oruru River @ Oruru Road	1644740	6122563	C2, MCI-sb
108977	Paparoa Stream @ walking bridge	1711218	6004190	C2, MCI-sb
110370	Pukenui Stream u/s of Ridge Track crossing (P)	1714309	6048314	C1, MCI
105231	Punakitere River @ Taheke Recorder	1660001	6075453	C1, MCI
105008	Ruakaka River @ Flyger Road	1726626	6029623	C2, MCI-sb
109020[1]	Utakura River @ Okaka Road Bridge	1656910	6089081	C2, MCI-sb
105532	Victoria River @ Thompsons Bridge (P)	1637132	6110554	C1, MCI
105677	Waiarohia Stream @ Kamo tributary culvert (P)	1717682	6048783	C1, MCI
105674	Waiarohia Stream @ Russell Road Bridge (Nth)	1718284	6047585	C1, MCI
105672	Waiarohia Stream @ Rust Ave Bridge	1719047	6046013	C1, MCI
107773	Waiarohia Stream @ Whau Valley Road	1717568	6048671	C1, MCI
100007	Waiharakeke Stream @ Stringers Road Bridge (P)	1692604	6082806	C2, MCI-sb
109098	Waimamaku River @ SH12 (P)	1640666	6064914	C1, MCI
102248	Waiotu River @ SH1	1711381	6067240	C2, MCI-sb
108941	Waipao River @ Draffin Road	1701772	6045796	C2, MCI-sb
101751	Waipapa River @ Forest Ranger (P)	1662582	6096421	C1, MCI
101524	Waipapa River @ Waipapa Landing Bridge (P)	1688150	6103986	C2, MCI
103304	Waipoua River @ SH12 Rest Area (P)	1651633	6054443	C1, MCI
101753	Wairua River @ Purua	1704273	6053948	C2, MCI-sb
101752	Waitangi River @ Watea	1695269	6095708	C2, MCI-sb
103178	Waitangi Stream @ Waimate Road	1681894	6093741	C2, MCI
102249	Whakapara River @ cableway	1715259	6066116	C2, MCI-sb

[1] Invertebrate sampling could not be done at the water quality monitoring site. Collection was made upstream at Okaka Road Bridge.

Table 2. Locations and details of the 4 Resource Consent sites throughout Northland (u/s = upstream, d/s = downstream, (P) = Periphyton sample taken).

NRC Site No.	Site name	GPS Coordinates (NZ Transverse Mercator)		Sampling protocol and index calculation
		Easting	**Northing**	
106508	Dam d/s	1675697	6068165	C1, MCI
106509	Dam u/s	1676506	6067761	C1, MCI
100010	Meatworks d/s	1693927	6082944	C2, MCI-sb
100007	Meatworks u/s	1692604	6082806	C2, MCI-sb
100280	Oxidation Pond A d/s	1715260	6058497	C2, MCI-sb
100279	Oxidation Pond A u/s	1715480	6058620	C2, MCI-sb
103824	Quarry d/s	1681164	6118975	C1, MCI
103823	Quarry u/s	1681183	6119003	C1, MCI

The Northland Invertebrate Monitoring Programme contains sites with a wide range of physical and geological conditions including large (20-30m wide) hard-bottomed and soft-bottomed rivers, medium-sized (5-10m wide) lowland rivers and small (1-3m wide) upper-catchment streams (Figs. 2–5).

Figure 2. Hard-bottomed site on Hatea River, Whangarei.

Figure 3. Soft-bottomed site on Whakapara River, Hukerenui.

Figure 4. Lowland site north (Waiotu Stream) near Towai.

Figure 5. Mid-catchment site on the Victoria River near Kaitaia.

2.3   Sampling period

Samples were collected during March (01–09/03/11). All samples were collected during stable weather conditions and streams and rivers were at normal summer base-flow levels. However, severe rain events during January 2011 caused widespread flooding (see Appendix D, Fig 19 for select river flows prior to sampling).

2.4   Data analysis

Data obtained from the samples were entered into Microsoft Excel and analysed in order to describe and compare the community assemblages at each site. Data were transferred to the statistical package Statistica 8.0 to produce scatterplots for trend analysis, with Lowess fitted lines set to a stiffness of 0.4 (following Stark & Maxted (2007b)). The following biotic indices were requested by NRC:

• Taxonomic richness
This is a measure of biodiversity and community composition. It records the number of different taxa at each sampling site and describes the community structure. The results of this biometric give an indication of the ecological conservation value of the macroinvertebrate fauna (Poynter 2003).

• Percentage of Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera and Trichoptera taxa (%EPT*)
This metric is useful alongside taxonomic richness and is the percentage of the total community that belong to the Ephemeroptera (mayfly), Plecoptera (stonefly), and Trichoptera (caddisfly) orders. These three insect orders are generally considered to be more sensitive to organic pollution. The greater the proportions of these orders present in the stream community, the healthier the waterway is considered to be. The caddisflies *Oxyethira* and *Paraoxyethira* (Hydroptilidae) are routinely excluded from this analysis (an asterisk following the %EPT abbreviation indicates the exclusion of Hydroptilidae members), as they are often associated with filamentous algal growths (Collier & Kelly 2006) that often occur in enriched conditions, and thus Hydroptilidae members are considered relatively tolerant to organic pollution.

• Macroinvertebrate Community Index (MCI and MCI-sb)

The Macroinvertebrate Community Index (MCI) and its soft-bottomed derivative (MCI-sb) are designed to assess organic enrichment and work by using macroinvertebrates as biological indicators of water quality. They are based on presence of macroinvertebrate taxa, which are assigned scores reflecting their tolerance to environmental changes. Tolerance scores range between 1 and 10 for MCI and between 0.1 and 10 for MCI-sb (1 or 0.1 being highly tolerant, 10 being highly sensitive), and have been predetermined by aquatic ecologists. The final index score for each sample is the sum of the tolerance scores for each taxon present (a_i), divided by the number of taxa (S), and multiplied by 20 (a scaling factor) i.e., $20\sum a_i / S$ (Boothroyd & Stark 2000). A score of 120 or greater indicates 'clean water', scores between 100 and 119 indicate 'possible mild pollution', scores between 80 and 99 indicate 'probable moderate pollution', and scores lower than 80 are considered as having 'probable severe pollution' (Boothroyd & Stark 2000).

When interpreting the MCI it is important to acknowledge the 'fuzzy' divisions between quality classes (Stark & Maxted 2007b), and Stark (1985) suggests a buffer of ± 5 MCI units. The Northland Regional Council requested MCI-sb tolerance scores be used only at naturally occurring soft-bottomed sites and provided a list of sites which were deemed to be naturally soft-bottomed with the aid of REC software (Snelder & Biggs 2002) and NRC habitat assessments. All soft-bottomed sites that are deemed to be 'human induced' are calculated using the conventional MCI and hard-bottomed tolerance scores.

•The Semi-Quantitative Macroinvertebrate Community Index (SQMCI and SQMCI-sb)
These are similar to the MCI, but also take into account the number of individuals belonging to each taxon. Because of this they are considered to be a more accurate reflection of stream health than the MCI, when samples to be compared are collected within a relatively short temporal period.

Tolerance scores for SQMCI and SQMCI-sb are the same as those used for MCI and MCI-sb. The final index score for each sample is the taxon coded abundance (c_i) multiplied by taxon tolerance score (a_i) for each taxon present, summed, and divided by the total coded abundance (M) i.e., $\sum (c_i \times a_i) / M$ (Boothroyd & Stark 2000). Resulting scores are a number between 0.1 and 10; scores >6.00 indicate 'clean water', scores of 5.00 to 5.99 indicate 'possible mild pollution', scores of 4.00 to 4.99 indicate 'probable moderate pollution', and scores of 3.99 and lower indicate 'probable severe pollution' (Boothroyd & Stark 2000).

As with the MCI, it is important to acknowledge the 'fuzzy' divisions between quality classes when interpreting the SQMCI or SQMCI-sb. Stark & Maxted (2007b) suggest a buffer of ± 1.00 unit. As with MCI, the NRC has requested SQMCI-sb tolerance scores be used only with naturally occurring soft-bottomed sites. All soft-bottomed sites that are deemed to be 'human induced' are calculated using the conventional MCI and hard-bottomed tolerance scores.

3.   Results

3.1   State of the Environment (SoE) sites

3.1.1   Biotic indices

Raw macroinvertebrate SoE data is tabled in Appendix E. Taxonomic richness at the 37 SoE sites ranged from five at the Paparoa @ walking bridge site to 34 at Waipoua @ SH12 Rest Area and Pukenui Stream u/s Ridge Track crossing sites (Fig. 6). The mean number of taxa was 18.4 ± 1.2 (SE, n=37).

Five SoE sites recorded no insect taxa from the orders Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera and Trichoptera (EPT*) this year. In addition, eight other sites recorded less than four EPT* taxa. Of the 37 SoE sites, the range of EPT* taxa was 0.0–61.5% (Fig. 7). Thirteen sites (35.1%) scored at least 40% EPT*, however 20 sites in total (54.1%) scored ≤30% EPT* taxa. The mean %EPT* for all 37 SoE sites was 30.0% ± 3.1 (SE, n=37).

Macroinvertebrate Community Index (MCI) scores for the 37 SoE sites ranged from 48.9 (Manganui @ Mitaitai Rd) to 132.6 (Pukenui Stream u/s Ridge Track crossing) (Fig. 8), with a mean of 89.9 ± 3.2 (SE, n=37). Eleven (29.7%) of the sites recorded MCI scores less than 80.0, which can be interpreted as water of probable severe 'organic' pollution (Boothroyd & Stark 2000). Two of the sites (5.4%) scored above 120 (Waipoua @ SH12 Rest Area and Pukenui Stream u/s Ridge Track crossing), which is accepted as the 'clean water' lower limit, however two additional sites (Ruakaka @ Flyger Road and Waipapa @ Forest Ranger) likely also fall into this category if the ± 5 unit buffer is considered.

Semi-Quantitative Macroinvertebrate Community Index (SQMCI) results ranged from 1.02 (Wairua @ Purua) to 7.91 (Waipoua @ SH12 Rest Area) (Fig. 9). Twenty of the sites (54.1%) recorded SQMCI scores of less than 4.00, which is interpreted as water of probable 'severe pollution'. However, a further nine sites (24.3%) were recorded in the 'moderate pollution' interpretation (a total of 78.4% sites in poorly polluted categories), which is indicated by a low-scoring mean of just 3.86 ± 0.29 (SE, n=37). In contrast, the five sites listed below scored above 6.00, which is interpreted as the 'clean water' lower limit:

- Waipoua @ SH12 Rest Area
- Pukenui Stream u/s Ridge Track crossing
- Ruakaka @ Flyger Road
- Mangahahuru @ end of Main Rd
- Waipapa @ Forest Ranger

Figure 6. Number of macroinvertebrate taxa recorded from the 37 State of Environment sites for March 2011.

Sampling sites

Figure 7. Percentage of Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, and Trichoptera (excluding Hydroptilidae) taxa from the 37 State of Environment sites for March 2011.

Figure 8. MCI scores for the 37 State of Environment sites for March 2011. Error bars represent ± 5 MCI units.

Figure 9. SQMCI scores of the 37 State of Environment sites for March 2011. Error bars represent ± 1 SQMCI unit.

3.2   Resource Consent (RC) activities
3.2.1   Biotic indices

Raw macroinvertebrate RC data is tabled in Appendix F. Taxonomic richness recorded at the four Resource Consent activities (upstream and downstream) ranged from 11 upstream of Oxidation Pond A, to 23 downstream of the Dam (Fig. 10). The mean number of taxa was 18.1 ± 1.3 (SE, n=8).

The range of %EPT* taxa was 11.1–55.0% with a mean of 34.6% ± 5.7% (SE, n=8) (Fig. 11). Four (50.0%) of the sites scored highly, these being Meatworks u/s, Dam u/s, Quarry u/s and Quarry d/s (40.0, 42.9, 52.6, and 55.0% respectively).

MCI values ranged from 57.2 (Oxidation Pond A d/s) to 124.0 (Quarry d/s) (Fig. 12) with a mean of 93.2 ± 7.9 (SE, n=8). Upstream and downstream of Oxidation Pond A and downstream of the meatworks recorded an MCI score of less than 80, which can be interpreted as water of 'probable severe pollution' (Boothroyd & Stark 2000). Three RC sites scored well which included downstream of the quarry with 124.0, which is interpreted as the 'clean water'.

SQMCI scores ranged from 2.32–6.89 (Fig. 13); the mean being 4.22 ± 0.60 (SE, n=8). Upstream and downstream of Oxidation Pond A, meatworks downstream and dam downstream results all suggested water with 'probable severe pollution', while upstream of the meatworks, quarry and dam all appeared reasonable quality. Quarry downstream recorded a 'clean water' SQMCI score this year.


Figure 10. Macroinvertebrate taxonomic richness at the four Resource Consent activities for March 2011, u/s = upstream, d/s = downstream.

Figure 11. Percentage of Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, and Trichoptera orders within each sample for the four Resource Consent activities for March 2011, u/s = upstream, d/s = downstream.


Figure 12. MCI scores for the four Resource Consent activities for March 2011. Error bars represent ± 5 MCI units, which potentially separate water quality classes, u/s = upstream, d/s = downstream.

Figure 13. SQMCI scores for the four Resource Consent activities for March 2011. Error bars represent ± 1 SQMCI unit, which potentially separate water quality classes, u/s = upstream, d/s = downstream.

The change in community composition, reflected through SQMCI index scores, from upstream to downstream of the activity, is important in determining whether the consented discharge is having adverse effects on the waterway. Only the Dam activity showed a considerable difference between the downstream and upstream SQMCI values (Figs 14, 15).


Figure 14. SQMCI values comparing the upstream and downstream sites for March 2011. Error bars represent ± 1 SQMCI unit.

Figure 15. Resource Consent sites showing the difference between upstream and downstream SQMCI values for March 2011.

3.3   Trend analysis

Analysis of 22 (of 37) SoE sites and 8 (of 8) Resource Consent activity sites was carried out, looking at the MCI and SQMCI results over time (Figs 16, 17). Fifteen (of 37) other SoE sites have been established over the last six years, but were considered inadequate to produce reliable trends, thus were excluded from analysis. Collier & Kelly (2006) considered that a minimum time series of eight occasions were sufficient to detect meaningful ecological (but not statistical) treads in invertebrate data, thus caution should be taken for several of the reported analyses i.e., Waiotu, Waipoua, and Kaihu sites.

Inspection of collective MCI and SQMCI index trends, for SoE sites, indicated that 9 of the 22 sites (40.9%) showed little ecological change. A further 10 sites (45.5%) indicated a reduction in their biotic index over time and 3 sites (13.6%) indicated an increase in their biotic index over time. One of the 'improving sites' was Mangahahuru @ Apotu Rd Bridge which was one of the worse SoE sites in the programme (mean MCI 72.9 ± 4.3, mean SQMCI 2.62 ± 0.11; SE and n=20 for both), consistently interpreted as 'probable severe pollution'.

When looking at the averaged trend results of MCI and SQMCI collectively, and loosely fitting them into water quality classes presented in Boothroyd & Stark (2000), 77.3% of sites can be interpreted as 'probable moderate' or 'probable severe pollution', 13.6% of sites as 'mild pollution' and 9.1% as clean water.

Figure 16. MCI (blue) and SQMCI (orange) trends with LOWESS fitted lines (tension = 0.4) for the SoE monitoring sites. Green dashed lines represent lower clean water limit.

Figure 16 continued. MCI (blue) and SQMCI (orange) trends with LOWESS fitted lines (tension = 0.4) for the SoE monitoring sites. Green dashed lines represent lower clean water limit.

Figure 16 continued. MCI (blue) and SQMCI (orange) trends with LOWESS fitted lines (tension = 0.4) for the SoE monitoring sites. Green dashed lines represent lower clean water limit.

Figure 17. MCI (blue) and SQMCI (orange) trends with LOWESS fitted lines (tension = 0.4) for the Resource Consent activity sites. Green dashed lines represent lower clean water limit.

4.   Conclusions

- Five sites, being Waipoua @ SH12 Rest Area, Pukenui Stream u/s Ridge Track crossing, Ruakaka @ Flyger Road, Mangahahuru @ end of Main Rd and Waipapa @ Forest Ranger recorded clean water this year based on MCI and/or SQMCI results. However, declining trends are observed for several of these.

- Twenty of the SoE sites (54.1%) recorded SQMCI scores of less than 4.00, which is interpreted as water of probable 'severe pollution'. However, a further nine sites (24.3%) were recorded in the 'moderate pollution' interpretation (a total of 78.4% sites in poorly polluted categories).

- The worst of the SoE sites for 2011, based on SQMCI results were (worst site first):

    - Wairua @ Purua
    - Waiarohia @ Kamo Tributary Culvert
    - Manganui @ Mitaitai Rd
    - Waiotu @ SH1 Bridge
    - Awanui u/s Waihue Channel, and
    - Waitangi @ Watea

    These 'bottom six' regularly feature at/near the bottom of the invertebrate monitoring programme and for most part, the reasons will be related to difficulties of sampling due to their large size combined with the nature of their position in their river continuum, effectively receiving nutrients from large catchments.

    One particular concern is the **Kamo Tributary Culvert site** on the Waiarohia Stream which has had poor biological scores since monitoring began however the surrounding habitat, in-stream habitat, as well as physical water parameters, all appear excellent.

- With regard to the consented activities (RC sites), SQMCI differences between upstream and downstream sites didn't indicate major changes in the invertebrate communities, although most were impaired (the exception being the Quarry activity). The worst of the RC sites, based on SQMCI differences, was the damming activity, which is most likely due to the retention of sediment at the downstream site.

- Inspection of collective MCI and SQMCI index trends, for SoE sites, indicated that 9 of the 22 sites (40.9%) showed little ecological change. A further 10 sites (45.5%) indicated a reduction in their biotic index and 3 sites (13.6%) indicated an increase in their biotic index, over time.

- When looking at the averaged trend results of MCI and SQMCI collectively, and loosely fitting them into water quality classes presented in Boothroyd & Stark (2000), 77.3% of sites can be interpreted as 'probable moderate' or 'probable severe pollution', 13.6% of sites as 'mild pollution' and 9.1% as clean water.

5. References

Biggs, J.F. & Kilroy, C. 2000. Stream periphyton monitoring manual. Prepared for The New Zealand Ministry for the Environment. NIWA. Christchurch. 226 p.

Boothroyd, I.K & Stark, J.D. 2000. Use of invertebrates in monitoring. *In*: Collier, K.J. & Winterbourn, M.J. *eds. New Zealand stream invertebrates: ecology and implications for management*. New Zealand Limnological Society, Christchurch. Pp 344–373.

Chapman, M.A. & Lewis, M.H. 1976. *An introduction to the freshwater Crustacea of New Zealand*. William Collins Ltd. Auckland. 261 p.

Collier, K.J. & Kelly, J. 2006. Patterns and trends in the ecological condition of Waikato streams based on the monitoring of aquatic invertebrates from 1994 to 2005. Environment Waikato Technical Report 2006/04. 28 p.

Cuffney, T.F., Gurtz, M.E. & Meador, M.R. 1993 *Methods for collecting benthic invertebrate samples as part of the national water-quality assessment program*. United States Geological Survey, Report No. 93–104. 66 p. (http://water.usgs.gov/nawqa/protocols/OFR-93-406).

Frost, S., Huni, A. & Kershaw, W.E. 1971 Evaluation of a kicking technique for sampling stream bottom fauna. *Canadian Journal of Zoology 49*: 167–173.

Poynter, M. 2003. *Kaeo River Environmental Monitoring Programme. Aquatic Macroinvertebrate Survey.* Prepared by Poynter & Associates Environmental Ltd. and Amy Bazeley Ecological Services for Northland Regional Council. 9 p.

Smith, B.J. & Ward, J.B. Unpublished. *An identification guide to the New Zealand hydrobiosid caddisflies (Insecta: Trichoptera).* 151 p.

Snelder, T.H. & Biggs, B.J.F. 2002. Multiscale River Environment Classification for water resources management. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association 38*: 1225–1239.

Stark, J.D. 1985. *A Macroinvertebrate Community Index of water quality for stony streams*. Water and Soil Miscellaneous Publication No 87. National Water and Soil Conservation Authority, Wellington. 53 p.

Stark, J.D. 1993. Performance of the Macroinvertebrate Community Index: effects of sampling method, sample replication, water depth, current velocity, and substratum on index values. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research 27*: 463–478.

Stark, J.D. 1998. SQMCI: a biotic index for freshwater macroinvertebrate coded-abundance data. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research 32*: 55–66.

Stark, J.D. & Maxted, J.R. 2004. *Macroinvertebrate Community Indices for Auckland's soft-bottomed streams and applications to SOE reporting*. Report prepared for Auckland Regional Council. 59 p.

Stark, J.D. & Maxted, J.R. 2007a. A biotic index for New Zealand's soft-bottomed streams. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research 41*: 43–61.

Stark, J.D. & Maxted, J.R. 2007b. *A user guide for the Macroinvertebrate Community Index*. Prepared for The New Zealand Ministry for the Environment. Cawthron Report No.1166. 58 p.

Stark, J.D., Boothroyd, I. K. G., Harding, J. S., Maxted, J. R. & Scarsbrook, M. R. 2001. *Protocols for sampling macroinvertebrates in wadeable streams*. New Zealand Macroinvertebrate Working Group Report No. 1. Prepared for The New Zealand Ministry for the Environment. Sustainable Management Fund Project No. 5103. 57 p.

Towns, D.R. & Peters, W.L. 1996. Leptophlebiidae (Insecta: Ephemeroptera). *Fauna of New Zealand Number 36*. 143 p.

Winterbourn, M.J. 1973. A guide to the freshwater Mollusca of New Zealand. *Tuatara 20*: 141–159.

Winterbourn, M.J., Gregson, K.L.D. & Dolphin, C.H. 2006. Guide to the aquatic insects of New Zealand. *Bulletin of the Entomological Society of New Zealand 14*, 108 p.

6. Acknowledgements