Do Beaver Dam Analogues Act as Passage Barriers to Juvenile Coho Salmon and Steelhead Trout?



Chris O'Keefe



Dr. Darren Ward, Dr. Alison O'Dowd,

Dr. Mark Henderson, Dr. Michael Pollock







FOUNDATION



Roadmap for today's talk

- Introduction Very Brief
 - Background on stream ecology and beavers
 - Why this research matters
- Study methods, analyses, and results
- Discussion
- Questions



200 Years of Stream Alteration



Historic Stream Conditions





Current Stream Conditions - Pollock 2014

Beaver Dam Analogue (BDA)

Cross Section View



Aerial View



Benefits to Salmonids

- ↑ Fish productivity and abundance
- ↑ Habitat and habitat heterogeneity
- ↑ Rearing and overwinter habitat
- ↑ Growth rates
- ↑ Flow refuge
- ↑ Invertebrate production

- Kemp et al., 2012

Spread it, slow it, sink it, and grow it

BDA's are Cheap

\$2,000-\$4,000 per structure Limited restoration funding

- Pollock, 2015

Concerns About BDAs



- Siltation and limits spawning gravel
- Increased water temperatures
 - ... but beaver dam structures lower water temp due to groundwatersurface water connectivity

- Weber et al., 2017

• Fish passage



FISH and FISHERIES, 2012, 13, 158-181



Sean M. Johnson-Bice 🗙, Kathryn M. Renik, Steve K. Windels, Andrew W. Hafs

First published: 18 August 2018 | https://doi.org/10.1002/nafm.10223 | Citations: 4

"The mechanics of fish passage at beaver dams requires more intensive research, using both experimental and field-based empirical approaches."

- Kemp, 2012

"Further research is needed to clarify this common misconception that beaver dams block fish passage." - Pollock, 2015

"Ultimately, more research is needed to determine which... characteristics of dams (e.g., height and permeability) that are more likely to restrict salmonid movements..."

- Johnson-Nice, 2018

Photo credit: Worth A Dam Foundation (martinezbeavers.org)

Juvenile Salmonid Passage Research

• Malison et al. 2016

 Natural beaver dams <u>limited stream connectivity</u> for juvenile Coho and Chinook Salmon in large floodplain rivers in Alaska and Russia

• Malison et al. 2020

 Natural beaver dams <u>did not block the movement</u> of juvenile Atlantic Salmon and sea trout or their ability to use upstream habitats in Central Norway

• Pollock et al. 2019

- 21-day study during the Fall on two Sugar Creek BDAs
- 54% of juvenile steelhead passed both
- 91% of juvenile Coho passed both
- Fish used side channels and leaped over 40 cm jumps
- Concluded salmonids have evolved to cross beaver dams

• White et at. 2019

- 30 cm may be an acceptable jump height for juvenile Coho and steelhead for culverts
- More tests are needed to understand the jumping ability of smaller fish



2019 Field Experiments – Scott River Tributaries





Early Summer Experiments – Study Design

- Constructed net pens to keep fish confined to Miners Creek BDAs
- Released 20-50 Fin clipped Coho < 65 mm below BDAs
- Minnow Traps and Seining to Recapture











Early Summer Experiments





Van Kirk and Naman, 2008







0









Released ~ 300 Juvenile Coho > 65 mm with PIT tag







Side Channel

Passed all three BDAs over nine days



August 4th Snorkel



Before Side Channel Connected



After Side Channel Connected



Two hours after side channel was reconnected

Passed all three BDAs over nine days





9/10/2019

0/6/2019

WWW

9/6/2019 9/10/2019



Logistic Regression: p(Passage) ~ FL



Jump and Subsurface Hatchery Experiments

- Built BDA-like structures in the hatchery
- June 1 July 31 with four treatments per week
- 50 steelhead per trial allowed 24 hours to pass
- Fork lengths ranged from 43 mm to 110 mm
- Each fish exposed to both jump and subsurface
- Trial order was randomized
- Tagged fish with smaller PIT tags to accommodate the smaller fish
- Allowed 1 week to recover before each experiment
- Suspended BioMark HPR Pro Handheld Wand Antenna to detect passage



8 mm

2 3



Hatchery Jump Experiments

16 total jump trials

52% passage overall



Four replicates of each treatment

cm

40 cm willow



Probability of passage while holding the additional fixed effects at their mean

Results



Review of Main Results

Early Summer

- Coho successfully passed 20-36.5 cm jumps in 24 hrs
- Water use posed as barrier

Mid Summer

- Series of BDAs were passable
- Coho passed via subsurface passageways
- Lack of side channel may have slowed passage



Jump Experiments

- 24 cm jump did not limit passage for any size trout
- When fish were on average 82 mm, passage between the tallest (44 cm) and shortest (24 cm) treatments was comparable

Discussion – Fish Movement and Stream Flow

Lang and Love (2014) state, "even in unimpaired stream systems there are flows that fish will not attempt to move upstream due to physical and behavioral reasons, such as at low flows when depths throughout the channel are naturally too shallow".

Should we require restoration practitioners be required to maintain passage when fish would not naturally move during low flow periods?

Lower Klamath River BDAs – Maintain passage ≥1 CFS



- Faukner et al. 2019

Special Thanks To Everyone That Helped With This Project!!!

Humboldt State University

FACULTY/STAFF: Darren Ward, Mark Henderson, Alison O'Dowd, Andre Buchheister, Patrick Nero, Tim Miller, Bernard, and Colin Wingfield.

CLASSMATES: Erika Thalman, Gavin Bandy, Emily Chen, Max Ramos, Ely Boone, Monica Tonty, Joshua Cahill, Natasha Ficzycz, Grace Ghrist, Thomas Starkey-Owens, Natalie Okun, Quinn Wulffson, Maddie Halloran, Braden Herman, Chris Loomis, and many others!

Colleagues and Friends

Charnna Gilmore, Erich Yokel, Betsy and Michael Stapleton, Dale Munson, Isis Izora, Amanda Schmalenberger, Emily Savides, Linda Bailey, the Youth Environmental Summer Studies (YESS) program, Scott Silloway, Jimmy Faukner, David White, Shari Witmore, Bob Pagliuco, Mariska Obedzinski, William Boucher, Andrew Bartshire, Sarah Nossaman, and Nick Bauer

Family

Krystal, Perry, and Rita Mae O'Keefe; Shelley Chavoor; Lauren, John, and Skwala Hunter

Funders

National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, Scott River Watershed Council, Humboldt State University, Roelofs Humboldt Fisheries Fund, Joseph Sidney Woolford Fund, Danielle Zumbrun Memorial Scholarship, Donald Morris Hegy Memorial Fund, Joseph and Barbara Bania Scholarship, PacifiCorp







tinyurl.com/TroutJumping

Questions?













Discussion – BDAs and Diversions

- Adequate Flows = Passage on Scott River BDAs
- Diversions are potentially creating passage issues





Discussion – Subsurface Passage

- Physical characteristics of the BDAs vary greatly between sites
- Side channel and jump points are a lot easier to confirm passage
- Holes are often patched to retain water and to increase weir flow for passage, which would limit subsurface passage
- More research is needed to understand subsurface passage



Discussion – Limited Movement and BDA Benefits at the Population Level



Discussion – BDA Maintenance and Passage

- BDAs require maintenance to ensure passage
- More funding for maintained and monitoring



Bring beavers back that will do it for free



If I Had To Do It Again

- Release 1/3 of the fish below each Sugar Creek BDA as opposed to below the bottom BDA
- Use Coho Salmon for the hatchery experiments
- Complete additional experiments on BDAs outside of the Scott River



On Deck Slides

Discussion – Passage and Length

- Unlike the hatchery experiments, length was not a strong predictor of passage in the field... but why?
 - Potentially a product of study design (differences in fork length ranges)
 - Maybe there are more influential factors in the field such as flow



Discussion – BDAs and Predation



Potential Future Research

Predation at fish passage side channel VS. Added safety in BDA pond VS. Risk of predation without pond

Miners Creek

Summarized data from the Miners Creek passage experiments

Trial	1	2	3	4
BDA Site	Miners 2.4	Miners 2.3	Miners 2.4	Miners 2.1
Start Date	6/18/2019	6/19/2019	6/19/2019	6/20/2019
Physical Parameters				
Jump Height	36.5 cm	20 cm	33 cm	20 cm
Plunge Pool Depth	23.5 cm	19.5 cm	26.5 cm	12.5 cm
Permeability Estimate	0-33%	33-66%	0-33%	33-66%
Water Temperature	12.8 C°	10.9 C°	10.9 C°	10 C°
Spill Crest Depth	3 cm	3 cm	7.5 cm	4.5 cm
Spill Crest Width	205 cm	170 cm	205 cm	200 cm
Velocity at Crest	0.518 m/s	0.137 m/s	0.612 m/s	0.307 m/s
Stream Flow	0.013 cms	0.023 cms	0.023 cms	0.028 cms
Dagaaga				
Tassage	6	9	23	15
Recaptured Above	2	8	6	1
Not Reconstured	- 12	8	18	34
Percent of Recaptured	75%	53%	79%	94%
Fish Caught Above	1010	2270	1270	2110
Percent of Released Fish	30%	36%	49%	30%
Caught Above				
Fish Size				
Fork Length (Avg \pm SD)	$58.5 \pm 3.4 \text{ mm}$	$58.7\pm5.0\ mm$	$55.3 \pm 4.1 \text{ mm}$	$55.2 \pm 6.1 \text{ m}$

Hatchery Jump Experiments - Analysis

model	df	AICc	delta	weight
Passage ~ Trial + zFL + zFL^2	7	640.930	0.000	0.656
Passage ~ Trial + zFL + zFL^2 + zWater Temp	8	642.254	1.324	0.338
Passage ~ $zFL + zFL^2$	4	651.168	10.238	0.004
Passage ~ $zFL + zFL^2 + zWater Temp$	5	652.415	11.485	0.002
Passage ~ Trial + zFL + $zWater$ Temp	7	662.919	21.989	0.000
Passage ~ Trial + zFL	6	664.352	23.422	0.000
Passage ~ zFL + zWater Temp	4	672.624	31.694	0.000
Passage ~ zFL	3	672.938	32.007	0.000
Passage ~ zWater Temp	3	765.668	124.737	0.000
Passage ~ Trial + zWater Temp	6	766.244	125.314	0.000
Passage ~ $zFL^2 + zWater Temp$	4	767.619	126.689	0.000
Passage ~ Trial + zFL^2 + $zWater Temp$	7	768.251	127.320	0.000
Passage ~ 1	2	769.796	128.866	0.000
Passage ~ zFL^2	3	771.656	130.726	0.000
Passage ~ Trial	5	771.894	130.963	0.000
Passage ~ Trial + zFL^2	6	773.793	132.862	0.000

Mixed-Effects Logistic Regression

Averaged models within two delta AIC scores

Fixed Effects

- <u>**Trial**</u> combination of jump height and presence of willow
- **<u>zFL</u>** standardized fork lengths
- **<u>zTemp</u>** standardized water temperature

Random Effect

<u>Sample</u> – random intercept based on sample number to account for variation between samples Hatchery Jump Experiment – Temperature Histogram



Water Temperature (C)