ECOLOGICAL
SOCIETY
OF AMERICA

Ecology/Ecological Monographs/Ecological Applications

PREPRINT

This preprint is a PDF of a manuscript that has been accepted for publication in an ESA journal. It is the final version that was uploaded and approved by the author(s). While the paper has been through the usual rigorous peer review process of ESA journals, it has not been copy-edited, nor have the graphics and tables been modified for final publication. Also note that the paper may refer to online Appendices and/or Supplements that are not yet available. We have posted this preliminary version of the manuscript online in the interest of making the scientific findings available for distribution and citation as quickly as possible following acceptance. However, readers should be aware that the final, published version will look different from this version and may also have some differences in content.

The doi for this manuscript and the correct format for citing the paper are given at the top of the online (html) abstract.

Once the final published version of this paper is posted online, it will replace the preliminary version at the specified doi.

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Running head: Flood effects on a river food web

ECOSYSTEM ECOLOGY MEETS ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT: FOOD WEB RESPONSE TO A CONTROLLED FLOOD ON THE COLORADO RIVER, GLEN CANYON

Wyatt F. Cross[1,5*], Colden V. Baxter[2], Kevin C. Donner[2], Emma J. Rosi-Marshall[3], Theodore A. Kennedy[4], Robert O. Hall, Jr. [5], Holly A. Wellard Kelly[3], and R. Scott Rogers[6]

[1]Department of Ecology, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT 59717

[2]Department of Biology, Idaho State University, Pocatello, ID 83209

[3]Cary Institute of Ecosystem Studies, Millbrook, NY 12545

[4]US Geological Survey, Southwest Biological Science Center, Flagstaff, AZ 86001

[5]Department of Zoology and Physiology, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY 82071

[6]Arizona Game and Fish Department, Flagstaff, AZ 86001

* Corresponding author: Email: wyatt.cross@montana.edu; Phone: 406-994-2473; Fax: 406-994-3190

esa preprint

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

ABSTRACT

Large dams have been constructed on rivers to meet human demands for water, electricity, navigation and recreation. As a consequence, flow and temperature regimes have been altered, strongly affecting river food webs and ecosystem processes. Experimental high flow dam releases, i.e., controlled floods, have been implemented on the Colorado River, USA, in an effort to re-establish pulsed flood events, redistribute sediments, improve conditions for native fishes, and increase understanding of how dam operations affect physical and biological processes. We quantified secondary production and organic matter flows in the food web below Glen Canyon dam for two years prior and one year after an experimental controlled flood in March 2008. Invertebrate biomass and secondary production declined significantly following the flood (total biomass: 55% decline, total production: 56% decline), with most of the decline driven by reductions in two non-native invertebrate taxa, *Potamopyrgus antipodarum* and *Gammarus lacustris*. Diatoms dominated the trophic basis of invertebrate production before and after the controlled flood, and the largest organic matter flows were from diatoms to the three most productive invertebrate taxa (*P. antipodarum*, *G. lacustris*, and Tubificida). In contrast to invertebrates, production of rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) increased substantially (194%) following the flood despite the large decline in total secondary production of the invertebrate assemblage. This counterintuitive result is reconciled by a post-flood increase in production and drift concentrations of select invertebrate prey (i.e., Chironomidae and Simuliidae) that supported a large proportion of trout production, but had relatively low secondary production. In addition, interaction strengths, measured as species impact values, were strongest between rainbow trout and these two taxa before and after the flood, demonstrating that the dominant consumer-resource interactions were not necessarily congruent with the dominant organic matter

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

flows. Our study illustrates the value of detailed food web analysis for elucidating pathways by which dam management may alter production and strengths of species interactions in river food webs. We suggest that controlled floods may benefit production of non-native rainbow trout, and this information can be used to help guide future dam management decisions.

Keywords: secondary production, trophic basis of production, organic matter flows, dam, species interactions, high-flow experiment, regulated river

INTRODUCTION

Human alteration of ecosystems is a global phenomenon with serious consequences for biological diversity, energy and material cycling, climate, and human well-being (Vitousek et al. 1997, Chapin et al. 2000). Changes to physical characteristics of landscapes can create novel biological assemblages that tolerate or even thrive in altered physical conditions (With 2002, Johnson et al. 2008). Such changes can affect ecosystem-level processes because species composition and consumer-resource interactions govern flows of energy and materials (Carpenter et al. 1985, Jones and Lawton 1995, Schmitz 2010). Highly altered ecosystems, therefore, may serve as endpoints for examining how changes in assemblage structure influence function, and detailed study of these ecosystems can help develop key management and restoration strategies (Hobbs and Huenneke 1992, Stanford et al. 1996).

River regulation (i.e., dam construction) represents a pervasive alteration of the landscape, and has led to unprecedented changes in river flow regime, temperature regime, and sediment delivery worldwide (Nilsson et al. 2005, Poff et al. 2007, Olden and Naiman 2010). Regulation of large rivers can cause substantial ecological discontinuities that facilitate introduction and establishment of invasive species (Bunn and Arthington 2002, Johnson et al.

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

2008), which can modulate flows of energy and materials. Although many studies have documented structural changes to river assemblages below dams (e.g., Englund and Malmqvist 1996, Stevens et al. 1997, Vinson 2001), few have constructed detailed flow food webs for these heavily altered ecosystems. Characterization of energetic and material flows in food webs is much more informative than structural information (i.e., abundance, biomass, diversity) because flows can be used to test hypotheses related to consumer-resource interaction strengths, the potential for food limitation, and the importance of animals in whole-ecosystem material cycling (Hall et al. 2003, Cross et al. 2007, Benke and Huryn 2010). Moreover, flow-based food webs can identify key pathways of materials in ecosystems (Hall et al. 2000) and can provide a mechanistic framework to inform adaptive management decisions regarding changes in flow regime, species introductions, and temperature mitigation (Kennedy and Gloss 2005). Despite the high potential of this approach, it has not yet been applied to adaptive management (*sensu* Holling 1978, Walters 2002) of river ecosystems.

Water managers and policy makers increasingly recognize that human needs can be balanced with maintained ecological integrity of freshwater ecosystems (Baron et al. 2002, Richter et al. 2003, Postel and Richter 2003). Many management decisions for regulated rivers are now geared towards restoring the ‘natural’ river ecosystem with regard to physical characteristics, while still maintaining water availability for a variety of human uses (Arthington and Pusey 2003, Allan and Castillo 2007). For example, controlled floods aim to restore geomorphic processes as well as key components of the natural disturbance regime that are necessary for many aquatic organisms (Poff et al. 1997, Patten et al. 2001, Robinson and Uehlinger 2008). These controlled floods represent ecosystem-level experiments that can advance our understanding of the ecosystem, thereby informing future management decisions in

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

an adaptive management framework (Walters 2002, Poff et al. 2003). However, these floods are most useful for adaptive management if detailed process-based research is conducted before, during, and after the experimental event (Souchon et al. 2008).

The Glen Canyon Adaptive Management Program implemented three controlled floods on the Colorado River, USA in March 1996, November 2004, and March 2008. These experimental floods were geared towards partially restoring the natural disturbance regime and redistributing tributary-derived fine sediment to build sandbars for recreational use (Patten et al. 2001). In addition, these floods aimed to restore backwater habitat for downstream native fishes (e.g., humpback chub; *Gila cypha*), while maintaining a productive, non-native rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) fishery in the 25-km tailwater reach below Glen Canyon Dam. Previous research examining the influence of these floods on the Colorado River food web has focused predominantly on assemblage structural attributes, reporting changes in abundance and biomass of dominant taxa over relatively short time scales (Shannon et al. 2001, Valdez et al. 2001). While these studies are extremely useful for short-term assessment of river assemblage responses to experimental floods, process-based studies of food web interactions and ecosystem processes are needed to help inform future adaptive management decisions.

Here we present a three-year analysis of secondary production and flow food webs in the tailwater reach of the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam. Our primary objective was to build detailed flow food webs (*sensu* Benke and Wallace 1997, Hall et al. 2000) to characterize and understand the response of the river food web to a 60-h controlled flood in March 2008. Our approach allowed us to (a) elucidate dominant pathways of material flow in the food web, (b) assess the potential for food limitation of predatory rainbow trout, and (c) quantify variation in consumer-resource interaction strengths. We show that trout production increased following the

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

flood, despite a large reduction in total invertebrate production. This counterintuitive result is reconciled by flow food web analysis that demonstrates increased availability and consumption of highly palatable prey items following the flood. In particular, prey items that benefitted from the flood were taxa that most likely limit rainbow trout production and for which trout exhibit the highest interaction strengths. Our results underscore the value of detailed food web analysis for supporting decision-making in an adaptive management framework and provide quantitative information that can be used in predictive modeling of future water release scenarios on the Colorado River.

METHODS

Study site

The Colorado River watershed includes a large area (~629,000 km^2) of the western United States and drains portions of seven states on its path toward the Gulf of California. Six major dams regulate flow in the lower Colorado River basin, and the timing and magnitude of discharge is now largely determined by fluctuating demand for irrigation water and electricity (Topping et al. 2003). Since completion of Glen Canyon dam in 1963, river flow, temperature, and sediment delivery in the Colorado River have been altered (Gloss et al. 2005), leading to significant changes in the river ecosystem and establishment of many non-native invertebrate taxa (Blinn and Cole 1991, Stevens et al. 1997). In 1995, New Zealand mudsnails (*Potamopyrgus antipodarum*) were discovered below Glen Canyon Dam and have since become a dominant component of the invertebrate assemblage (Cross et al. 2010).

We studied the 25-km segment of the Colorado River directly downstream of Glen Canyon Dam near Page, Arizona. River discharge originates from the hypolimnion of Lake Powell, and water temperature at the downstream end of the reach (Lees Ferry) is relatively cold

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

throughout the year (mean daily temperature 10.1°C during July 2006 – June 2009; Fig. 1A) with low diel fluctuation (0.5 – 1°C). There are no perennial tributaries in this segment and, consequently, the water is clear for all but a few days of the year. River width and thalweg depth average ~120 and 7 m, respectively, at a discharge of 325 m^3/s (Grams et al. 2007, P.E. Grams, U.S. Geological Survey, unpublished data). Discharge varies widely on a diurnal, seasonal, and annual basis to meet shifting demands for hydroelectric power and water delivery (Topping et al. 2003). Downstream of Glen Canyon, in Grand Canyon National Park, river characteristics change markedly because of gradual river warming and seasonal inputs of tributary sediment and organic matter (Carothers and Brown 1991).

River substrata in Glen Canyon consist of variably-sized talus, cobble-gravel bars, cliff faces, and sandy depositional zones. Filamentous algae (predominantly *Cladophora glomerata*) dominate river biofilms throughout most of the year (Angradi and Kubly 1993), and sloughing and transport peak in the spring (Shannon et al. 1996, T.A. Kennedy, unpublished data). Fish species richness in Glen Canyon is low (predominantly rainbow trout, brown trout, and common carp), and non-native rainbow trout constitute >95% of abundance and biomass (McKinney et al. 2001, Gloss and Coggins 2005).

Between 5 and 9 March, 2008, a controlled flood experiment was conducted below Glen Canyon Dam (Figure 1B). This experimental flood lasted approximately 60 hours, with a maximum discharge of ~1200 m^3/s. The magnitude of this controlled flood, as well as previous experimental floods, was only ~50 percent of the average annual pre-dam flood (Topping et al. 2003).

Invertebrate abundance, biomass, and production

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

We quantitatively sampled dominant benthic habitats for invertebrates each month between July 2006 and June 2009. Habitat classes included cobble/gravel bars, talus/cliff faces, and fine-grained depositional zones (hereafter referred to as cobble/gravel, talus/cliff, and depositional, respectively). The number of samples collected from habitats was roughly proportional to their areal contribution based on habitat surveys (n = 5 for cobble/gravel and talus/cliff, and n = 10 for depositional; see *Habitat Area Estimation* below). We sampled cobble/gravel habitat with a Hess sampler (0.085 m^2, 250-μm mesh size) to a depth of ~10 cm, and depositional zones with a standard Ponar dredge sampler (0.052 m^2) deployed from a motor boat. Talus/cliff habitat was sampled with a custom suction device (battery-powered submersible bilge pump connected to pool hosing, a Nitex bag and dolphin bucket [250 μm mesh]). Each suction sample consisted of 30 sequential intakes totaling a sample area of 0.066 m^2. We sampled during minimum daily discharge (usually between 06:00 and 09:00h) to ensure that samples were collected from the permanently-wetted zone (Blinn et al. 1995).

We preserved samples in the field (70% EtOH) and brought them to the laboratory for subsequent processing. Each sample was rinsed onto nested sieves (pore sizes 1 mm and 250 μm), and material retained on each sieve was elutriated to separate organic from inorganic material. All invertebrates were removed from the large fraction (>1 mm) at 10X magnification, counted, and total body lengths measured (nearest 0.5 mm) on the first 30 individuals encountered of each taxon. Prohibitively large samples were subsampled using a device modeled after the Folsom Plankton Splitter (Wildco, Buffalo, New York, USA). Organic material in the smaller fraction (i.e., <1 mm and >250 μm) was placed in a known volume of water, suspended in a modified Imhoff cone (Wards Natural Science, Rochester, New York, USA) with forced air, and subsampled (by volume) with a 60-ml plastic syringe. Invertebrates in subsamples were

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

removed at 15X magnification, counted, and measured to the nearest 0.5 mm (first 30 encountered of each taxon). Individuals counted but not measured were assumed to have the same size distribution as those that were directly measured on that date. Biomass of each taxon was calculated for each habitat on each date using either length-weight relationships developed for Glen Canyon or literature-based relationships (Benke et al. 1999, Cross et al. 2010, U.S. Geological Survey Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center, unpublished data).

We estimated annual secondary production (g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1}) of invertebrate taxa using methods most appropriate for each taxon (Benke 1993, Benke and Huryn 2006). The instantaneous growth method was used to quantify production of New Zealand mudsnails (*P. antipodarum*) and *Gammarus lacustris* by applying empirically derived size-specific growth rates from Glen Canyon (*P. antipodarum*: g (d^{-1}) = -0.006 × shell length (mm) + 0.029; *G. lacustris*: g (d^{-1}) = -0.016 × ln(body length [mm]) + 0.042; Cross et al. 2010). We also used the instantaneous growth method to estimate production of dominant Oligochaeta taxa using either literature-based size-specific growth rates (Lumbricidae; Barne and Striganova 2005) or application of a constant daily growth rate (0.0095 d^{-1}) derived from initial and final body size (3 and 23 mm) and a maturation time of 7.5 months (Tubificidae; Poddubnaya 1980; estimate based on moderate density and temperature). For Chironomidae, we used the size- and temperature-specific equation of Huryn (1990). This equation, based on a different geographic region, may lead to small error in our production estimates. However, large variability in biomass across samples and sampling dates should far outweigh variation driven by potential differences in individual growth rates. For other taxa with overlapping and/or indistinguishable cohorts, we used the size-frequency method corrected with our best estimate of cohort production intervals based on size frequency data (CPIs; Turbellaria, Simuliidae, Physidae; Hamilton 1969, Benke

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

1979, Benke and Huryn 2006). For the few remaining taxa (Acari, Ceratopogonidae, Cladocera, Copepoda, Sphaeridae, Ostracoda, Nematoda), we multiplied mean annual biomass values by appropriate production:biomass (P:B) ratios (Table 1). Error in our production estimates based on the size frequency method or P:B ratios (i.e., all taxa except *P. antipodarum*, *G. lacustris*, Oligochaeta, and Chironomidae) would have little effect on our results as these taxa only represented 4.3% of assemblage-wide mean habitat-weighted biomass.

We used bootstrap analysis to generate 95% confidence intervals for mean annual abundance, biomass, and production according to Benke and Huryn (2006). Briefly, size-specific abundance data from replicate samples in each habitat on each date were resampled with replacement 1,000 times to generate vectors of mean size-specific abundance and biomass. For those taxa in which we applied the instantaneous growth method, each of the biomass estimates was multiplied by size-specific growth rates and the time interval between sampling dates to generate 1,000 estimates of interval production. These estimates were summed across sampling intervals to generate a vector of annual production. For production estimates that used the size frequency method, two sources of variation were included in bootstrapped estimates: (1) resampled abundance data and (2) randomly selected CPIs within a restricted range based on size frequency data (e.g., between 335 and 365 days; selected from a normal distribution). Vectors of annual abundance, biomass, and production were generated for each taxon in each habitat. Habitat-weighted vectors (1,000 values) were generated by multiplying values in each habitat-specific vector by the relative proportion of that habitat per average square meter. These values were summed across habitats to generate habitat-weighted vectors. Means and the 2.5% and 97.5% quantiles were calculated from habitat-weighted vectors.

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Habitat area estimation

We quantified the area of dominant habitat types in Glen Canyon at 48 linear transects (approximately every 0.3 to 0.5 km) between 9.7 and 24 km below Glen Canyon Dam with a motorized boat and an underwater video sled (see Cross et al. 2010 for details). At each transect, linear habitat proportions were estimated visually using timed videos, total ferry time (min), and total river width (m). Major habitat categories used for our analysis corresponded to the three major habitats sampled for invertebrates and comprised 52% depositional, 27% cobble/gravel, and 21% talus/cliff.

Rainbow trout abundance, biomass, and secondary production

Abundance of rainbow trout was estimated in Glen Canyon on three to four dates per year between 2006 and 2009. On each date, 34-36 reaches were surveyed with single-pass boat electro-fishing, half of which were fixed monitoring locations and the other half were randomly distributed among representative habitats (as described in McKinney et al. 1999). The number of fish captured during these monitoring surveys was used to generate population estimates for the entire Glen Canyon segment. A capture probability (0.095) was estimated by comparing data from two previous years (2000 and 2004) during which both monitoring and whole population estimates via mark-recapture were conducted (Arizona Game and Fish Department, unpublished data). River conditions (e.g., clarity, conductivity) during this earlier period were similar to the years of our study. We assumed a constant capture probability among sample dates and our main source of error was associated with variation in abundance among sampled reaches. Size-specific biomass was calculated for each reach on each date using a fork length – weight relationship developed in Glen Canyon (R.S. Rogers, unpublished data). On each sampling date, a subsample

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

of trout (n = 8 – 24) representing a range of size classes was sacrificed, and their gut contents were removed and preserved in 95% ethanol (see *Gut content analysis* below).

Secondary production of rainbow trout was estimated with the instantaneous growth rate method (Benke 1993, Benke and Huryn 2006). Size-specific growth rates were derived from length-at-age data from Glen Canyon (R.S. Rogers, unpublished data). Bootstrap analysis (as described above for invertebrates) was used to generate bootstrap percentile 95% confidence intervals for annual values. In brief, the size-specific abundance data from replicate samples on each date were resampled with replacement 1000 times to generate vectors of mean size-specific abundance and biomass. Each of these biomass estimates was multiplied by size-specific growth rates and the time interval between sampling dates to generate estimates of interval production, which were summed across intervals to generate vectors of annual production. Annual secondary production (g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1}) was estimated on a per square meter basis.

Gut content analysis

To quantify the proportion of dominant food resources consumed by invertebrates, we used standard gut content analysis (Benke and Wallace 1980, Hall et al. 2000). Invertebrates were collected seasonally from multiple sites in Glen Canyon between June 2006 and January 2009 and immediately preserved in Kahle's solution (Stehr 1987). We quantified the proportions of food types in the diets of *G. lacustris*, *P. antipodarum*, Lumbricidae, Tubificidae, Simuliidae, and non-Tanypodinae Chironomidae. These taxa represented between 88 and 96% of total annual production. Dissected gut contents were sonicated, filtered onto gridded Metricel ® membrane filters (25 mm diameter, 0.45 μm pore size; Pall Corp., Ann Arbor, Michigan), and mounted on slides using Type B immersion oil and nail polish sealant. For preparation of each

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

slide, we used gut contents from one to four individuals of each taxon. During each sampling date, two to four slides for each taxon were analyzed. Approximately 50 food particles from each slide were identified along random transects and their area measured using a phase-contrast compound microscope (100X; 400X to confirm difficult identifications) equipped with a digital camera and image analysis software (ImagePro Plus®, Media Cybernetics Inc., Bethesda, Maryland). Particles were categorized as either: diatoms, filamentous algae, amorphous detritus, leaf material, fungi, macrophytes, or animal material. For each slide we calculated the proportion of each food item in the gut by dividing the area of each category by the total area of the 50 particles measured. For trophic basis of production calculations (*see below*), we applied average values from multiple slides.

We examined diet composition of rainbow trout on 11 dates between 2006 and 2009 (total n = 164). For each individual, we removed the foregut contents and manually separated the dominant food categories (i.e., filamentous algae/epiphytes, terrestrial plant material, terrestrial invertebrates, and aquatic invertebrates). We further separated aquatic invertebrates into groups at the same level of taxonomic resolution as benthic invertebrate samples. For each individual, diet categories were oven-dried at 60°C for 24 hours and weighed. Final dietary proportions were based on the proportion that each food item contributed to total dry weight. Diet proportions were averaged across all individuals analyzed in a given season. Diets of age zero fish (n = 40) were examined and analyzed separately from age 1+ fish.

Trophic basis of production and flow food webs

We quantified annual organic matter flows through the food web using the trophic basis of production method which estimates (a) contributions of different food resources to animal

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

production and (b) rates of resource consumption that support measured rates of animal production (Benke and Wallace 1980). For each taxon, seasonal proportions of food types consumed during a given year were averaged to obtain annual average proportions. The relative fraction of annual production attributed to each food type (Fi) was calculated as:

$$Fi = (Gi \times AEi \times NPE) \qquad (1),$$

where Gi = proportion of food type i in a consumer's gut, AEi = assimilation efficiency of food type i, and NPE = net production efficiency. The actual amount of consumer j's production attributed to each food type ($PFij$ measured in g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1}) was calculated as:

$$PFij = \frac{Fi}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} Fi} \times Pj \qquad (2),$$

where Pj = annual secondary production (g AFDM m^{-2} $y^{-}1$) of consumer j. Lastly, annual flows from each food type i to consumer j ($FCij$ measured in g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1}) were calculated as:

$$FCij = \frac{PFij}{AEi \times NPE} \qquad (3).$$

We used the following assimilation efficiencies for invertebrate consumers: diatoms 0.3, amorphous detritus 0.1, leaf litter 0.1, filamentous algae 0.3, macrophytes 0.1, fungi 0.7, and animal material 0.7 (Bärlocher and Kendrick 1975, Benke and Wallace 1980, 1997). Assimilation efficiencies used for rainbow trout were: most aquatic invertebrates 0.75, Physidae 0.15, *P. antipodarum* 0.09 (Vinson and Baker 2008), terrestrial invertebrates 0.7, terrestrial plant material 0.05, filamentous algae/epiphytes 0.1 (see Liebfried 1988, Angradi 2004). Error in annual estimates of organic matter flows was quantified by resampling secondary production (randomly selected between the maximum and minimum values assuming a uniform distribution) and NPE values (randomly selected between 0.2 and 0.3 for age 0 and age 1

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

rainbow trout and between 0.075 and 0.15 for larger age 2-7 rainbow trout; held constant at 0.5 for invertebrates; Benke and Wallace 1980) to generate 1,000 estimates of annual flows.

Although there are multiple approaches for estimating production and consumption by fishes (e.g., bioenergetics models; Kitchell et al. 1977, Hanson et al. 1997), we opted to use the instantaneous growth method and trophic basis of production approach because we had detailed information on size-specific growth rates from Glen Canyon and we wished to avoid uncertainties associated with applying bioenergetic model parameters from other ecosystems and taxa to Glen Canyon. Nonetheless, our annual estimates of production and consumption agreed with those based on the Wisconsin bioenergetics model.

To examine the strength of interactions between trout predators and their prey, we calculated 'species impact' (SI) values for each year of the study following Wootton (1997). SI values were calculated as:

$$SI = \frac{FCij}{Bi} \qquad (4),$$

where $FCij$ is the mean annual flow (g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1}) of a given prey item to a predator (as defined above) and Bi is the mean annual habitat-weighted biomass of that prey item (g AFDM m^{-2}). The units of this metric are (1/y), and can thus be directly compared with annual biomass turnover rates of prey (i.e., P:B ratios).

We visually compared bootstrap percentile 95% confidence intervals to examine differences among years in secondary production, trophic basis of production, organic matter flows, and species impact values. Means with non-overlapping confidence intervals were interpreted as significantly different.

Invertebrate drift concentration

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

To examine patterns of concentration and composition of invertebrates in the drift before and after the controlled flood, we measured daytime rates of invertebrate drift at Lees Ferry monthly between October 2007 and October 2009 following McKinney et al. (1999). We used a plankton net with a 50-cm opening, 0.25-mm mesh, and 1:5 ratio of opening diameter to net length (to minimize back-pressure and clogging) outfitted with a flow-meter (General Oceanics Inc., Miami, Florida). Depth-integrated samples were collected from the thalweg by slowly raising and lowering the weighted net (45 kg sounding weight) using a hand-powered winch. Triplicate samples were collected at five evenly spaced intervals between 07:00 and 19:00 hours, preserved in the field, and processed as above for benthic invertebrates. The volume of water filtered, which was used to determine concentrations of organisms in drift, was typically between 10-80 m^3. Bootstrap analysis was used to generate 95% confidence intervals for concentrations of drifting invertebrates.

RESULTS

Physical characteristics

Mean daily water temperature in Glen Canyon varied between 7.5 and 13.5°C during the three-year study, with maximum and minimum temperatures occurring in November and February, respectively (Figure 1A). Mean daily discharge varied between 225 and 433 m^3/s, except during the controlled flood when discharge was held at ~1200 m^3/s for 60 hours (Figure 1B). In general, mean daily discharge was higher in summer and winter than autumn and spring, and there was considerable daily and hourly variation (Figure 1B).

Biomass and secondary production

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Total invertebrate secondary production declined following the flood. Annual habitat-weighted invertebrate production was similar (overlapping 95% CIs) and relatively high in years one and two of the study, averaging 28.3 g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1} and 29.9 g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1}, respectively (Table 1). In contrast, total invertebrate production was significantly reduced in year three (12.9 g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1}; Table 1) following the controlled flood.

The two-fold reduction in year three production was largely driven by declines in *P. antipodarum* (84% lower in year three relative to years one and two) and *G. lacustris* (66% lower in year three relative to years one and two; Table 1, Figure 2), although there was substantial inter-annual variability in production of other taxa. The invertebrate assemblage was relatively species-poor and unevenly distributed with regard to secondary production, particularly during the first two years of study (Table 1, Figure 2). For example, four taxa (*P. antipodarum*, *G. lacustris*, Tubificida (a), and Lumbricidae) represented between 89 and 93% of invertebrate production in years one and two (Table 1). Following the flood, production was more evenly distributed among taxa, but the four aforementioned taxa still represented 71% of total invertebrate production (Table 1, Figure 2). Despite reduced whole-assemblage production following the flood, a few taxa significantly increased their production in year three relative to years one and two (i.e., Chironomidae, Simuliidae, Nematoda; Table 1, Figure 2).

Annual patterns in invertebrate biomass closely followed production (Table 1), but mean monthly habitat-weighted biomass varied greatly (Figure 3). Biomass peaked in autumn and early winter of each year (Figure 1). In months prior to the controlled flood (March 2008), *P. antipodarum* dominated invertebrate biomass (average of 51% of total biomass; Figure 3), but their contribution declined substantially in months following the flood (19% of total biomass). Similarly, biomass of *G. lacustris* was reduced by the flood, but their relative contribution to

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

total biomass did not change (~12-14%, Figure 3; see Web Appendix A for habitat-specific biomass and error estimates).

Trout production increased after the flood. Annual production of rainbow trout averaged 0.18 and 0.14 g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1} in years one and two of the study (Table 1). In year three, following the flood, rainbow trout production increased significantly (+194%; to 0.47 g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1}) despite the reduced production of the invertebrate assemblage. Increased survival, abundance, and instantaneous growth rates of age 0 and age 1 fish drove this increase in production following the controlled flood (Korman et al., in press; see Web Appendix B for size frequency histograms over time).

Flow food webs and trophic basis of production

At the base of the food web, the dominant flows were from diatoms and amorphous detritus to the three most productive taxa: *P. antipodarum*, *G. lacustris*, and Tubificida (black arrows in Figure 4). Consumption by these three taxa alone represented 89%, 79%, and 72% of total organic matter flows to invertebrates in years one, two, and three, respectively. Overall patterns of consumption were similar in years one and two, but flows to Lumbricidae increased significantly in year two (Figure 4B). Following the flood (2008-2009), total flows of organic matter to invertebrates declined significantly (i.e., year three flows were 39% of years one and two; Figure 4C), but flows to a few taxa increased (e.g., Chironomidae and Simuliidae; Web appendix C), reflecting increases in their secondary production.

Organic matter flows to rainbow trout were relatively diverse and included a variety of aquatic and terrestrial invertebrate taxa, as well as filamentous algae and leaf litter (gray arrows in Figure 4). The highest magnitude flow in all years was of filamentous algae (predominantly

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Cladophora glomerata), representing between 30 and 40% of total consumption by trout. Annual consumption by rainbow trout was similar in years one and two (year one: 3.6 g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1} [95% CI: 2.5 – 5.3], year two: 2.1 [1.5 – 2.9]), but increased by ~50% following the flood (year three: 5.1 [4.0 – 6.4]). Trout ate more Chironomidae, Simuliidae, and *G. lacustris*, following the flood, yet there were significant inter-annual differences for most prey types (Web Appendix D). In general, patterns of consumption by invertebrates and rainbow trout were represented by few large- and many small-magnitude flows (Figure 4; Web Appendices C and D).

Invertebrate production was predominantly supported by those items that were consumed the most (Figure 5). For example, diatoms fueled between 68 and 76% of invertebrate production, while amorphous detritus supported an additional 14-21% (Figure 5). Proportional contributions of basal resources to invertebrate production varied significantly among years (see Web Appendix E), but these differences were relatively small in magnitude (≤10%).

Relatively few invertebrate taxa supported rainbow trout production and this pattern did not parallel flows (i.e., Figure 4) of prey consumption (Figure 5). The largest contributors to trout production were *G. lacustris*, Simuliidae and Chironomidae (Figure 5). Two of these taxa (i.e., Simuliidae and Chrionomidae) supported between 43 and 50% of trout production, but only comprised a small percentage of total invertebrate secondary production (i.e., 2-3% before the flood and 16% after the flood). Although trout consumed large amounts of filamentous algae, this food item was unimportant in fueling trout production (Figures 4 and 5) because its assimilation efficiency is low relative to invertebrates. Proportional contributions of food resources to rainbow trout production differed significantly among years (Web Appendix E). Most notably, the contribution of Simuliidae increased in each successive year, while the proportional contribution of Chironomidae declined (Figure 5; Web Appendix E).

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

The potential for food limitation of rainbow trout appeared to be low before and after the flood based on ecosystem-wide estimates of invertebrate production and trout demand (Figure 6). Total invertebrate production far exceeded annual demands of rainbow trout in all years, resulting in large annual surpluses of invertebrate prey regardless of whether *P. antipodarum* (a taxon with very high production, but limited consumption and assimilation by trout) were included (Figure 6). In contrast, detailed comparisons of taxon-specific production and trout demand revealed potential for food limitation during all three years, with strongest potential during year 1 (Table 2). In particular, annual consumption of Simuliidae overlapped with estimates of Simuliidae production during all three years of the study. In addition, consumption of Chironomidae did not differ from Chironomidae production during years one and three (Table 2).

Species impact

Species impact values (y^{-1}), calculated as flows (g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1}) to rainbow trout divided by mean annual biomass of prey (g AFDM m^{-2}; Wootton 1997), revealed that trout interacted most strongly with a small subset of the invertebrate assemblage, and this impact varied among years (Figure 7). Species impact values overlapped with or were higher than mean annual P:B values of Chironomidae and Simuliidae, demonstrating that trout consumption keeps up with (and is comparable to) biomass turnover of these prey. Species impact values were much lower for other dominant prey, and consistently fell below the average prey P:B values (Figure 7).

Drift

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Concentrations of invertebrate drift increased in months following the controlled flood (Table 3). A direct comparison of the October to March time period revealed a 148% mean increase in drift concentrations following the flood. This result was even more pronounced (i.e., 188% increase) when *P. antipodarum* was removed from the analysis (Table 3). Large increases in drift were also apparent when comparing the entire pre- and post-flood time series (i.e., total drift biomass: 75% increase; without *P. antipodarum*: 193% increase; Table 3). Importantly, Chironomidae (up to 400% increase) and Simuliidae (~800% increase; T. A. Kennedy, unpublished data) largely drove increased drift concentrations, and these two taxa had the highest interaction strengths with trout.

DISCUSSION

Rainbow trout increased their production following the controlled flood, despite a large decline in production of the invertebrate assemblage. This counterintuitive result was reconciled by a significant increase in production of invertebrate taxa most important to rainbow trout, as well as an increase in the occurrence of these prey in the drift following the flood that was sustained for at least 18 months. In particular, drift concentrations increased dramatically for the two invertebrate taxa that had the highest rainbow trout species impact values. We suggest that conditions after the flood were much more favorable for age 0 trout than years prior, and that flood-induced changes in food availability and accessibility drove the positive trout response. Interestingly, the controlled flood effectively reduced production of the invasive New Zealand mudsnail. This taxon represents a ‘trophic dead end’ in Glen Canyon because it has high production and uses considerable energy at the base of the food web, but does not support a substantial amount of production at higher trophic positions. We suggest that controlled floods

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

may benefit non-native rainbow trout and reduce populations of dominant non-native invertebrates (i.e., New Zealand mudsnails).

Flow food webs and insights for river management

Ecologists increasingly recognize the importance of production-based approaches for understanding food web interactions and ecosystem-dynamics (Wootton and Emmerson 2005; Woodward et al. 2005, Benke and Huryn 2010). In streams, early research in this area was motivated by the 'Allen paradox' (Allen 1951, Waters 1988), in which benthic invertebrate production appeared to be too low to support the energetic demands of fish predators. Huryn (1998), using a production-budget approach in a New Zealand stream, demonstrated that annual energetic demand (i.e., consumption) of non-native trout was statistically indistinguishable from the annual supply of invertebrate prey (i.e., secondary production), highlighting strong potential effects of trout on stream food webs.

We used a similar approach in our study, but additionally estimated taxon-specific flows of prey resources to rainbow trout by incorporating trout gut content information (*sensu* Hall et al. 2000). This exercise provided insights that would not have been possible with an aggregated total budget approach. For example, our annual energetic budgets (Figure 6) suggested that food limitation was unlikely throughout the study because invertebrate production far exceeded the energetic demands of trout. However, some invertebrate taxa were either rarely consumed by trout or contributed little to their production (e.g., Tubificida and *P. antipodarum*). Trout consumed nearly all of the annual production of few key taxa (e.g., Chironomidae and Simuliidae; Table 2), and these were the taxa that supported the near majority of trout production throughout the study (43-50%). Moreover, production of these two key taxa and their

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

contribution to drift increased substantially following the flood. These results align with Rader's (1997) analysis that ranked Chironomidae and Simuliidae among taxa that had the highest propensity to drift and occurred most frequently in the diets of trout. Our results also agree with prior research in Glen Canyon suggesting a high potential for food limitation of rainbow trout (e.g., McKinney and Speas 2001). Thus, insights from our detailed food web analysis, together with patterns observed in the literature, suggest a chain of causal linkages among the experimental flood, increased production and drift of key taxa available to drift-feeding salmonids, and a 2-fold increase in trout production despite a decline in total production of invertebrates. Two important points emerge from these results: (1) total benthic secondary production does not necessarily reflect production that is available to drift feeding salmonids; and (2) aggregated production budgets (as in Figure 6) may be misleading with regard to ecosystem-level assessments of food limitation.

Food web linkages with the highest species impact values were not the largest from an energy-flow perspective. For example, flows of Chironomidae and Simuliidae were relatively small in comparison to other prey items before the flood. Nonetheless, these linkages represented the strongest interaction strengths (Figure 7), and increased production of these taxa following the flood reduced constraints on trout production. In contrast, although energy flows of *G. lacustris* to trout were relatively large, the interaction strength was consistently weak, and flood-induced reductions in *G. lacustris* did not negatively affect trout production. Thus, by using an observational approach to assess interaction strengths (Wootton 1997), we were effectively able to predict the most important linkages that drive the response of rainbow trout to controlled floods. These results are consistent with theoretical (McCann et al. 1998) and empirical (e.g., Paine 1992) research demonstrating that (a) food webs generally consist of few strong and many

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

weak links and (b) changes in abundance of strongly interacting species are likely to affect food web productivity and stability.

We can only speculate as to why production of Chironomidae and Simuliidae increased following the controlled flood. Our leading hypothesis is that flood-induced scouring of the benthos led to increased habitat quality for these taxa. In particular, Simuliidae often prefer 'clean' epilithon for attachment, and our observations suggest that epilithon was scoured in mobile river habitats (i.e., cobble/gravel and depositional; T. A. Kennedy, unpublished data). In addition, benthic scouring may have led to early successional stages of epilithic algae that are typically of high nutritional value and rapid growth (e.g., Fisher et al. 1982). Additional research is warranted to determine mechanisms causing increased production of these key invertebrate taxa.

River regulation and experimental floods

Controlled floods have been implemented in a few rivers (e.g., Molles et al. 1998, Patten et al. 2001, Scheurer and Molinari 2003) as an attempt to restore or mimic some degree of natural flow variability to the ecosystem. In rare cases, these floods have been conducted frequently enough to fundamentally alter community structure and ecosystem processes. For example, an unprecedented seven-year series of experimental floods on the Spöl River in Switzerland shifted the invertebrate assemblage towards small-bodied and short-lived taxa (Robinson et al. 2003, Robinson and Uehlinger 2008). In addition, these floods reduced cover of attached moss, altered biomass and species composition of diatoms, and reduced primary production and ecosystem respiration (Uehlinger et al. 2003, Mannes et al. 2008). Interestingly, these changes increased the quality of fish habitat and the number of brown trout (*Salmo trutta*)

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

redds during the time period of the experimental floods (Ortlepp and Mürle 2003). Although the setting and size of the Colorado River below Glen Canyon dam is quite different than the Spöl River, our results were parallel and suggest some degree of generality in the direction of food web response following restorative controlled floods.

The large increase (194%) in rainbow trout production following the flood was driven by increased survival and growth rates of age-0 trout (Korman et al., in press; Web Appendix B). Because the flood occurred during the average time of peak spawning (~ March 6th based on 2003 – 2009; Korman et al., in press), there was significant potential for reduced survival and weak cohort strength in 2008. Nonetheless, rainbow trout survival rates following the flood were much higher than predicted based on the number of observed viable spawning redds (Korman et. al., in press). In particular, individuals that hatched over a month following the flood (i.e., after April 15) had extremely high survival rates and had instantaneous growth rates that were among the highest on record for Glen Canyon (Korman et al., in press). Together, these changes resulted in extremely high abundance of juvenile rainbow trout in 2008, and continued high recruitment and abundance in 2009 – a full year following the flood (Web Appendix B). We suggest that conditions after the flood were much more favorable for age 0 trout than years prior, and that flood-induced changes in food availability and accessibility played a key role.

The seasonal timing of controlled floods (i.e., spring versus autumn) may influence the magnitude of ecological response and the recovery rates of ecosystem processes following the flood. Of the three controlled floods conducted on the Colorado River, two were in spring (March-April 1996 and 2008) and one was in autumn (November 2004). These time periods represent strongly contrasting conditions, particularly with regard to light, temperature, and invertebrate biomass. During spring, temperature is low and invertebrate biomass is generally at

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

the annual minimum (Figures 1 and 3). This season also precedes months of peak solar insolation (Yard et al. 2005), and late spring coincides with high rates of primary production and downstream algal transport (Shannon et al. 1996). Thus, conditions following spring floods should promote rapid recovery of biological processes (i.e., within weeks). In contrast, November has relatively high water temperatures and invertebrate biomass, but precedes winter months of minimal insolation, low temperatures, and reduced gross primary productivity (R. O. Hall, Jr., unpublished data). Therefore, recovery of biological processes from autumn floods should be protracted relative to spring floods.

The low number of controlled floods on the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam (*n* = 3) precludes strong inference about biological recovery relative to flood timing. It is intriguing that rainbow trout recruitment and survival was high after both the 1996 and 2008 spring floods (Gloss and Coggins 2005, Korman et al., in press), yet rainbow trout did not respond positively to the controlled flood conducted in autumn 2004 (Makinster et al. 2010). Unfortunately, parallel data on invertebrate biomass or production surrounding the autumn 2004 flood are not available, and thus seasonal variation in trout response cannot be attributed to differences in invertebrate assemblage response. While past research associated with the spring 1996 flood showed a rapid recovery of algal and invertebrate biomass in Glen Canyon (i.e., within ~three months; Blinn et al. 1999, Valdez et al. 1999, Shannon et al. 2001), our study showed little sign of invertebrate biomass recovery and a large reduction in annual invertebrate production. These differences in response among two floods conducted in the same season (spring) may be related to significant changes in assemblage structure over time; invasive *P. antipodarum* dominated invertebrate biomass and production in our study, but was at very low abundance in 1996 as it was first introduced in 1995 (Cross et al. 2010). These data suggest that the timing of floods may be a key

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

factor influencing rainbow trout response, but effects of flood timing on invertebrate recovery and production are equivocal because data are currently lacking. Because the timing of controlled floods is a point of considerable discussion and interest among stakeholders, varying the timing of controlled floods is a logical choice for future experimentation. Considering the highly altered physical and biological status of the Colorado River in Grand Canyon, matching the timing of experimental floods to stated management goals may be more critical than matching their timing to the historic natural flood regime (i.e., snowmelt during spring-early summer).

Management implications

Flood-induced changes to the food web in the Glen Canyon tailwater should not be viewed in isolation. Shifts in production and food web dynamics in the Glen Canyon can alter communities and ecosystem processes downstream in Grand Canyon National Park. Consideration of these upstream-downstream linkages is critical because the river ecosystem changes longitudinally and management goals along this continuum may differ or even conflict (Susskind et al. 2010).

Native fishes such as humpback chub and flannelmouth sucker (*Catostomus latipinnus*) comprise a substantial component of the downstream fish assemblage (Gloss and Coggins 2005, Coggins and Walters 2009, Makinster et al. 2010). Humpback chub, in particular, are protected under the Endangered Species Act and there is concern that competition with (and predation by) non-native fishes, such as rainbow trout, threatens their persistence (Gloss and Coggins 2005, Yard et al., in press). These concerns motivated a massive 3.5-y effort (2003-2006) to remove non-native trout from the downstream area of river that corresponds to the highest densities of

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

humpback chub (i.e., near the mouth of a tributary, the Little Colorado River; Coggins et al., in press). This removal effort was very successful; trout numbers were reduced to <10% of pre-removal levels, and recent data suggest that adult humpback chub abundance has been increasing since around 2002 (Coggins and Walters 2009). Unfortunately, changes in river temperature during this same time period somewhat confound a mechanistic explanation (Vernieu et al. 2005). That is, increases in humpback chub since 2002 could be due to decreases in non-native rainbow trout, increases in water temperatures that allow for higher humpback chub growth and survival rates, or a combination of the two (Coggins et al., in press).

Nonetheless, there is recent evidence that rainbow trout populations are increasing downstream in Grand Canyon again, and that downstream migration of the large post-flood trout cohorts that were spawned upstream in Glen Canyon drove this increase (Makinster et al. 2010). Although a positive rainbow trout response to the flood in Glen Canyon may benefit the recreational sport fishery in this segment, consequent increases in abundance of trout downstream may reduce populations of native fishes. To make matters more complex, there is a perception that controlled floods may benefit downstream native fishes by redistributing sediment, rebuilding sandbars, and increasing backwater habitat (US DOI circular 2007). Thus, there is a great deal of uncertainty regarding whether controlled floods will positively or negatively influence native fishes downstream and this uncertainty represents a key question for future research.

Controlled floods on the Colorado River have been broadly designed to “assist in conservation of endangered species, provide benefits to sediment conservation, increase scientific understanding, and collect data for use in determining future dam operations” (US DOI circular 2007; also see Patten et al. 2001). Our study was limited to the 25-km tailwater section

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

in Glen Canyon and cannot provide information regarding effects on downstream endangered species (e.g., humpback chub) or sediment dynamics. However, our study clearly illustrates the value of quantitative food web analysis for quantifying how dam operations ripple through food webs to influence rainbow trout predators. In Glen Canyon, floods can benefit rainbow trout by increasing productivity and drift of the invertebrate taxa that support a large proportion of trout production. Floods in Glen Canyon effectively reduce biomass and production of undesirable New Zealand mud snails that dominate flows of energy at the base of the food web and represent a trophic dead end. However, future research is needed to address two key questions: (1) what are the net effects of controlled floods on species of concern in downstream river segments (humpback chub), and (2) what are the effects of varied timing and magnitude of controlled floods on the Colorado River ecosystem?

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the many field and laboratory assistants that made this research possible: Kate Behn, Adam Copp, Amber Gaul, Jason Fobair, Carina Hall, and Tom Sabol. We also acknowledge the logistical support of Grand Canyon Monitoring and Research Center (Carol Fritzinger and crew). We thank Dr. Amelia Ward and two anonymous reviewers for excellent comments that improved the manuscript. The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation via the U.S. Geological Survey supported this research through cooperative agreements 05WRAG005 to ROH and ERM and G10AC00142 to WFC.

LITERATURE CITED

Allan, J. D., and M. M. Castillo. 2007. Stream Ecology: Structure and function of running

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

waters. 2nd edition. Springer. New York, NY, USA.

Allen, K. R. 1951. The Horokiwi Stream: a study of a trout population. N. Z. Dep. Fish. Bull. 10.

Angradi, T. R. 1994. Trophic linkages in the lower Colorado River: multiple stable isotope evidence. Journal of the North American Benthological Society 13:479-495.

Angradi, T. R., and D. M. Kubly. 1993. Effects of atmospheric exposure on chlorophyll a, biomass and productivity of the epilithon of a tailwater river. Regulated Rivers: Research and Management 8:345-358.

Arthington, A. H., and B. J. Pusey. 2003. Flow restoration and protection in Australian rivers. River Research and Applications 19:377-395.

Bärlocher, F., and B. Kendrick. 1975. Assimilation efficiency of *Gammarus pseudolimnaeus* (Amphipoda) feeding on fungal mycelium or autumn-shed leaves. Oikos 26:55-59.

Barne, A. Zh., and B. R. Striganova. 2005. Evaluation of production parameters of earthworms *Eiseniella tetraedra* Sav. in a laboratory culture. Biology Bulletin 32:264-267.

Baron, J. S., N. L. Poff, P. L. Angermeier, C. N. Dahm, P. H. Gleick, N. G. Hairston Jr., R. B. Jackson, C. A. Johnston, B. D. Richter, and A. D. Steinman. 2002. Meeting ecological and societal needs for freshwater. Ecological Applications 12:1247-1260.

Benke, A. C. 1979. A modification of the Hynes method for estimating secondary production with particular significance for multivoltine populations. Limnology and Oceanography 24:168-171.

Benke, A. C. 1993. Concepts and patterns of invertebrate production in running waters. Verh. Internat. Verein. Limnol. 25:1-24.

Benke, A.C., A. D. Huryn, L. A. Smock, and J. B. Wallace. 1999. Length-mass relationships

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

for freshwater macroinvertebrates in North America with particular reference to the southeastern United States. Journal of the North American Benthological Society 18: 308–343.

Benke A. C., and A. D. Huryn. 2006. Secondary productivity of macroinvertebrates. In: F. R. Hauer, G. A. Lamberti (eds) Methods in Stream Ecology, pp 691-710. Elsevier. New York, NY, USA

Benke, A.C., and A.D. Huryn. 2010. Benthic invertebrate production – facilitating answers to ecological riddles in freshwater ecosystems. Journal of the North American Benthological Society 29:264-285.

Benke, A. C. and J. B. Wallace. 1980. Trophic basis of production among net-spinning caddisflies in a southern Appalachian stream. Ecology 61:108-118.

Benke, A. C. and J. B. Wallace. 1997. Trophic basis of production among riverine caddisflies: implications for food web analysis. Ecology 78:1132-1145.

Blinn D. W., and G. A. Cole. 1991. Algae and invertebrate biota in the Colorado River: comparison of pre- and post-dam conditions, pp. 85-104. In: Committee on Glen Canyon Environmental Studies (eds.). National Research Council. Colorado River Ecology and Dam Management. National Academy of Science Press, Washington, D.C. 238 pp.

Blinn, D. W., J. P. Shannon, L. E. Stevens, and J. P. Carder. 1995. Consequences of fluctuating discharge for lotic communities. Journal of the North American Benthological Society 14:233-248.

Blinn, D. W., J. P. Shannon, K. P. Wilson, C. O'Brien, and P. L. Benenati. 1999. Response of benthos and organic drift to a controlled flood, *in* Webb, R. H., Schmidt, J.C., Marzolf, G. R., and Valdez, R.A., eds., The controlled flood in Grand Canyon: Washington, D.C.,

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

American Geophysical Union, p. 259-272.

Bunn, S. E., and A. H. Arthington. 2002. Basic principles and ecological consequences of alter flow regimes for aquatic biodiversity. Environmental Management 30:492-507.

Carothers, S. W., and B. T. Brown. 1991. The Colorado River through Grand Canyon: natural history and human change. The University of Arizona Press, Tuscon, AZ.

Carpenter, S. R., J. F. Kitchell, and J. R. Hodgson. 1985. Cascading trophic interactions and lake productivity. BioScience 35:634-639.

Chapin, F. S., E. S. Zavaleta, V. T. Eviner, R. L. Naylor, P. M. Vitousek, H. L. Reynolds, D. U. Hooper, S. Lavorel, O. E. Sala, S. E. Hobbie, M. C. Mack, and S. Díaz. 2000. Consequences of changing biodiversity. Nature 405:234-242.

Coggins, L. G., Jr., M. D. Yard, and W. E. Pine. In press. Nonnative fish control in the Colorado River in Grand Canyon, Arizona – an effective program or serendipitous timing? Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 00:000-000.

Coggins, L. G., Jr., and C. J. Walters. 2009. Abundance trends and status of the Little Colorado River population of humpback chub: an update considering data from 1989-2008. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2009-1075.

Cross, W. F., J. B. Wallace, and A. D. Rosemond. 2007. Nutrient enrichment reduces constraints on material flows in a detritus-based food web. Ecology 88:2563-2575.

Cross, W. F., E. J. Rosi-Marshall, K. E. Behn, T. A. Kennedy, R. O. Hall, Jr., A. E. Fuller, and C. V. Baxter. 2010. Invasion and production of New Zealand mud snails in the Colorado River, Glen Canyon. DOI 10.1007/s10530-010-9694-y

England, G., and B. Malmqvist. 1996. Effects of flow regulation, habitat area and isolation on the macroinvertebrate fauna of rapids in north Swedish rivers. Regulated Rivers:

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Research and Management 12:433-445.

Fisher, S. G., L. J. Gray, N. B. Grimm, and D. E. Busch. 1982. Temporal succession in a desert stream ecosystem following flash flooding. Ecological Monographs 52:93-110.

Gloss, S. P, J. E. Lovich, and T. S. Melis. 2005. The state of the Colorado River ecosystem in Grand Canyon. U. S. Geological Survey Circular 1282. 220 pp.

Gloss, S. P, and L. G. Coggins, Jr. 2005. Fishes of Grand Canyon. Ch. 2 in: The state of the Colorado River ecosystem in Grand Canyon. U. S. Geological Survey Circular 1282. 220 pp.

Grams, P. E., J. C. Schmidt, and D. J. Topping. 2007. The rate and pattern of bed incision and bank adjustment on the Colorado River in Glen Canyon downstream form Glen Canyon Dam, 1956-2000. GSA Bull 119:556-575.

Hall, R. O. J., J. B. Wallace, and S. L. Eggert. 2000. Organic matter flow in stream food webs with reduced detrital resource base. Ecology 81:3445-3463.

Hall, R. O., J. L. Tank, and M. F. Dybdahl. 2003. Exotic snails dominate nitrogen and carbon cycling in a highly productive stream. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 1:407-411.

Hamilton, A. L. 1969. On estimating annual production. Limnology and Oceanography 14:771-782.

Hanson, P., T. Johnson, J. Kitchell, and D. E. Schindler. 1997. Fish bioenergetics 3.0. University of Wisconsin Sea Grant Institute, Report WISCU-T-97-001.

Hobbs, R. J., and L. F. Huenneke. 1992. Disturbance, diversity, and invasion: implications for conservation. Conservation Biology 6:324-337.

Holling, C. S. 1978. Adaptive environmental assessment and management. John Wiley,

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

London, UK.

Huryn, A. D. 1990. Growth and voltinism of lotic midge larvae: patterns across an Appalachian mountain basin. Limnology and Oceanography 35:339-351.

Huryn, A. D. 1998. Ecosystem-level evidence for top-down and bottom-up control of production in a grassland stream system. Oecologia 115:173-183.

Johnson, P. T. J., J. D. Olden, and M. J. Vander Zanden. 2008. Dam invaders: impoundments facilitate biological invasions into freshwaters. Frontiers in Ecology and Environment 6:357-363.

Jones, C. G., and J. H. Lawton. 1995. Linking Species and Ecosystems. Chapman and Hall, New York, NY, USA.

Kennedy, T.A., and S. P. Gloss. 2005. Aquatic ecology: the role of organic matter and invertebrates. In: Gloss, S.P., Lovich, J.E., and Melis, T.S. (eds.) The state of the Colorado River ecosystem in Grand Canyon: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1282.

Kitchell, J. F., D. J. Stewart, and D. Weininger. 1977. Applications of a bioenergetics model to yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*) and walleye (*Stizostedion vitreum vitreum*). Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada 34:1922-1935.

Korman, J., M. Kaplinski, and T. S. Melis. In press. Effects of fluctuating flows and a controlled flood on incubation success and early survival rates and growth of age-0 rainbow trout in a large regulated river. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 00:000-000.

Leibfried, W.C. 1988. The utilization of *Cladophora glomerata* and epiphytic diatoms as a food resource by rainbow trout in the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam, Arizona. M.S. Thesis. Northern Arizona University, Flagstaff.

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Makinster, A. S., W. R. Persons, L. A. Avery, and A. J. Bunch. 2010. Colorado River fish monitoring in Grand Canyon, Arizona – 2000 to 2009 summary. U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 2010-1246.

Mannes, S., C. T. Robinson, U. Uehlinger, T. Scheurer, J. Ortlepp, U. Mürle, and P. Molinari. 2008. Ecological effects of a long-term flood program in a flow-regulated river. Journal of Alpine Research 1:125-134.

McCann, K., A. Hastings, and G. R. Huxel. 1998. Weak trophic interactions and the balance of nature. Nature 395:794-798.

McKinney, T., R. S. Rogers, and W. R. Persons. 1999. Effects of flow reductions on aquatic biota of the Colorado River below Glen Canyon Dam, Arizona. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 19:984-991.

McKinney, T., and D. W. Speas. 2001. Observations of size-related asymmetries in diet and energy intake of rainbow trout in a regulated river. Environmental Biology of Fishes 61:435-444.

McKinney, T., D. W. Speas, R. S. Rogers, and W. R. Persons. 2001. Rainbow trout in a regulated river below Glen Canyon Dam, Arizona following increased minimum flows and reduced discharge variability. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 21:216-222.

Molles, M. C., Jr., C. S. Crawford, L. M. Ellis, H. M. Valett, and C. N. Dahm. 1998. Managed flooding for riparian ecosystem restoration. BioScience 48:749-756.

Nilsson, C., C. A. Reidy, M. Dynesius, and C. Revenga. 2005. Fragmentation and flow regulation of the world's large river systems. Science 308:405-408.

Olden, J. D., and R. J. Naiman. 2010. Incorporating thermal regimes into environmental flows

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

assessments: modifying dam operations to restore freshwater ecosystem integrity. Freshwater Biology 55:86-107.

Ortlepp, J., and U. Mürle. 2003. Effects of experimental flooding on brown trout (Salmo trutta fario L.): the River Spöl, Swiss National Park. Aquatic Sciences 65:232-238.

Paine, R. T. 1992. Food webs analysis through field measurement of per capita interaction strength. Nature 355:73-75.

Patten, D. T., D. A. Harpman, M. I. Voita, and T. J. Randle. 2001. A managed flood on the Colorado River: background, objectives, design, and implementation. Ecological Applications 11:635-643.

Poddubnaya, T. L. 1980. Life cycles of mass species of Tubificidae (Oligochaeta). Pages 175-184 in R. O. Brinkhurst and D. G. Cook, editors. Aquatic Oligochaete Biology. Plenum, New York, NY, USA.

Poff, N. L., J. D. Allan, M. B. Bain, J. R. Karr, K. L. Prestegaard, B. D. Richter, R. E. Sparks, and J. C. Stromberg. 1997. The natural flow regime. BioScience 47:769-784

Poff, N. L., J. D. Allan, M. A. Palmer, D. D. Hart, B. D. Richter, A. H. Arthington, K. H. Rogers, J. L. Meyer, and J. A. Stanford. 2003. River flows and water wars: emerging science for environmental decision making. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment 1:298-306.

Poff, N. L., J. D. Olden, D. M. Merritt, and D. M. Pepin. 2007. Homogenization of regional river dynamics by dams and global biodiversity implications. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 104:5732-5737.

Postel, S. and B. D. Richter. 2003. Rivers for Life. Managing Water for People and Nature. Island Press. Washington DC, USA.

Rader, R. B. 1997. A functional classification of the drift: traits that influence invertebrate

esa preprint

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

availability to salmonids. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 54:1211-1234.

Richter, B. D., R. Mathews, D. L. Harrison, and R. Wigington. 2003. Ecologically sustainable water management: managing river flows for ecological integrity. Ecological Applications 13:206-224.

Robinson, C. T. and U. Uehlinger. 2008. Experimental floods cause ecosystem regime shift in a regulated river. Ecological Applications 18:511-526.

Robinson, C. T., U. Uehlinger, and M. T. Monaghan. 2003. Effects of a multi-year experimental flood regime on macroinvertebrates downstream of a reservoir. Aquatic Sciences 65:210-222.

Scheurer, T., and P. Molinari. 2003. Experimental floods in the river Spöl, Swiss National Park: framework, objectives, and design. Aquatic Sciences 65:183-190.

Schmitz, O. J. 2010. Resolving Ecosystem Complexity. Monographs in Population Biology 47. Princeton University Press.

Shannon, J. P., D. W. Blinn, P. L. Benenati, and K. P. Wilson. 1996. Organic drift in a regulated desert river. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 53:1360-1369.

Shannon, J. P., D. W. Blinn, T. McKinney, E. P. Benenati, K. P. Wilson, and C. O'Brien. 2001. Aquatic food base response to the 1996 test flood below Glen Canyon Dam, Colorado River, Arizona. Ecological Applications 11:672-685.

Souchon, Y., C. Sabaton, R. Deibel, D. Reiser, J. Kershner, M. Gard, C. Katopodis, P. Leonard, N. L. Poff, W. J. Miller, and B. L. Lamb. 2008. Detetcting biological responses to flow management: missed opportunities; future directions. River Research and Applications

esa preprint

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

24:506-518.

Stanford, J. A., J. V. Ward, W. J. Liss, C. A. Frissell, R. N. Williams, J. A. Lichatowich, and C. C. Coutant. 1996. A general protocol for restoration of regulated rivers. Regulated Rivers: Research and Management 12:391-413.

Stehr, F. W. 1987. Immature insects. Kendall/Hunt, Dubuque, Iowa, USA.

Stevens, L. E., J. P. Shannon, and D. W. Blinn. 1997. Colorado River benthic ecology in Grand Canyon, Arizona, USA: dam, tributary and geomorphological influences. Regulated Rivers: Research & Management 13:129-149.

Susskind, L., A. E. Camacho, and T. Schenk. 2010. Collaborative planning and adaptive management in Glen Canyon: a cautionary tale. Columbia Journal of Environmental Law 35:1-53.

Topping, D. J., J. C. Schmidt, and L. E. Vierra. 2003. Computation and analysis of the instantaneous-discharge record for the Colorado River at Lees Ferry, Arizona – May 8, 1921, through September 30, 2000. Professional Paper 1677. USGS

Uehlinger, U., B. Kawecka, and C. T. Robinson. 2003. Effects of experimental floods on periphyton and stream metabolism below a high dam in the Swiss Alps (River Spöl). Aquatic Sciences 65:199-209.

US DOI circular. 2007. Reclamation: managing water in the west. Biological assessment on the operation of Glen Canyon dam and proposed experimental flows for the Colorado River below Glen Canyon dam during the years 2008-2012.

Valdez, R. A., T. L. Hoffnagle, C. C. McIvor, T. McKinney, and W. C. Leibfried. 2001. Effects of a test flood on fishes of the Colorado River in Grand Canyon, Arizona. Ecological Applications 11:686-700.

esa preprint

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Valdez, R. A., J. P. Shannon, and D. W. Blinn. 1999. Biological implications of the 1996 controlled flood, *in* Webb, R. H., Schmidt, J.C., Marzolf, G. R., and Valdez, R.A., eds., The controlled flood in Grand Canyon: Washington, D.C., American Geophysical Union, p. 259-272.

Vernieu, W. S., S. J. Hueftle, and S. P. Gloss. 2005. Water quality in Lake Powell and the Colorado River. Pages 69-85 in S.P. Gloss, J. L. Lovich, and T. S. Melis, editors. The state of the Colorado River ecosystem in Grand Canyon. U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1282.

Vinson, M. R. 2001. Long-term dynamics of an invertebrate assemblage downstream from a large dam. Ecolgical Applications 11:711-730.

Vinson, M. R., and M. A. Baker. 2008. Poor growth of rainbow trout fed New Zealand mud snails *Potamopyrgus antipodarum*. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 28:701-709.

Vitousek, P. M., H. A. Mooney, J. Lubchenco, and J. M. Melillo. 1997. Human domination of Earth's ecosystems. Science 277:494-499.

Walters, C. 2002. Adaptive Management of Renewable Resources. Blackburn Press. USA.

Ward, J. V., and J. A. Stanford. 1983. The serial discontinuity concept of lotic ecosystems. In: Fontaine III, T. D., and S. M. Bartell (eds). Dynamics of Lotic Ecosystems. Ann Arbor Science Publishers. Ann Arbor.

Waters, T. F. 1988. Fish production-benthos production relationships in trout streams. Pol. Arch. Hydrobiol. 35:545-561.

With, K. A. 2002. The landscape ecology of invasive spread. Conservation Biology 16:1192-1203.

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Woodward, G., D. C. Speirs, and A. G. Hildrew. 2005. Quantification and resolution of a complex, size-structured food web. Advances in Ecological Research 36:85-135.

Wootton, J. T. 1997. Estimates and tests of per capita interaction strength: diet, abundance, and impact of intertidally foraging birds. Ecological Monographs 67:45-64.

Wootton, J. T., and M. Emmerson. 2005. Measurement of interaction strength in nature. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Sytematics 36:419-444.

Yard, M. D., G. E. Bennett, S. N. Mietz, L. G. Coggins, Jr., L. E. Stevens, S. Hueftle, and D. W. Blinn. 2005. Influence of topographic complexity on solar insolation estimates for the Colorado River, Grand Canyon, AZ. Ecological Modelling 183:157-172.

Yard, M. D., L. G. Coggins, Jr., C. V. Baxter, G. E. Bennett, and J. Korman. In press. Trout piscivory in the Colorado River, Grand Canyon – effects of turbidity, temperature, and fish prey availability. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 00:000-000.

esa preprint

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Table 1. Abundance (*N*; number/m^2), biomass (*B*; mg AFDM/m^2), production (*P*; mg AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1}), and production:biomass ratios (*P:B*) of invertebrates and rainbow trout(*O. mykiss*) in the Colorado River, Glen Canyon. Numbers in parentheses are bootstrap percentile 95% confidence intervals. Lower case letters indicate significant differences in production among years for each taxon (non-overlapping confidence intervals).

	Year 1 (July 2006 – June 2007)						
Taxon	***N***		***B***		***P***		***P:B***
P. antipodarum	144,257	(106,946 – 191,497)	4,366	(3,353 – 5,525)	13,259[a]	(10,238 – 16,677)	3.0
Gammarus lacustris	3,562	(2,753 – 4,430)	1,186	(861 – 1,574)	7,010 [a]	(,5398 – 9,000)	5.9
Tubificida (a)	41,728	(33,913 – 51,997)	1,262	(1,040 – 1,498)	4,287 [a]	(3,543 – 5,068)	3.4
Turbellaria	1,501	(1,255 – 1,775)	150	(115 – 195)	754 [a]	(577 – 983)	5.0
Physidae	352	(215 -527)	146	(104 – 193)	1,077 [a]	(676 – 1,625)	7.4
Lumbricidae	284	(215 – 368)	331	(237 – 436)	706 [a]	(526 – 905)	2.1
Chironomidae	5,801	(4,404 – 7,381)	85	(65 – 109)	559 [a]	(433 – 690)	6.6
Ostracoda	1,889	(1,405 – 2,374)	54	(37 -75)	274 [a]	(183 – 377)	5.0
Nematoda	922	(754 – 1,111)	12	(9 – 14)	116 [a]	(95 – 142)	10.0

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Sphaeridae	204	(66 – 421)	23	(8 – 44)	116	(41 – 219)	5.0
Simuliidae	33	(7 – 66)	8	(3 – 13)	49 [a]	(21-83)	6.1
Cladocera	1,676	(1,162 – 2,234)	4	(3 – 5)	37	(26-50)	10.0
Copepoda	3,822	(2,719 – 4,981)	4	(3 – 5)	36	(26 -47)	10.0
Tubificida (b)	83	(52 – 118)	7	(4 – 11)	57	(28 – 109)	8.1
Ceratopogonidae	3	(<1 – 7)	<1		0.8	(0.0 – 2.0)	3.21
Acari	54	(18 – 108)	<1		1 [a]	(0.2 – 2)	5.0
Total Invertebrate	206,431	(167,650 – 255,012)	7,649	(6,533 – 8,894)	28,339 [a]	(24,448 – 32,246)	3.7
Oncorhynchus mykiss	0.013	(0.011 – 0.015)	596	(510 – 692)	183 [a]	(157 – 210)	0.3

esa preprint

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Table 1 (continued. . .2 of 3)

	Year 2 (July 2007 – June 2008)						
Taxon	***N***		***B***		***P***		***P:B***
P. antipodarum	58,834	(44,834 – 73,509)	4,280	(3,044 – 6,014)	10,664 [a]	(6,800 – 17,042)	2.5
Gammarus lacustris	3,754	(2,957 – 4,601)	1,384	(1,062 – 1,732)	8,685 [a]	(6,536 – 10,995)	6.3
Tubificida (a)	19,996	(16,649 – 23,569)	808	(674 – 964)	2,859 [b]	(2,322 – 3,477)	3.5
Turbellaria	748	(582 – 938)	77	(58 – 98)	382 [b]	(287 – 489)	5.0
Physidae	311	(142 – 539)	128	(48 – 241)	494 [b]	(373 – 627)	3.9
Lumbricidae	2,190	(1,110 – 3,461)	2,254	(1,149 – 3,787)	5,469 [b]	(2,543 – 9,401)	2.4
Chironomidae	6,268	(5,353 – 7,167)	152	(111 – 201)	657 [a]	(548 – 757)	4.3
Ostracoda	734	(564 – 903)	14	(11 – 18)	70 [b]	(53 – 90)	5.0
Nematoda	939	(673 – 1,248)	13	(9 – 17)	127 [a]	(92 – 167)	10.0
Sphaeridae	40	(4 – 83)	6	(<1 – 12)	29	(2 – 58)	5.0
Simuliidae	311	(153 – 484)	70	(25 – 121)	348 [b]	(141 – 604)	5.0
Cladocera	2,455	(896 – 4,637)	5	(2 – 9)	46	(17 – 85)	10.0
Copepoda	4,109	(2,783 – 5,515)	3	(2 – 4)	29	(19 – 40)	10.0

esa preprint

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Tubificida (b)	27	(15 – 40)	3	(2 – 5)	27	(12 – 46)	9.0
Ceratopogonidae	2	(0 – 5.8)	<1		0.1	(0.0 – 0.3)	6.0
Acari	2	(<1 – 5)	<1		0.1 [a]	(0.0 – 0.3)	5.0
Total Invertebrate	101,276	(86,508 – 117,367)	9,132	(7,266 – 11,366)	29,886 [a]	(23,896 – 37,372)	3.3
Oncorhynchus mykiss	0.014	(0.012 – 0.016)	515	(417 – 635)	140 [a]	(117 – 166)	0.3

esa preprint

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Table 1 (continued . . .3 of 3)

	Year 3 (July 2008 – June 2009)						
Taxon	***N***		***B***		***P***		***P:B***
P. antipodarum	19,008	(15,123 – 23,579)	863	(692 – 1,045)	1,998[b]	(1,644 – 2,389)	2.3
Gammarus lacustris	1,475	(1,158 – 1,851)	588	(455 – 762)	2,647 [b]	(2,091 – 3,346)	4.5
Tubificida (a)	34,289	(29,243 – 40,099)	1,168	(990 – 1,375)	3,933 [ab]	(3,312 – 4,665)	3.4
Turbellaria	711	(587 – 838)	116	(86 – 150)	577[ab]	(428 -748)	5.0
Physidae	173	(134 – 213)	91	(69 – 116)	500 [b]	(388 – 626)	5.5
Lumbricidae	216	(123 – 357)	376	(253 – 505)	634[a]	(428 – 859)	1.7
Chironomidae	8,373	(6,960 – 9,882)	252	(190 – 330)	937 [b]	(808 – 1,072)	3.7
Ostracoda	446	(357 – 560)	6	(5 – 7)	31 [c]	(26 – 36)	5.0
Nematoda	1,737	(1,490 – 2,015)	21	(18 – 25)	215 [b]	(184 – 249)	10.0
Sphaeridae	122	(83 – 164)	12	(9 – 17)	62	(43 – 85)	5.0
Simuliidae	912	(576 – 1,337)	222	(124 – 350)	1,177 [c]	(672 – 1,824)	5.3
Cladocera	3,359	(2,227 –	5	(4 – 7)	53	(36 – 73)	10.0

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

		4,614)					
Copepoda	6,987	(5,405 – 8,725)	4	(3 – 5)	37	(29 – 46)	10.0
Tubificida (b)	152	(102 – 216)	23	(16 – 32)	86	(53 – 124)	3.7
Ceratopogonidae	1	(<1 – 2)	<1		0.0	(0.0 – 0.0)	11.2
Acari	5	(1 – 9)	<1		0.0	(0.0 – 0.0) [b]	5.0
Total Invertebrate	78,153	(70,884 – 86,015)	3,749	(3,386 – 4,153)	12,876 [b]	(11,700 – 14,185)	3.4
Oncorhynchus mykiss	0.056	(0.048 – 0.064)	847	(742 – 960)	467 [b]	(406 – 532)	0.6

esa preprint

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Table 2. Secondary production (g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1}) of dominant invertebrate taxa consumed by rainbow trout and annual consumption (g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1}) by rainbow trout (i.e., demand). Asterisks to the right of demand values indicate that trout demand overlaps with or exceeds the 95% confidence intervals of invertebrate prey production.

	2006 - 2007			**2007 - 2008**		**2008 - 2009**		
Taxon	Production	Demand		Production	Demand	Production	Demand	
Chironomidae	0.56 (0.43 – 0.69)	0.73 (0.50 – 1.05)	*	0.66 (0.55 – 0.76)	0.36 (0.26 – 0.50)	0.94 (0.81 – 1.07)	0.68 (0.55 – 0.84)	*
G. lacustris	7.01 (5.40 – 9.00)	0.44 (0.31 – 0.63)		8.69 (6.54 – 11.00)	0.38 (0.28 – 0.52)	2.65 (2.09 – 3.35)	0.93 (0.75 – 1.15)	
Lumbricidae	0.71 (0.53 – 0.91)	0.16 (0.11 – 0.22)		5.47 (2.54 – 9.40)	0.06 (0.04 – 0.07)	0.63 (0.43 – 0.86)	0.26 (0.20 – 0.32)	
Physidae	1.08 (0.68 – 1.63)	0.006 (0.004–		0.49 (0.37 – 0.63)	0.03 (0.02 – 0.04)	0.50 (0.39 – 0.63)	0.20 (0.16 – 0.27)	

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

		0.008)										
P. antipodarum	13.3 (10.3 – 16.7)	0.26 (0.18 – 0.37)		10.66 (6.80 – 17.04)	0.18 (0.13 – 0.24)		2.00 (1.64 – 2.39)	0.25 (0.20 – 0.31)				
Simuliidae	0.05 (0.02 – 0.08)	0.15 (0.10 – 0.21)	*	0.35 (0.14 – 0.60)	0.31 (0.22 – 0.42)	*	1.18 (0.67 – 1.82)	1.11(0.88 – 1.41)	*			
Tubificida (a)	4.29 (3.54 – 5.07)	0.04 (0.03 – 0.06)		2.86 (2.32 – 3.48)	0.008 (0.006 – 0.011)		3.93 (3.31. – 4.67)	0.002 (0.002 – 0.003)				

esa preprint

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Table 3. Average concentration of invertebrates in daytime drift (mg AFMD/m^3) before and after the March 2008 controlled flood. Drift collections started in October 2007 - thus our pre-flood record only spans October 2007-March2008. We present average drift for two different post-flood time periods: October 2008-March2009, which matches the seasonality of our pre-flood dataset, and April 2008-October 2009, which represents our entire post-flood dataset. Numbers in parentheses are bootstrap percentile 95% confidence intervals. Lower case letters indicate significant differences in drift concentrations among time periods (non-overlapping confidence intervals).

	Total invertebrate drift biomass (mg AFDM/m^3)	Total invertebrate drift biomass without *P. antipodarum* (mg AFDM/m^3)
Pre-Flood (Oct 07-Mar08)	0.09 (0.07-0.12)[a]	0.06 (0.05-0.07)[a]
Post-Flood (Oct08-Mar09)	0.23 (0.21-0.26)[b]	0.23 (0.20-0.26)[b]
Post-Flood (Apr08-Oct09)	0.163 (0.127-0.208)[b]	0.16 (0.13-0.21)[b]

esa preprint

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Mean daily water temperature (°C; A) and daily discharge (mean, minimum, and maximum m^3s^{-1}; B) in the Colorado River, Glen Canyon, Arizona, USA between July 2006 and July 2009. Panel B shows the timing of the controlled flood.

Figure 2. Annual habitat-weighted invertebrate secondary production (g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1}) was dominated by relatively few taxa and considerably higher in 2006-07 and 2007-08 relative to 2008-09. Error bars represent bootstrap percentile 95% confidence intervals. The 'other' category includes Cladocera, Copepoda, Tubificida (b), Ceratopogonidae, and Acari.

Figure 3. Mean monthly habitat-weighted invertebrate biomass (g AFDM m^{-2}) was dominated by *P. antipodarum* and *G. lacustris*, declined following the controlled flood, and was generally highest during autumn months. 'ND' indicates no habitat-weighted data due to missing depositional samples in October and November 2007. The 'other' category includes Cladocera, Copepoda, Tubificida (b), Ceratopogonidae, Acari, Ostracoda, and Nematoda. The vertical line represents the timing of the controlled flood.

Figure 4. Annual organic matter flows (i.e., consumption in g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1})in the Glen Canyon food web in 2006-07 (A), 2007-08 (B), and 2008-09 (C). Arrow widths represent the magnitude of flows from resources to consumers (see key inset; note different scale for flows to invertebrates and flows to rainbow trout). Black arrows are flows from basal resources to invertebrate taxa; grey arrows are flows from resources to rainbow trout. Flows from basal

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

resources to the 'other' invertebrate category include flows to Ostracoda, Nematoda, Sphaeridae, Cladocera, Copepoda, Tubificida (b), Ceratopogonidae, and Acari. Flows from the 'other' category to rainbow trout include flows of unidentified aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates.Rainbow trout image courtesy of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Figure 5. Invertebrate production (A) was almost completely supported by diatoms. Rainbow trout production (B) was predominantly supported by Chironomidae, *G. lacustris*, and Simuliidae. Stacked areas show the absolute amount of secondary production (g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1}) supported by each food resource. Error bars represent bootstrap percentile 95% confidence intervals of annual habitat-weighted secondary production. The 'other' category in the lower panel includes Physidae, *P. antipodarum*, Tubificida, terrestrial invertebrates, terrestrial plant material, and unidentifiable aquatic and terrestrial invertebrates.

Figure 6. Rainbow trout demand was much lower than total habitat-weighted invertebrate production during all three years of the study, with large apparent surpluses of invertebrate prey. All units are g AFDM m^{-2} y^{-1}. Error bars represent bootstrap percentile 95% confidence intervals (see text for methods used to derive these error estimates). See text for description of why these coarse total budgets may be misleading.

Figure 7. Rainbow trout had large species impacts (y^{-1}; Wootton 1997) on Chironomidae and Simuliidae, as evidenced by values equal to or greater than prey annual production:biomass ratios (y^{-1}; bold horizontal bars). Error bars represent bootstrap percentile 95% confidence intervals. Different letters among bars within a given prey item represent significant differences

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA

among years (non-overlapping 95% confidence intervals). Horizontal bars represent the mean annual production:biomass values (y^{-1}) of prey items.

esa preprint

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA



Figure 1

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA



Figure 2

preprint

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA



Figure 3

preprint


2006 - 2007
Terrestrial Inverts
Tubificida (a)
Turbellaria
Physidae
Lumbricidae
Chironomidae
G. lacustris
Simuliidae
P. antipodarum
Other
Amorphous Detritus
Diatoms
Leaf Litter
Filamentous Algae
Macrophytes
Fungi
Animal
100 50 25 10 1 <1
Flows to Invertebrates
2 1 0.5 0.25 0.13 <0.05
Flows to Trout
(g AFDM m-2 y-1)

Figure 4A


2007 - 2008
Terrestrial Inverts
Tubificida (a)
Turbellaria
Physidae
Lumbricidae
Chironomidae
G. lacustris
Simuliidae
P. antipodarum
Other
Amorphous Detritus
Diatoms
Leaf Litter
Filamentous Algae
Macrophytes
Fungi
Animal

Figure 4B


2008 - 2009
Terrestrial Inverts
Tubificida (a)
Turbellaria
Physidae
Lumbricidae
Chironomidae
G. lacustris
Simuliidae
P. antipodarum
Other
Amorphous Detritus
Diatoms
Leaf Litter
Filamentous Algae
Macrophytes
Fungi
Animal

Figure 4C


A
Trophic Basis of Invertebrate Production
(g AFDM m-2 y-1)
40
35
30
25
20
15
10
5
0
06-07
07-08
08-09
Animal
Fungi
Macrophytes
Filamentous Algae
Leaves
Diatoms
Amorphous detritus
B
Trophic Basis of Trout Production
(g AFDM m-2 y-1)
0.6
0.5
0.4
0.3
0.2
0.1
0
06-07
07-08
08-09
Chironomidae
Gammarus lacustris
Lumbricidae
Simuliidae
Filamentous Algae/Epiphytes
Other

Figure 5

ECOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF AMERICA



Figure 6

preprint

ECOLOGICAL SOCI OF AMERICA



Figure 7

preprint