

December 20, 2021

Ms. Sarah MacDonald  
Watershed Science Coordinator  
Athabasca Watershed Council  
5101- 50<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
PO Box 1058  
Athabasca, AB, T9S 2A8  
780-213-4550

Dear Sarah,

Please find following our report on the benthic invertebrates from sites in the Athabasca watershed collected in 2021. In this report you will find a list of the benthic invertebrates and their occurrence per sample. We have followed the CABIN protocol as outlined in the CABIN Laboratory Methods (May 2014) for subsampling, sorting, taxa identification and the auditing protocols.

We have identified 98% of the organisms used in the CABIN analysis to the genus-level. In a few cases, invertebrates were identified to the family level because they were too immature, no keys were available to the generic level or were too damaged to proceed to the genus level. Tabulated counts per sample are provided in this report. A digital copy in Excel is also provided with the first tab containing the data in the format for uploading to CABIN and the second tab contains the count data with Phylum, Class, Order, Family and Genus, as well as the excluded taxa.

It has been our pleasure to work on the taxonomy portion of this project. We hope that these data meet your expectations, and we would be delighted to work with the Athabasca Watershed Council again. Photography will commence in the new year.

If you have any questions or require further information, please don't hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,

Diane Edwards, PhD, P.Ag  
John Swann, PhD(Cand.), P.Biol

ABI Environmental Services Ltd  
3911 Varsity Dr. NW  
Calgary, AB  
T3A 0Z3

[Diane@ABIEnvironmental.ca](mailto:Diane@ABIEnvironmental.ca), Ph/Fax 403-247-6363

**Benthic Invertebrates**

**Report December 2021**

**Taxonomy, Methods and Quality Control**

**for**

**Athabasca Watershed Council**

**Athabasca, AB**

Prepared by:  
ABI Environmental Services LTD  
Calgary, AB

3911 Varsity Dr. NW, Calgary, AB, T3A 0Z3

Table of Contents

**Sample Reception**..... 1

**Sample Processing**..... 1

**Subsampling and Sample Sorting**..... 2

**Sorting Audit Protocol** ..... 2

**Identification and Taxonomy**..... 2

**Auditing Protocol**..... 3

**Taxonomic Keys and References** ..... 3

**Equipment List**..... 5

**Tables**..... 6

**Table 1. Number and size of plastic collection jars** ..... 6

**Table 2. Sub sampling effort, and measured and calculated number of invertebrates per sample** .... 6

**Table 3. Sorting efficiency for one randomly selected sample.** ..... 6

**Table 4. Standard taxonomic effort for practical Identification**..... 7

**Table 5. Excluded taxa** ..... 7

**Table 6. Identification error rate for sample UAB002.** ..... 7

**Table 7. Total number of benthic macroinvertebrates per sample**..... 8

**Sample Reception**

Five sample containers containing 4 samples were received by ABI Environmental Services (3911 Varsity Dr. NW, Calgary, Alberta) on October 8, 2021. Samples were received, counted, inspected, and compared to the packing list. All sample containers were free from damage and leaks. Samples were in one or two labelled containers (Table 1).

Label information was:

- UAB001: 10/01/2021, Athabasca River – Solomon Creek
- UAB002: 10/02/2021, Athabasca River-Gregg River
- UAB003: 10/02/2021, Athabasca River – Whitehorse Creek
- UAB004: 10/02/2021, Athabasca River – Mcleod River

**Sample Processing**

Large plant material like twigs and leaves were rinsed and then removed from the samples and discarded. The smaller macrophytes and the silt/mud, gravel and sand were reduced in the

samples by washing and sieving to separate the invertebrates from this debris. Samples were emptied on to a series of stacked sieves, in order from the top: 13.3 mm, 4000 um, 1000 um and 400 um, and gently washed with water. A pan or basin was placed under the bottom sieve. The vegetation and substrate resting on the 13.3 mm and 4000 um sieves was gently washed with water, inspected for invertebrates and then discarded. Any large invertebrates captured on these coarse sieves were transferred to a labelled wide mouth glass mason jar. The contents resting on the 1000 and 400 um sieves were inverted into separate basins and gently washed through these sieves to remove as much of the plant debris and substrate as was practical and then transferred to the above mason jar with 70% ethanol. The fraction that passed through the 400 um sieve was inspected for invertebrates and none were found. This procedure was repeated for all 4 samples.

### **Subsampling and Sample Sorting**

Initially samples were poured into a white pan and roughly counted to determine if subsampling was necessary. Invertebrates were found to be abundant in all four of the samples (Table 2). The method of subsampling was accomplished following the CABIN procedure (McDermott 2014). Briefly, the samples were transferred to a Marchant box, mixed with water, inverted, swirled, and righted. Using a random number generator in Excel, the first five cells were selected, and the contents removed to a watch glass using a transfer pipette. If at least 300 organisms of the taxa of interest (listed in Table 4) were not reached in the five cells, additional cells were randomly chosen until this criterion was reached. If the count was met partway through the cell the entire cell contents was counted as per the CABIN protocol. Invertebrates were rough sorted into major taxa groups. These invertebrates were placed in labeled glass vials with 70% ethanol. Excluded taxa were identified and noted (Table 5). For each of the samples, the cells that were sorted (invertebrates removed) were bulked together labeled as “sorted” and retained for auditing. For each of the subsampled samples, the unsorted cells were labelled as “unsorted” and transferred to containers and retained.

### **Sorting Audit Protocol**

One of the four samples (25%) was randomly chosen for resorting by another team member. Sorting precision was calculated as percent sorting efficiency (% SE) using the CABIN method.

$$\%SE = \left(1 - \frac{\# \text{ of } \textit{Organisms Missed}}{\textit{Total \# of Organisms Found}}\right) * 100$$

The sorting efficiency is in Table 3, the sample exceeded the CABIN protocol of 95% with an average sorting efficiency of 98% (Table 3).

### **Identification and Taxonomy**

The rough sorted samples were further examined to identify organisms to the genus level. Taxa were entered on paper data sheets and then transferred to an excel spreadsheet and the counts summarized using a Pivot Table. The CABIN Protocols for effort and identification level of respective taxa were followed as closely as possible. In the case of Chironomidae, temporary glycerine slide mounts of dissected specimens were made to confirm identifications to the genus level. Where there were disarticulated specimens only those with heads were counted to

avoid double counting specimens. There was also exuviae from larval moults in some samples that were not counted as this may have been double counting specimens present or counting specimens that were not in the portion of the stream bed as exuviae tend to float downstream after a moult. This was especially true for Ephemeroptera. Where possible pupal keys were used to get fly pupae to family/genus.

All samples contained a high number of invertebrates which enabled subsampling. The number of organisms (included taxa) identified in this study was 1332. Another nine organisms were identified but were in the CABIN excluded taxa of Hemerobiidae, Planariidae and Gordiidae. These organisms were excluded from the analysis. To facilitate comparisons among the samples, the subsampled collections were scaled up to a full sample. The total number of organisms would then be 12865 (Table 7). These organisms were distributed among 28 families and 56 genera (Table 7). We were pleased that 98% could be identified to the genus level. The remaining two percent were either too immature or damaged or identification keys didn't exist to be confidently identified lower than family. The CABIN analysis protocol will provide further information on site indices and statistics.

## Auditing Protocol

The auditing protocol was performed on the same sample as the sorting efficiency. We followed the CABIN protocol for determining the Identification Error Rate and tabulated the incorrect identifications and missed organisms (Table 6).

$$\% \text{ Identification Error} = \frac{\# \text{ Incorrect Identifications}}{\text{Total Organisms Found in Audit}} * 100$$

The Identification Error Rate for sample UAB002 was 1.7%. This error rate is within the tolerances for CABIN. The persistent errors were the misidentification of small and gill-less *Drunella* with *Ephemerella* and small and gill-less *Leptophlebia* with *Rithrogena*. These errors were corrected and all the Ephemerellidae and Heptageniidae were re-examined in the non-audited samples.

## Taxonomic Keys and References

1. Arnett Jr. RH, Thomas MC. 2001. American Beetles Volume 1: Archostemata, Mycophaga, Adephaga, Polyphaga: Staphyliniformia. Boca Raton: CRC Press. 443 p.
2. Borkent A. The pupae of the biting midges of the world (Diptera: Ceratopogonidae), with generic key and analysis of the phylogenetic relationships between genera. Zootaxa [Internet]. [cited 2019 Nov 1; 3879(1): 001-327 Available from: <http://zoobank.org/urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:6423894B-97D9-4286-ABB9-D4AF072B57FD>. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11646/zootaxa.3879.1.1>.
3. Bousquet Y, Bouchard P, Davis AE, Sikes DS. 2013. Checklist of beetles (Coleoptera) of Canada and Alaska. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Sofia Bulgaria: Pensoft Publishers. 402 p.
4. Brinkhurst, RO. 1986. Guide to the freshwater aquatic microdrile oligochaetes of North America. Can. Spec. Publ. Fish. Aquat. Sci. 84: 259 p.

5. Clarke AH, 1981. The Freshwater Molluscs of Canada. Ottawa: National Museums of Canada. 446 p.
6. Clifford, HF. 1991. Aquatic Invertebrates of Alberta. Edmonton, Alberta: The University of Alberta Press. 550p.
7. Epler, JH. 2001. Identification Manual for the larval Chironomidae (Diptera) of North and South Carolina. A guide to the taxonomy of the midges of the southeastern United States, including Florida. Special Publication SJ2001-SP13. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Raleigh, NC, and St. Johns River Water Management District, Palatka, FL. 526 pp.
8. ITIS - [Internet]. c2021. Integrated Taxonomic Information System [cited 2021 Dec 21]. Available from <http://www.itis.gov/>
9. Leung A, Pinder A, Edward D. 2011. Photographic guide and keys to the larvae of Chironomidae (Diptera) of south-west Western Australia. Part 1. Key to subfamilies and Tanypodinae. The University of Western Australia. 12 p.
10. Liu Q. 2016. Diversity of wetland non-biting midges (Diptera: Chironomidae) and their responses to environmental factors in Alberta. MSc thesis. Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta. 164 p.
11. McAlpine JF. 1981. Manual of Nearctic Diptera. Volume 1. Monograph 27 of the Research Branch, Agriculture Canada. Ottawa: 674 p.
12. McAlpine JF. 1987. Manual of Nearctic Diptera. Volume 2. Monograph 28 of the Research Branch, Agriculture Canada. Ottawa: 668 p.
13. McDermott H, Paull T, Strachan S. [Internet]. 2014. Laboratory Methods: Processing, Taxonomy, and Quality Control of Benthic Macroinvertebrate Samples. Government of Canada: Publications.gc.ca; [Cited 2021 Nov 1]. Available from <http://publications.gc.ca/site/eng/476513/publication.html>
14. Merritt RW, Cummins KW, Berg MB, editor. 2019. An introduction to the aquatic insects of North America, 5th. Dubuque, IA: KendallHunt. 1480 p.
15. Merritt RW, Cummins KW, Berg MB, editor. 2008. An introduction to the aquatic insects of North America, 4th. Dubuque, IA: KendallHunt. 1158 p.
16. Namayandeh A, Culp JM. 2016. Chironomidae larvae from the lower Athabasca River, AB, Canada and its tributaries including macroscopic subfamily and the tribe keys, indices for environmental tolerance and trait-based information for biomonitoring. J. Entomological and Acarological Research. 48:7075.
17. Oliver, DR. and ME Roussel. 1983. The Insects and Arachnids of Canada Part 11. The Genera of larval midges of Canada. Biosystematics Research Institute. Ottawa, Ontario. Research Branch, Agriculture Canada. Publication 1746. 263 p.
18. Proctor H. [Internet]. 2010. Key to Aquatic Mites Known from Alberta. University of Alberta: [biology.ualberta.ca](http://biology.ualberta.ca); [cited 2021 Nov 1]. Available from

<https://hproctorlabuofa.files.wordpress.com/2017/07/key-to-aquatic-mites-known-from-alberta-2010-version.pdf>

19. Stimpson KS, Klemm DJ, Hiltunen JK. 1982. A guide to the freshwater Tubificidae (Annelida: Clitellata: Oligochaeta) of North America. Cincinnati, Ohio: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 61 p.
20. Wiggins GB. 1998. Larvae of the North American Caddisfly Genera (Tricoptera) 2nd ed. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press. 457

### **Equipment List**

- Tyler stainless steel and brass sieves: 13.3 mm, 4000 um, 1000 um and 400 um
- Catchment pan and basin.
- Marchant box for subsampling
- Tools: Transfer pipettes, forceps, slides, cover slips, watch glasses, glass vials with screw tops, acid free paper, squeeze bottles
- Mason Jars: 125, 250, 500 and 1000 ml
- Glycerine for temporary slides
- 70% ethanol
- Dissecting microscopes: Leica MZ6 and Leica MS5 (6.3 – 80X)
- Compound microscope Olympus CX41 (40-1000X)
- Light sources: MI-150 Fiber-lights

## Tables

**Table 1. Number and size of plastic collection jars**

Sample name	Number of jars	Jar size
UAB001	2	500 ml
UAB002	1	500 ml
UAB003	1	500 ml
UAB004	1	500 ml

**Table 2. Sub sampling effort, and measured and calculated number of invertebrates per sample**

Sample name	Number of cells sampled from Marchant box <sup>1</sup>	No. of organisms in subsamples	Total number of organisms in sample <sup>2</sup>
UAB001	10	326	3260
UAB002	12	362	3017
UAB003	7	326	4657
UAB004	16	309	1931
<b>Total</b>		<b>1323</b>	<b>12865</b>

1. Marchant box has 100 cells
2. Scaled up to a full sample

**Table 3. Sorting efficiency for one randomly selected sample.**

Sample	Original Count	QA Audit Count	Comments	% SE
UAB002			Missed 8. Organisms: 6 small chironomids, 1 mite and 1 Ephemeroptera.	98%
<b>% Sorting Efficiency</b>				<b>98%</b>

**Table 4. Standard taxonomic effort for practical Identification**

Group	Taxa	Attained Level of Identification
Insects	Coleoptera	Family/Genus
	Diptera	Family/Genus
	Ephemeroptera	Genus
	Plecoptera	Family/Genus
	Trichoptera	Family/Genus
Non-insects	Heterostropha	Genus
	Lumbriculida	Genus
	Neophora	Genus
	Trombidiformes	Family/Genus
	Tubificida	Genus

**Table 5. Excluded taxa**

	Taxa
<b>Aquatic</b>	Copepoda, Ostracoda, Grodioidea (Nematomorpha), Platyhelminthes
<b>Non-aquatic</b>	Neuroptera: Hemerobiidae

**Table 6. Identification error rate for sample UAB002.**

Order	Family	Genus	Raw Count	Audit Count	Audit Flag	IE Error	Comments
Diptera	Psychodidae	<i>Pericoma/ Telmatoscopus</i>	17	18			Enumeration (+1)
Ephemeroptera	Ephemerellidae	<i>Ephemerella</i>	52	49	52		Misidentification, 3 specimens
Ephemeroptera	Ephemerellidae	<i>Drunella</i>	13	16		3	3 Misidentified as Ephemerella, no front legs nor abdominal gill
Ephemeroptera	Heptageniidae	<i>Rithrogena</i>	19	16	19		Misidentification of 3 individuals
Ephemeroptera	Leptophlebiidae	<i>Leptophlebia</i>	0	3		3	Misidentification; identified as Rithrogena; small, no gills
Plecoptera	Chloroperlidae	<i>Sweltsa</i>	9	8			1 rolled up to family
Plecoptera	Chloroperlidae		0	1			
<b>Total</b>			110	111	71	6	
<b>Total organisms found in audit</b>			361	362			
<b>Average % Identification Error Rate</b>							<b>1.7%</b>

**Table 7. Total number of benthic macroinvertebrates per sample**

Taxonomic Group	UAB001	UAB002	UAB003	UAB004	Total
<b>Class: Clitellata</b>					
<b>Order: Lumbriculida</b>					
<b>Family: Lumbriculidae</b>					
<i>Lumbriculus</i>	170				170
<b>Order: Tubificida</b>					
<b>Family: Naididae</b>					
<i>Specaria</i>	10				10
<b>Class: Euchelicerata</b>					
<b>Order: Trombidiformes</b>					
<b>Family: Hydrachnidae</b>					
<i>Hydrachna</i>		8			8
<b>Family: Lebertiidae</b>					
<i>Lebertia</i>		58		81	140
<b>Family: Sperchontidae</b>					
<i>Sperchon</i>		25	86	75	186
<b>Class: Gastropoda</b>					
<b>Heterostropha</b>					
<b>Family: Valvatidae</b>					
<i>Valvata</i>	40				40
<b>Class: Insecta</b>					
<b>Order: Coleoptera</b>					
<b>Family: Elmidae</b>					
<i>Narpus</i>		42		13	54
<i>Zaitzevia</i>		25			25
<b>Order: Diptera</b>					
<b>Family: Chironomidae</b>					
<i>Orthocladius</i>	110	17	14	56	197
<i>Diamesa</i>			157		157
<i>Cricotopus</i>	250	50	86		386
<i>Polypedilum</i>	390	158	343	6	897
<i>Brillia</i>		17	29	25	70
<i>Parametrioctenemus</i>			14		14
<i>Pagastia</i>	220	25	57		302
<i>Potthastia</i>		50	57		107
<i>Eukiefferiella</i>	40	8		75	123
<i>Psectrocladius</i>				25	25
<i>Abiskomyia</i>				19	19
<i>Prodiamesa</i>	10				10
<i>Parakiefferiella</i>	50	58			108
<i>Cardiocaldus</i>	40				40
<i>Chironomus</i>	10				10
<i>Ablabesmyia</i>		8			8

Table 7. Total number of benthic macroinvertebrates per sample					
Taxonomic Group	UAB001	UAB002	UAB003	UAB004	Total
<b>Family: Empididae</b>					
<i>Neoplasta</i>	10	17		6	33
<i>Oreogeton</i>		17			17
<b>Family: Psychodidae</b>					
<i>Pericoma/Telmatoscopus</i>	10	150		6	166
<b>Family: Simuliidae</b>					
<i>Prosimulium</i>	90			6	96
<i>Simulium</i>	100				100
<b>Family: Tipulidae</b>					
<i>Hexatoma</i>				6	6
<i>Dicranota</i>	30		14		44
<b>Order: Ephemeroptera</b>					
<b>Family: Ameletidae</b>					
<i>Ameletus</i>	110	133	29		272
<b>Family: Baetidae</b>					
<i>Baetis</i>	640	975	557	100	2272
<b>Family: Ephemerellidae</b>					
<i>Drunella</i>		133	14	319	466
<i>Ephemerella</i>	150	408	14	94	666
<b>Family: Heptageniidae</b>	40				40
<i>Cinygmula</i>	10	83			93
<i>Epeorus</i>				6	6
<i>Rhithrogena</i>		133	257	119	509
<b>Family: Leptophlebiidae</b>					
<i>Leptophlebia</i>		25	2157	269	2451
(blank)	10				10
<b>Order: Plecoptera</b>					
<b>Family: Capniidae</b>					
<i>Capnia</i>			14		14
<b>Family: Chloroperlidae</b>		8			8
<i>Plumiperla</i>	20		29	6	55
<i>Sweltsa</i>		67	14	6	87
<b>Family: Leuctridae</b>					
<i>Paraleuctra</i>		17	14		31
<b>Family: Nemouridae</b>	20				20
<i>Amphinemura</i>				19	19
<i>Malenka</i>	200	75	14	31	321
<i>Zapada</i>	320	33	400	13	766

Table 7. Total number of benthic macroinvertebrates per sample					
Taxonomic Group	UAB001	UAB002	UAB003	UAB004	Total
<b>Family: Perlidae</b>		8		6	15
<i>Hesperoperla</i>		42		6	48
<b>Family: Perlodidae</b>					
<i>Cultus</i>		17		6	23
<i>Diura</i>	40	50		13	103
<i>Kogotus</i>			14	31	46
<i>Megarcys</i>			29		29
<b>Family: Taeniopterygidae</b>					
<i>Taenionema</i>	40	17	214	356	627
<b>Order: Trichoptera</b>					
<b>Family: Brachycentridae</b>					
<i>Brachycentrus</i>		42		38	79
<b>Family Glossosomatidae</b>					
<i>Glossosoma</i>		17		6	23
<b>Family: Hydropsychidae</b>					
<i>Arctopsyche</i>	30		14		44
<i>Parapsyche</i>				13	13
<b>Family: Rhyacophilidae</b>					
<i>Rhyacophila</i>	50		14	75	139
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>3260</b>	<b>3017</b>	<b>4657</b>	<b>1931</b>	<b>12865</b>