ILLINOIS NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY
PRAIRIE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Prairie Research Institute
William Shilts, Executive Director

ILLINOIS NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY
Brian D. Anderson, Director
1816 South Oak Street
Champaign, IL 61820
217-333-6830

# Evaluating Water Temperature, Habitat and Fish Communities in Candidate Coolwater Streams in Illinois

Leon C. Hinz Jr., Brian A. Metzke,
and Ann Marie Holtrop

Prepared for: Illinois Department of Natural Resources

State Wildlife Grant / Project Number (T-13-P-001)

INHS Technical Report 2011 (21)
Date of issue: 8 July 2011

## Executive Summary:

Coolwater streams are less common in Illinois than their warmwater counterparts, but because of their unique temperature patterns they have the potential to harbor biota not typically found in warmwater streams. However, these systems are poorly understood and few attempts to define and characterize coolwater streams have been made in Illinois. This study was designed to provide a comprehensive evaluation of coolwater streams as a foundation for managing these resources.

The primary objectives of this study include validating initial attempts to locate cool streams, conducting *in situ* measurements of stream temperature throughout Illinois, characterizing physical components and biota in cool streams, and evaluating methods for rapid estimation of stream temperature. We were able to obtain 280 temperature records from 232 locations collected between 1999 and 2010 (early collections from previous studies). More than one third (35.3%) of sampled locations were classified as cold or cool (<21.0 $^{o}$C mean daily July temperature). Although this proportion is artificially high since we targeted streams we suspected to be cool for monitoring in this study, one in five (20.8%) of our random survey of wadeable stream sites was observed to have coolwater conditions. In addition, maps of their distribution indicate that they are fairly common in some watersheds (e.g., Apple River, Rock River, upper Kishwaukee River).

Prior to initiation of this study, potential coolwater streams were identified using the locations of fish species considered indicators of cool temperatures and a GIS derived model of potential groundwater discharge. Observed stream temperatures revealed that the majority of these fish species were not reliable as indicators of cool conditions and that the groundwater model was effective only under certain conditions. However, the distributions of four fish species (brook stickleback, longnose dace, mottled sculpin, brown trout) correlated well with cold and cool temperatures, and indicator analysis revealed a coldwater fish community type. Coolwater and warmwater fish communities were generally similar in their species makeup. Although it was beyond the scope of this study combining multiple characteristics into predictive models may hold promise for differentiating stream thermal patterns amongst Illinois streams.

Landscape features, instream habitat, vegetation, fish, mussels, and macroinvertebrates were evaluated in streams where temperature data were available in an effort to discover characteristics that might aid in rapid estimation of thermal conditions. Few physical characteristics correlated well with stream temperature, and conclusive patterns related to prediction of thermal regime remain elusive. Vegetation character and macroinvertebrate taxa (including mussels) from summer collections were not related to coolwater conditions. Overall, few individual characteristics were related clearly to temperature.

Models derived temperature classes were reviewed and revised for stream segments throughout Illinois as part of this study. Model predictions were more accurate in identifying the thermal character of stream segments than the biological indicators that were examined in this study. However, only a small fraction of all stream segments have been monitored for temperature and additional validation of the model is needed.

## Table of Contents:

**Project Overview**……...…1

**Job Outcomes**…….2

Job 1. Review list of candidate streams and identify a subset of those streams for validation……2

Job 2. Categorize the thermal regime, habitat (e.g., channel morphology), and vegetation in each stream identified in Job 1……..3

Job 3. Determine availability and applicability of other data to predict additional coolwater streams…….4

Job 4. Characterize a subset of streams identified in Job 3……..9

Job 5. Conduct macroinvertebrate sampling at a subset of sites……19

Job 6. Compile and analyze data and write report……..20

**Data Gaps and Proposed Future Efforts**……...21

**Literature Cited**……...23

**Acknowledgements**……..…25

**Tables**

Table 1. Coolwater fish species candidate list
Table 2. Proportion of cold or cool streams in Illinois
Table 3. Validation of candidate coolwater sites
Table 4. Variation in July and August mean daily temperature
Table 5. Air temperature and annual variation in July and August mean daily temperature
Table 6. Summary of sampled streams
Table 7. Modeled temperature category and measured temperature category
Table 8. Coefficients for Illinois stream temperature model development from stream temperature data collected 1999-2010
Table 9. Effectiveness of revised temperature model at classifying stream segments based on thermal classes of Wehrly *et al.* (2003)
Table 10. Darcy model prediction and measured temperature category
Table 11. Summary of sites with multiyear temperature data
Table 12. Temperature probe results and associated temperature data
Table 13. Shading study temperature results
Table 14. Result of vertical temperature analysis
Table 15. Regression analysis summary for landuse proportions
Table 16. Chi-squared test results for comparison of habitat characters
Table 17. Summary of vegetation characteristics at streams with temperature records
Table 18. Additional fish analyzed for thermal preference
Table 19. Temperature class for selected fish species
Table 20. Most common species in cold and cool streams
Table 21. Ten highest indicator species analysis values for each temperature category
Table 22. Validation of coldwater and coolwater fish communities (as determined by indicator analysis)
Table 23. Potential macroinvertebrate coolwater indicator taxa

**Figures**

Figure 1. Darcy model output values
Figure 2. Candidate coolwater sites in Illinois streams
Figure 3. Weekly mean noon temperature with 95% confidence intervals for each thermal class
Figure 4. Comparison of mean change in monthly mean water temperature and mean change in monthly mean air temperature
Figure 5. Logger deployment locations
Figure 6. Temperature model results
Figure 7. Logger locations color coded by mean thermal category
Figure 8. Revised stream temperature model for Illinois
Figure 9. Comparison of measured temperature and modeled watershed Darcy value
Figure 10. Random site locations
Figure 11. Summary of multiyear records
Figure 12. Network sampling locations
Figure 13. Satellite images of shading study sites
Figure 14. Proportion of channel unit number
Figure 15. Proportion of dominant substrate type
Figure 16. Proportion of channel shading category
Figure 17. Proportion of riparian width category
Figure 18. Proportion of flow category
Figure 19. Collection locations for brook stickleback (BKS), longnose dace (LGD), mottled sculpin (MTS), and brown trout (BRT)
Figure 20. Locations of original coldwater and coolwater sites with expanded (23.7$^{o}$C) coolwater sites.

**Appendix A. Collection locations for the original 17 indicator fish species**

**Appendix B. Network temperature sampling results**

**Appendix C. Supplemental fish collections**

**Appendix D. Temperature at collection locations for each fish species**

ILLINOIS NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY
PRAIRIE RESEARCH INSTITUTE

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Prairie Research Institute
William Shilts, Executive Director

ILLINOIS NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY
Brian D. Anderson, Director
1816 South Oak Street
Champaign, IL 61820
217-333-6830

# Evaluating Water Temperature, Habitat and Fish Communities in Candidate Coolwater Streams in Illinois

Leon C. Hinz Jr., Brian A. Metzke,
and Ann Marie Holtrop

Prepared for: Illinois Department of Natural Resources

State Wildlife Grant / Project Number (T-13-P-001)

INHS Technical Report 2011 (21)
Date of issue: 8 July 2011

## Project Overview:

Coolwater streams can be defined many ways, but most generally they are streams that have low summer water temperatures due to input of groundwater via springs, seeps through the stream channel. Coolwater streams have been studied throughout much of the United States, but in the southern portion of the Midwest these systems are presumed to be uncommon and are rarely evaluated. Streams are thus generally considered warmwater in these areas and temperature monitoring is rare unless directly associated with springs or industrial discharges. However, the presence of fish species associated with cooler waters and anecdotal evidence of cool conditions based on research and monitoring for other purposes suggests that coolwater streams occur in Illinois.

Recent studies regarding the distribution and characteristics of cool streams have been conducted in the Midwest (e.g., Aquatic Research Center of the Indiana Biological Survey 2007, Iowa Department of Natural Resources 2004, Lyons *et al*. 2009, Wehrly *et al*. 2003). Although these studies vary with respect to definition and classification of cool streams, each has a common theme; stream thermal regime is broken into multiple categories and each thermal category has its own unique characteristics. Lyons *et al*. (2009) and Wehrly *et al*. (2003) divide stream temperature into three or four categories that are defined by fish community structure. Each category has its own expectations in terms of thermal patterns and composition of biota. Studies from Iowa (Iowa DNR 2004) and Indiana (IBS 2007) recognize biological differences between coolwater and warmwater streams. Taken together, these studies highlight the unique biotic and physical qualities of cool streams in the Midwest.

Differences amongst studies conducted in Wisconsin, Michigan, Indiana, and Iowa emphasize the need for coolwater research in Illinois. Some of the most basic questions related to distribution and characterization of cool streams in Illinois cannot be answered due to lack of information about these systems. By expanding state agency and scientists' comprehension and awareness of cool streams, these rare systems and the unique biota within them can be more adequately protected.

This study attempts to fill gaps in understanding of coolwater streams in Illinois by providing fundamental knowledge regarding the distribution and characteristics of these systems. This objective was approached by measuring thermal patterns in streams and by examining potential relationships between temperature and biotic or physical characteristics at multiple scales. Additional data and analyses related to methods for rapid detection (i.e., indicators of cool conditions) of cool streams are also presented. Findings are described below under the Jobs outlined in the original grant agreement (T-13-P-001).

## Job Outcomes:

## Job 1: Review list of candidate streams and indentify a subset of those streams for validation.

***Defining thermal categories:***
Although many methods for categorization of stream thermal patterns exist, this study uses the mean daily July temperature (Wehrly *et al*. 2003) to quantify stream temperature. Categorical temperature thresholds defined by Wehrly *et al*. (2003) are: coldwater ≤18.9 $^{o}$C, coolwater 19.0-21.9 $^{o}$C, warmwater ≥22.0 $^{o}$C. Mean daily July temperature provides a measurement of the average condition for a stream. Because aquatic biota can tolerate temperatures above preferred levels for short periods of time and Illinois streams can experience large diel variation in temperature, an average measure of temperature is preferred over one based solely on maximums. Accordingly, we used mean daily July temperature to determine thermal categorization for all analyses requiring set temperature thresholds.

***Creation of preliminary cold-/coolwater streams list:***
Prior to initiation of this study, candidate cold-/coolwater streams in Illinois were identified by evaluating distribution of fish species with potential as indicators of cold/cool thermal conditions and by locating stream reaches with potential for groundwater discharge. Fish species used during this process were identified through literature review and by professional judgment of thermal preferences. Seventeen species were selected for use as cold-/coolwater indicators (Table 1). Groundwater discharge was estimated using output from an Illinois specific version of a GIS model of subsurface water potential (referred to here as the Darcy Model, Baker *et al.* 2003). This model uses Darcy's Law, which incorporates hydraulic conductivity and slope to determine likelihood of groundwater discharge. Darcy model outputs were used to calculate a value for each stream arc (confluence to confluence stream reach) that represents the probability that groundwater will enter (or leave) the stream. For the purposes of this selection process, whole-watershed Darcy values were calculated for each stream arc and those arcs that were at least one standard deviation below (negative values) the mean were considered groundwater discharge streams (i.e., those with high potential to receive groundwater inputs; Holtrop *et al.* 2005). Darcy values for the whole-watershed (Figure 1) were used because the watershed scale was correlated significantly with the existing temperature model (see Job 3 below for temperature model explanation).

An initial list of potential coolwater streams was developed by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) prior to initiating this project from the complete complement of Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA)/ IDNR sample sites using two criteria: the presence of one or more of the seventeen indicator fish species (distributions presented in Appendix A), or high potential for groundwater discharge (based on the Darcy Model) in addition to presence of at least one of those species. One hundred and ninety-nine sites were identified using these two methods (Figure 2): 88 sites based on

presence of fish alone and 111 based on fish present in areas of high groundwater potential (Table 2).

***Validation of candidate streams list:***
Three methods (indicator fish list, Darcy model, and stream summer water temperature model) were available to locate potential cold-/coolwater streams in Illinois during this project. However, none of these three methods had been validated with *in situ* data collection, and therefore a subset of predicted cold-/coolwater sites was chosen for measurement of thermal characteristics. Sixty-six sites (30 of the 88 candidate cool sites based on fish, and 36 from the 111 candidate cool sites based on fish and groundwater) were successfully sampled, and summer temperature patterns are summarized as detailed below (Job 2 and Job 4).

## Job 2: Characterize the thermal regime, habitat (e.g., channel morphology), and vegetation in each stream identified in Job 1.

***Validation of subset of sites from the candidate streams list:***
Temperature data loggers (Onset Computer Corporation: HOBO Pendant, HOBO Water Temp Pro v2, or StowAway TidbiT) were placed in stream segments selected from the initial list of candidate locations for validation of thermal status (Job 1). Most loggers were set in May or June once water levels approached summer (baseflow) conditions. Temperature was recorded at one hour intervals and loggers were generally retrieved from streams after summer data had been collected. Some data loggers were maintained in the stream throughout the year; however, this frequently resulted in the loss of the logger during high flow events in late winter and early spring. Mean daily July temperature was calculated for each site and was used to place each stream into a thermal category (cold, cool, warm). Mean daily August temperature was used if July data were incomplete (see *Validation of assessment methods* in Job 3 for justification of this substitution). Candidate coolwater sites (Figure 2) were compared to thermal category based on observed temperatures. Measured temperatures confirmed that 12 of the 30 sites identified as coolwater candidates based solely on fish (i.e., 40%) were indeed cool or cold (Table 3). Additionly, 29 of the 36 sites identified as coolwater candidates based on fish and the Darcy Model (i.e., 80%) were confirmed as cool or cold (Table 3). These results suggest using multiple indicators (i.e., fish and groundwater) increases the accuracy of predicting locations of cold-/coolwater streams. Furthermore they suggest that the initial list of coolwater indicator fish contained species that are not good indicators of coolwater conditions (i.e., many species were warmwater or eurythermal).

Habitat and vegetation data were collected at candidate sites where temperatures were monitored and will be discussed below (Job 4) with similar information from sites identified using other methods (Job 3). An evaluation of spatial temperature patterns (i.e., between and within selected and adjacent reaches) is provided in Job 4.

## Job 3: Determine availability and applicability of other data to predict additional coolwater streams.

The initial coolwater candidate list was developed using potential indicator fish species and a groundwater model related to physical characteristics of stream segments. To further refine identification of coolwater streams, we used output from a model of stream temperature developed in a previous project (Holtrop *et al.* 2006 [T-2]) and searched for commonalities in biological, habitat, and landscape characteristics within predicted cool stream segments that could be used to identify potential thermal conditions in Illinois streams that had not been monitored. Characters used in this analysis include presence of fish and macroinvertebrate species, fish community structure, habitat and landscape features, and presence of aquatic and riparian vegetation.

Additional assessments of instream thermal characteristics were conducted to gain an understanding of lateral and longitudinal temperature variation, interstitial temperature patterns, and the degree to which sun and shade impact temperature. Characterization of cold-/coolwater streams (including evaluation of thermal thresholds) and the utility of these characteristics as thermal predictors will be discussed below (Job 4). Here we will focus on validation of the assessment methods and using computer-based (modeling) methods of predicting stream temperature patterns.

***Validation of assessment methods:***
If temperature thresholds for each thermal category have been appropriately set, then differences in temperature patterns should be apparent. However, given that streams were categorized using a single summary statistic based on data collected during a limited period of time (i.e., mean daily July temperature during one year), the uncertainty associated with the classification and any conclusions based on it is dependent upon our ability to detect actual differences in thermal regimes. We calculated mean weekly temperature at noon for sites within each thermal category to determine if sufficient discriminatory power exists for this assessment technique. Between calendar days 134 and 274 (approximately mid May to early October) each thermal category exhibits a unique temperature pattern (Figure 3), with the largest degree of distinction occurring between calendar days 163 and 247 (approximately mid June and early September). The largest difference between warm and cold sites and warm and cool sites occurs on calendar day 212 (late July), while cold and cool sites differ most in late June on day 177 (although July contains four of the eight largest differences between these two categories). These results indicate that summer, especially July, is the best period in which to observe distinctions in stream temperature between thermal classes.

When July temperature data were unavailable or incomplete, August data were used to determine thermal category. We examined differences in classifying stream segments when using the thermal record for July or August in an effort to validate this substitution. Mean daily temperature was compared between the two months for each site where data were available to assess variation in this summary statistic and for differences that may lead to changes in thermal categorization. Complete July and August data sets were available from 142 monitoring records at 125 sites. The mean difference between July

and August mean daily temperature was 0.27 $^{o}$C (July value minus August value) with a maximum difference of 6.02 $^{o}$C for July minus August values and 6.57 $^{o}$C for August minus July (Table 4). As mean daily temperatures are used to determine thermal category of streams, variation in thermal category between July and August is most relevant to validating use of August temperature data. No clear pattern was observed when categories were compared between July and August. Thirteen monitoring events (20%) would have been categorized at least one category warmer (e.g., cold to cool) when using August data instead of July, while 25 (22%) would have been categorized cooler (e.g., warm to cool).

The absence of any clear pattern between July and August stream temperatures suggests that differences between these temperatures are related to natural variability in weather patterns. Differences in July and August air temperature data (ISWS 2010) were compared with differences in July and August mean daily water temperature at individual sites to examine the relative influence of regional weather patterns on stream temperature patterns (Table 5). Difference in monthly mean air temperature in Springfield, IL exhibited a similar pattern to that of difference in mean daily water temperature (Figure 4). This suggests that using August temperature data to determine a thermal category is also appropriate. Observed shifts in thermal category occur only in approximately 21% of samples and the direction of these changes was not predictable without additional knowledge of local air temperatures during the monitoring period.

***Modeling stream temperature in Illinois:***
Prior to this study, IDNR had collected temperature data in Illinois streams primarily during two studies. The first was the Pilot Watershed Study (Dodd *et al*. 2005 [F-136-R]) that collected water temperature as part of a habitat characteristic analysis at four pairs of sites in selected river basins (i.e., Spoon, Embarras, Kaskaskia, Cache). The second was an effort with collaborators in Michigan and Wisconsin that examined water temperatures and a host of other characteristics at representative sites across the region (Holtrop *et al*. 2005 [T-3], Holtrop *et al.* 2006 [T-2]). Summer temperature records were collected at 77 sites in Illinois (Figure 5) during these two efforts, representing 68 different streams (there were multiple sites per stream in the Pilot Watershed Study).

Temperature summaries from 72 of these sites were used to develop multiple linear regression models that estimate summer water temperatures using a stepwise regression procedure (Holtrop *et al.* 2006). Several models were developed for different temperature summaries (e.g., maximum daily maximum temperature for June - September, minimum daily mean temperature for July). We found that averaging two of the model outputs (July maximum daily mean and July minimum daily mean) gave us fewer extreme estimates of the average July daily thermal signature than using the models that directly estimated mean July daily temperature. We have expressed these averages as the mean daily mean temperature and have assigned a thermal code (cold, cool, warm) to each stream arc based on our temperature criteria (Wehrly *et al*. 2003). Model based cold-/coolwater segments made up approximately 13% of the total number of coded segments state-wide (Figure 6, Table 2).

***Collection and summary of additional temperature records:***
We used summaries from the available temperature model and the Darcy Model output to select additional stream segments to assess throughout the state. In addition to the 77 previously monitored sites (described above), 172 sites on 159 streams were monitored during this study (203 summer temperature records from 2007-2010). Sites for monitoring were selected by identifying stream segments that contained multiple indicators that coolwater temperatures may be present (e.g., multiple species present, extreme Darcy model values). Most of these additional sites were selected based on predicted cold-, cool-, or warmwater temperatures and characters related to physical or biotic conditions that might be associated with these thermal regimes. The remaining sites were suggested by Illinois Department of Natural Resources (INDR) streams biologists, or directly sampled by the biologists themselves during the study period. Some stream segments with existing records were also monitored during multiple years to examine interannual temperature patterns. To date we have 280 temperature records from 232 sites in Illinois (Figure 5). All sites were used for validation of Darcy Model and temperature model summaries as well as characterizations related to site-specific attributes (see Job 4) reported for this study unless specified elsewhere in this report.

Of the 280 temperature records, 34 records met the criterion for coldwater and 72 records were categorized as coolwater (Table 6). The majority of records were determined to be warmwater (174 records). Most of the cold- and coolwater streams are located in the northern third of the state (Figure 7). Only one coolwater site (IXF-01) was discovered in the southern (Shawnee Forest area) portion of Illinois. Potential relationships between spatial arrangement of thermal classes within the state and physical variables (e.g. climate, geology) are explored in later sections.

Eighty-two of the 232 (35.3%) sites monitored were cold or cool during at least one sample year, a proportion much higher than the 0.13 predicted by the temperature model (Table 2). However, this high proportion of cold and cool sites likely indicates our success at targeting these streams with our monitoring program rather than the true proportion of these systems within Illinois.

***Testing temperature model as a predictor of coolwater sites:***
Observed temperature summaries were compared at each site to the thermal category assigned by the temperature model (Figure 6). The model correctly associated the thermal category with the observed thermal category sixty-three percent of the time (Table 7). However, the model tended to over-predict temperatures and was thus less accurate when assigning cold (18% but some were predicted to be cool) and coolwater (30%) streams. Warmwater streams were correctly categorized by the model for 85% of the temperature records.

***Revision of the Illinois Stream Temperature Model:***
We selected temperature records from 207 site-year placements that occurred between 1999 and 2010 to revise the Illinois Stream Temperature Model. A primary site record included only information from the most recent recorded year available and excluded those sites that were either too small to occur on the 1:100,000 NHD or were part of the

randomly selected survey sites sampled in 2010. Secondary site records included all other records. Since the distribution of site-temperature records was skewed due to our sampling design that targeted locations expected to have cooler water temperatures we randomly selected records from the primary sites for model development that represented the observed state-wide range of temperatures. The primary site records were stratified into five thermal classes (<17.5 $^{o}$C, 17.5-19.5 $^{o}$C, 19.6-21.0 $^{o}$C, 21.1-22.0 $^{o}$C, >22.0 $^{o}$C) based on their mean daily water temperatures during July. Fifty-five records selected for modeling were from the warm class (>22 $^{o}$C) and the remainder were from the cooler water classes (110 records total). Ten records were randomly selected from the coldest class (<17.5 $^{o}$C) and fifteen records from each of the other coolwater classes.

Mean July daily water temperatures at the primary sites varied greatly (minimum 11.4 $^{o}$C, maximum 28.7 $^{o}$C) with the overall average at the high end of the cool water category (mean July daily water temperature 21.7 $^{o}$C). The secondary sites (97 sites-year placements with temperature records) were reserved to test the model predictions. Secondary sites had a slightly narrower range (minimum 15.0, maximum 26.9) but were slightly warmer on average than the primary sites (mean July daily water temperature 23.0 $^{o}$C).

Potential predictor variables were selected from GIS based summaries of landcover/use, surficial geology, bedrock geology, weather and soil conditions, and characteristics of the stream channel developed in an earlier project (Holtrop *et al.* 2005). Specific summaries were selected at one or more scales (local channel, local riparian, upstream watershed) based on our expectation on how they would influence local water temperature. Forty-one different summary-scale combinations were included in the modeling dataset.

We developed multiple linear regression models to estimate mean summer water temperatures using a stepwise regression procedure similar to that used in the initial model development (Holtrop *et al.* 2006). Patterns of mean annual air temperature in Illinois show a relatively distinct geographic gradient associated with the north-south extent of the State's boundaries. To examine this effect we developed two major series of models that differed primarily in the direct use of site location as a predictor. Models that allowed latitude and longitude (location of site) to be selected as predictor variables consistently included catchment size characteristics (drainage area and link number), air temperature (July max, July mean, and mean annual growing degree days), and the presence of bedrock near the surface. Models that excluded latitude and longitude as possible predictors included catchment size (drainage area), air temperature (mean annual air temperature, July-maximum, July-mean, growing degree days) or precipitation, and surficial geology associated with higher infiltration (coarse) or runoff (fines) as predictors. Overall models that included site location had better fits then those that did not. Since our objective was to identify thermal conditions for wadeable streams in Illinois we selected a single model (Table 8) that included information on the site location and applied the model to stream reaches statewide (Figure 8).

Mean differences between modeled and observed temperatures averaged 0.5 $^{o}$C and ranged from - 6.6 $^{o}$C to + 6.6 $^{o}$C of the observed mean daily July temperature based on

204 sites with existing records. Observed temperature summaries were compared at each site to the thermal category assigned by the temperature model. The model correctly associated the thermal category with the observed thermal category sixty-nine percent of the time using the criteria from Wehrly *et al.* 2003 (Table 9). This model did a better job predicting coldwater (50%) and coolwater (65%) stream segments then the earlier model but was slightly less efficient at predicting warmwater locations (74%). If we combine cold and coolwater predictions into a single group (e.g., non-warmwater) the model correctly classified these segments 85% of the time and had a 78% overall correct classification rate (Table 9).

***Testing Darcy Model as a predictor of coolwater sites:***
Stream reaches with potential groundwater inputs were identified by locating arcs with a Darcy Model value less than or equal to negative one standard deviation (SD) from the statewide mean at the watershed scale (Figure 1). Stream segments meeting this threshold were considered potential cold-/coolwater streams for this analysis. In total 1766 stream arcs (3.7% of the total) were predicted as cold or cool based on Darcy Model values (Table 2). Observed temperatures from each site were compared with the Darcy model value assigned to the corresponding stream segment (arc).

Less than four percent of all stream reaches in Illinois have Darcy Model values ≤ 1 SD from the mean (Table 2). Twenty-three percent of the stream reaches with measured cold or cool temperatures had Darcy Model values ≤ 1 SD. Overall this method assigned thermal categories correctly 70% of the time (Table 10) for all sampled sites. Only two sites with an observed warmwater thermal regime had a Darcy Model value this low (99% of sites with higher values did not meet the coolwater criteria). Therefore, this method appears to be an efficient way to eliminate sites with high Darcy Model values as potential coolwater reaches. Caution must still be taken in assigning such reaches to a coolwater category since a few stream segments with these low Darcy Model values were observed to have warm water thermal characteristics. We recommend targeting stream reaches with very low Darcy Model values for in situ temperature monitoring to determine the current thermal regime.

Another approach for using the Darcy Model as a predictor of thermal regime is to identify thresholds at which streams can be divided into thermal categories. Upon observing the numerical distribution of Darcy Model output for monitored streams, a value of -50 appears to be a reasonable prediction threshold (Figure 9). A positive relationship occurs between water temperature and Darcy Model value with values higher than -50 generally associated with warmwater conditions and lower values with coolwater conditions. Overall, 69% of sites with thermal records were correctly classified using this -50 threshold for the Darcy Model value (Table 10). Much like using the standard deviation approach, Darcy Model values were less accurate at classifying cold-/coolwater locations (22% correctly classified) than warmwater sites (98%).

## Job 4: Characterize a subset of streams identified in Job 3.

Selected physical and biological characteristics were sampled at the majority of the 232 sites with temperature records to identify patterns between sites within the same thermal category and to look for differences between categories. Spatial and temporal temperature patterns were examined to describe the longitudinal and temporal extent of observed thermal conditions.

***Random site selection and monitoring:***
As described in Job 3, most temperature loggers were placed at sites with the potential for cool temperatures (e.g., presence of potential coolwater species, low Darcy Model values), a method which likely created bias towards sampling coolwater streams. In an effort to improve our understanding of the distribution and abundance of the thermal character of streams in the state, 30 stream segments were randomly selected from all potential stream segments in Illinois. These random segments were chosen using a stratified selection method where small and large streams (i.e., first order and greater than seventh order) and those segments with poor access (i.e., no road crossings) were removed from the selection pool. A group of 30 alternate segments were chosen during to be used as substitutes if an initially selected segment was deemed inappropriate when visited (e.g., not wadeable, intermittent, inaccessible). A site was selected on each stream segment (usually at a bridge crossing), temperature loggers were deployed out of the influence of the bridge, and data were collected following methods outlined in Job 3. All random site monitoring data were collected in the summer of 2010.

Of the 30 random sites monitored, 24 loggers were recovered (Figure 10). Twenty-three of the random sites were in steams that had not been sampled during other sampling efforts, but all sites were located in major watersheds that had already been sampled at other locations. Five of the random sites (20.8%) fell into the coolwater category, while none were coldwater (Table 4, random sites identified by GIS Processing Unit [PUGap code] designation rather than IEPA/IDNR station code). These coolwater sites were found in regions of the state where previous coolwater segments had been observed. Although this sample of segments was relatively small it suggests that one in five wadeable stream segments in Illinois experiences a coolwater thermal regime.

***Interannual temperature patterns:***
Temperature data were collected during two or more years at 28 sites to examine interannual variation in thermal patterns (Table 11). The degree of interannual variation in temperature varied with a mean difference of within-site mean daily July temperature of 3.7 $^{o}$C, a maximum difference of 7.5 $^{o}$C, and a minimum of 0.4 $^{o}$C (Figure 11). Twelve (42.9%) of the sites had mean daily July temperatures that fell within adjacent thermal categories (i.e., cold and cool, or cool and warm) between years, and one site (station MND-01) had events in both the cold and warm categories. These results suggest that annual patterns in local weather (i.e., temperature, rainfall) can play an important role in the observed thermal pattern at some sites. These results are not surprising given the positive relationship between air and water temperatures observed between years (Figure 4). However, given the degree of variability at some sites, further examination of the

mechanisms underlying interannual temperature variation is warranted. These results suggest that stream reaches should be characterized using mean conditions over several years whenever possible. We used the mean daily temperature from July calculated from all available temperature records to describe the thermal character of stream reaches in Illinois and classified 23 sites as coldwater, 55 as coolwater, and the remainder as warmwater (151, Figure 7).

***Spatial temperature patterns:***
Spatial temperature patterns, including longitudinal (upstream or downstream) and lateral (adjacent streams) variation, are poorly documented for Illinois streams. One specific aspect of spatial temperature variation that requires consideration is the applicability of the observed temperature beyond the location at which they were recorded.

Lateral and longitudinal temperature patterns were assessed using strategically positioned sampling sites (identified as network sampling) within 15 watersheds throughout Illinois (Figure 12). Network sampling utilized multiple temperature loggers placed within a single watershed during a period of two to four weeks. Most network locations were chosen based on an expectation of cool temperatures within the watershed (given prior sampling in the watershed or some other indicator), while individual sample locations were arranged so as to discern intersegment and intrastream thermal variability within the watershed.

Each watershed displayed a unique pattern of spatial variability with some networks containing sites consistently in the same thermal category while other networks had sites in all three categories (Figure 12 and Appendix B). This suggests that extrapolating beyond the monitored reach must be done with great care as local conditions influence realized temperatures at individual sites even when in close proximity.

***Measurement of hyporheic water temperature:***
As thermal regime of streams often is related to input of groundwater, direct measurement of hyporheic temperature may allow for determination of groundwater levels relative to channel morphology. In summer streams receiving groundwater inputs will have a hyporheic thermal pattern that quickly cools with increasing depth. Those streams that are groundwater rechargers will have a slowly cooling pattern resulting from interstitial flow. Furthermore, groundwater in Illinois maintains a temperature within a small range, usually within the low teens. Observing these temperatures below the stream channel indicates presence of groundwater. Interstitial water temperature was measured using a Hanna Instruments® waterproof K-Type thermocouple and thermometer (model number HI 93531N) with 1.0m penetration probe (model number HI 766TR2). At each sample location the penetration probe was held perpendicular to the streambed and inserted into the hyporheic zone. To create a hyporheic temperature profile, the first temperature measurement was taken at the streambed surface (0cm) and subsequent samples were taken at 10cm intervals until a depth of 1m was reached. If substrate characteristics prevented insertion of the probe to 1m, the deepest temperature measurement was recorded. Sample location corresponded to temperature logger placement.

Hyporheic temperature profiles were analyzed only if the probe could penetrate at least 50cm below substrate surface. Probe measurements were placed into one of four categories based upon their vertical temperature patterns; likely, probable, unlikely, or not receiving groundwater inputs. Those in the likely or probable categories were expected to be positively correlated with cold or cool thermal categories, while those in the unlikely or not receiving should be negatively correlated (e.g., warm). These categories are somewhat subjective, but they reflect our estimation of groundwater patterns based on a priori observations of hyporheic temperatures within streams of know thermal conditions.

Hyporheic temperature probe measurements were taken 49 times at 43 sites where in channel water temperature records had been collected (Table 12). Sample size was small relative to total number of temperature records as substrate composition in some regions prevented probing. Of those eleven samples determined to have likely or probable groundwater inputs, ten were observed to have coldwater or coolwater thermal conditions based on the longer term monitoring of water within the stream channel. Warmwater streams were correctly placed in the unlikely or not receiving categories 31 of 38 times. Assigning thermal classes using hyporheic temperature profiles resulted in 83.7% of segments being correctly classified. However, we were only able to use this technique at a small fraction of the sites monitored during this study since sites with hard substrates, like cobble or packed claypan, could not be sampled using the temperature probe.

***Influence of shading on water temperature:***

Although groundwater and climate may be the greatest determinants, other factors may also influence observed instream temperature patterns. One such factor investigated during this study is the impact of channel shading created by overhanging vegetation. Shading could reduce thermal inputs from sunlight and prevent or reduce heating during daylight hours, and therefore, lower mean daily or maximum temperatures. Three streams were chosen to examine the influence of sunlight exposure and forested riparian areas on thermal patterns (Figure 13). These streams were selected by using satellite images (Google Inc. 2010) to locate watersheds with a mix of agricultural land use with intermittently forested riparian areas. Individual sites in each stream were arranged in alternating shaded and unshaded reaches. Thermal data loggers were affixed at a standard depth from the water's surface (to standardize the influence of turbidity) and were set to record hourly temperature measurements for approximately two weeks. In general, mean daily temperatures were lower at shaded sites than at unshaded sites within the same stream system (Table 13). This relationship between shading and temperature is consistent at Brush Creek (3) and Robinson Creek (1). Thermal patterns at South Kinnikinnik Creek (2) are less clear, possibly because this stream is categorized as coldwater (Table 4, station code PT-01) while the other two likely are warmwater. Shaded sites had mean maximum temperatures equal or less than unshaded sites while temperature variability was, in all but one case, lower in shaded sites (Table 13). These results demonstrated a reduction in stream temperature and diurnal temperature variability associated with shading over a relatively short reach (~500m) in a warmwater stream. Further evaluation on coolwater streams is needed to examine the potential for

shading to assist with maintaining stream temperatures that are near the transition between coolwater and warmwater conditions.

***Vertical temperature stratification:***
Studies have shown that groundwater inputs can create thermal stratification resulting in areas of cool temperatures in transitional or warm streams (e.g., Tate *et al.* 2006, Torgersen *et al.* 1999). These thermal refugia can provide habitat for species that are cold-/coolwater obligates and allow persistence of species that would otherwise be outside of their tolerance limits. Accordingly, we attempted to identify potential thermal refugia in wadeable streams in Illinois.

Three streams were chosen to examine the possibility of thermal refugia in Illinois streams. Each of these streams was known to have both warm and cold/cool reaches (based on prior data collection) and habitat heterogeneity (i.e., presence of pools). All sites selected in a stream were located within a 1km reach. Loggers were deployed in pools at multiple sites in each stream. We affixed two loggers to a pole at each site with one approximately 0.1m above the substrate surface and the other approximately 0.3m from the water surface. Temperature data were collected at fifteen minute intervals and loggers were removed approximately ten days after deployment.

At all stream-site combinations, the logger closer to the substrate surface had temperature summaries equal to or less than the logger nearer the air-water interface (Table 14). The maximum intra-site difference in mean daily temperature was 1.2$^{o}$C, but the mean difference was only 0.3$^{o}$C. West Okaw River saw the largest differences in temperature between the upper and lower loggers, while Kickapoo Creek had the smallest differences (mean = 1.5 $^{o}$C and 0.17 $^{o}$C, respectively). These results suggest thermal refugia may exist in some Illinois streams; however, this limited analysis failed to detect large temperature differences in assessed streams (i.e., cool, stable refugia in warm streams).

***Landuse structure in relation to stream temperature:***
Watershed and riparian zone landuse can alter movement and infiltration of rainwater, and thus impact groundwater discharge to streams, and subsequently instream temperature patterns. Therefore, landuse may be a correlate of stream thermal category. The proportions of urban, forest, and agricultural landuse at each monitoring site were determined by GIS mapping (Holtrop *et al*. 2005). Regression analysis was used to compare temperature summaries with local (immediate watershed associated with arc) and upstream (associated with all upstream arcs) riparian summaries, and local (associated with arc) and upstream (entire catchment) watershed landuse composition to examine relationships between thermal category and landscape characteristics at multiple scales. No statistically significant correlations were observed between the proportion of urban landcover and mean daily July water temperature (Table 15). Water temperature was significantly and positively correlated with agricultural landcover in the upstream watershed, but not significantly correlated at any of the other scales. As only one scale yielded significant results, assessing the relationship between temperature and agricultural landcover is difficult. One possibility is that an increase in agriculture near the riparian corridor results in a greater occurrence of field tiles moving cool groundwater

to the stream. Alternatively, there may be no direct relationship between the two variables and the observed statistical significance may result from an indirect relationship associated with the geographic location of cool streams within the state (i.e., cool and cold streams are located in the agricultural central and northern parts of the state rather than the forested south). The proportion of forested landuse was positively correlated with mean daily July temperature at all four spatial scales. While this may seem unexpected, forest landcover is more common in the southern third of the state where higher summer air temperatures also occur. Given the strong association between geographic location and air temperature, and the small number of coolwater sites observed in southern Illinois, we did not attempt to further examine the interactions between forested landcover and water temperature at the statewide scale.

***Habitat characterization of streams in relation to thermal category:***
Streams in Illinois display a wide range of instream and riparian habitat conditions, but the relationship between instream temperature patterns and physical characteristics has not been extensively studied in the state. Instream and riparian conditions were characterized at 500 sites on 442 streams from 2006-2009 to develop a wadeable streams habitat index (Sass *et al*. 2010 [T-25]). Seventy-nine of these habitat sites occurred where temperature records were available and were used to examine the relationships between thermal category and habitat variables. Habitat variables analyzed included predominant substrate, riparian zone width, predominant flow (fast, moderate, slow, none), degree of channel shading, and the number of channel units (defined as riffles, runs, or pools) in each sample reach. We compared the observed frequency of habitat elements within temperature categories to their statewide distributions using chi-squared analysis.

Slightly more than half the habitat elements examined showed no difference between thermal classes from their expected statewide distribution (Table 16). For example, the number of channel units (Figure 14) showed no significant difference between thermal classes. Channel shading and dominant substrate deviated from the state-wide pattern only in the coolwater streams (Table 16). Larger substrates were dominant in coolwater streams which show a higher proportion of gravel than expected (Figure 15) while also having a higher proportion of channel shading (Figure 16). All three thermal categories showed statistically significant deviations from the state-wide pattern with respect to riparian zone width (Figure 17), although no pattern was observed for any of the three thermal categories. Coldwater and coolwater streams have a larger proportion of fast and moderate flow conditions than the state-wide average, while warmwater streams are more likely to exhibit slow or non-flowing conditions (Figure 18). The lack of no flow conditions observed in the coldwater and coolwater streams suggests higher baseflow yields associated with the presence of groundwater inputs, although we did not test this hypothesis.

***Vegetation Assessments:***
Vegetative communities may be useful for estimating thermal conditions within streams by identifying species that indicate presence of cold or cool thermal regimes. Unfortunately, no practical or spatially extensive database containing aquatic or

semiaquatic plant community data exists for streams in Illinois. Information collected during the wadeable streams habitat index project (Sass *et al*. 2010 [T-25]) yielded some information related to instream macrophytes, and these data were used to compare macrophyte density and bank vegetation type with temperature summaries. Temperature records and vegetation data from the habitat index development project overlapped at 76 sites. We examined the relationships between observed thermal class and within reach mean macrophyte density, and bank vegetation types (mean densities of herbaceous, woody/shrub, and trees), based on a qualitative assessment of condition (0-3 scale) at these sites.

Mean macrophyte density varied between 0.54 and 0.77 with coolwater streams having the highest densities (Table 17). These mean scores place overall macrophyte density between the qualitative categories of absent and sparse. Macrophytes were dense in a few streams, but overall were sparse and little variation existed amongst thermal categories. Bank vegetation showed a similar pattern amongst thermal categories (Table 17). Herbaceous vegetation was the most abundant vegetative component for all three stream types, ranging from 2.53 to 2.71 (which falls between the intermediate and abundant categories), and varied little amongst thermal categories. Woody/shrub, trees, and bare banks (no vegetation) also varied little amongst categories. Both woody/shrub and tree mean densities fell between 1.04 and 1.68 (or between sparse and intermediate), while bare bank was between 0.41 and 0.47. Analyses involving macrophyte density and bank vegetation showed little utility for identifying temperature patterns in large part due to the extremely low occurrence of aquatic macrophytes and highly disturbed banks in Illinois streams.

***Fish species as cold-/coolwater indicators:***

The IDNR listing of candidate coolwater stream reaches, which this project was developed to test, used fish species as indicators of cold/cool thermal conditions within streams (Job 1). Although Illinois contains few examples of typical coldwater fish communities (i.e., trout, sculpin, daces), some fish species may prefer cold or cool temperatures, and therefore serve as indicators of these conditions. The goal of this analysis was to determine which species, if any, could be used to accurately predict the location of cold-/coolwater streams. Prior to initiation of this study, 17 species of fish were used as indicators of cold-/coolwater streams (Table 1, Figure 2). Due to the preliminary nature of this species list, an additional 31 species that represent a large range of taxonomic and behavioral diversity were added to our analysis (Table 18). For each site with temperature monitoring data we reviewed recent fish surveys (within seven years of temperature record) for the presence of our focal species. Most of these data were collected during IDNR basin surveys, although some originated from special surveys conducted by the INDR or other state agencies. Not all locations with temperature records had associated fish data, and consequently we made supplemental samples at 22 additional sites during the summers of 2007, 2008 and 2010 using a backpack electrofishing unit (Appendix C). These sites were chosen to fill gaps in existing data, however, because standard IDNR fish community sampling protocols were not followed (i.e., block-netting, use of electric seine, time/length minimums), these data were used only to access species presence. To establish thermal preferences, temperature

records associated with all 48 fish species were reviewed and each species was placed into a class (e.g., cold, cool, warm, eurythermal) to determine utility as a cold/cool indicator. Only those species that were always collected in cold-/coolwater streams were considered as coolwater indicators in this analysis.

Focal fish species were classified based on observed distributions using the mean daily July temperature. These classifications were compared to Wehrly *et al*. (2003) and Lyons *et al.* (2009) temperature categorization, thermal classes listed in Lyons *et al*. (2009), Indiana's coolwater index (Aquatic Research Center of the Indiana Biological Survey 2007), and those from the Ohio EPA's bioassessment manual (State of Ohio Environmental Protection Agency 1987) to assess thermal preference in other Midwestern states (Table 19, Appendix D).

Most species assessed during this study were classified into the eurythermal category, as they were present in stream segments with each of the three thermal categories (Table 19). Five species (American brook lamprey, brown trout, rainbow trout, longnose dace, ninespine stickleback) were present only in coldwater or coolwater streams, but many of these species have extremely limited ranges within the state (e.g., American brook lamprey has been collected at only one site in Illinois) or too few of the species' know locations have associated temperature data for a robust assessment of thermal preference to be made. These factors effectively eliminate American brook lamprey, rainbow trout, and ninespine stickleback as robust indicators, leaving only the presence of brown trout and/or longnose dace as good indicators of cool or cold conditions. However, brown trout have been found at very few stream sites in Illinois (3 sites in IDNR fisheries database) giving it a limited degree of utility with respect to predicting location of cool streams. Longnose dace also have a limited statewide distribution, known from only two watersheds, although it has been collected at more locations than brown trout. The brook stickleback and mottled sculpin nearly met our rather restrictive criterion, each having been found at one warmwater site in addition to several coolwater sites. For brook stickleback, one of 31 temperature records exceeded the coolwater threshold, although that record was from a site categorized as a coolwater location during a previous monitoring year. Given that streams have been shown to shift thermal categories between years (*Interannual temperature patterns*, Job 4) and fish can tolerate temperatures in excess of their preferred ranges, these two species should not necessarily be eliminated from use as coolwater predictors, but rather given a conditional status and used in conjunction with other predictive methods. Even if used together, though, these four species have limited utility for predicting locations of coolwater streams in Illinois outside their known, but limited range (Figure 19). Additional thermal and fish distribution data would improve the usefulness of this assessment and aid in producing conclusions about those species that occur mainly at sites that have not been monitored for temperature.

Our assessment of fish as indicators of cold or cool conditions was conducted using mean daily July temperature thresholds outlined in the introduction to this report (Wehrly *et al.* 2003). A similar type of assessment was also conducted using Lyons *et al*. (2009) thresholds of cold (< 17.5$^{o}$C mean daily July temperature), transitional (17.5-21.0 $^{o}$C),

and warm (> 21.0$^{o}$C) temperature categories. When we use these thermal thresholds with our data, brown trout, longnose dace, brook stickleback, and mottled sculpin are considered transitional species (Table 19). The transitional category is similar to, but not synonymous with coolwater, and therefore, the species we recognized during our study may receive the same classification in other assessment schemes. In fact, Lyons *et al* (2009) lists brown trout and mottled sculpin as coldwater indicators, but longnose dace and brook stickleback as transitional species. Indiana (Aquatic Research Center of the Indiana Biological Survey 2007) uses a classification scheme with similar thresholds to those used in Lyons *et al.* (2009), yet based on their assessment methods brown trout and mottled sculpin are not coolwater species, while longnose dace and brook stickleback are coolwater indicators (Table 19). The Ohio EPA's (1987) bioassessment manual, which designates certain species as coldwater indicators, does not assess thermal preference of longnose dace, but lists brown trout, brook stickleback and mottled sculpin as coldwater obligates. All three studies (Lyons *et al*. 2009, Indiana 2007, and Ohio 1987) designate cold or cool indicator species that this study does not recognize, and visa versa. These discrepancies in categorization of fish likely indicate that some species have broader than expected thermal tolerances that differ geographically.

***Fish community analysis:***
Thermal categories often can be defined by a characteristic fish community present within these streams. For instance, Lyons *et al*. (2009) found that coldwater streams were dominated by trout and sculpin, while transitional species from such diverse taxonomic groups as suckers, daces, and sticklebacks were present in coolwater streams. Many of these cold and cool species are not common in Illinois waters, and accordingly, these community types may not be prevalent in their respective thermal categories. Fish collection records for each site with temperature data were used to determine which species were most common in coldwater and coolwater streams to determine if community types related to temperature could be described for Illinois. Three analyses were used to evaluate community types: an observation of species richness, an analysis of species common to each temperature category, and indicator species analysis.

Species richness was explored in an effort to describe differences between warmwater and cold-/coolwater streams with an expectation that coldwater streams have the lowest richness and warmwater streams the highest. Fish collection records were used to determine species richness at each site with a temperature record. Mean fish species richness was 14.3 (range: 1-29) for coldwater, 18.5 (range: 5-33) for coolwater and 20.3 (range: 8-40) for warmwater sites. Independent sample t-tests indicate species richness at cold sites was significantly different than both cool ($p=0.015$) and warm ($p<0.001$) sites; however, cool and warm sites were not different ($p=0.146$). This positive relationship of species richness and temperature provides insight into the ecological role of temperature in defining cold-/coolwater communities.

For the second analysis of community structure, we defined common species as those present from at least 50% of sampled sites. This value creates an arbitrary threshold for determining dominance, but does provide a baseline for examination of community structure. Eight species were common to both coldwater and coolwater streams (Table

20). The two thermal categories differed in only a few species with southern redbelly dace, blacknose dace, and fantail darter common in cold streams, while bluegill sunfish, smallmouth bass, and sand shiner were common only in coolwater streams.

All species found in cool-/coldwater streams were more common in reaches with those thermal classes than at all surveyed sites (Table 20). When considering just sites with temperature records, only bluntnose minnow in coldwater streams, bluegill sunfish in coolwater streams, and green sunfish in coolwater and coldwater streams were less abundant in their respective categories than in statewide collections. These results suggest that the species included in the cold and cool categories of Table 20 are potentially cold- or coolwater species (excluding the three discussed above). However, we observed these species in streams with a broad array of thermal patterns indicating that most of them have eurythermal or warmwater tolerances (Table 19) rather than being representative of cold of cool communities. We expect that the observed patterns occur as a result of the geographical distribution of these common species being concurrent with the distribution of cold and cool streams mainly in the northern portion of the state (Figure 7).

To consider abundance of fish species in addition to presence/absence patterns, indicator species analysis was conducted to explore the relationship between fish community structure and thermal category. Indicator species analysis is an ordination technique that considers both presence and abundance in assigning a fidelity value (ranging from 0-100; 100 is the strongest indicator) for each species in each category (cold, cool, warm). For each site with existing temperature data, fish community data were downloaded from the IDNR's fisheries database (Fisheries Analysis System was accessed in 2010). Only the most recent collection was used for each site and only those collection records more recent than 1987 were used to assure consistency within the sampling procedures (the current basin survey procedure was implemented in 1988).

Fidelity values were calculated for 140 fish species with values ranging from 0-54, indicating, at best, only moderate species-thermal category relationships. However, 25 species had significant (Monte Carlo test of significance) values for their specific temperature category. If we consider only the ten species in each category with the highest indicator values our analysis indicates five significant species for coldwater, one for coolwater, and six for warmwater streams (Table 21). Brook stickleback was the only coldwater or coolwater species with a significant fidelity value that was included on the list of coolwater indicator species (brown trout, longnose dace and mottled sculpin did not have significant fidelity values).

To test the validity of coldwater and coolwater community structure (as determined by indicator analysis), we identified where these community types were present and compared these locations to measured temperatures. Of those sites with corresponding temperature data, the coldwater community type was present in cold- or coolwater streams for more than 97% of the cases, however, the coolwater community type was found in cold or cool streams approximately as often as warmwater sites (Table 22). These results suggest the coldwater community type has been accurately identified by

indicator analysis, but that the coolwater community has little utility in separating coldwater or coolwater streams from warmwater streams in Illinois.

Fidelity values and common species assessments (Table 20) largely overlap for cold and cool streams. Together, these two analyses suggest the occurrence of representative coldwater and coolwater fish communities, even though individual species may not be exclusively found in cold- and/or coolwater streams. For instance, a community containing southern redbelly dace, fantail darter, blacknose dace, and common shiner is likely present in a coldwater or coolwater stream in Illinois. Further analysis (e.g., Classification And Regression Tree [CART] analysis) may allow refinement of community typing although this was beyond the scope of the current study.

***Evaluation of Thermal Thresholds:***
Throughout this study we have used Wehrly *et al.'s* (2003) thermal thresholds for defining temperature categories. However, upon identifying coldwater predictor species and describing coldwater communities, it appears that the upper threshold for the coolwater category may not be high enough for Illinois streams given the presence of several species that are generally considered coldwater obligates in streams with mean daily July temperatures above 22$^{o}$C. Lyons *et al.* (2009) described a method for determining the upper and lower boundaries of the coolwater category by using the warmest temperature at which coldwater species are found (for the upper threshold) and the lowest temperature at which warmwater species are found (for the lower threshold). We applied this technique to evaluate the need to adjust thresholds for the coolwater category for Illinois streams.

Defining the upper threshold for the coolwater category requires comparing the distribution of coldwater species with their observed thermal distribution. Fortunately, information for these species had been obtained during previous tasks associated with predictor and community analysis. Each of the four identified predictor species (brown trout, longnose dace, mottled sculpin, brook stickleback) and the four significant coldwater indicator analysis species (Table 21; brook stickleback is included in the predictor group) were used to determine the upper coolwater category threshold. After removing the warmest 10% of mean daily July temperatures associated with each site-species combination, the highest observed mean daily July temperature for any of these eight species was 23.7$^{o}$C. Overall, 30 of 256 site-species combinations were over Wehrly *et al.'*s (2003) 22$^{o}$C threshold, suggesting the upper boundary of the coolwater category in Illinois may be slightly higher than what was found in their study. An additional 61 sites that were monitored during this study would be included in the coolwater category if the upper threshold was adjusted to 23.7$^{o}$C (Figure 20). In contrast to the 22$^{o}$C threshold sites which are located primarily in the northern third of Illinois, sites within a 23.7$^{o}$C threshold are distributed throughout the state. This pattern indicates many streams are near the 22$^{o}$C threshold and could contain transitional species or community types. These transitional streams may also provide an opportunity to investigate expectations regarding community shifts related to climate change scenarios (i.e., they may offer insight into future stream conditions). To identify the lower boundary of the coolwater condition (i.e., upper boundary of the coldwater category) using this method requires

determining warmwater fish species' thermal distributions (Table 19) at the coldest temperatures where they occur. This proved difficult with the low number of cold water sites and given the large number of eurythermal species we observed. For example the indicator analysis revealed that the bluntnose minnow was common in all three thermal categories. Due to these issues adjusting the lower temperature threshold for coolwater streams was deemed impractical and we suggest maintaining the 19.0 $^{o}$C lower boundary from Wehrly *et al.* (2003) at this time.

## Job 5: Conduct macroinvertebrate sampling at a subset of sites.

***Macroinvertebrate taxa as cold-/coolwater indicators:***
Twenty-four aquatic macroinvertebrate taxa (Table 23) were chosen as potential indicators of cold or cool thermal conditions. These taxa were selected based on their status as cool indicators in other Midwestern states (Iowa DNR 2004) and professional judgment. The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency's (IEPA) macroinvertebrate collection database was used to compare collection records for each taxon to sites with temperature records. Overlapping sites were documented and the mean of mean daily July temperature was calculated for sites in which each taxon was present.

Only eight of the 24 taxa were collected at sites for which temperature records were available (Table 23). Six of the eight taxa had observed mean daily July temperatures above the coolwater threshold, indicating none are useful indicator species. The remaining two taxa had too few associated temperature records to make a determination regarding their utility as indicator species. Although it would appear that the macroinvertebrate taxa proposed are poor indicators of thermal regime, many of these species emerge from streams prior to IEPA summer collection efforts. Some of these taxa may still have utility as indicator species if an alternate sampling protocol that included early spring collection was implemented.

We used macroinvertebrate community data from the IEPA's database to determine taxa richness for each site with a temperature record. Over a wide range in temperatures the standard expectation would be that cooler streams have lower taxa richness, and therefore this measure might be able to be used to identify coolwater streams. Mean taxa richness was 43.1 (range: 11-109) at coldwater sites, 56.8 (range: 8-123) at coolwater, and 61.6 (range: 17-121) at warmwater. Taxa richness was higher in warmwater than coldwater streams (t-test, $p=0.003$) and higher in coolwater than coldwater ($p=0.038$), but coolwater richness did not differ from warmwater ($p=0.375$), a result which mirrors that of species richness for fish communities.

***Mussel species as cold-/coolwater indicators:***
Patterns of freshwater mussel distribution were also analyzed to determine if species from this group have utility as indicators of cold or cool thermal conditions. Professional malacologists and Natural Heritage Biologists from Illinois (e.g., Kevin Cummings, Robert Szafoni) were consulted to determine which species might favor coolwater conditions. Two species were selected for this analysis of thermal preference; Ellipse,

(*Venustaconcha ellipsiformis*) and Elktoe (*Alasmidonta marginata*). Collection records for these two species were provided by the IDNR and Illinois Natural History Survey (INHS) mussel databases, and inhabited locations were matched with collected temperature records.

Nineteen temperature records from eleven sites were available for the Ellipse. Mean daily July temperature for those records ranged from 18.08 – 24.6$^{o}$C with eight records above the coolwater threshold, indicating the presence of this species is not suitable as an indicator of cold or cool conditions. Only two temperature records were available at locations in Illinois where the Elktoe was present (20.4 and 22.5$^{o}$C), and one of the two was above the coolwater threshold.

## Job 6: Compile and analyze data and write report.

***Study summary and conclusions:***
A prevailing goal of this study was to locate cool streams within Illinois, either through direct monitoring of temperature or through surrogate measures (e.g., predictive models or indicator characteristics). To this end, 203 temperature records were collected in addition to the 77 secured prior to study initiation. Of the 232 sites monitored, 106 were classified as cold or cool (Figure 7). Temperature data also were used in conjunction with other information to characterize physical and biotic components of cold-/coolwater streams. Detailed data collection methods and analyses are presented above in Jobs 1-5.

Many physical and biological attributes were examined to characterize coldwater and coolwater streams and allow for rapid determination of where these streams are located. Several analyses yielded results with potential to consistently detect thermal category. Darcy Model predictions of potential groundwater movement are good predictors of cold and cool stream conditions where the Model indicates extreme values. Direct measurements of water temperature in the hyporheic zone were also relatively accurate at detecting cold and cool streams where the substrate permitted these measurements. Several habitat measurements were correlated with thermal character (e.g., water flow and percent forest in riparian zones and watersheds).

Although identifying coolwater streams with potential groundwater inputs was moderately successful (i.e., Darcy Model), the initial list of "coolwater" fish species proved less useful. Monitoring at candidate cold and cool streams in Illinois (Job 2) revealed that only two of the 17 original indicator species were observed to be always located within cold or cool streams (brown trout and longnose dace), although two others (brook stickleback and mottled sculpin) were very rarely observed outside of these conditions. Certain fish community assemblages also had some utility as predictors of stream thermal regimes. This low accuracy is partly a reflection of insufficient information related to thermal preference for these species in Illinois. Further consideration of ecological factors that influence their distributions would assist in determining fish species and biological assemblages that are characteristic of the different thermal habitats occurring in Illinois wadeable streams.

The lack of a single definitive indicator of stream thermal regime suggests that observed water temperatures are based on multiple factors acting at several scales There is little doubt climate and local weather affects stream temperature (e.g., Figure 4), but many of the watershed scale factors we examined were poorly correlated with observed stream temperature (e.g., Table 15). Similarly, many of the local scale factors we measured were poor predictors of stream temperature (e.g., Figures 15, 16). These results may reflect our failure to measure or detect those characteristics that are directly related with observed water temperature (e.g., field tile inputs, depth to groundwater), or that many factors act upon temperature simultaneously and diminish our analytic power in detecting direct correlations. Certainly, additional correlates exist that we have not considered or do not have the ability to measure.

***Study's relationship to Species in Greatest Need of Conservation:***
Thirteen of the original 17 proposed coolwater fish species, and eight of the 24 additional species examined in this study are listed in the Illinois Wildlife Action Plan as Species in Greatest Need of Conservation (SGNC) (Illinois Department of Natural Resources 2005). Mottled sculpin and brook stickleback, which were determined to be preliminary indicators of cool conditions in Illinois, and longnose dace, a coolwater indicator species, are included in the SGNC list. Data collected during this study will assist future revisions of the IWAP by refining thermal expectations for fish species in greatest need of conservation and for instream habitats. We have also provided additional information regarding the range of thermal tolerance in other lotic species.

## Data gaps and proposed future efforts:

As results of this study highlight, coldwater and coolwater streams in Illinois are more common than generally realized and may differ from their counterparts in adjacent Midwestern states. However, many questions regarding their physical processes and ecological function remain. For instance, designating the extent of cold or cool stream reaches based on a single point measurement of temperature is a difficult task. A temperature record is certainly valid for the specific location (i.e., within the immediate habitat) and time, but the lateral, longitudinal, and temporal extent to which this temperature can be applied varies due to catchment wide and local conditions. Network sampling conducted during this study indicates that a point measurement likely does not represent the entire upstream extent or adjacent branches of the stream network. An alternate sampling protocol conducted at a finer scale may be required to verify the thermal regime in adjacent stream reaches although predictive models can be used as a preliminary indicator in their absence. Additional information is also needed to further assess the biological assemblages present in cold-/coolwater streams. Several of the fish species used in the indicator analysis have temperature records associated with only a few of their known locations resulting in an incomplete assessment of their thermal tolerance. Several other species (i.e., mottled sculpin and brook stickleback) have a single associated temperature record above the coolwater threshold we used in this study, thereby eliminating them as a primary indicator species in some of our analyses despite their inclination for cool streams. Further complications regarding fish indicator analysis

occur because fish collection records exist for only a small proportion of Illinois stream segments. This is highlighted by the supplemental electrofishing samples taken during this study (Job 4) at three IEPA stations (PQE-10, PQDA-01, and AO-03), which revealed new records at these locations for 14 species including potential indicator species.

Our study found coolwater and warmwater fish communities that contained similar species but with different relative abundances. Populations of cold- and/or coolwater fish species were also frequently observed at low or very low abundances. Many of these stream segments appear to be thermally stressful for these species and are putting their populations at risk. Continued warming due to changes in landcover, landuse, or climate change will likely exacerbate this problem and could lead to further homogenization of fish assemblages by removing the thermally sensitive species from these unique habitats.

Although it was beyond the scope of this project we suggest that a review of the map based on the temperature model be made by an expert panel with knowledge of local streams conditions. Such an effort was undertaken in Michigan and resulted in a small revision of their stream temperature designations (<5% of segments; P. W. Seelbach personnel communication) and a greater acceptance of the product by managers.

In addition we suggest that temperature monitoring in streams becomes part of normal operations within the comprehensive basin survey program. Temperature loggers are relatively inexpensive (<$100) and simple to deploy. Currently available data are not sufficient for trend analysis, identifying interannual variability in thermal conditions, and are mainly restricted to the summer. Thermal records are also uncommon for headwater segments and are available at few locations on larger streams and rivers. A carefully designed temperature monitoring program linked with biological monitoring would provide information to track potential impacts of landscape alteration and climate change on stream thermal regimes and their associated biota.

## Literature Cited:


Aquatic Research Center of the Indiana Biological Survey. 2007. Development of Coolwater Index of Biotic Integrity Expectations for Use in Streams and Rivers Indiana and Review of Existing Data. Technical Report 2007-01.

Baker, M. E., M. J. Wiley, M. L. Carlson, and P.W. Seelbach. 2003. A GIS Model of Subsurface Water Potential for Aquatic Resource inventory, Assessment, and Environmental Management. Environmental Management 32(6): 706-719.

Dodd, H.R., J.W. Neisler, and D.H. Wahl. 2005. Evaluation of Watershed Management Practices for Improving Stream Quality in the Illinois Watershed Program. INHS Center for Aquatic Ecology and Conservation, Champaign, Illinois.

Google, Inc. 2010. Google Earth Version 5.2.1.1588. http://www.google.com/earth/index.html

Holtrop, A.M., D. Day, C. Dolan, and J. Epifanio. 2005. Ecological Classification of Rivers for Environmental Assessment and Management: Stream Attribution and Model Preparation. Illinois Natural History Survey Technical Report 2005(04).

Holtrop, A.M., L. C. Hinz Jr., and J. Epifanio. 2006. Ecological Classification of Rivers for Environmental Assessment and Management: Model Development and Risk Assessment. Illinois Natural History Survey Technical Report 2006(12).

Illinois Department of Natural Resources. 2005. The Illinois Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plan and Strategy, Version 1.0.

Illinois State Water Survey. 2003. Biological and Physical Monitoring of Waukegan River Restoration Efforts in Biotechnical Bank Protection and Pool/Riffle Protection.

Illinois State Water Survey. 2010. Illinois Climate Network Data webpage. http://www.isws.illinois.edu/warm/datatype.asp, Accessed September 2010.

Iowa Department of Natural Resources. 2004. Cold Water Use Designation Assessment Protocol.

Lyons, J., T. Zorn, J. Stewart, P. Seelbach, K. Wehrly, and L. Wang. 2009. Defining and Characterizing Coolwater Streams and Their Fish Assemblages in Michigan and Wisconsin, USA. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 29: 1130-1151.

Sass, L., L.C. Hinz Jr., J. Epifanio, and A.M. Holtrop. 2010. Developing a Multimetric Habitat Index for Wadeable Streams in Illinois. Illinois Natural History Survey Technical Report 2010(21).

State of Ohio Environmental Protection Angecy. 1987. Biological Criteria for the Protection of Aquatic Life: Volume II: Users Manual for Biological Field Assessment of Ohio Surface Waters.

Tate, K.W., D.L. Lancaster, and D.F. Lile. 2006. Assessment of thermal stratification within pools as a mechanism to provide refugia for native trout in hot, arid rangelands. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 124: 289-300.

Torgersen, C.E., D.M. Price, H.W. Li, and B.A. McIntosh. 1999. Multiscale thermal refugia and stream habitat association of Chinook Salmon in northeastern Oregon. Ecological Applications 9: 301-319.

Wehrly, K. E., M. J. Wiley, and P. W. Seelbach. 2003. Classifying regional variation in thermal regime based on stream fish community patterns. Transactions of the American Fisheries Society 132:18-38.

## Acknowledgements:

This study was funded with a cooperative State Wildlife Grant through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (T-13-P-001). Many people and organizations contributed to the planning and implementation of this study.

Specific appreciation goes to the following:

**Illinois Department of Natural Resources' Office of Resource Conservation:** Joel Cross (Watershed Protection Section); Bob Szafoni (Division of Natural Heritage); Trent Thomas, Gary Lutterbie, Steve Pescitelli, Doug Carney, Karen Rivera, Randy Sauer, Robert Rung, Jana Hirst (Fisheries Division).

**Illinois Natural History Survey:** Brian Anderson, Yong Cao, Kevin Cummings, Ed DeWalt, John Epifanio, Mike Retzer, Laura Sass, Greg Sass and the Illinois River Biological Station (for loaning us the backpack shocking unit).

**Illinois State Water Survey:** Bill White (for providing some temperature records).

Robert Fischer and students (Eastern Illinois University).

Coolwater streams (T-13) and wadeable streams habitat index (T-25) interns in Springfield, including Otis Foster, McKenzie Stock, Jackie Negro, and Bill House.

Illinois Council of Trout Unlimited and the Forbes and Oak Brook Chapters.

Paul Seelbach (USGS), Kevin Wehrly (Michigan DNR) and John Lyons (Wisconsin DNR) for discussions on thermal characteristics of Midwestern streams and a variety of other topics.

# Tables

**Table 1. Coolwater fish species candidate list**

| Common Name | Scientific Name |
|---|---|
| Northern brook lamprey | *Ichthyomyzon fossor* |
| American brook lamprey | *Lampetra lamottei* |
| Least brook lamprey | *Lampetra aepyptera* |
| Brown trout | *Salmo trutta* |
| Rainbow trout | *Salmo gairdneri* |
| Southern redbelly dace | *Phoxinus erythrogaster* |
| Blacknose dace | *Rhinichthys atratulus* |
| Longnose dace | *Rhinichthys cataractae* |
| Ozark minnow | *Dionda nubila* |
| Weed shiner | *Notropis texanus* |
| Ironcolor shiner | *Notropis chalybaeus* |
| Ninespine stickleback | *Pungitius pungitius* |
| Brook stickleback | *Culaea inconstans* |
| Banded sculpin | *Cottus carolinae* |
| Mottled sculpin | *Cottus bairdi* |
| Iowa darter | *Etheostoma exile* |
| Least darter | *Etheostoma microperca* |

**Table 2. Proportion of cold or cool streams in Illinois**

| Method Used to Determine Proportion | Sites/Arcs Predicted | Statewide Sites/Arcs | Proportion Cold or Cool |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Predictive Methods:* | | | |
| Darcy Model Stream Arcs (≤ 1 negative st. dev.) | 1766 | 47,430 | 0.037 |
| Candidate List - Fish Sites Only | 88 | 7549 | 0.012 |
| Candidate List - Fish Plus Groundwater Potential Sites | 111 | 7549 | 0.015 |
| Temperature Model Stream Arcs (< 22°C) | 6247 | 47,335 | 0.132 |
| Darcy Model Stream Arcs (≤ -50.0 output value) | 3601 | 47,430 | 0.076 |
| | Sites Varified | Sampled Sites | Proportion Cold or Cool |
| *Measurements:* | | | |
| Temperature Measurement Sites (< 22°C)* | 82 | 232 | 0.353 |
| Site Records of Coolwater Indicator Fish Species** | 44 | 1186 | 0.037 |

* if multiple years sampled, at least one year was cold or cool.
** total sites determined by counting the number of sites assessed by the IDNR from 1997-2007.

**Table 3. Validation of candidate coolwater sites**

Sites Based on Presence of Fish Species (n=88):

| Verified Coolwater Sites | Sites Determined to be Warmwater | Untested Sites | |
|---|---|---|---|
| DKV-01 | ADD-02 | AD-05 | LDE-03 |
| DTK-06 | ADDB-01 | AD-06 | MJA-01 |
| DTZD-01 | ADL-01 | AD-08 | MJB-03 |
| MJ-02 | AJ-09 | ADD-01 | MN-04 |
| MN-18* | AJF-16 | BE-15 | MN-07 |
| MND-01* | AJG-18 | BNB-02 | MQ-02 |
| MNIA-11 | AOA-01 | DH-03 | MQB-01 |
| PK-01 | DI-03 | DJ-14 | NDD-03 |
| PLE-03 | DJJ-04 | DJHA-01 | O-40 |
| PP-01 | DTC-07 | DJI-01 | PB-05 |
| PWI-01 | DZA-02 | DJIA-01 | PBU-10 |
| QC-03 | DZA-03 | DJJ-03 | PH-16 |
| | FCC-01 | DJNA-01 | PHE-01 |
| | FLDA-01 | DJZS-01 | PIA-01 |
| | ICD-02 | DK-15 | PQ-14 |
| | IXJ-01 | DKK-01 | PQC-09 |
| | IXJ-02 | DLG-01 | PQF-08 |
| | PQB-04 | DQD-02 | PWN-03 |
| | | DQF-01 | PWNA-02 |
| | | DSA-02 | PWPA-01 |
| | | DTAB-01 | PZZL-01 |
| | | DTB-02 | QC-02 |
| | | DTF-04 | |
| | | DZJ-01 | |
| | | EE-02 | |
| | | EE-03 | |
| | | EIE-10 | |
| | | F-01 | |
| | | F-02 | |
| | | F-04 | |
| | | F-06 | |
| | | F-15 | |
| | | FLD-01 | |
| | | IC-03 | |
| | | IXJ-03 | |
| | | LDB-01 | |

**Table 3. Validation of candidate coolwater sites (continued)**

Sites Based on Presence of Fish Species and groundwater potential (n=111):

| Verified Coolwater Sites | Sites Determined to be Warmwater | Untested Sites | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DQD-01 | FKA-01 | AD-09 | DZ3P-01 | PWB-03 |
| DTC-05 | FLD-03 | AO-02 | DZG-02 | PWBA-01 |
| DTCA-01 | FLI-06 | AO-03 | DZIA-01 | PWH-01 |
| DTF-02* | IXD-01 | DB-03 | EEA-02 | PWNA-01 |
| DTZP-04 | KCL-01 | DJA-02 | EH-01 | PWNA-03 |
| DTZT-01 | OZZD-03 | DJBZ-01 | EH-03 | PZR-01 |
| DTZT-02 | PWA-01 | DJD-02 | F-03 | |
| EH-02 | | DJDB-01 | F-14 | |
| FLDAE-01 | | DJJB-05 | FQ-01 | |
| MJA-02 | | DJL-02 | IC-01 | |
| MNI-12 | | DJM-01 | ICE-01 | |
| PBM-11 | | DJZA-01 | JH-03 | |
| PHB-01 | | DJZF-01 | KCA-02 | |
| PN-02 | | DJZN-01 | KCAA-01 | |
| PN-03 | | DK-17 | OQA-01 | |
| PQCK-01 | | DK-19 | PBD-02 | |
| PQD-05 | | DKE-01 | PBG-10 | |
| PQD-06 | | DKF-11 | PBJA-02 | |
| PQE-06 | | DLF-01 | PBJA-05 | |
| PQEA-01 | | DM-01 | PBO-10 | |
| PQEF-01 | | DP-02 | PBP-01 | |
| PQH-01 | | DP-03 | PH-17 | |
| PQJ-01 | | DP-04 | PLC-01 | |
| PSB-01 | | DQ-01 | POA-01 | |
| PT-01 | | DQ-03 | PQ-02 | |
| PWC-01 | | DTC-02 | PQ-07 | |
| PWIA-01 | | DTCA-02 | PQB-03 | |
| PWPC-01 | | DTCA-04 | PQCB-01 | |
| PWQ-04 | | DTD-06 | PQD-07 | |
| | | DTD-07 | PQE-07 | |
| | | DTD-08 | PQI-02 | |
| | | DTG-01 | PQI-10 | |
| | | DTZL-02 | PQIC-02 | |
| | | DWBB-01 | PV-01 | |

* site also falls into warm category during one or more sample years.

**Table 4. Variation in July and August mean daily temperature.**

| | |
|---|---|
| *Summary Data:* | |
| n | 142 |
| mean difference (July - August mdt*, $^{o}$C) | 0.27 |
| maximum (July - August mdt, $^{o}$C) | 6.02 |
| maximum (August - July mdt, $^{o}$C) | 6.57 |
| | |
| *Variation in Thermal Category**:* | |
| n cold to cool | 7 |
| n cold to warm | 1 |
| n cool to cold | 1 |
| n cool to warm | 5 |
| n warm to cold | 0 |
| n warm to cool | 24 |
| | |
| n warmed at least one category (n=64) | 13 |
| n cooled at least one category (n=115) | 25 |

* mdt = mean daily temperature
** change in thermal category when July mdt compared to August mdt

**Table 5. Air temperature and annual variation in July and August mean daily temperature**

*Annual variation in July and August stream temperature:*

| Year | n* | Mean Change in Temperature, $^{o}$C** | Maximum Difference, $^{o}$C** | Minumim Difference, $^{o}$C** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1999 | 4 | 3.65 | 6.57 | 1.85 |
| 2001 | 5 | 0.81 | 2.54 | -0.91 |
| 2002 | 4 | 1.03 | 1.53 | 0.09 |
| 2003 | 15 | -0.12 | 3.32 | -3.08 |
| 2004 | 12 | 2.15 | 3.66 | -0.24 |
| 2005 | 4 | 1.86 | 4.59 | -0.02 |
| 2006 | 1 | n/a | 0.52 | n/a |
| 2007 | 25 | -0.71 | 1.16 | -3.19 |
| 2008 | 31 | 0.35 | 5.24 | -6.02 |
| 2009 | 39 | -0.84 | 1.03 | -5.21 |
| 2010 | 2 | -0.05 | 1.21 | -1.31 |

* number of sites with comlete July and August temperature data.

** July minus August mean daily temperature

*Illinois climate summary, Springfield weather station:*

| Year | July Mean Temp., $^{o}$C | August Mean Temp., $^{o}$C. |
|---|---|---|
| 1999 | 77.9 | 71.5 |
| 2001 | 76.6 | 74.1 |
| 2002 | 78 | 75 |
| 2003 | 75 | 75.3 |
| 2004 | 73.1 | 68.8 |
| 2005 | 76.7 | 76.6 |
| 2006 | 74.9 | 64.5 |
| 2007 | 73 | 79.3 |
| 2008 | 74.2 | 71.6 |
| 2009 | 71.3 | 71.8 |
| 2010 | 79.2 | 78.6 |

**Table 6. Summary of sampled streams.**

| Site Code* | Stream Name | Mean Daily July Temperature | Maximum Daily Temperature Range | Year Sampled |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Coldwater sites:* | | | | |
| BPB-01 | Whippoorwill Branch | 18.95 | 5.06 | 2009 |
| DKU-01 | Patton Creek | 18.90 | 10.52 | 2009 |
| DTC-05 | Big Rock Creek | 15.92 | 4.98 | 2005 |
| DTZD-01 | Mission Creek | 18.90 | 4.19 | 2009 |
| EIEI-03 | Little Kickapoo Creek North | 18.70 | 8.66 | 2007 |
| IXF-01 | Mill Creek | 18.15 | 4.95 | 2008 |
| MJA-02 | Camp Creek | 17.20 | 4.00 | 2009 |
| MND-01 | Furnace Creek | 18.51 | 5.62 | 2009 |
| MNDA-01 | Long Hollow | 17.71 | 7.72 | 2009 |
| MNF-01 | Welsh Hollow | 16.78 | 6.00 | 2009 |
| MNIA-11 | Clear Creek | 18.20 | 4.67 | 2008 |
| PHB-01 | Sugar Creek | 17.61 | 4.76 | 2010 |
| PK-01 | Franklin Creek | 17.79 | 4.76 | 2009 |
| PQE-10 | Piscasaw Creek | 14.17 | 7.64 | 2008 |
| PQE-10 | Piscasaw Creek | 18.03 | 6.68 | 2010 |
| PQFX-XX | Hampshire Creek | 18.10 | 8.39 | 2009 |
| PQH-01 | Rush Creek | 18.08 | 7.82 | 2009 |
| PSB-01 | North Fork Kent Creek | 17.36 | 7.34 | 2009 |
| PT-01 | South Kinnikinnik Creek | 18.31 | 9.81 | 2003 |
| PT-01 | South Kinnikinnik Creek | 18.15 | 6.38 | 2007 |
| PU-01 | North Kinnikinnik Creek | 18.46 | 3.81 | 2009 |
| PWBA-01 | North Branch Otter Creek | 17.00 | 4.48 | 2010 |
| PWC-01 | Rhule Creek | 15.77 | 13.11 | 2003 |
| PWC-01 | Rhule Creek | 15.01 | 11.00 | 2007 |
| PWC-01 | Rhule Creek | 14.63 | 8.50 | 2008 |
| PWC-01 | Rhule Creek | 13.71 | 8.02 | 2009 |
| PWC-01 | Rhule Creek | 15.71 | 9.28 | 2010 |
| PWI-01 | Rock Run | 17.86 | 7.15 | 2008 |
| PWIA-01 | Pink Creek | 16.18 | 5.63 | 2009 |
| PWNA-04 | Crane Grove Creek | 16.29 | 5.25 | 2009 |
| PWPC-01 | East Branch Richland Creek | 17.80 | 6.00 | 2010 |
| PWX-XX | Tunnison Creek | 18.57 | 6.39 | 2010 |
| QCA-01 | South Branch Waukegan River | 17.07 | 7.73 | 2009 |
| QF-01 | Kellog Ravine | 17.17 | 5.24 | 2009 |
| *Coolwater sites:* | | | | |
| BPJ-09 | Salt Fork Vermilion River | 21.73 | 12.25 | 2003 |
| BPJ-09 | Salt Fork Vermilion River | 21.85 | 5.49 | 2009 |
| BPZA-01 | Willow Creek | 20.06 | 4.60 | 2009 |
| DKK-XX | Panther Creek | 21.01 | 3.24 | 2009 |
| DKV-01 | Henline Creek | 20.59 | 8.09 | 2009 |
| DQD-01 | West Bureau Creek | 19.59 | 6.87 | 2009 |
| DRA-02 | Tomahawk Creek | 20.90 | 4.87 | 2009 |

**Table 6. Summary of sampled streams (continued).**

| Site Code* | Stream Name | Mean Daily July Temperature | Maximum Daily Temperature Range | Year Sampled |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| DTC-05 | Big Rock Creek | 21.89 | 4.73 | 2010 |
| DTCA-01 | Little Rock Creek | 21.83 | 7.29 | 2004 |
| DTE-01 | Waubansee Creek | 21.77 | 7.66 | 2009 |
| DTF-02 | Ferson Creek | 20.49 | 5.00 | 2009 |
| DTK-06 | Nippersink Creek | 21.05 | 7.44 | 2008 |
| DTKA-04 | North Branch | 21.57 | 5.34 | 2008 |
| DTZP-04 | Tyler Creek | 19.75 | 5.37 | 2009 |
| DTZT-02 | Boone Creek | 20.05 | 7.15 | 2008 |
| DZP-03 | Spring Creek | 19.95 | 5.63 | 2009 |
| edwar 558 | North Henderson Creek | 21.29 | 6.13 | 2010 |
| EH-02 | Crane Creek | 20.69 | 13.30 | 2004 |
| EH-02 | Crane Creek | 21.92 | 13.34 | 2007 |
| EH-02 | Crane Creek | 21.63 | 8.32 | 2008 |
| EH-02 | Crane Creek | 19.69 | 7.85 | 2009 |
| EH-02 | Crane Creek | 21.86 | 8.39 | 2010 |
| EIEM-02 | Unnamed Trib. To Kickapoo Ck. | 19.13 | 9.47 | 2007 |
| EQ-01 | Mosquito Creek | 21.61 | 5.76 | 2008 |
| EY-01 | Drummer Creek | 19.72 | 9.45 | 2009 |
| EZZH-02 | Dickerson Slough | 21.78 | 9.29 | 2003 |
| FLDAE-01 | Little Beaver Creek | 20.88 | 7.58 | 2008 |
| GV-01 | Bull Creek | 21.77 | 6.23 | 2003 |
| illin 17241 | Fancy Creek | 20.63 | 7.49 | 2010 |
| illin 7626 | Camp Creek | 21.81 | 8.21 | 2010 |
| illin14115 | Main Ditch | 20.05 | 5.35 | 2010 |
| IXF-01 | Mill Creek | 19.17 | 3.66 | 2009 |
| IXF-01 | Mill Creek | 20.94 | 2.96 | 2010 |
| MJ-02 | Plum River | 20.65 | 7.46 | 2008 |
| MJA-02 | Camp Creek | 20.04 | 4.57 | 2010 |
| MJB-02 | Carroll Creek | 20.46 | 4.86 | 2010 |
| MN-18 | Apple River | 21.73 | 9.29 | 2003 |
| MN-18 | Apple River | 19.27 | 6.31 | 2009 |
| MND-01 | Furnace Creek | 20.20 | 6.01 | 2010 |
| MNI-12 | South Fork Apple Rver | 20.22 | 6.08 | 2007 |
| MPA-01 | Smallpox Creek | 19.72 | 5.25 | 2009 |
| MU-01 | Menominee River | 20.37 | 6.01 | 2010 |
| O-70 | Kaskaskia River | 21.10 | 9.25 | 2008 |
| OJCX-XX | Webster Creek | 21.49 | 2.90 | 2009 |
| OL-05 | Hurricane Creek | 21.83 | 4.52 | 2009 |
| PBG-10 | Big Slough Ditch | 21.64 | 7.98 | 2010 |
| PBM-11 | Fairfield Ditch | 19.30 | 5.77 | 2009 |
| PK-01 | Franklin Creek | 20.92 | 6.44 | 2003 |
| PK-01 | Franklin Creek | 20.19 | 6.52 | 2007 |
| PK-01 | Franklin Creek | 19.84 | 5.24 | 2008 |
| PK-01 | Franklin Creek | 21.03 | 4.79 | 2010 |
| PL-03 | Kyte River | 19.68 | 5.33 | 2009 |
| PLE-03 | Prairie Creek | 21.21 | 5.66 | 2010 |

**Table 6. Summary of sampled streams (continued).**

| Site Code* | Stream Name | Mean Daily July Temperature | Maximum Daily Temperature Range | Year Sampled |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| PN-02 | Leaf River | 20.11 | 4.30 | 2007 |
| PN-03 | Leaf River | 21.88 | 3.81 | 2007 |
| PP-01 | Stillman Creek | 21.68 | 7.74 | 2007 |
| PQC-11 | South Branch Kishwaukee R. | 20.39 | 4.48 | 2009 |
| PQCK-01 | Rosseter Farm Creek | 20.49 | 8.80 | 2010 |
| PQD-05 | Beaver Creek | 21.35 | 7.57 | 2007 |
| PQD-06 | Beaver Creek | 21.25 | 6.96 | 2010 |
| PQDA-01 | Mosquito Creek | 19.10 | 6.29 | 2007 |
| PQE-06 | Piscasaw Creek | 20.05 | 6.59 | 2010 |
| PQEA-01 | Moakler Creek | 19.20 | 5.52 | 2008 |
| PQEF-01 | Little Beaver Creek | 20.27 | 8.54 | 2010 |
| PQJ-01 | North Branch | 19.67 | 6.58 | 2009 |
| PSB-01 | North Fork Kent Creek | 19.96 | 6.92 | 2003 |
| PSB-01 | North Fork Kent Creek | 21.62 | 7.09 | 2010 |
| PWQ-04 | Waddams Creek | 19.13 | 4.76 | 2010 |
| PX-XX | Clear Creek | 19.12 | 7.25 | 2010 |
| QC-03 | Waukegan River | 21.29 | 4.48 | 2008 |
| rockr 6825 | Trib. To Kyte River | 20.33 | 7.46 | 2010 |
| *Warmwater sites:* | | | | |
| ADCD-01 | New Columbia Ditch | 25.33 | 9.01 | 2008 |
| ADD-02 | Dutchman Creek | 24.25 | 5.89 | 2008 |
| ADDB-01 | Little Cache Creek | 24.12 | 2.32 | 2008 |
| ADL-01 | Lick Creek | 22.88 | 3.85 | 2008 |
| AJ-08 | Bay Creek | 24.07 | 3.36 | 2007 |
| AJ-09 | Bay Creek | 24.53 | 5.63 | 2008 |
| AJ-11 | Bay Creek | 27.04 | 3.28 | 2007 |
| AJF-16 | Cedar Creek | 22.25 | 3.08 | 2008 |
| AJG-18 | Hayes Creek | 23.19 | 2.20 | 2003 |
| AK-02 | Lusk Creek | 24.68 | 4.25 | 2009 |
| AK-02 | Lusk Creek | 28.03 | 1.66 | 2010 |
| AK-02 | Lusk Creek | 25.10 | 4.66 | 2003 |
| AK-07 | Lusk Creek | 27.01 | 2.53 | 2007 |
| AL-01 | Big Grand Pierre Creek | 27.25 | 5.72 | 2007 |
| AOA-01 | Hog Thief Creek | 22.10 | 4.45 | 2008 |
| ATF-06 | North Fork Saline River | 27.79 | 11.77 | 2003 |
| ATHD-01 | Little Saline River | 25.46 | 3.18 | 2007 |
| ATHD-03 | Little Saline River | 25.31 | 2.09 | 2007 |
| ATHG-02 | Sugr Creek | 26.51 | 7.80 | 2007 |
| ATHG-07 | Sugr Creek | 26.83 | 3.01 | 2007 |
| ATHW-01 | Maple Branch | 24.51 | 3.84 | 2007 |
| BE-01 | Embarras River | 22.80 | 8.37 | 2003 |
| BE-17 | Embarras River | 24.93 | 4.08 | 2003 |
| bearc 158 | Rocky Run | 25.00 | 10.56 | 2010 |

**Table 6. Summary of sampled streams (continued).**

| Site Code* | Stream Name | Mean Daily July Temperature | Maximum Daily Temperature Range | Year Sampled |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| BEL-03 | Hurricane Creek | 25.89 | 6.75 | 1999 |
| BEN-01 | Kickapoo Creek | 25.37 | 4.59 | 2002 |
| BEN-02 | Kickapoo Creek | 25.83 | 8.13 | 1999 |
| BENA-01 | Riley Creek | 22.46 | 6.06 | 2004 |
| BEZZ-05 | Brushy Fork | 23.84 | 3.90 | 2008 |
| BF-01 | Sugar Creek | 23.08 | 7.84 | 2004 |
| BFC-11 | Robinson Creek | 27.73 | 7.83 | 2003 |
| BFC-20 | Robinson Creek | 23.03 | 4.74 | 2003 |
| BJ-01 | Big Creek | 23.67 | 9.91 | 2009 |
| BJ-02 | Big Creek | 24.22 | 9.84 | 2009 |
| bmudd 2128 | Lake Creek | 23.59 | 6.88 | 2010 |
| BNB-01 | Crabapple Creek | 22.35 | 6.86 | 2008 |
| BPJA-01 | Jordan Creek | 26.11 | 9.43 | 2005 |
| BPJC-10 | Saline Branch | 23.40 | 5.15 | 2007 |
| BPJC-10 | Saline Branch | 22.24 | 4.52 | 2008 |
| broui 76 | South Fork Brouilletts Creek | 24.92 | 7.49 | 2010 |
| BZO-01 | Hutson Creek | 25.39 | 4.51 | 2010 |
| CA-08 | Skillet Fork | 23.63 | 3.02 | 2003 |
| CAGC-01 | Auxier Creek | 25.39 | 17.04 | 2004 |
| CAGC-01 | Auxier Creek | 25.81 | 13.00 | 2009 |
| CJ-06 | Big Muddy Creek | 23.29 | 4.33 | 2003 |
| DF-05 | Indian Creek | 24.10 | 10.32 | 2004 |
| DGL-04 | East Fork La Moline River | 23.56 | 5.38 | 2003 |
| DGLC-01 | Drowning Fork | 22.85 | 8.68 | 2003 |
| DI-03 | Otter Creek | 23.89 | 4.76 | 2008 |
| DJH-03 | Haw Creek | 25.25 | 7.95 | 2002 |
| DJH-04 | Haw Creek | 25.18 | 11.00 | 2002 |
| DJJ-04 | Court Creek | 24.45 | 6.60 | 2002 |
| DJJB-04 | North Creek | 24.45 | 6.60 | 2002 |
| DKJ-03 | Walnut Creek | 25.25 | 7.95 | 2002 |
| DKV-01 | Henline Creek | 23.76 | 7.50 | 2006 |
| DSB-02 | Otter Creek | 22.99 | 7.79 | 2003 |
| DSG-01 | Mud Creek | 22.70 | 7.86 | 2003 |
| DSH-01 | Scattering Point Creek | 23.60 | 6.34 | 2003 |
| DSH-02 | Scattering Point Creek | 24.90 | 6.92 | 2003 |
| DTC-04 | Big Rock Creek | 23.04 | 6.93 | 2005 |
| DTC-07 | Big Rock Creek | 22.98 | 4.54 | 2007 |
| DTD-02 | Blackberry Creek | 24.94 | 6.37 | 2008 |
| DTF-02 | Ferson Creek | 24.63 | 5.47 | 2010 |
| DTZI-01 | Rob Roy Creek | 22.24 | 9.40 | 2008 |
| DVE-03 | West Fork Mazon River | 23.30 | 10.53 | 2009 |
| DZA-02 | Otter Creek | 27.48 | 5.48 | 2007 |
| DZA-03 | Otter Creek | 23.65 | 7.53 | 2004 |
| E-05 | Sangamon River | 26.98 | 4.35 | 2003 |
| edwar 1591 | Cedar Glen Creek | 23.99 | 6.64 | 2010 |
| edwar 37 | Camp Creek | 22.17 | 5.41 | 2010 |

**Table 6. Summary of sampled streams (continued).**

| Site Code* | Stream Name | Mean Daily July Temperature | Maximum Daily Temperature Range | Year Sampled |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| EI-11 | Salt Creek | 25.17 | 3.96 | 2007 |
| EI-11 | Salt Creek | 23.92 | 5.76 | 2008 |
| EID-01 | Sugar Creek | 23.78 | 9.41 | 2004 |
| EIE-18 | Kickapoo Creek | 22.24 | 10.21 | 2007 |
| EIEI-02 | Little Kickapoo Creek North | 23.67 | 9.69 | 2007 |
| EIG-02 | Lake Fork | 26.23 | 12.89 | 2007 |
| EIH-01 | Ten Mile Creek | 22.52 | 6.05 | 2003 |
| EL-01 | Spring Creek West | 24.47 | 7.40 | 2007 |
| embar 1224 | East Crooked Creek | 25.72 | 4.90 | 2010 |
| EOC-02 | Horse Creek | 22.81 | 5.75 | 2007 |
| EOH-01 | Flat Branch | 26.31 | 7.45 | 2007 |
| EOH-01 | Flat Branch | 24.64 | 5.53 | 2008 |
| EQ-01 | Mosquito Creek | 23.17 | 9.27 | 2007 |
| EQ-01 | Mosquito Creek | 24.52 | 3.34 | 2010 |
| ES-13 | Steven's Creek | 23.25 | 4.76 | 2003 |
| EY-01 | Drummer Creek | 26.41 | 10.92 | 2010 |
| EY-01 | Drummer Creek | 24.64 | 12.25 | 2003 |
| FCC-01 | East Branch Horse Creek | 24.23 | 10.64 | 2008 |
| FKA-01 | Exline Slough | 22.45 | 5.97 | 2008 |
| FLD-03 | Beaver Creek | 24.86 | 5.15 | 2006 |
| FLDA-01 | Little Beaver Creek | 23.69 | 7.54 | 2003 |
| FLDA-04 | Little Beaver Creek | 25.33 | 10.51 | 2004 |
| FLE-01 | Langan Creek | 24.93 | 5.85 | 2008 |
| FLE-01 | Langan Creek | 23.81 | 3.72 | 2007 |
| FLF-01 | Pike Creek | 24.25 | 9.62 | 2006 |
| FLH-01 | Spring Creek | 23.77 | 6.16 | 2007 |
| FLH-01 | Spring Creek | 23.59 | 6.53 | 2008 |
| FLH-03 | Spring Creek | 26.77 | 14.08 | 2007 |
| FLHA-01 | Shavetail Creek | 26.50 | 10.27 | 2007 |
| FLI-06 | Sugar Creek | 23.91 | 11.76 | 2008 |
| FLIA-01 | Coon Creek | 22.75 | 3.91 | 2007 |
| FLIA-02 | Coon Creek | 25.68 | 6.99 | 2007 |
| FLIDB-01 | Gay Creek | 26.16 | 7.38 | 2007 |
| G-26 | Des Plaines River | 23.82 | 4.05 | 2003 |
| GHE-01 | Long Run | 22.41 | 8.38 | 2003 |
| HBE-02 | Plum Creek | 23.34 | 6.27 | 2008 |
| ICD-02 | Dutch Creek | 25.72 | 4.05 | 2008 |
| II-9X | Mary's River | 23.50 | 1.94 | 2008 |
| illin 18559 | Spring Branch | 23.39 | 5.62 | 2010 |
| illin 20243 | Little Sandy Creek | 24.13 | 5.70 | 2010 |
| illin 2957 | Big Bureau Creek | 24.99 | 4.35 | 2010 |
| illin 4305 | Pond Creek | 23.67 | 8.52 | 2010 |
| illin 4548 | Forked Creek | 25.32 | 7.24 | 2010 |
| IXD-01 | Sandy Creek | 26.70 | 6.78 | 2008 |
| IXFX-XX | Jackson Creek | 24.04 | 3.98 | 2009 |
| IXJ-01 | Big Creek | 25.23 | 3.73 | 1999 |

**Table 6. Summary of sampled streams (continued).**

| Site Code* | Stream Name | Mean Daily July Temperature | Maximum Daily Temperature Range | Year Sampled |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| IXJ-02 | Big Creek | 25.23 | 4.04 | 2001 |
| IXM-04 | Cypress Creek | 25.51 | 7.32 | 1999 |
| IXM-05 | Cypress Creek | 22.30 | 4.82 | 2001 |
| JMAA-01 | Prairie DuPont Creek | 24.15 | 5.11 | 2003 |
| JND-01 | Judy's Branch | 23.03 | 5.84 | 2004 |
| JND-01 | Judy's Branch | 22.34 | 6.61 | 2007 |
| JV-01 | Piasa Creek | 28.29 | 9.18 | 2007 |
| kasky 2186 | Sandy Run | 24.09 | 4.58 | 2010 |
| kasky 2301 | Hickory Creek | 25.76 | 4.70 | 2010 |
| kasky 3335 | Burbacker Creek | 24.42 | 3.85 | 2010 |
| kasky 4368 | North Creek | 25.59 | 4.46 | 2010 |
| kasky 715 | Sand Creek | 22.13 | 9.03 | 2010 |
| kasky 969 | Middle Fork Shoal Creek | 26.90 | 14.76 | 2010 |
| KCA-01 | Bay Creek | 23.49 | 3.16 | 2009 |
| KCA-01 | Bay Creek | 27.16 | 4.95 | 2007 |
| KCB-05 | Six Mile Creek | 25.87 | 9.59 | 2007 |
| KCL-01 | West Panther Creek | 22.15 | 2.28 | 2007 |
| KI-05 | Bear Creek | 23.38 | 7.10 | 2003 |
| LF-05 | Edwards River | 23.81 | 6.32 | 2003 |
| ltwab 1194 | Skillet Fork | 25.46 | 3.93 | 2010 |
| marys 169 | North Fork Cox Creek | 26.84 | 4.33 | 2010 |
| MN-18 | Apple River | 22.33 | 6.11 | 2007 |
| MND-01 | Furnace Creek | 22.02 | 5.72 | 2007 |
| MPA-01 | Smallpox Creek | 22.01 | 4.48 | 2007 |
| MPA-01 | Smallpox Creek | 22.60 | 4.60 | 2010 |
| MX-XX | Unnamed Trib. to Mississippi R. | 26.42 | 8.80 | 2008 |
| NDD-04 | Grassy Creek | 25.35 | 4.35 | 2003 |
| NDC-99 | Drury Creek | 24.44 | 5.60 | 2008 |
| NJ-07 | Casey Fork | 25.42 | 11.38 | 2004 |
| O-32 | Kaskaskia River | 26.39 | 5.57 | 2003 |
| OCB-97 | Prairie Dulong Creek | 24.66 | 3.83 | 2003 |
| OD-09 | Silver Creek | 22.86 | 13.98 | 2004 |
| OD-09 | Silver Creek | 25.34 | 6.74 | 2007 |
| OE-05 | Mud Creek | 22.99 | 7.28 | 2003 |
| OG-01 | Elkhorn Creek | 24.67 | 8.32 | 2005 |
| OHA-01 | Lake Branch East | 23.59 | 6.37 | 2001 |
| OHA-05 | Lake Branch East | 26.56 | 10.15 | 2001 |
| OHC-XX | Grassy Branch | 22.60 | 3.78 | 2009 |
| OI-14 | Shoal Creek | 26.00 | 4.89 | 2003 |
| OI-14 | Shoal Creek | 25.42 | 7.85 | 2007 |
| OI-14 | Shoal Creek | 26.41 | 4.15 | 2010 |
| OID-XX | East Fork Shoal Creek | 22.14 | 4.76 | 2009 |
| OJB-03 | Lost Creek | 25.83 | 9.67 | 2001 |
| OJB-03 | Lost Creek | 23.09 | 5.61 | 2007 |
| OJB-04 | Lost Creek | 23.99 | 6.50 | 2001 |
| OK-01 | East Fork Kaskaskia River | 25.00 | 16.57 | 2003 |

**Table 6. Summary of sampled streams (continued).**

| Site Code* | Stream Name | Mean Daily July Temperature | Maximum Daily Temperature Range | Year Sampled |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| OK-01 | East Fork Kaskaskia River | 24.52 | 3.90 | 2007 |
| OK-01 | East Fork Kaskaskia River | 22.42 | 3.81 | 2009 |
| OK-01 | East Fork Kaskaskia River | 25.60 | 3.17 | 2010 |
| OT-03 | West Okaw River | 22.34 | 4.72 | 2008 |
| OW-01 | Lake Fork | 26.72 | 10.60 | 2003 |
| OW-01 | Lake Fork | 22.84 | 4.99 | 2008 |
| OZYA-02 | Copper Slough | 22.81 | 8.55 | 2008 |
| OZZD-01 | Ash Creek | 22.24 | 10.02 | 2007 |
| PBG-12 | Big Slough Ditch | 23.15 | 13.95 | 2003 |
| PH-15 | Elkhorn Creek | 23.96 | 7.20 | 2003 |
| PQ-13 | Kishwaukee River | 23.02 | 8.32 | 2010 |
| PQB-04 | Killbuck Creek | 22.99 | 6.80 | 2007 |
| PWA-01 | Racoon Creek | 23.09 | 7.08 | 2010 |

* Site code written as the associated EPA station code (e.g. BPB-01), a unique code based on the EPA station code system (if the site did not have an EPA station code, e.g. PQFX-XX), or the PU Gap code for the sampled arc (for randomly chosen sites, e.g. edwar 558).

**Table 7. Modeled temperature category and measured temperature category**

| Measured Temperature Category* | n** | Proportion Correctly Predicted | Predicted Cold | Predicted Cool | Predicted Warm |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cold | 33 | 0.18 | 6 | 6 | 21 |
| Cool | 71 | 0.30 | 5 | 21 | 55 |
| Warm | 170 | 0.85 | 2 | 23 | 145 |
| Overall accuracy: | | 0.63 | | | |

* based on mean daily July temperature.
** each sample event counted separately.

**Table 8. Coefficients for Illinois Stream Temperature Model developed from stream temperature data collected 1999-2010 (Adjusted R2 = 63.2%, standard error = 1.7, df = 100).** Latitude of the site in decimal degrees, DA is the natural log of the upstream drainage area in km2, Max Air is 10 times the maximum air temperature for the local watershed in July, Mean Air is 10 times the mean air temperature for the entire upstream watershed for the month of July, GDD is 10 times the mean annual growing degree days for the entire upstream watershed, Longitude of the site in decimal degrees, Bedrock is the proportion of bedrock within the entire upstream watershed that is within 50 ft of the surface, Link is the natural log of the link number of the channel at the location of the site.

| Constant | Latitude | DA | Max Air | Mean Air | GGD | Longitude | Bedrock | Link number |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 156.0240 | -2.3038 | 1.6562 | -0.3632 | 0.8064 | -0.0137 | 0.9315 | 1.1825 | -0.6847 |

**Table 9. Effectiveness of revised temperature model at classifying stream segments based on thermal classes of Wehrly *et al*. (2003).**

| Measured Thermal Class | n* | Proportion Correctly Predicted | Predicted Cooler | Predicted Warmer |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cold | 24 | 0.50 | NA | 12 |
| Cool | 55 | 0.65 | 9 | 10 |
| Warm | 125 | 0.74 | 32 | NA |
| Overall accuracy | 204 | 0.69 | 41 | 22 |
| Cold+Cool | 79 | 0.85 | NA | 12 |
| Warm or not Warm | 204 | 0.78 | 32 | 12 |

* for those sites used in revised temperature model.

**Table 10. Darcy model prediction and measured temperature category.**

*Standard Deviation Method:*

| Temp. Category | n | Model Value ≤ 1 SD | Model Value ≥ 1 SD | Accuracy |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cold | 35 | 10 | 25 | 0.286 |
| Cool | 69 | 14 | 55 | 0.203 |
| Warm | 170 | 2 | 168 | 0.988 |
| | | | overall accuracy: | 0.701 |

*Model Value Method:*

| Temp. Category | n | Model Value ≤ -50.0 | Model Value > 50.0 | Accuracy |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cold | 33 | 10 | 23 | 0.303 |
| Cool | 70 | 13 | 57 | 0.186 |
| Warm | 168 | 3 | 165 | 0.982 |
| | | | overall accuracy: | 0.694 |

**Table 11. Summary of Sites with Multiyear Temperature Data**

| Site | Year Sampled | Mean Daily July Temperature | Maximum Daily Temperature Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| AK-02 | 2003 | 25.10 | 4.66 |
| | 2009 | 24.68 | 4.25 |
| | 2010 | 28.03 | 1.66 |
| BPJ-09 | 2003 | 21.73 | 12.25 |
| | 2009 | 21.85 | 5.49 |
| BPJC-10 | 2007 | 23.40 | 5.15 |
| | 2008 | 22.24 | 4.52 |
| CAGC-01 | 2004 | 25.39 | 17.04 |
| | 2009 | 25.81 | 13.00 |
| DKV-01* | 2006 | 23.76 | 7.50 |
| | 2009 | 20.59 | 8.09 |
| DTC-05* | 2005 | 15.92 | 4.98 |
| | 2010 | 21.89 | 4.73 |
| DTF-02* | 2009 | 20.49 | 5.00 |
| | 2010 | 24.63 | 5.47 |
| EH-02 | 2004 | 20.69 | 13.30 |
| | 2007 | 21.92 | 13.34 |
| | 2008 | 21.63 | 8.32 |
| | 2009 | 19.69 | 7.85 |
| | 2010 | 21.86 | 8.39 |
| EOH-01 | 2007 | 26.31 | 7.45 |
| | 2008 | 24.64 | 5.53 |
| EQ-01* | 2007 | 23.17 | 9.27 |
| | 2008 | 21.61 | 5.76 |
| | 2010 | 24.52 | 3.34 |
| EY-01* | 2003 | 24.64 | 12.25 |
| | 2009 | 19.72 | 9.45 |
| | 2010 | 26.41 | 10.92 |
| FLE-01 | 2007 | 23.81 | 3.72 |
| | 2008 | 24.93 | 5.85 |
| FLH-01 | 2007 | 23.77 | 6.16 |
| | 2008 | 23.59 | 6.53 |
| IXF-01* | 2008 | 18.15 | 4.95 |
| | 2009 | 19.17 | 3.66 |
| | 2010 | 20.94 | 2.96 |
| KCA-01 | 2007 | 27.16 | 4.95 |
| | 2009 | 23.49 | 3.16 |
| MJA-02* | 2009 | 17.20 | 4.00 |
| | 2010 | 20.04 | 4.57 |
| MN-18* | 2003 | 21.73 | 9.29 |
| | 2007 | 22.33 | 6.11 |
| | 2009 | 19.27 | 6.31 |
| MND-01* | 2007 | 22.02 | 5.72 |
| | 2009 | 18.51 | 5.62 |
| | 2010 | 20.20 | 6.01 |
| MPA-01* | 2007 | 22.01 | 4.48 |
| | 2009 | 19.72 | 5.25 |
| | 2010 | 22.60 | 4.60 |
| OD-09 | 2004 | 22.86 | 13.98 |
| | 2007 | 25.34 | 6.74 |
| OI-14 | 2003 | 26.00 | 4.89 |
| | 2010 | 26.41 | 4.15 |
| OK-01 | 2003 | 25.00 | 16.57 |
| | 2007 | 24.52 | 3.90 |
| | 2009 | 22.42 | 3.81 |
| | 2010 | 25.60 | 3.17 |
| OW-01 | 2003 | 26.72 | 10.60 |
| | 2008 | 22.84 | 4.99 |
| PK-01* | 2003 | 20.92 | 6.44 |
| | 2007 | 20.19 | 6.52 |
| | 2008 | 19.84 | 5.24 |
| | 2009 | 17.79 | 4.76 |
| | 2010 | 21.03 | 4.79 |
| PQE-10 | 2008 | 14.17 | 7.64 |
| | 2010 | 18.03 | 6.68 |
| PSB-01* | 2003 | 19.96 | 6.92 |
| | 2009 | 17.36 | 7.34 |
| | 2010 | 21.62 | 7.09 |
| PT-01 | 2003 | 18.31 | 9.81 |
| | 2007 | 18.15 | 6.38 |
| PWC-01 | 2003 | 15.77 | 13.11 |
| | 2007 | 15.01 | 11.00 |
| | 2008 | 14.63 | 8.50 |
| | 2009 | 13.71 | 8.02 |
| | 2010 | 15.71 | 9.28 |

* denotes sites that fall into more than one thermal category.

**Table 12. Temperature probe results and associated temperature data.**

| Site Code* | Groundwater Input Potential** | Mean Daily July Temperature ($^{o}$C) |
|---|---|---|
| ADD-02 | N | 24.25 |
| ADDB-01 | N | 24.12 |
| ATHD-01 | N | 25.46 |
| ATHD-03 | N | 25.31 |
| ATHG-07 | N | 26.83 |
| BJ-01 | U | 23.67 |
| bmudd 2128 | N | 23.59 |
| edwar 37 | N | 22.17 |
| edwar 558 | U | 21.29 |
| EH-02 | P | 21.92 |
| EH-02 ('10) | L | 21.86 |
| EIG-02 | P | 27.58 |
| EOC-02 | U | 24.74 |
| FLDAE-01 | N | 20.88 |
| FLH-03 | N | 26.77 |
| FLI-06 | N | 23.91 |
| FLIA-01 | N | 22.75 |
| FLIA-02 | N | 25.68 |
| ICD-02 | N | 25.72 |
| II-9X | N | 23.50 |
| illin 18559 | N | 23.39 |
| IXD-01 | N | 26.70 |
| IXF-01 ('08) | U | 18.15 |
| IXF-01 ('09) | N | 19.17 |
| IXF-01 ('10) | U | 20.94 |
| IXFX-XX | N | 24.04 |
| JND-01 | U | 23.03 |
| JV-01 | N | 28.29 |
| kasky 2186 | N | 24.09 |
| kasky 2301 | N | 25.76 |
| kasky 4368 | N | 25.59 |
| KCA-01 | N | 27.16 |
| ltwab 1194 | N | 25.46 |
| marys 169 | N | 26.84 |
| MX-XX | N | 26.42 |
| OD-09 | N | 25.34 |
| OK-01 | N | 25.00 |
| OZZD-01 | U | 24.34 |
| PBG-10 | P | 21.64 |
| PLE-03 | U | 21.21 |
| PN-02 | L | 20.11 |
| PQC-11 | N | 20.39 |
| PQCK-10 | P | 20.49 |
| PWA-01 | U | 23.09 |
| PWC-01 ('07) | L | 15.01 |
| PWC-01 ('08) | L | 14.63 |
| PWC-01 ('09) | L | 13.71 |
| PWC-01 ('10) | L | 15.71 |
| rockr 6825 | L | 20.33 |

* see Table 6 for description of site identification.

** based on vertical temperature profile in hyporheic zone. L = likely receiving groundwater inputs, P = possibly receiving inputs, U = unlikely receiving inputs, N = not receiving inputs.

**Table 13. Shading study temperature results.**

| Stream | Site* | Site Type | Mean Daily Temp. | Difference From Stream Mean** | Mean Daily Min. Temp. | Mean Daily Max. Temp. | Mean Daily Temp. Range |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Brush Creek | 1 | Sun | 23.4 | 0.2 | 21.9 | 24.9 | 3.0 |
| | 2 | Shade | 23.2 | 0.0 | 21.9 | 24.6 | 2.7 |
| | 3 | Shade | 22.7 | -0.5 | 21.6 | 24.2 | 2.6 |
| | 4 | Sun | 23.3 | 0.1 | 21.2 | 26.7 | 5.5 |
| | 5 | Sun | 23.2 | 0.0 | 21.2 | 26.6 | 5.0 |
| Robinson Creek | 1 | Shade | 24.4 | -0.3 | 23.6 | 25.6 | 2.0 |
| | 2 | Shade | 24.6 | -0.1 | 23.5 | 25.9 | 2.4 |
| | 3 | Sun | 24.8 | 0.1 | 23.5 | 26.7 | 3.2 |
| | 4 | Sun | 24.9 | 0.2 | 23.5 | 26.8 | 3.4 |
| | 5 | Shade | 24.8 | 0.1 | 23.4 | 26.7 | 3.3 |
| South Kinnikinnik Creek | 1 | Shade | 19.6 | 0.0 | 18.3 | 20.9 | 2.6 |
| | 2 | Sun | 19.9 | 0.3 | 18.4 | 21.4 | 3.0 |
| | 3 | Sun | 19.4 | -0.2 | 17.9 | 20.7 | 2.8 |
| | 4 | Shade | 19.4 | -0.2 | 18.0 | 20.7 | 2.7 |

* Most upstream location is site 1 in each stream.

** Difference of site mean daily temperature and stream-wide mean daily temperature.

**Table 14. Result of vertical temperature analysis.**

| Stream | Site | Mean Daily Temp. | Mean Daily Max. Temp. | Mean Daily Temp. Range |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| West Okaw River | 1 Top | 23.1 | 25.6 | 4.6 |
| | 1 Bottom | 22.9 | 25.1 | 4.0 |
| | 2 Top | 23.8 | 28.0 | 6.7 |
| | 2 Bottom | 23.2 | 26.0 | 4.6 |
| | 3 Top | 24.3 | 26.7 | 4.2 |
| | 3 Bottom | 23.1 | 23.8 | 1.4 |
| | 4 Top | 23.5 | 26.1 | 4.3 |
| | 4 Bottom | 23.2 | 25.5 | 3.7 |
| Crane Creek | 1 Top | 22.7 | 27.4 | 7.5 |
| | 1 Bottom | 22.5 | 27.0 | 7.1 |
| | 2 Top | 22.0 | 25.3 | 5.9 |
| | 2 Bottom | 22.0 | 25.2 | 5.7 |
| | 3 Top | 20.9 | 23.6 | 4.8 |
| | 3 Bottom | 20.9 | 23.4 | 4.6 |
| Kickapoo Creek | 1 Top | 27.5 | 29.6 | 4.1 |
| | 1 Bottom | 27.5 | 29.5 | 4.0 |
| | 2 Top | 26.0 | 27.6 | 3.2 |
| | 2 Bottom | 26.0 | 27.6 | 3.2 |
| | 3 Top | 26.2 | 28.0 | 3.4 |
| | 3 Bottom | 26.1 | 27.7 | 3.0 |

**Table 15. Regression analysis summary for landuse proportions.**

| Landuse Type | Spatial Scale | Significance Value* | Slope | Adjusted $R^2$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agriculture | Whole Watershed | 0.182 | -0.916x + 23.018 | 0.003 |
| | Local Watershed | 0.836 | 0.139x + 22.502 | -0.004 |
| | **Upstream Riparian** | **0.024** | -1.727x + 23.342 | 0.015 |
| | Local Riparian | 0.445 | -0.542x + 22.717 | -0.002 |
| Urban | Whole Watershed | 0.925 | -0.176x + 22.575 | -0.002 |
| | Local Watershed | 0.365 | -1.271x + 22.629 | 0.000 |
| | Upstream Riparian | 0.787 | -0.644x + 22.584 | -0.003 |
| | Local Riparian | 0.284 | -2.130x + 22.623 | 0.001 |
| Forest | **Whole Watershed** | **< 0.001** | 4.434x + 21.945 | 0.070 |
| | **Local Watershed** | **< 0.001** | 3.202x + 21.837 | 0.053 |
| | **Upstream Riparian** | **< 0.001** | 4.862x + 21.455 | 0.125 |
| | **Local Riparian** | **< 0.001** | 3.173x + 21.311 | 0.095 |

* df = 272 for all analyses

**Table 16. Chi-squared test results for comparison of habitat characters.**

| Habitat Character | Thermal Category | n samples | Chi-Squared Value |
|---|---|---|---|
| Dominant Substrate | Coldwater | 26 | 0.317 |
| | Coolwater | 73 | **0.030** |
| | Warmwater | 149 | 0.196 |
| Riparian Width | Coldwater | 53 | **< 0.001** |
| | Coolwater | 146 | **0.043** |
| | Warmwater | 297 | **0.011** |
| Dominant Flow | Coldwater | 26 | 0.070 |
| | Coolwater | 71 | **< 0.001** |
| | Warmwater | 151 | **< 0.001** |
| Shading | Coldwater | 27 | 0.089 |
| | Coolwater | 72 | **0.039** |
| | Warmwater | 152 | 0.532 |
| Number of Channel Units | Coldwater | 27 | 0.063 |
| | Coolwater | 70 | 0.234 |
| | Warmwater | 150 | 0.700 |

**Table 17. Summary of Vegetation Characteristics at Streams with Temperature Records**

| Site Code | Mean Proportion of Bank Cover[1] Herbaceous | Woody | Trees | No Veg. | Mean Abundance of Instream Macrophytes* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Coldwater streams:* | | | | | |
| DTC-05 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0.25 | 0.11 |
| EIEI-03 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| IXF-01 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 1.2 |
| MND-01 | 3 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 |
| MNIA-11 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0.5 | 0.11 |
| PHB-01 | 3 | 1 | 0.5 | 0 | 1.63 |
| PK-01 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0.75 | 1.75 |
| PQH-01 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 |
| PSB-01 | 2.5 | 1 | 2 | 0.5 | 0.14 |
| PT-01 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| PWC-01 | 3 | 2 | 2.5 | 0 | 1 |
| Mean values (cold): | 2.59 | 1.32 | 1.64 | 0.41 | 0.66 |
| *Coolwater streams:* | | | | | |
| DTE-01 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0.33 |
| DTF-02 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0.5 | 0.75 |
| DTKA-04 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0.25 | 1 |
| DTZT-02 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1.67 |
| DZP-03 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| EH-02 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| IXF-01 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 1.2 |
| MN-18 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| MND-01 | 3 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 |
| MNI-12 | 2.5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0.38 |
| MPA-01 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.44 |
| PK-01 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0.75 | 1.75 |
| PN-03 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0.75 | 0 |
| PP-01 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0.38 | 1 |
| PQDA-01 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0.25 | 0 |
| PQJ-01 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| PSB-01 | 2.5 | 1 | 2 | 0.5 | 0.14 |
| PWQ-04 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0.5 | 1 |
| QC-03 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0.11 |
| Mean values (cool): | 2.71 | 1.16 | 1.50 | 0.44 | 0.77 |

**Table 17. Summary of Vegetation Characteristics at Streams with Temperature Records (cont.)**

| Site Code | Mean Proportion of Bank Cover[1] Herbaceous | Woody | Trees | No Veg. | Mean Abundance of Instream Macrophytes* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Warmwater streams:* | | | | | |
| ADCD-01 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| ADD-02 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| ADDB-01 | 1.75 | 0.75 | 2 | 0.5 | 0 |
| AJ-09 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| AJG-18 | 2.5 | 0 | 1.5 | 0.75 | 0 |
| ATHG-02 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0.5 | 1 |
| BEN-01 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| BEN-02 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 | 1 | 0.15 |
| BENA-01 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.13 |
| BEZZ-05 | 1.5 | 1 | 3 | 0.75 | 2.5 |
| BFC-11 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0.75 | 0 |
| BJ-01 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| BPJA-01 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| CAGC-01 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| DF-05 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| DGLC-01 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0.75 | 1 |
| DJJB-04 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0.25 |
| DSB-02 | 2 | 2 | 2.5 | 1.25 | 0.3 |
| DSG-01 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0.5 | 1.67 |
| DSH-01 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1.75 | 0.25 |
| DSH-02 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0.5 | 2.22 |
| DTC-04 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0.5 | 0 |
| DTC-07 | 2.5 | 1 | 1.5 | 0.75 | 0.33 |
| DTF-02 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0.5 | 0.75 |
| DZA-03 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0.25 | 0 |
| EL-01 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0.5 | 0 |
| FCC-01 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| FKA-01 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 2.5 |
| FLD-03 | 2 | 1 | 2.5 | 0.75 | 0 |
| FLH-01 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| FLIA-01 | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 0.5 | 1 |
| GV-01 | 1 | 1 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 0 |
| HBE-02 | 3 | 0 | 1.5 | 1.25 | 0 |
| ICD-02 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| IXM-04 | 3 | 1 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0 |
| KI-05 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0.25 | 1 |
| MN-18 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

**Table 17. Summary of Vegetation Characteristics at Streams with Temperature Records (cont.)**

| Site Code | Mean Proportion of Bank Cover[1] Herbaceous | Woody | Trees | No Veg. | Mean Abundance of Instream Macrophytes* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| MND-01 | 3 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 |
| MPA-01 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0.75 | 1.44 |
| OCB-97 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0.5 | 0 |
| OD-09 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1.5 | 0 |
| OI-14 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0.5 | 0 |
| OK-01 | 2 | 0.5 | 2 | 0.5 | 0 |
| OT-03 | 2.5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| PQ-13 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 0 | 1 |
| PQB-04 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.67 |
| Mean values (warm): | 2.53 | 1.04 | 1.68 | 0.47 | 0.54 |

* Values range from 0 to 3 (0=absent, 1=sparse, 2= intermediate, 3=abundant). Mean bank vegetation calculated from both left and right bank values. Mean instream macrophytes caluculated from values at each channel unit (riffle, run, pool) within sampled stream reach.

**Table 18. Additional fish analyzed for thermal preference.**

| Common Name | Scientific Name |
|---|---|
| American eel | *Angiulla rostrata* |
| Banded killfish | *Fundulus diaphanus* |
| Black redhorse | *Moxostoma duquesnei* |
| Blackspotted topminnow | *Fundulus olivaceus* |
| Brassy minnow | *Hybognathus hankinsoni* |
| Brindled madtom | *Noturus miurus* |
| Central mudminnow | *Umbra limi* |
| Chestnut lamprey | *Ichthyomyzon castaneus* |
| Common shiner | *Notropis cornutus* |
| Creek chub | *Semotilus atromaculatus* |
| Fantail darter | *Etheostoma flabellare* |
| Golden redhorse | *Moxostoma erythrurum* |
| Grasss pickerel | *Esox americanus* |
| Horneyhead chub | *Nocomis biguttatus* |
| Lake chubsucker | *Erimyzon sucetta* |
| Largescale stoneroller | *Campostoma oligolepis* |
| Northern hogsucker | *Hypentelium nigricans* |
| Northern pike | *Esox lucius* |
| Orangethroat darter | *Etheostoma spectabile* |
| Rainbow darter | *Etheostoma caeruleum* |
| Rock bass | *Ambloplites rupestris* |
| Sauger | *Stizostedion canadense* |
| Shorthead redhorse | *Moxostoma macrolepidotum* |
| Silver lamprey | *Ichthyomyzon unicuspis* |
| Smallmouth bass | *Micropterus dolonieui* |
| Starhead topminnow | *Fundulus dispar* |
| Stonecat | *Noturus flavus* |
| Striped shiner | *Notropis chrysocephalus* |
| Stripetail darter | *Etheostoma kennicotti* |
| Walleye | *Stizostedion vitreum* |
| White sucker | *Catostomus commersoni* |

**Table 19. Temperature class for selected fish species.**

| Species | Number of Sites with Temp. Records | Number of Temp. Records | Mean Temp. of Occurrence | Range of Mean Temps. | Wherly Method IL Thermal Class | Lyons Method IL Thermal Class | Published Lyons Thermal Class | Published Indiana Thermal Class | Published Ohio Thermal Class |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Northern brook lamprey | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Trans | Cl | N/A |
| American brook lamprey | 1 | 1 | N/A | 18.1 | Cd | Cl | Trans | Cl | N/A |
| Least brook lamprey | 1 | 1 | N/A | 24.5 | Wm | Wm | N/A | Wm | N/A |
| Brown trout | 3 | 6 | 19.5 | 17.4-21.6 | Cd-Cl | Trans | Cd | Wm | Cd |
| Rainbow trout | 3 | 3 | 18.9 | 17.1-21.3 | Cd-Cl | Trans | Cd | Wm | Cd |
| Southern redbelly dace | 35 | 48 | 20.4 | 16.3-28.3 | Eury | Trans | Wm | Cl | N/A |
| Blacknose dace | 34 | 49 | 19.6 | 13.7-25.3 | Eury | Trans | Trans | Cl | N/A |
| Longnose dace | 8 | 9 | 19.1 | 16.8-21.3 | Cd-Cl | Trans | Trans | Cl | N/A |
| Ozark minnow | 9 | 16 | 19.6 | 16.3-22.3 | Eury | Trans | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Weed shiner | 4 | 4 | 23.1 | 19.3-25.3 | Cl-Wm | Wm | N/A | Wm | N/A |
| Ironcolor shiner | 4 | 8 | 22.5 | 19.7-25.3 | Cl-Wm | Wm | N/A | Wm | N/A |
| Ninespine stickleback | 2 | 2 | 19.2 | 17.1-21.3 | Cd-Cl | Trans | N/A | Cl | N/A |
| Brook stickleback | 22 | 31 | 18.6 | 13.7-23.0 | Eury | Trans | Trans | Cl | Cd |
| Banded sculpin | 9 | 11 | 24.4 | 22.1-27.5 | Wm | Wm | N/A | Cl | N/A |
| Mottled sculpin | 11 | 13 | 19.9 | 15.9-24.6 | Eury | Trans | Cd | Wm | Cd |
| Iowa darter | 3 | 3 | 20.3 | 18.1-23.1 | Eury | Trans | Wm | Wm | N/A |
| Least darter | 3 | 3 | 23.5 | 22.5-24.2 | Wm | Wm | Wm | Wm | N/A |
| Grasss pickerel | 56 | 74 | 23.1 | 13.7-27.5 | Eury | Wm | Wm | Wm | N/A |
| Horneyhead chub | 86 | 114 | 21.9 | 15.9-27.5 | Eury | Trans | Wm | Wm | N/A |
| Striped shiner | 62 | 80 | 23.1 | 15.9-28.0 | Eury | Wm | N/A | Wm | N/A |
| Northern hogsucker | 64 | 85 | 22.2 | 15.9-28.0 | Eury | Wm | Trans | Wm | N/A |
| Shorthead redhorse | 52 | 65 | 23.1 | 15.9-28.3 | Eury | Wm | Wm | Wm | N/A |
| Black redhorse | 20 | 27 | 22.4 | 15.9-28.0 | Eury | Wm | N/A | Wm | N/A |
| Golden redhorse | 85 | 112 | 22.8 | 15.9-28.3 | Eury | Wm | Wm | Wm | N/A |
| Stonecat | 53 | 71 | 21.7 | 15.9-26.4 | Eury | Wm | Wm | Wm | N/A |
| Brindled madtom | 7 | 9 | 22.6 | 18.2-27.3 | Eury | Wm | N/A | Wm | N/A |
| Blackspotted topminnow | 24 | 28 | 24.6 | 18.1-28.0 | Eury | Wm | N/A | Wm | N/A |
| Rainbow darter | 19 | 21 | 23.4 | 18.1-28.0 | Eury | Wm | Wm | Wm | N/A |
| Stripetail darter | 9 | 11 | 25.5 | 22.9-28.0 | Wm | Wm | N/A | Wm | N/A |
| Orangethroat darter | 40 | 47 | 23.1 | 18.1-28.3 | Eury | Wm | N/A | Wm | N/A |
| Fantail darter | 51 | 69 | 20.8 | 14.6-26.4 | Eury | Trans | Wm | Wm | N/A |
| Rock bass | 34 | 42 | 22.4 | 17.8-26.4 | Eury | Wm | Wm | Wm | N/A |
| Smallmouth bass | 62 | 79 | 22.1 | 15.9-27.5 | Eury | Wm | Wm | Wm | N/A |
| Common shiner | 57 | 76 | 20.3 | 13.7-25.4 | Eury | Trans | Wm | Wm | N/A |
| Northern pike | 15 | 16 | 22.4 | 16.2-26.8 | Eury | Wm | Trans | Wm | N/A |
| Walleye | 6 | 6 | 24.7 | 19.7-28.3 | Cl-Wm | Wm | Trans | Wm | N/A |
| Brassy minnow | 2 | 2 | 20.2 | 16.2-24.2 | Eury | Trans | Trans | Wm | N/A |
| Largescale stoneroller | 13 | 20 | 20.7 | 15.9-24.6 | Eury | Trans | Wm | Wm | N/A |
| Central mudminnow | 9 | 13 | 21.3 | 18.1-25.3 | Eury | Wm | Trans | Wm | N/A |
| Silver lamprey | 0 | 0 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Wm | N/A |
| Banded killfish | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | Wm | N/A |
| White sucker | 134 | 174 | 22.1 | 13.7-28.3 | Eury | Trans | Trans | Wm | N/A |
| Creek chub | 137 | 173 | 22.4 | 16.2-28.3 | Eury | Wm | Trans | Wm | N/A |
| Sauger | 5 | 5 | 24.4 | 23.8-26.4 | Wm | Wm | N/A | Wm | N/A |
| American eel | 2 | 2 | 23.7 | 20.1-27.3 | Cl-Wm | Wm | N/A | Wm | N/A |
| Starhead topminnow | 3 | 7 | 21.8 | 19.7-23.7 | Cl-Wm | Wm | N/A | Wm | N/A |
| Lake chubsucker | 3 | 7 | 22.1 | 19.7-24.9 | Cl-Wm | Wm | Wm | Wm | N/A |
| Chestnut lamprey | 1 | 3 | 25.9 | 24.7-25.1 | Wm | Wm | Wm | Wm | N/A |

**Table 20. Most common species in cold and cool streams.**

| Common Name | Proportion of Sites Present | Statewide Proportion (n=5643) | Proportion of Sites Sampled with Fish Collection Records (n=127) |
|---|---|---|---|
| *Coldwater sites (n=24)* | | | |
| White sucker | 0.88 | 0.22 | 0.72 |
| Creek chub | 0.83 | 0.20 | 0.71 |
| Johnny darter | 0.75 | 0.16 | 0.57 |
| Common stoneroller | 0.71 | 0.14 | 0.58 |
| Fantail darter | 0.67 | 0.05 | 0.28 |
| Green sunfish | 0.58 | 0.27 | 0.77 |
| Southern redbelly dace | 0.58 | 0.02 | 0.16 |
| Bluntnose minnow | 0.54 | 0.26 | 0.83 |
| Horneyhead chub | 0.54 | 0.12 | 0.51 |
| Blacknose dace | 0.50 | 0.03 | 0.19 |
| Common shiner | 0.50 | 0.05 | 0.32 |
| *Coolwater sites (n=45)* | | | |
| White sucker | 0.93 | 0.22 | 0.72 |
| Bluntnose minnow | 0.89 | 0.26 | 0.83 |
| Creek chub | 0.84 | 0.20 | 0.71 |
| Horneyhead chub | 0.73 | 0.12 | 0.51 |
| Green sunfish | 0.71 | 0.27 | 0.77 |
| Johnny darter | 0.67 | 0.16 | 0.57 |
| Common stoneroller | 0.67 | 0.14 | 0.58 |
| Common shiner | 0.64 | 0.05 | 0.32 |
| Bluegill sunfish | 0.60 | 0.24 | 0.65 |
| Smallmouth bass | 0.56 | 0.11 | 0.34 |
| Sand shiner | 0.56 | 0.18 | 0.53 |
| *Warmwater sites (n=72)** | | | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 0.89 | 0.26 | 0.83 |
| Green sunfish | 0.86 | 0.12 | 0.77 |
| Bluegill sunfish | 0.72 | 0.24 | 0.65 |
| Sand shiner | 0.60 | 0.18 | 0.53 |
| Creek chub | 0.58 | 0.20 | 0.71 |
| White sucker | 0.53 | 0.22 | 0.72 |
| Common stoneroller | 0.49 | 0.14 | 0.58 |
| Johnny darter | 0.46 | 0.16 | 0.57 |
| Horneyhead chub | 0.38 | 0.16 | 0.51 |
| Smallmouth bass | 0.26 | 0.02 | 0.34 |
| Fantail darter | 0.10 | 0.27 | 0.28 |
| Common shiner | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.32 |
| Southern redbelly dace | 0.01 | 0.11 | 0.16 |
| Blacknose dace | 0.01 | 0.03 | 0.19 |

* species listed are only those found to be dominant in cold or cool streams and may not represent dominant species for warm streams.

**Table 21. Ten highest indicator species analysis values for each temperature category.**

| Coldwater | | Coolwater | | Warmwater | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Species | Indicator Value | Species | Indicator Value | Species | Indicator Value |
| **Southern redbelly dace** | 54 | White sucker | 41 | **Red shiner** | 49 |
| White sucker | 41 | **Smallmouth bass** | 30 | **Longear sunfish** | 48 |
| Common stoneroller | 40 | Hornyhead chub | 29 | **Green sunfish** | 47 |
| **Fantail darter** | 39 | Bluegill | 27 | **Blackstripe topminnow** | 44 |
| Creek chub | 38 | Creek chub | 26 | **Yellow bullhead** | 41 |
| **Blacknose dace** | 35 | Common shiner | 25 | Bluntnose minnow | 37 |
| Johnny darter | 34 | Johnny darter | 24 | Largemouth bass | 33 |
| **Common shiner** | 28 | **Stonecat** | 23 | **Gizzard shad** | 33 |
| **Brook stickleback** | 26 | Fantail darter | 22 | Sand shiner | 31 |
| Bluntnose minnow* | 24 | Bluntnose minnow | 22 | Common carp | 31 |
| Hornyhead chub* | 24 | | | | |

Bolded species are those statistically significant within their category.

* Tied for 10th

**Table 22. Validation of coldwater and coolwater fish communities (as determined by indicator analysis).**

| | n sites, statewide | n sites with temp. records | n temp. records | n confirmed coldwater records | n confirmed coolwater records | n confirmed warmwater records | accuracy (records < 22°C) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Coldwater community* | 60 | 25 | 35 | 16 | 18 | 1 | 97.1% |
| Coolwater community* | 323 | 43 | 59 | 7 | 24 | 28 | 52.5% |

* community structure comprised of species significantly associated with their respective category (coldwater communties contained at least 4 of the 7 species, coolwater communities contained both species).

Coldwater = blacknose dace, brook stickleback, common shiner, fantail darter, longnose dace, mottled sculpin, southern redbelly dace.

Coolwater = smallmouth bass, stonecat.

**Table 23. Potential macroinvertebrate coolwater indicator taxa.**

| Order | Taxa | n locations with temp. records | Mean daily July temp. preference |
|---|---|---|---|
| Ephemeroptera | *Acerpenna macdunnoughi* | 0 | N/A |
| | *Ephemerella inermis* | 0 | N/A |
| | *Ephemerella subvaria* | 0 | N/A |
| | *Eurylophella sp.* | 2 | 27.13 |
| | *Timpanoga lita* | 0 | N/A |
| | *Paraleptophlebia debilis* | 9 | 25.96 |
| Plecoptera | *Leuctra tenuis* | 0 | N/A |
| | *Amphinemura linda* | 0 | N/A |
| | *Nemoura trispinosa* | 0 | N/A |
| Trichoptera | *Brachycentrus americanus* | 0 | N/A |
| | *Brachycentrus lateralis* | 0 | N/A |
| | *Glossosoma sp.* | 0 | N/A |
| | *Diplectrona modesta* | 0 | N/A |
| | *Parapsyche apicalis* | 0 | N/A |
| | *Hesperophylax designatus* | 0 | N/A |
| | *Frenesia missa* | 0 | N/A |
| | *Chimarra aterrima* | 0 | N/A |
| | *Rhyacophila vibox* | 0 | N/A |
| Megaloptera | *Corydalus sp.* | 21 | 24.04 |
| | *Sialis sp.* | 51 | 23.24 |
| Diptera | *Eukiefferiella sp.* | 2 | 21.37 |
| | *Thienemanniella sp.* | 1 | 20.11 |
| Gastropodia (Class) | *Ferrissia sp.* | 18 | 23.06 |
| Malacostraca (Class) | *Hyalella azteca* | 57 | 23.31 |

Figures




Figure 1. Darcy model output values




**Figure 2.** Candidate coolwater sites in Illinios streams.




**Figure 3. Weekly mean noon temperature with 95% confidence intervals for each thermal class.**




**Figure 4. Comparison of mean change in monthly mean daily water**




**Figure 5. Logger deployment locations.**




**Figure 6. Temperature model results**




**Figure 7. Logger locations color coded by mean thermal category.**




**Figure 8. Revised stream temperature model for Illinois**. Predicted temperatures of stream segments are presented as in Wehrly *et al.* 2003. Note: These results suggest expected thermal classes for relatively unimpacted watersheds and channels. Observed temperatures in these stream segments may be different.




**Figure 9. Comparison of measured temperature and modeled watershed Darcy value**




**Figure 10. Random site locations.**




**Figure 11. Summary of multiyear records.**

◆ Mean of mean daily July temperature

Range of mean of maximum and minimum mean daily July temperature

Range of mean of mean daily July temperature

# Figure 12. Network sampling locations.



# Figure 12 (continued). Network sampling locations.



# Figure 12 (continued). Network sampling locations.






**Figure 13. Satellite images of shading study sites.**




**Figure 14. Proportion of Channel Unit Number**




**Figure 15. Proportion of Dominant Substrate Type**




**Figure 16. Proportion of Channel Shading Category**




**Figure 17. Proportion of Riparian Width Categories**




**Figure 18. Proportion of Flow Category**




**Figure 19. Collection locations for brook stickleback (BKS), longnose dace (LGD), mottled sculpin (MTS), and brown trout (BRT).**




**Figure 20. Locations of original coldwater and coolwater sites with expanded (23.7°C) coolwater sites.**

# Appendix A

American Brook Lamprey (ABL)
Lampetra lamottei




**Data Key**

- IDNR Fish Data
- INHS Fish Data

Banded Sculpin (BAS)
Cottus carolinae



Blacknose Dace (BKD)
Rhinichthys atratulus




**Data Key**

- IDNR Fish Data
- INHS Fish Data

Brook Stickleback (BKS)
Culaea inconstans



Brown Trout (BRT)
Salmo trutta

**Data Key**

- IDNR Fish Data
- INHS Fish Data

Least Brook Lamprey (LBL)
Lampetra aepyptera

Least Darter (LED)
Etheostoma microperca




**Data Key**

- IDNR Fish Data
- INHS Fish Data

Longnose Dace (LGD)
Rhinichthys cataractae

**Data Key**

- IDNR Fish Data
- INHS Fish Data

Mottled Sculpin (MTS)
Cottus bairdi




**Data Key**

- IDNR Fish Data
- INHS Fish Data

Northern Brook Lamprey (NBL)
Ichthyomyzon fossor

**Data Key**

- IDNR Fish Data
- INHS Fish Data

Ninespine Stickleback (NSS)
Pungitius pungitius

**Data Key**

- IDNR Fish Data
- INHS Fish Data

Iowa Darter (OWD)
Etheostoma exile




**Data Key**

- IDNR Fish Data
- INHS Fish Data

Ozark Minnow (OZM)
Dionda nubila

**Data Key**

- IDNR Fish Data
- INHS Fish Data

Rainbow Trout (RBT)
Salmo gairdneri

**Data Key**

- IDNR Fish Data
- INHS Fish Data

Ironcolor Shiner (RCS)
Notropis chalybaeus




**Data Key**

- IDNR Fish Data
- INHS Fish Data

Southern Redbelly Dace (SRD)
Phoxinus erythrogaster




**Data Key**

- IDNR Fish Data
- INHS Fish Data

Weed Shiner (WES)
Notropis texanus



# Appendix B

# Apple River Network Results (July-August, 2008)




| Site ID | Stream Name | Mean Daily Temperature | Mean Daily Temperature Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | Apple River | 20.65 | 4.56 |
| 02 | Apple River | 21.12 | 4.65 |
| 03 | Welsh Hollow Creek | 18.33 | 4.52 |
| 04 | Apple River | 21.03 | 3.94 |
| 05 | Coon Creek | 19.35 | 3.85 |
| 06 | Lilly Branch | 20.93 | 7.41 |
| 07 | S. Fork Apple River | 20.62 | 3.24 |
| 08 | Birch Creek | 17.91 | 3.12 |
| 10 | Apple River | 21.46 | 3.89 |

# Beaver Creek Network Results (August-September, 2007)




| Site ID | Stream Name | Mean Daily Temperature | Mean Daily Temperature Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | Trib. to Mosquito Creek | 17.21 | 0.83 |
| 02 | Beaver Creek | 20.44 | 2.88 |
| 03 | Trib. to Beaver Creek | 21.48 | 3.05 |
| 04 | Trib. to Beaver Creek | 19.13 | 2.94 |
| 05 | Beaver Creek | 18.87 | 2.97 |
| 06 | Trib. to Beaver Creek | 18.03 | 5.86 |
| 07 | Beaver Creek | 18.99 | 2.92 |
| 08 | Trib. to Beaver Creek | 18.52 | 3.26 |
| 09 | Trib. to Beaver Creek | 18.57 | 3.72 |
| 10 | Trib. to Beaver Creek | 18.29 | 3.41 |
| PQDA-01 | Mosquito Creek | 18.84 | 2.99 |
| PQD-05 | Beaver Creek | 19.12 | 3.29 |

# Big Creek Network Results (July-September, 2009)




| Site ID | Stream Name | Mean Daily Temperature | Mean Daily Temperature Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | Big Creek | 23.67 | 9.91 |
| 02 | Unnamed Trib. to Big Creek | 21.39 | 6.64 |
| 03 | Big Creek | 24.22 | 9.84 |
| 04 | East Fork Big Creek | 23.45 | 8.29 |
| 05 | West Fork Big Creek | 23.41 | 11.63 |
| 06 | West Fork Big Creek | 22.26 | 8.32 |
| 07 | East Fork Big Creek | 21.02 | 10.95 |
| 08 | Big Creek | 22.12 | 8.61 |

Note: Site 02 was dry for most of sample period, but when water was present, site was cool

# Big Rock Creek Network Results (July-August, 2008)




| Site ID | Stream Name | Mean Daily Temperature | Mean Daily Temperature Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | Little Rock Creek | 19.49 | 3.00 |
| 02 | Big Rock Creek | 21.04 | 9.30 |
| 03 | Little Rock Creek | 22.49 | 3.40 |
| 04 | Big Rock Creek | 23.12 | 3.42 |
| 05 | Big Rock Creek | 23.24 | 5.57 |
| 06 | Welch Creek | 22.19 | 4.26 |
| 07 | Big Rock Creek | 19.59 | 3.22 |
| 08 | E. Branch Big Rock Creek | 22.42 | 4.40 |
| 09 | Welch Creek | 22.92 | 5.30 |
| 10 | W. Branch Big Rock Creek | 20.78 | 4.87 |

# Cache River Network Results (June-July, 2009)




| Site ID | Stream Name | Mean Daily Temperature | Mean Daily Temperature Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | Pulaski Slough | 26.90 | 6.68 |
| 02 | Boar Creek | 25.66 | 1.83 |
| 03 | Cache River | 26.89 | 1.27 |
| 04 | Hartline Creek | 23.32 | 2.83 |
| 05 | Mill Creek | 25.62 | 2.23 |
| 06 | Crooked Creek | 23.65 | 3.09 |
| 07 | Mill Creek | 22.40 | 2.84 |
| 08 | Cooper Creek | 23.68 | 2.46 |
| IXF-01 | Mill Creek | 19.17 | 3.66 |
| IXFX-01 | Jackson Creek | 24.04 | 3.98 |

# Crane Creek Network  Results (July, 2008)




| Site ID | Stream Name | Mean Daily Temperature | Mean Daily Temperature Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | Crane Creek | 21.68 | 6.15 |
| 02 | Herget Drainage Ditch | 21.59 | 6.22 |
| 03 | Crane Creek | 20.31 | 5.01 |
| 04 | Crane Creek | 20.83 | 4.25 |
| 05 | Hall Ditch | 15.04 | 3.55 |
| 06 | Hardin Ditch | 23.05 | 3.82 |
| 07 | Furrer Ditch | 22.16 | 4.35 |
| EH-02 | Crane Creek | 21.85 | 4.24 |

# Drummer Creek Network Results (May-September, 2009)




| Site ID | Stream Name | Mean Daily Temperature | Mean Daily Temperature Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | Drummer Creek | 20.99 | 7.67 |
| 02 | Drummer Creek | 20.60 | 6.86 |
| 03 | Drummer Creek | 20.50 | 8.50 |
| 04 | Drummer Creek | 20.33 | 7.09 |
| 05 | W. Br. Drummer Creek | 19.46 | 7.66 |
| 06 | Drummer Creek | 20.88 | 11.43 |
| 07 | Unnamed Trib. to Drummer Creek | 19.67 | 10.82 |
| 08 | Drummer Creek | 20.82 | 11.65 |
| 09 | Drummer Creek (EY-01) | 19.72 | 9.45 |

| Site ID | Stream Name | Mean Daily Temperature | Mean Daily Temp. Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | Leaf River | 21.21 | 4.77 |
| 02 | Leaf River | 23.05 | 4.88 |
| 03 | Unnamed Trib. to Leaf River | 23.04 | 5.41 |
| 04 | Leaf River | 23.12 | 5.29 |
| 05 | Unnamed Trib. to Leaf River | 17.36 | 7.90 |
| 06 | Leaf River | 21.44 | 4.88 |
| 07 | Mud Creek | 20.73 | 7.10 |
| 08 | Leaf River | 22.50 | 6.77 |
| 09 | Otter Creek | 19.47 | 4.52 |
| 10 | Leaf River | 21.77 | 3.40 |
| PN-03 | Leaf River | 24.67 | 2.08 |
| PN-02 | Leaf River | 22.94 | 2.97 |

Leaf River Network Results (August, 2007)



# Panther Creek Network Results (July, 2008)




| Site ID | Stream Name | Mean Daily Temperature | Mean Daily Temperature Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | Panther Creek | 23.52 | 3.76 |
| 02 | Panther Creek | 23.25 | 3.50 |
| 04 | Cox Creek | 20.99 | 2.48 |
| 05 | Panther Creek | 21.20 | 3.74 |
| 07 | Panther Creek | 20.68 | 3.00 |
| 08 | Panther Creek | 18.21 | 2.38 |
| 09 | Cox Creek | 20.31 | 3.97 |

# Spring Creek Network Results (August-September, 2007)




| Site ID | Stream Name | Mean Daily Temperature | Mean Daily Temperature Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | Spring Creek | 26.37 | 9.73 |
| 02 | Little Spring Creek | 24.73 | 3.43 |
| 03 | Spring Creek | 25.57 | 7.35 |
| EL-01 | Spring Creek | 26.04 | 5.33 |

# Tyler Creek Network Results (August, 2007)




| Site ID | Stream Name | Mean Daily Temperature | Mean Daily Temp. Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | Tyler Creek | 25.39 | 7.52 |
| 02 | Unnamed Trib. to Tyler Creek | 23.96 | 6.18 |
| 04 | Tyler Creek | 24.47 | 5.33 |
| 05 | Tyler Creek | 20.58 | 3.51 |
| 06 | Tyler Creek | 20.83 | 3.76 |
| 07 | Tyler Creek | 23.57 | 4.38 |
| 08 | Unnamed Trib. to Tyler Creek | 23.62 | 7.35 |
| 09 | Tyler  Creek | 23.60 | 4.14 |
| 10 | Tyler Creek | 23.55 | 3.71 |

# Green River Network Temperature Results (July, 2010)




| Site ID | Stream Name | Mean Daily Temperature | Mean Daily Temperature Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | Willow Creek | 21.74 | 3.42 |
| 02 | Green River | 18.49 | 7.6 |
| 03 | Willow Creek | 22.1 | 8.96 |
| 04 | Green River | 22.1 | 7.74 |
| 05 | Tributary to Green River | 22.5 | 8.27 |
| 06 | Green River | 22.66 | 6.6 |
| 07 | Tributary to Green River | 23.3 | 7.35 |
| 08 | Green River | 22.89 | 5.42 |
| 09 | Tributary to Green River | 22.12 | 6.1 |
| 10 | Tributary to Green River | 21.68 | 4.24 |

# Kankakee River Network Temperature Results (July, 2010)

| Site ID | Stream Name | Mean Daily Temperature | Mean Daily Temperature Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | Mud Creek | 24.68 | 5.41 |
| 02 | Pigeon Creek | 27.48 | 5.6 |
| 03 | Fountain Creek | 26.51 | 2.51 |
| 04 | Mud Creek | 27.22 | 4.16 |
| 05 | Tributary to Mud Creek | 25.32 | 4.6 |
| 06 | Sugar Creek | 25.61 | 3.72 |
| 07 | Sugar Creek | 26.29 | 1.89 |
| 08 | Tributary to Sugar Creek | 24.93 | 2.46 |



# Kickapoo Creek Network Temperature Results (August, 2010)




| Site | Stream Name | Mean Daily Temperature | Mean Daily Temperature Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| 01 | Kickapoo Creek | 27.49625 | 3.9565 |
| 02 | Clear Creek | 25.45791 | 2.807846 |
| 03 | Prairie Creek | 26.40778 | 6.0575 |
| 04 | Long Point Creek | 27.06597 | 5.1935 |
| 05 | Kickapoo Creek | 26.03017 | 3.225071 |
| 06 | Kickapoo Creek | 26.08552 | 3.655571 |
| 07 | Kickapoo Creek | 26.12889 | 3.032643 |
| 08 | Kickapoo Creek | 24.38878 | 3.003857 |
| 09 | Kickapoo Creek | 25.74481 | 4.262714 |
| 10 | Kickapoo Creek | 26.15651 | 5.643929 |

# Vermillion Network Temperature Results (July-August, 2010)




| Site | Stream Name | Mean Daily Temperature | Mean Daily Temperature Range |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Middle Fork Vermillion | 27.09509 | 7.072182 |
| 2 | Middle Fork Vermillion | 23.21548 | 2.917091 |
| 3 | Bluegrass Creek | 25.35106 | 3.404727 |
| 4 | Bean Creek | 22.62158 | 3.345364 |
| 5 | Middle Fork Vermillion | 26.97034 | 3.208545 |
| 6 | North Fork Vermillion | 25.99641 | 2.823182 |
| 7 | Jordan Creel | 26.43356 | 3.826 |
| 8 | Middle Branch | 25.12312 | 4.487273 |
| 9 | North Fork Vermillion | 24.74529 | 5.044273 |
| 10 | North Fork Vermillion | 24.68466 | 4.195364 |

# Appendix C

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | AO-03 |
| Stream Name | Big Creek |
| Location | upstream of marked location of AO-03, 150' upstream of 600N ?bridge |
| Sample Date | 8/29/2007 |
| Sample Time | 1400 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~ 200' |
| Sample Effort | 841 sec. 14.02 min |
| Water Temp. | 26.5 C |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Northern hog sucker | 12 | 22.5/123; 22.0/117; 20.0/82; 14.0/27; 14.5/28 |
| Orangespotted sunfish | 10 | 11.5/27; 12.0/34; 12.5/39/ 8.0/9; 12.0/28 |
| Rock bass | 3 | 12.5/30; 11.5/28 |
| Central stoneroller | 30 | |
| Bluegill | 7 | |
| Banded sculpin | 11 | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 3 | |
| Blackspotted topminnow | 2 | |
| White sucker | 4 | |
| Redfin shiner | 22 | |
| Johnny darter | 5 | |
| Stripetail darter | 1 | |
| () darter | 18 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 128 |
| Total Species Collected | 13 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 547 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | AJ-09 |
| Stream Name | Bay Creek |
| Location | just north of route 147, upstream of bridge ~20 feet |
| Sample Date | 8/30/2007 |
| Sample Time | 1030 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~150' |
| Sample Effort | 907 sec. 15.12 min |
| Water Temp. | 23.5 C |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Orangespotted sunfish | 14 | 9.0/11; 13.0/41; 12.0/31; 10.0/20; 9.5/14; 9.5/19 |
| Yellow bullhead | 12 | 13.0/28; 12.0/18 |
| Blackspotted topminnow | 2 | |
| Bluegill | 16 | |
| Creek chub | 16 | |
| Central stoneroller | 5 | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 2 | |
| Blackstripped topminnow | 2 | |
| Mosquito fish | 1 | |
| Freckled madtom | 8 | |
| Banded sculpin | 25 | |
| Johnny darter | 2 | |
| Pirate perch | 2 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 107 |
| Total Species Collected | 13 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 425 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | AJG-18 |
| Stream Name | Hayes Creek |
| Location | upstream and downstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 8/29/2007 |
| Sample Time | 1700 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~100 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 690 sec. 11.50 min |
| Water Temp. | 23.0 C at 0900 |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Pirate perch | 17 | |
| Banded sculpin | 21 | |
| Creek chub | 37 | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 1 | |
| Central stoneroller | 7 | |
| Blackside darter | 1 | |
| Blugill | 4 | |
| Orangespotted sunfish | 1 | |
| () minnow | 4 | |
| Mosquito fish | 3 | |
| Freckled madtom | 2 | |
| () darter | 2 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 100 |
| Total Species Collected | 12 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 521 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | PWC-01 |
| Stream Name | Rhule Creek |
| Location | upstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 9/11/2007 |
| Sample Time | 0800 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~200 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 868 sec 14.47 min |
| Water Temp. | 11.5 C |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Bluegill | 6 | |
| Creek Chub | 80 | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 8 | |
| Largemouth bass | 4 | |
| Orangespotted sunfish | 18 | |
| Brook stickleback | 32 | |
| Common carp | 1 | |
| Johnny darter | 2 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 151 |
| Total Species Collected | 8 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 627 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | PQDA-01 |
| Stream Name | Mosquito Creek |
| Location | upstream and downstream of culvert |
| Sample Date | 9/10/2007 |
| Sample Time | 1700 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~300 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 1093 sec 18.22 min |
| Water Temp. | 15.5 C |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Creek chub | 77 | |
| White sucker | 13 | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 63 | |
| Orangespotted sunfish | 3 | |
| Largescale stoneroller | 35 | |
| Fathead minnow | 9 | |
| Bluegill | 35 | |
| Common shiner | 4 | |
| Blacknose dace | 4 | |
| Largemouth bass | 2 | |
| Smallmouth bass | 2 | |
| Johnny darter | 6 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 253 |
| Total Species Collected | 12 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 832 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | DZP-03 |
| Stream Name | Spring Creek |
| Location | upstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 9/25/2007 |
| Sample Time | 1100 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~300 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 1551 sec 25.85 min |
| Water Temp. | 23.0 C |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Common shiner | 2 | |
| Gizzard shad | 1 | |
| Creek chub | 6 | |
| Central stoneroller | 77 | |
| Horneyhead chub | 18 | |
| Bluegill | 20 | |
| Yellow bullhead | 4 | |
| Green sunfish | 32 | |
| () Sunfish | 2 | |
| Smallmouth bass | 3 | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 8 | |
| White sucker | 1 | |
| Log perch | 3 | |
| Orangespotted sunfish | 1 | |
| Stonecat | 2 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 180 |
| Total Species Collected | 15 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 418 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | ADD-02 |
| Stream Name | Dutchman Creek |
| Location | upstream of crossing |
| Sample Date | 8/13/2007 |
| Sample Time | 1000 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~150 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 1315 sec 21.92 min |
| Water Temp. | |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Bluegill | 29 | |
| Largemouth bass | 1 | |
| Gizzard shad | 1 | |
| Grass pickerel | 1 | |
| Longear sunfish | 5 | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 6 | |
| Green sunfish | 3 | |
| Yellow bullhead | 1 | |
| Orangespotted sunfish | 2 | |
| Blackspotted topminnow | 1 | |
| Blackside darter | 3 | |
| Banded sculpin | 1 | |
| Spotted sucker | 1 | |
| Golden redhorse | 1 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 56 |
| Total Species Collected | 14 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 153 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | AOA-01 |
| Stream Name | Hogthief Creek |
| Location | upstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 8/12/2007 |
| Sample Time | 1300 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~150 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 1658 sec 27.63 min |
| Water Temp. | |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Creek chub | 28 | |
| Striped shiner | 16 | |
| Central stoneroller | 98 | |
| Northern hogsucker | 1 | |
| Blackspotted topminnow | 3 | |
| Orangspotted sunfish | 5 | |
| Bluegill | 2 | |
| Longear sunfish | 2 | |
| White sucker | 1 | |
| Green sunfish | 2 | |
| Rock bass | 1 | |
| Banded sculpin | 28 | |
| Rainbow darter | 35 | |
| Golden redhorse | 2 | |
| Spottail darter | 9 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 233 |
| Total Species Collected | 15 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 505 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | AJF-16 |
| Stream Name | Cedar Creek |
| Location | upstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 8/12/2007 |
| Sample Time | 1600 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~100 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 1085 sce 18.08 min |
| Water Temp. | |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Bluegill | 7 | |
| Golden redhorse | 2 | |
| Orangespotted sunfish | 4 | |
| Pirate perch | 3 | |
| Longear sunfish | 1 | |
| Blackspotted topminnow | 1 | |
| Blackside darter | 1 | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 3 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 22 |
| Total Species Collected | 8 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 73 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | ADDB-01 |
| Stream Name | Little Cache Creek |
| Location | upstream of park bridge |
| Sample Date | 8/13/2007 |
| Sample Time | 0800 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~150 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 1164 sec 19.40 min |
| Water Temp. | |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Bluegill | 39 | |
| Orangespotted sunfish | 5 | |
| Longear sunfish | 4 | |
| Banded sculpin | 1 | |
| Blackside darter | 3 | |
| Green sunfish | 3 | |
| Largemouth bass | 1 | |
| Pirate perch | 7 | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 1 | |
| Carp | 2 | |
| Tadpole madtom | 1 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 67 |
| Total Species Collected | 11 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 207 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | DZA-03 |
| Stream Name | Otter Creek |
| Location | upstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 9/2/2007 |
| Sample Time | 1115 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~200 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 1419 sec 23.65 min |
| Water Temp. | |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Channel catfish | 1 | 22/140 |
| Yellow bullhead | 11 | 18/115; 17/75; 15/45; 17/75; 17.5/82; 13/39; 15/48; 14/34; 19.5/90; 17/NA |
| Freshwater drum | 3 | 21/137; 20/90; 19/67 |
| Common Carp | 1 | 43/930 |
| Bluntnose minnow | 76 | |
| Largemouth bass | 4 | 11/20; 10/17; 12/21; 11/18 |
| Bluegill | 20 | 14/59 |
| White sucker | 1 | 20/67 |
| Golden redhorse | 10 | 21/92; 91/37; 37/558; 21/105; 32/314; 19/72; 20/93; 22/124; 19.5/81; 24.5/169 |
| Horneyhead chub | 1 | |
| Smallmouth bass | 6 | 17.5/66; 10/12; 10.5/44 |
| Green sunfish | 5 | |
| Blackstripe topminnow | 3 | |
| Log perch | 10 | |
| Sand shiner | 55 | |
| Mosquitofish | 1 | |
| Redfin shiner | 2 | |
| Johnny darter | 6 | |
| Central stoneroller | 2 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 218 |
| Total Species Collected | 19 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 553 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | FLDAE-01 |
| Stream Name | Little Beaver Creek |
| Location | downstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 8/21/2008 |
| Sample Time | 1130 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~300 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 1725 sec 28.75 min |
| Water Temp. | 19.5 |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Common shiner | 2 | |
| Striped shiner | 8 | |
| White sucker | 7 | 33/440; 22/130; 22/120; 23/140; 25/170 |
| Grass pickerel | 3 | |
| Black bullhead | 3 | 27/300 |
| River redhorse | 1 | 28/340 |
| Longear sunfish | 4 | |
| Largemouth bass | 1 | 21/140 |
| Creek chub | 1 | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 2 | |
| Green sunfish | 4 | |
| Yellow bullhead | 4 | |
| Bluegill | 1 | |
| Johnny darter | 10 | |
| Rock bass | 3 | 24/220 |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 54 |
| Total Species Collected | 15 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 113 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | PWIA-01 |
| Stream Name | Pink Creek |
| Location | upstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 8/19/2008 |
| Sample Time | 1300 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~300 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 1633 sec 27.22 min |
| Water Temp. | 19 |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| White sucker | 23 | 35/325; 28/240; 25/170; 27/270; 30/280; 27/190; 22/140; 21/110; 33/400; 24/140; 31/360; 30/320; 29/290; 22/130; 18/70; 23/120; 24/150; 25/200; 20/100 |
| Northern pike | 6 | 25/90; 20/40; 21/50; 21/50; 23/70; 22/60; 21/100; 19/90; 14/40 |
| Green sunfish | 1 | 15/80 |
| Largemouth bass | 1 | 15/40 |
| Grass pickerel | 1 | |
| Black redhorse | 1 | |
| Johnny darter | 2 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 35 |
| Total Species Collected | 7 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 77 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | PWI-01 |
| Stream Name | Rock Run |
| Location | upstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 8/19/2008 |
| Sample Time | 1500 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~150 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 1717 sec 28.62 min |
| Water Temp. | 20 |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Smallmouth bass | 3 | 10/16; 38/720; 14/40 |
| White sucker | 26 | 27/200; 26/230; 30/310; 26/180; 22/100; 22/110; 22/110; 25/170; 30/280; 30/290; 30/270; 22/120; 19/70; 16/40; 23/150; 23/130; 18/60; 21/100; 18/120; 28/260; 26/180; 18/50; 18/70 |
| Hornyhead chub | 44 | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 47 | |
| Common shiner | 3 | |
| Bigmouth shiner | 5 | |
| Northern pike | 1 | |
| Central stoneroller | 5 | |
| Fathead minnow | 1 | |
| Creek chub | 3 | |
| Fantail darter | 146 | |
| Johnny darter | 19 | |
| Bluegill | 1 | |
| Stonecat | 3 | |
| Carp | 2 | 0.71m/NA; >0.50m/NA |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 309 |
| Total Species Collected | 15 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 648 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | PU-01 |
| Stream Name | North Kinnikinnik Creek |
| Location | upstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 8/20/2008 |
| Sample Time | 1000 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~300 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 2086 sec 34.77 min |
| Water Temp. | 19 |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Carp | 1 | 46/1100 |
| White sucker | 19 | 32/360; 23/110; 20/70; 18/60; 24/140; 18/80; 21/120; 21/90; 21/90; 19/80; 18/70; 18/70; 19/80; 24/140; 20/90 |
| Creek chub | 11 | |
| Bluegill | 5 | |
| Common shiner | 2 | |
| Green sunfish | 1 | |
| Northern pike | 2 | 32/240; 20/40 |
| Hornyhead chub | 14 | |
| Grass pickerel | 4 | |
| Northern hogsucker | 13 | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 10 | |
| Stonecat | 1 | |
| Yellow bullhead | 1 | |
| Central stoneroller | 10 | |
| Fantail darter | 13 | |
| Johnny darter | 4 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 111 |
| Total Species Collected | 16 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 198 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | PQE-10 |
| Stream Name | Piscasaw Creek |
| Location | upstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 8/20/2008 |
| Sample Time | 1300 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~200 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 1826 sec 30.43 min |
| Water Temp. | 18 |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Creek chub | 31 | |
| White sucker | 22 | 25/190; 34/450; 21/90; 41/770; 23/170; 24/170; 26/200; 20/110; 28/240; 23/130; 29/250; 18/70; 22/110; 24/130; 21/100; 20/80 |
| Common shiner | 2 | |
| Central stoneroller | 12 | |
| Blacknose dace | 31 | |
| Sothern redbelly dace | 1 | |
| Brook stickleback | 3 | |
| Bluegill | 3 | |
| Green sunfish | 12 | |
| Johnny darter | 20 | |
| Rainbow darter | 40 | |
| Fantail darter | 10 | |
| Minnow | 9 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 196 |
| Total Species Collected | ? |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 387 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | HBE-02 |
| Stream Name | Plum Creek |
| Location | upstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 8/21/2008 |
| Sample Time | 900 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~200 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 1748 sec 29.13 min |
| Water Temp. | 20 |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| White sucker | 16 | 34/390; 24/140; 19/60; 29/220; 33/290; 21/90; 18/60; 22/90; 16/40 |
| Creek chub | 27 | |
| Grass pickerel | 1 | |
| Common shiner | 7 | |
| Bluegill | 3 | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 26 | |
| Largemouth bass | 1 | 17/60 |
| Hornyhead chub | 15 | |
| Green sunfish | 20 | |
| Yellow bullhead | 1 | 17/80 |
| Johnny darter | 16 | |
| Largescale stoneroller | 17 | |
| Blackside darter | 4 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 154 |
| Total Species Collected | 13 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 317 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | DH-03 |
| Stream Name | Sugar Creek |
| Location | upstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 8/25/2008 |
| Sample Time | 1000 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~200 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 1454 sec 24.23 min |
| Water Temp. | 19.5 |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Bluntnose minnow | 105 | |
| Creek chub | 59 | |
| Central stoneroller | 101 | |
| Striped shiner | 5 | |
| Bluegill | 22 | |
| White sucker | 15 | |
| Eastern mosquitofish | 1 | |
| Black bullhead | 14 | |
| Green sunfish | 3 | |
| Largemouth bass | 7 | |
| Blackside darter | 6 | |
| Yellow bullhead | 1 | |
| Johnny darter | 8 | |
| Orangethroat darter | 18 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 365 |
| Total Species Collected | 14 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 903 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | PQCK-01 |
| Stream Name | Rosseter Farm Creek |
| Location | upstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 7/20/2010 |
| Sample Time | 13:00 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~200 total feet |
| Sample Effort | 1390 sec 23.17 min |
| Water Temp. | 21 |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Bluntnose minnow | 6 | |
| Creek chub | 15 | |
| Central stoneroller | 17 | |
| Bigmouth shiner | 6 | |
| Bluegill | 2 | |
| White sucker | 10 | |
| Sand shiner | 5 | |
| Orangespotted sunfish | 2 | |
| Green sunfish | 4 | |
| Largemouth bass | 12 | |
| Johnny darter | 17 | |
| Largescale stoneroller | 1 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 97 |
| Total Species Collected | 12 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 251 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | PW?-?? |
| Stream Name | Tunnison Creek |
| Location | upstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 7/20/2010 |
| Sample Time | 15:00 |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~200 total feet |
| Sample Effort | sec min |
| Water Temp. | |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Creek chub | 30 | 18 cm, 14, 17, 13.5, 20, 17 |
| White sucker | 20 | 26 cm, 26.5, 25, 28.5 |
| Johnny darter | 8 | |
| Southern redbelly dace | 1 | |
| Blacknose dace | 11 | |
| Blackside darter | 4 | |
| Central stoneroller | 1 | |
| Brook stickleback | 1 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 76 |
| Total Species Collected | 8 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | PWPC-01 |
| Stream Name | East Branch Richland Creek |
| Location | upstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 7/21/2010 |
| Sample Time | |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~200 total feet |
| Sample Effort | sec 1499 min 24.98 |
| Water Temp. | |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Creek chub | 26 | |
| White sucker | 13 | |
| Johnny darter | 16 | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 4 | |
| Fantail darter | 38 | |
| Largescale stoneroller | 9 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 106 |
| Total Species Collected | 6 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | 262 |

**General Information**

| | |
|---|---|
| Site ID | MJA-02 |
| Stream Name | Camp Creek |
| Location | upstream of bridge |
| Sample Date | 7/21/2010 |
| Sample Time | |
| Sample Method | Backpack |
| Sample Reach Length | ~200 total feet |
| Sample Effort | sec min |
| Water Temp. | |

**Fish Collection**

| Common Name | # Collected | Length/Weight Measurements |
|---|---|---|
| Creek chub | 1 | |
| White sucker | 9 | |
| Johnny darter | 3 | |
| Bluntnose minnow | 1 | |
| Fantail darter | 100 | |
| Largescale stoneroller | 1 | |
| Madtom | 1 | |
| Longnose dace | 29 | |
| Green sunfish | 1 | |
| Central mudminnow | 1 | |

**Summary**

| | |
|---|---|
| Total Fish Collected | 147 |
| Total Species Collected | 10 |
| CPUE (#/hour) | |

# Appendix D


American Brook Lamprey
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Banded Sculpin
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Blacknose Dace
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Brook Stickleback
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Brown Trout
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (ºC)
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (ºC)


Iowa Darter
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Ironcolor Shiner
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Least Brook Lamprey
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (ºC)
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (oC)


Least Darter
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (ºC)
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (ºC)


Longnose Dace
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Mottled Sculpin
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Ninespine Stickleback
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Ozark Minnow
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Rainbow Trout
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Southern Redbelly Dace
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Weed Shiner
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (ºC)
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (ºC)


American Eel
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (ºC)
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (oC)


Black Redhorse
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Blackspotted Topminnow
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Brassy Minnow
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Brindled Madtom (BRM)
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Central mudminnow
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Chestnut Lamprey
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Common Shiner
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Creek chub
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Fantail Darter
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Golden Redhorse
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Grass Pickerel
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Horneyhead Chub
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Lake Chubsucker
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Largescale stoneroller
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Northern Hogsucker
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Northern Pike
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Orangethroat Darter
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Rainbow Darter
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Rock Bass
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Suager
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (ºC)
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (ºC)


Shorthead Redhorse
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Smallmouth Bass
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Starhead Topminnow
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Stonecat
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Striped Shiner
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Stripetail Darter
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


Walleye
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)


White Sucker
Maximum Daily Temperature Range (°C)
0
2
4
6
8
10
12
14
16
18
10
12
14
16
18
20
22
24
26
28
30
Mean Daily July Temperature (°C)