

**The development and validation of an  
estuarine health index  
using fish community characteristics**

Christopher Sean Hallett

BSc (Hons), Manchester University, UK

MSc, Bangor University, UK

This thesis is presented for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Murdoch University

2010

## Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own account of my research and contains, as its main content, work which has not previously been submitted for a degree at any tertiary education institution.

.....  
Christopher Sean Hallett



Sampling site in the upper reaches of the Swan Estuary

## Abstract

---

The overall aim of this thesis was to develop an approach for constructing and validating a fish-based, multimetric index for assessing the ecological health of estuaries in south-western Australia, and to apply that approach to the large Swan Estuary, which has been subjected to substantial anthropogenic pressures. The indices developed for nearshore and offshore waters are the first to be produced for Western Australian estuaries. They deliver a reliable, practical and cost-effective method for quantifying the status of estuarine health, thus providing managers with a sound basis for preventative management actions and a means for communicating ecosystem health implications to the wider public.

An extensive range of potential fish community characteristics (metrics) were initially tested for their suitability for incorporation into the indices. These metrics included various measures of species composition, diversity and abundance, trophic and functional aspects of the assemblage, *i.e.* the contributions of different feeding and life-history guilds and, where relevant, sentinel species. An *a priori* hypothesis was formulated for each candidate metric, reflecting its predicted response to increasing ecosystem degradation.

Two different approaches were trialled to identify the subset of metrics that were most sensitive to changes in environmental integrity and thus most appropriate for inclusion in an index of ecosystem health. The first approach sought to identify those metrics that showed the strongest responses to spatial differences in the quality of physical habitat, as quantified using a novel and independent measure of habitat degradation. Habitat quality was thus assessed at 136 nearshore sites throughout the estuary in spring 2007, using rapid visual survey techniques to assign scores for each of six habitat quality metrics. Scores for all physical habitat metrics were then summed to produce an overall habitat quality index score for each site. The results of graphical screening and various multivariate statistical techniques (PERMANOVA, PCA and CCorA) demonstrated that this approach failed to confirm hypothesised responses of the

candidate fish metrics to physical habitat degradation and was thus unsuccessful in selecting appropriate metrics. This applied even to sites where water quality conditions were similar. Moreover, the compositions of the fish assemblages did not differ significantly among habitat quality categories, either across the whole estuary or within its various regions. It is thus suggested that habitat quality influences the fish communities of the Swan Estuary at a broader scale than that at which it was assessed.

As none of the candidate metrics were found to be sensitive to spatial differences in habitat quality at local scales, a novel alternative approach was employed to identify the metric subset that most consistently reflected temporal (inter-annual) changes at the ecosystem level, and was thus likely to be most sensitive to changes in ecosystem condition. This approach to metric selection relied on the assumption that the ecological condition of the Swan Estuary has varied over time in response to changes in the suite of stressors acting on the system. This assumption is supported by the fact that there has been considerable inter-annual variation in the severity of environmental perturbations affecting the estuary, including large phytoplankton blooms and hypoxic events, and consequently in their effects on ecological processes and biota including fish.

Given the above assumption, and the associated uncertainty surrounding the nature and magnitude of temporal changes in the ecological condition of the Swan Estuary over the last few decades, the second approach to metric selection employed a combination of multivariate (DISTLM and BEST) and information-theoretic statistical approaches to assess both metric sensitivity to inter-annual changes in ecosystem condition, and the extent of metric redundancy. This approach allowed inferences to be drawn from the weight of evidence derived from multiple analyses of fish data sets collected using divergent sampling techniques throughout the estuary between 1976 and 2009. Responsive and parsimonious subsets of 11 and seven candidate metrics were thus selected for subsequent incorporation into multimetric health indices for the nearshore waters (< 2 m depth) and offshore waters (> 2 m depth) of this system.

Reference conditions for each selected nearshore and offshore metric, representing the 'best available' values against which the previous, current and future

health of the Swan Estuary may be assessed and compared, were then established for each season and region of the estuary using 30 years of fish assemblage data recorded throughout that system. This included data collected during the current study, in which fish were sampled seasonally in the nearshore and offshore waters between 2007 and 2009, and in which the sampling locations, timing and net types employed replicated, as far as possible, those in all previous studies of fish assemblages in this system. However, prior to establishing the reference conditions for the nearshore metrics, the fish assemblage data recorded in those waters first required standardisation to minimise the effects of gear-induced bias that were attributable to the large differences in the characteristics of the seine nets used to sample the nearshore fish fauna of the Swan Estuary since the mid-1970s. A net selectivity study was thus conducted during spring 2008 and autumn 2009 in two main regions of the estuary to compare the compositions of fish samples collected using each of the different seine nets employed historically, *i.e.* 21.5, 41.5 and 133 m-long seines. The data from these samples were then subjected to generalised linear modelling techniques to derive net equivalence factors for quantitatively standardising fish species abundance data across all historical and current nearshore samples, and thereby minimise the effects of sampling biases.

Scoring thresholds were then determined statistically from the 5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles of the composite nearshore and offshore fish assemblage data sets, enabling each metric in each sample to be scored according to the extent of its deviation from the relevant reference condition. Finally, index scores for both nearshore and offshore health indices were calculated by summing the scores for their component metrics and then adjusting the resultant value by the number of metrics in the index to produce a final, easily interpretable index score ranging from 0-100. Thresholds for establishing the qualitative health status of the estuary (*i.e.* good, fair, poor, very poor) were also determined by subdividing the possible range of index scores into four equal classes.

The trends exhibited by the mean index scores for nearshore waters of the Swan Estuary suggest that the health of those waters has remained relatively constant over the last three decades, with their health status being classified as fair throughout this time. It is important to recognise, however, that interpretation of these trends in mean scores is

hindered by differences in the spatial distribution, timing and intensity of sampling among studies, and most notably among those from the mid-1970s to the mid-1990s. Interpretations of trends in the index scores for nearshore waters from the mid-1990s to the present are more reliable, due to greater similarities in the sampling methodology throughout this period. Such trends suggest that the health of these waters has increased in recent years, with the mean health index score increasing from *ca* 58 in 2005/06 to 64 in 2008/09. In contrast, the mean offshore index score has decreased consistently from 56.5 in the late 1970s to 47 in 2008/09, resulting, for the first time in three decades, in the health status of the offshore waters being classified as poor.

The reliability of the nearshore and offshore indices was evaluated by quantifying the variability of index scores among replicate sites, within and between seasons and between consecutive years. The effects of random sampling variation on the precision of index scores were also determined using bootstrap resampling techniques. The sensitivity of the final nearshore and offshore indices to environmental degradation and other stressors was tested by determining the degree to which the health index scores for each replicate sample responded to three water quality parameters measured during sampling and, in the case of the nearshore index, to habitat quality metrics assessed in spring 2007. Although index responses to changes in specific stressors were not detected, the consistent decrease in offshore health index scores from 1978 to 2009 suggests that this index is capable of detecting the widely-perceived, long-term decline in the condition of offshore waters of the Swan Estuary. Moreover, the far greater inter-seasonal variability among offshore than nearshore index scores provides further evidence that the deeper waters of the estuary are in poorer health than the shallower waters, most notably in the upper reaches of this system.

The consistently lower spatial variability of nearshore and offshore index scores recorded in summer and autumn indicates that, dependent upon an appropriate examination of intra-seasonal index variability, these seasons represent a suitable index period for future monitoring of the ecological health of the Swan Estuary. Overall, validation of the indices developed during this study demonstrated that their spatial and temporal variability was comparable to that of existing multimetric indices employed in

the USA and Europe, and that classification of the health status of the estuary was fairly robust, despite the effects of both natural spatio-temporal variability and sampling error on index scores.

Given the relative lack of quantitative, biological indicators currently available to estuarine managers, there is considerable potential for multimetric, biotic indices to advance the field of estuarine health assessment in Australia. Several issues must be addressed if we are to understand the complex ways in which the condition of these estuarine systems responds to natural and anthropogenic pressures or to management actions designed to improve or maintain them, not least of which is the need for such indices to be integrated within a broader monitoring framework employing multiple indicators.



# Table of contents

---

	Page
<b>Abstract</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>9</b>
List of Figures	13
List of Tables	16
List of acronyms	20
Acknowledgements	21
<b>Chapter 1 – General introduction: Assessing the health of aquatic ecosystems</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>1.1. Legislative context</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>1.2. The concept of ecosystem health</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>1.3. Indicators of aquatic ecosystem health</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>1.4. Biotic indicators: from indicator species to community-level indices</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>1.5. Choice of organism for community indicators</b>	<b>31</b>
1.5.1. BENTHIC MACROINVERTEBRATE COMMUNITIES AS BIOTIC INDICATORS	32
1.5.2. FISH COMMUNITIES AS BIOTIC INDICATORS	33
<b>1.6. Indicators of aquatic ecosystem health using fish communities</b>	<b>35</b>
1.6.1. IDENTIFYING CANDIDATE METRICS	37
1.6.2. METRIC SELECTION	38
1.6.3. ESTABLISHING REFERENCE CONDITIONS	38
1.6.4. METRIC SCORING AND INDEX CALCULATION	39
1.6.5. INDEX VALIDATION	39
<b>1.7. Assessing the health of estuaries using fish-based indicators</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>1.8. Development of a biotic index of estuarine health for south-western Australia</b>	<b>42</b>
1.8.1. ESTUARIES OF SOUTH-WESTERN AUSTRALIA	42
1.8.2. THE SWAN ESTUARY	43

<b>Chapter 2 – Selection of metrics</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>2.1. Introduction</b>	<b>47</b>
2.1.1. APPROACHES TO METRIC SELECTION	47
2.1.2. OBJECTIVES AND RATIONALE	49
2.1.2.1. Selection of metrics sensitive to spatial changes in habitat quality	49
2.1.2.2. Selection of metrics sensitive to temporal changes	51
<b>2.2. Materials and Methods</b>	<b>52</b>
2.2.1. ALLOCATION OF FISH TO ECOLOGICAL GUILDS	52
2.2.2. CANDIDATE FISH METRICS	55
2.2.3. SELECTION OF METRICS SENSITIVE TO SPATIAL CHANGES IN HABITAT QUALITY	58
2.2.3.1. Physical habitat metrics	58
2.2.3.2. Site selection and field assessment	60
2.2.3.3. Sampling of the nearshore fish community	63
2.2.3.4. Metric calculation and statistical analyses	64
2.2.4. SELECTION OF METRICS SENSITIVE TO TEMPORAL CHANGES	67
2.2.4.1. Refinement of the candidate fish metric list	67
2.2.4.2. Collation of data sets and calculation of metrics	68
2.2.4.3. Statistical analyses – nearshore data sets	71
2.2.4.4. Statistical analyses – offshore data set	75
<b>2.3. Results</b>	<b>77</b>
2.3.1. SELECTION OF METRICS SENSITIVE TO SPATIAL CHANGES IN HABITAT QUALITY	77
2.3.2. SELECTION OF METRICS SENSITIVE TO TEMPORAL CHANGES	89
<b>2.4. Discussion</b>	<b>99</b>
2.4.1. SELECTION OF METRICS SENSITIVE TO SPATIAL CHANGES IN HABITAT QUALITY	100
2.4.2. SELECTION OF METRICS SENSITIVE TO TEMPORAL CHANGES	102
2.4.3. SUMMARY	106

<b>Chapter 3 – Establishing reference conditions and scoring thresholds</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>3.1. Introduction</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>3.2. Materials and Methods</b>	<b>111</b>
3.2.1. NEARSHORE REFERENCE DATA SETS	111
3.2.2. SEINE NET COMPARISON	113
3.2.2.1. Sampling of nearshore fish communities	113
3.2.2.2. Statistical analysis	114
3.2.3. OFFSHORE REFERENCE DATA SETS	116
3.2.4. ESTABLISHING REFERENCE CONDITIONS AND SCORING METRICS	116
3.2.4.1. Predicted responses of metrics to degradation	116
3.2.4.2. Nearshore and offshore reference conditions and metric scores	116
<b>3.3. Results</b>	<b>118</b>
3.3.1. NEARSHORE SEINE NET COMPARISON	118
3.3.2. ESTABLISHING REFERENCE CONDITIONS AND SCORING METRICS	122
<b>3.4. Discussion</b>	<b>125</b>
3.4.1. BIASES AFFECTING REFERENCE DATA SETS	125
3.4.2. REFERENCE CONDITIONS AND SCORING THRESHOLDS	129
3.4.3. SUMMARY	132
<b>Chapter 4 – Index calculation and validation</b>	<b>133</b>
<b>4.1. Introduction</b>	<b>133</b>
4.1.1. INDEX CALCULATION AND INTERPRETATION	133
4.1.2. INDEX VALIDATION	135
4.1.3. OBJECTIVES	136
<b>4.2. Methods</b>	<b>137</b>
4.2.1. INDEX CALCULATION	137
4.2.2. PRELIMINARY INTERPRETATION OF INDEX PERFORMANCE	137
4.2.3. INDEX VALIDATION	138
4.2.3.1. Index sensitivity	138
4.2.3.2. Index variability	139

4.2.3.3. Random sampling variability	140
<b>4.3. Results</b>	<b>141</b>
4.3.1. PRELIMINARY INTERPRETATION OF INDEX PERFORMANCE	141
4.3.2. INDEX VALIDATION	146
4.3.2.1. Index sensitivity	146
4.3.2.2. Index variability	149
4.3.2.3. Random sampling variability	155
<b>4.4. Discussion</b>	<b>159</b>
4.4.1. PRELIMINARY INTERPRETATION OF INDEX PERFORMANCE	159
4.4.2. INDEX VALIDATION	161
4.4.2.1. Index sensitivity	161
4.4.2.2. Index variability	163
4.4.2.3. Random sampling variability	166
4.4.3. SUMMARY	167
<b>Chapter 5 – General discussion</b>	<b>170</b>
<b>5.1. Progress to date</b>	<b>170</b>
<b>5.2. What is required now?</b>	<b>172</b>
<b>5.3. The future of estuarine health assessment in Western Australia</b>	<b>174</b>
<b>References</b>	<b>179</b>

## List of Figures

Figure		Page
<b>Figure 1.1</b>	Main stages in the development of multimetric biotic indicators.	37
<b>Figure 1.2</b>	The Swan Estuary, Western Australia, and its location within Australia (inset), annotated to show regions of the estuary. CH = Channel, BA = Basin, CR = Canning River, LS = Lower Swan River, MD = Middle-downstream Swan River, MU = Middle-upstream Swan River, US = Upper Swan River.	44
<b>Figure 2.1</b>	Field sheet employed in the rapid visual assessment of habitat quality at sites throughout the Swan Estuary.	62
<b>Figure 2.2</b>	Sites throughout the Swan Estuary at which the fish community in the nearshore and offshore waters was sampled seasonally during 2007-2009. Sampling of the former sites employed seine nets, whilst that of the latter employed gill nets. See Fig. 1.2 for region codes.	71
<b>Figure 2.3</b>	Boxplots of candidate fish metric responses across Habitat Quality Categories.	78
<b>Figure 2.4</b>	Non-metric multidimensional scaling ordination plots of the pre-treated fish metric composition data recorded from 71 sites throughout the Swan Estuary. Samples are coded by (a) Habitat Quality Category and (b) region of the estuary (US = Upper Swan River, MU = Middle-Upstream Swan River, MD = Middle-Downstream Swan River, LS = Lower Swan River, CR = Canning River, BA = Basin, CH = Channel).	81
<b>Figure 2.5</b>	Non-metric multidimensional scaling ordination plots of the pre-treated fish abundance data recorded from 71 sites throughout the Swan Estuary. Samples are coded by (a) Habitat Quality Category and (b) region of the estuary (US = Upper Swan River, MU = Middle-Upstream Swan River, MD = Middle-Downstream Swan River, LS = Lower Swan River, CR = Canning River, BA = Basin, CH = Channel).	83
<b>Figure 2.6</b>	PCA ordination of normalised scores for the various physical habitat quality metrics measured at the 71 sites fished throughout the Swan Estuary. Samples are coded by habitat quality (HQ) category. Vector overlays denote the direction and magnitude of the contributions to the PC axes of each of the habitat metrics: Substrate, Instream Cover (Instr. Cover), Bank Stability (Bank Stab.), Riparian Zone Width (Rip. Width), Riparian Zone Length and Canopy Cover (Rip. Long.) and Human Stressors of Habitat/Riparian Zone (Human Impact).	85
<b>Figure 2.7</b>	PCA ordination of normalised scores for the various water quality variables measured at 71 sites fished throughout the Swan Estuary. Samples are coded by region of the estuary (US = Upper Swan River, MU = Middle-Upstream Swan River, MD = Middle-Downstream Swan River, LS = Lower Swan River, CR = Canning River, BA = Basin, CH = Channel). Vector overlays denote the direction and magnitude of the contributions to the PC axes of each of the water quality variables: Secchi depth (Avg Secchi), Temperature (Avg Temp), Salinity (Avg Sal) and Dissolved oxygen (Avg DO).	85
<b>Figure 2.8</b>	Canonical Analysis of Principal Coordinates (CAP) ordination, relating the fish metric composition (CAP1) to the physical habitat quality gradient (PC1a) across the 71 sites fished throughout the Swan Estuary. Proportion of variation in the data cloud explained by the first four ( <i>m</i> ) PCO axes = 64%.	86

<b>Figure 2.9</b>	Canonical Analysis of Principal Coordinates (CAP) ordination, relating the fish community composition (CAP1) to the physical habitat quality gradient (PC1a) across the 71 sites fished throughout the Swan Estuary. Proportion of variation in the data cloud explained by the first two ( <i>m</i> ) PCO axes = 63%.	87
<b>Figure 2.10</b>	Canonical Analysis of Principal Coordinates (CAP) ordination, relating the fish metric composition (CAP1) to the water quality gradient (PC1b) across the 71 sites fished throughout the Swan Estuary. Proportion of variation in the data cloud explained by the first six ( <i>m</i> ) PCO axes = 79%.	88
<b>Figure 2.11</b>	Canonical Analysis of Principal Coordinates (CAP) ordination, relating the fish community composition (CAP1) to the water quality gradient (PC1b) across the 71 sites fished throughout the Swan Estuary. Proportion of variation in the data cloud explained by the first two ( <i>m</i> ) PCO axes = 63%.	88
<b>Figure 3.1</b>	Locations of nearshore sites (< 2 m depth) throughout the Swan Estuary at which three seine nets of different sizes were used to sample the fish community during spring 2008 and autumn 2009.	113
<b>Figure 3.2</b>	Regions (Ecological Management Zones) of the Swan Estuary for which specific reference conditions were established for each of the nearshore and offshore metrics.	117
<b>Figure 3.3</b>	Plots of total fish densities obtained using the 41.5 m (blue) and 133 m (green) seine nets versus those obtained using the 21.5 m seine. Plot (a) shows unstandardised fish densities (corrected only to a common swept area of 116 m <sup>2</sup> ) whereas plot (b) shows fish densities following standardisation of the counts of each species in the former two net types to expected counts per 21.5 m seine. The broken line illustrates a 1:1 relationship between density estimates from the different net types.	122
<b>Figure 4.1</b>	Mean ( $\pm$ SE) nearshore health index scores across all sites sampled throughout the Swan Estuary from 1976 to 2009.	142
<b>Figure 4.2</b>	Mean ( $\pm$ SE) offshore health index scores across all sites sampled throughout the Swan Estuary from 1978 to 2009.	143
<b>Figure 4.3</b>	Scores for the 11 selected nearshore fish metrics vs the nearshore health index scores in each (non-zero) fish sample collected throughout the Swan Estuary from 1976 to 2009. Lines on plots indicate statistically significant correlations ( $P < 0.05$ ).	145
<b>Figure 4.4</b>	Scores for the seven selected offshore fish metrics vs the offshore health index scores in each (non-zero) fish sample collected throughout the Swan Estuary from 1978 to 2009. Lines on plots indicate statistically significant correlations ( $P < 0.05$ ).	146
<b>Figure 4.5</b>	Scores for the nearshore health index vs scores for the six habitat quality metrics (upper two rows) and average values for the three water quality variables (lower row) measured concurrently with fish sampling at sites throughout the Swan Estuary in spring 2007. Lines on plots indicate statistically significant correlations ( $P < 0.05$ ).	148
<b>Figure 4.6</b>	Plots of the standard deviation (s.d.) in nearshore health index scores among the three sites within each region of the Swan Estuary in each season during (a) 2007/08 and (b) 2008/09. See Fig. 1.2 for region codes. Dashed lines represent the average inter-site variability for each year, across all regions and seasons.	150

<b>Figure 4.7</b>	Plots of the standard deviation (s.d.) in offshore health index scores among the three sites within each region of the Swan Estuary, in each season during (a) 2007/08 and (b) 2008/09. See Fig. 1.2 for region codes. Dashed lines represent average inter-site variability for each year, across all regions and seasons.	151
<b>Figure 4.8</b>	Mean vs standard deviation (s.d.) of nearshore health index scores among seasons at each of the sites sampled in 2007-2009. Sites are colour-coded for region of the estuary (see Fig. 3.2 for region codes). The solid line is a simple linear regression.	152
<b>Figure 4.9</b>	Mean vs standard deviation (s.d.) of offshore health index scores among seasons at each of the sites sampled in 2007-2009. Sites are colour-coded for region of the estuary (see Fig. 3.2 for region codes). The solid line is a simple linear regression.	153
<b>Figure 4.10</b>	Comparison of nearshore health index scores at each site in year 1 (2007/08) vs year 2 (2008/09) of the current study. Line at index score of 50 indicates the threshold between fair and poor health status.	154
<b>Figure 4.11</b>	Comparison of offshore health index scores at each site in year 1 (2007/08) vs year 2 (2008/09) of the current study. Line at index score of 50 indicates the threshold between fair and poor health status.	155
<b>Figure 4.12</b>	Confidence interval (CI) length for the nearshore health index as a function of (a) total number of fish and (b) total number of species in the original sample. Solid lines are simple linear regressions.	156
<b>Figure 4.13</b>	Bias (mean bootstrapped index score minus original index score) of the nearshore index scores from each site visit throughout the Swan Estuary in 2007-09. Dashed line represents zero bias expected if bootstrapped index scores matched original index scores. Solid line is the simple linear regression of bias as a function of original index score.	157
<b>Figure 4.14</b>	Confidence interval (CI) length for the offshore health index as a function of (a) total number of fish and (b) total number of species in the original sample. Solid lines are simple linear regressions.	158
<b>Figure 4.15</b>	Bias (mean bootstrapped index score minus original index score) of the offshore index scores from each site visit throughout the Swan Estuary in 2007-09. Dashed line represents zero bias expected if bootstrapped index scores matched original index scores. Solid line is the simple linear regression of bias as a function of original index score.	159

---

## List of Tables

Table		Page
<b>Table 1.1</b>	Desirable characteristics for ecological indicators (after Dale and Beyeler 2001; Niemeijer and de Groot 2008).	26
<b>Table 1.2</b>	A list of selected studies which have developed biotic indices of aquatic ecosystem health using fish communities.	36
<b>Table 2.1</b>	Selected studies which have included schemes for assessing habitat quality in aquatic environments.	50
<b>Table 2.2</b>	List of fish species recorded in the Swan Estuary during current and previous studies, and the functional guilds to which they were allocated. Abbreviations: P – large pelagic; D – demersal (species closely associated with substrate, rocks or weed); BP – benthopelagic; SP – small pelagic; SB – small benthic; MS – marine straggler; MM – marine migrant (including marine estuarine opportunists); SA – semi-anadromous; ES – estuarine species; FM – freshwater migrant or straggler; PV – piscivore; ZB – zoobenthivore; ZP – zooplanktivore; DV – detritivore; OV – omnivore; HV – herbivore; OP – opportunist.	53
<b>Table 2.3</b>	Candidate metrics for potential inclusion in a fish-based biotic index of estuarine health, and their predicted responses to degradation of the estuarine environment. ‘Trophic Specialist’ comprises the feeding mode guilds Zooplanktivore, Zoobenthivore, Herbivore, Piscivore; ‘Trophic Generalist’ comprises the feeding mode guilds Omnivore, Opportunist; ‘Benthic’ comprises the habitat guilds Benthopelagic, Small Benthic, Demersal; ‘Estuarine Spawner’ comprises the habitat guilds Estuarine species and Semi-Anadromous. Where appropriate, two variants of each metric were tested, namely ‘number of taxa’ and ‘proportion of total individuals’ (variants not shown for brevity).	56
<b>Table 2.4</b>	Transformations applied to candidate fish metrics prior to analysis of metric responses to differences in habitat quality.	65
<b>Table 2.5</b>	Refined list of candidate metrics for possible inclusion in a biotic index of estuarine health for the Swan Estuary.	68
<b>Table 2.6</b>	Fish community data sets employed in the selection of metrics sensitive to temporal ecosystem change in the Swan Estuary, illustrating the regions of that system sampled consistently during each study and the methods employed to sample them. See Fig. 1.2 for the locations of the regions of the Swan Estuary.	69
<b>Table 2.7</b>	Transformations applied to metrics in the refined candidate list for each nearshore data set for the Swan Estuary. Metrics highlighted in grey were considered redundant and thus eliminated from subsequent analyses.	72
<b>Table 2.8</b>	Transformations applied to fish metrics in the refined candidate list for the offshore data set for the Swan Estuary. Metrics highlighted in grey were considered redundant and thus eliminated from subsequent analyses.	76
<b>Table 2.9</b>	Total numbers of sites allocated to each of the four Habitat Quality Categories (HQC) in each of the seven regions of the Swan Estuary. Numbers of sites at which the fish community was sampled are given in parentheses. See Fig. 1.2 for the location of each region.	77



<b>Table 2.10</b>	Mean squares (MS), pseudo-F ratios (Pseudo-F), significance levels ( <i>P</i> ) and components of variation (COV) for a region x Habitat Quality Category (HQC) PERMANOVA on the pre-treated fish metric composition data recorded throughout the Swan Estuary (d.f. = degrees of freedom, * denotes rejection of the null-hypothesis at $P \leq 0.05$ ).	82
<b>Table 2.11</b>	Mean squares (MS), pseudo-F ratios (Pseudo-F), significance levels ( <i>P</i> ) and components of variation (COV) for a region x Habitat Quality Category (HQC) PERMANOVA on the pre-treated fish abundance data recorded throughout the Swan Estuary (d.f. = degrees of freedom, * denotes rejection of the null-hypothesis at $P \leq 0.05$ ).	82
<b>Table 2.12</b>	Eigenvectors from PCAs of the normalised scores for (a) physical habitat metrics and (b) water quality variables recorded at the 71 sites fished throughout the Swan Estuary. Eigenvectors highlighted in bold denote those variables that contributed most strongly to the first PC axis in each of the two analyses.	84
<b>Table 2.13</b>	Selection criterion ( $AIC_c$ ) and associated measures of the evidence in favour of each of the subsets of models (fish metric combinations) identified as being substantially supported by the evidence ( $\Delta_i \leq 2$ ) from distance-based linear modelling of the 21 m data set. The estimated ‘best’ model, termed $AIC_{c(\min)}$ , is italicised.	90
<b>Table 2.14</b>	Fish metrics selected (highlighted) by distance-based redundancy analysis of the 21 m seine net data.	90
<b>Table 2.15</b>	Selection criterion ( $AIC_c$ ) and associated measures of the evidence in favour of each of the subsets of models (fish metric combinations) identified as being substantially supported by the evidence ( $\Delta_i \leq 2$ ) from distance-based linear modelling of the 41 m data set. The estimated ‘best’ model, termed $AIC_{c(\min)}$ , is italicised.	91
<b>Table 2.16</b>	Fish metrics selected (highlighted) by distance-based redundancy analysis of the 41 m seine net data.	93
<b>Table 2.17</b>	Selection criterion ( $AIC_c$ ) and associated measures of the evidence in favour of each of the subsets of models (fish metric combinations) identified as being substantially supported by the evidence ( $\Delta_i \leq 2$ ) from distance-based linear modelling of the 102-133 m data set. The estimated ‘best’ model, termed $AIC_{c(\min)}$ , is italicised.	93
<b>Table 2.18</b>	Fish metrics selected (highlighted) by distance-based redundancy analysis of the 102-133 m seine net data.	95
<b>Table 2.19</b>	Summary of the fish metrics selected by the DISTLM and BIOENV/BVSTEP analyses of each of the nearshore data sets (light highlight), including those metrics selected by multiple analyses and thus chosen for incorporation into a nearshore index of estuarine health for the Swan Estuary (dark highlight).	96
<b>Table 2.20</b>	Selection criterion ( $AIC_c$ ) and associated measures of the evidence in favour of each of the subsets of models (fish metric combinations) identified as being substantially supported by the evidence ( $\Delta_i \leq 2$ ) from distance-based linear modelling of the gill net data set. The estimated ‘best’ model, termed $AIC_{c(\min)}$ , is italicised.	97
<b>Table 2.21</b>	Set of fish metrics selected (highlighted) by distance-based linear modelling of the gill net data.	98

<b>Table 2.22</b>	Fish metrics selected by the DISTLM or BIOENV analyses of the offshore data set (light highlight) and thus chosen for incorporation into an offshore index of estuarine health for the Swan Estuary (dark highlight).	99
<b>Table 3.1</b>	Parameter estimates, their associated standard errors (SE) and <i>z</i> -statistics for the effects of the 41.5 and 133 m seine nets relative to the 21.5 m seine, derived from negative binomial modelling of the counts of fish belonging to each of five habitat guilds; * denotes a significant effect of net type on fish counts ( $P < 0.001$ ), NA denotes cases where the parameter of net type was absent from the best generalised linear model.	119
<b>Table 3.2</b>	Equivalence factors and associated upper and lower 95% confidence intervals (CI), derived for each fish habitat guild, for standardising counts of fish obtained using the 41.5-133 m seine nets to equivalent counts per 21.5 m seine. Equivalence factors for the 102.5 m seine and half-net 133 m seine were derived from parameter estimates of the effect of the 133 m seine. NA denotes no significant effect of net type on fish counts identified from the best-fitting generalised linear model.	120
<b>Table 3.3</b>	Reference conditions for each of the selected nearshore fish metrics, determined from standardised historical and current seine net data collected from each region of the Swan Estuary (Lower Swan-Canning Estuary [LSCE], Canning Estuary/Lower Canning River [CELCR], Middle Swan Estuary [MSE] and Upper Swan Estuary [USE]) in each season. <i>n</i> = number of samples per region*season combination. Metric abbreviations and the predicted responses of metrics to degradation, <i>i.e.</i> positive (+) or negative (-), are described in chapter 2.	123
<b>Table 3.4</b>	Reference conditions for each of the selected offshore fish metrics, determined from comparable historical and current gill net data collected from each region of the Swan Estuary (Lower Swan-Canning Estuary [LSCE], Canning Estuary/Lower Canning River [CELCR], Middle Swan Estuary [MSE] and Upper Swan Estuary [USE]) in each season. <i>n</i> = number of samples per region*season combination. Metric abbreviations and the predicted responses of metrics to degradation, <i>i.e.</i> positive (+) or negative (-), are described in chapter 2.	124
<b>Table 4.1</b>	Thresholds for qualitative classification of estuarine health status on the basis of index scores that ranged between 0 and 100.	137
<b>Table 4.2</b>	Spearman correlation coefficients ( $\rho$ ) and associated <i>P</i> -values for correlations between the scores for each of the selected nearshore fish metrics and those for the nearshore health index. * denotes rejection of the null-hypothesis of $\rho = 0$ at $P < 0.05$ .	144
<b>Table 4.3</b>	Spearman correlation coefficients ( $\rho$ ) and associated <i>P</i> -values for correlations between the scores for each of the selected offshore fish metrics and those for the offshore health index. * denotes rejection of the null-hypothesis of $\rho = 0$ at $P < 0.05$ .	144
<b>Table 4.4</b>	Spearman correlation coefficients ( $\rho$ ) and associated <i>P</i> -values for correlations between nearshore health index scores and habitat quality metric scores or average values for measured water quality variables. * denotes rejection of the null-hypothesis of $\rho = 0$ at $P < 0.05$ .	147

**Table 4.5** Spearman correlation coefficients ( $\rho$ ) and associated  $P$ -values for correlations between (a) nearshore and (b) offshore health index scores and water quality parameters measured concurrently with sampling of the fish community during 2007-2009. \* denotes rejection of the null-hypothesis of  $\rho = 0$  at  $P < 0.05$ .

---

## List of acronyms

---

AIC	Akaike's Information Criterion
AIC <sub>c</sub>	Version of Akaike's Information Criterion, modified for small samples
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
AUSRIVAS	Australian Rivers Assessment Scheme
BA	Basin (region of Swan Estuary)
BIOENV	Biota-Environment matching
BVSTEP	Biota-Environment matching – Stepwise
CAP	Canonical Analysis of Principal Coordinates
CCorA	Canonical Correspondence Analysis
CDI	Community Degradation Index
CELCR	Canning Estuary and Lower Canning River (region/management zone)
CH	Channel (region of Swan Estuary)
CR	Canning River (region of Swan Estuary)
DISTLM	Distance-based Linear Modelling
DPSIR	Drivers, Pressures, Status, Impact, Response
EBI	Estuarine Biotic (Integrity) Index
EcoQ (EcoQS)	Ecological Quality Status
EFI	European Fish Index
EFCI	Estuarine Fish Community Index
EIBI	Estuarine Index of Biotic Integrity
EQUATION	Estuarine Quality and Condition Index
FAME	Fish-based Assessment Method for the Ecological Status of European Rivers
FCI	Fish Community Index
FRI	Fish Recruitment Index
GLM	Generalised Linear Model
HQC	Habitat Quality Category
HQI	Habitat Quality Index
IBI	Index of Biotic Integrity
IHAS	Integrated Habitat Assessment System
ISC	Index of Stream Condition
LS	Lower Swan River (region of Swan Estuary)
LSCE	Lower Swan/Canning Estuary (region/management zone)
MD	Middle-Downstream Swan River (region of Swan Estuary)
MDS	(Non-metric) Multi-Dimensional Scaling
MMI	Multi-Model Inference
MSE	Middle Swan Estuary (region/management zone)
MU	Middle-Upstream Swan River (region of Swan Estuary)
NEECAAF	National Estuarine Environmental Condition Assessment Framework
NLWRA	National Land and Water Resources Audit
NSW	New South Wales
PC	Principal Component
PCA	Principal Components Analysis
PCO	Principal Coordinates Analysis
PERMANOVA	Permutational ANOVA and MANOVA
QHEI	Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index
RBP	Rapid Bioassessment Protocol
RCE	Riparian, Channel and Environmental Inventory
RDA	(Distance-based) Redundancy Analysis
RHS	River Habitat Survey
RIVPACS	River Invertebrate Prediction and Classification System
SWR	Stream-Wetland-Riparian Index
TFCI	Transitional Fish Classification Index
TL	Total length
US	Upper Swan River (region of Swan Estuary)
USE	Upper Swan Estuary (region/management zone)
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
WA	Western Australia
WFD	Water Framework Directive

---

## Acknowledgements

---

I wish to express my profound thanks to Fiona Valesini for her generous and dedicated supervision, endless advice, discussion and encouragement. My gratitude is expressed also to Ian Potter, for allowing me the opportunity to become part of ‘the fish group’ and for his enthusiasm and guidance throughout. Numerous friends and colleagues are thanked for their generous assistance with sampling and laboratory work, including Steeg Hoeksema, Ben Chuwen, James Tweedley, Alex Hesp, Bryn Farmer, Peter Coulson, Thea Linke, Emma Somerville and Jo Bannister. Particular thanks go to Alan Cottingham for his dedicated and tireless assistance in the field. I would like also to acknowledge the assistance of the many researchers from the Centre for Fish and Fisheries Research who have been involved in the collection of fish community data over several decades. Enormous thanks go to Norm Hall, Alex Hesp and Bob Clarke for their crucial statistical advice and problem solving, and for their patience in response to my constant questioning.

I thank Frances D’Souza and Naomi Hellriegel from the Department of Water for access to data and reports, and Rick Ellison of the Department of Fisheries for the loan of sampling equipment. Gratitude is expressed to the Swan River Trust, Department of Water, Department of Fisheries and Murdoch University for funding this project, and to the Western Australian Marine Science Institution (WAMSI) for financial support in the form of a top-up scholarship.

Above all else, I am immensely thankful to my beautiful wife Caitlin, whose patience and generosity continue to amaze me, for her ceaseless love and support throughout my studies.