Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences
Journal canadien des sciences halieutiques et aquatiques

Causes and consequences of invertebrate drift in running waters: from individuals to populations and trophic fluxes

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences</i>
Manuscript ID	cjfas-2015-0363.R1
Manuscript Type:	Perspective
Date Submitted by the Author:	05-Dec-2015
Complete List of Authors:	Naman, Sean; University of British Columbia, Zoology Rosenfeld, Jordan; British Columbia Ministry of the Environment, Richardson, John; University of British Columbia,
Keyword:	STREAMS < Environment/Habitat, DRIFT < General, RIVERS < Environment/Habitat, ECOLOGY < General, INVERTEBRATES < Organisms

Causes and consequences of invertebrate drift in running waters: from individuals to populations and trophic fluxes

Sean M. Naman^{1*}, Jordan S. Rosenfeld², John S. Richardson³

1. Department of Zoology, University of British Columbia
2. Conservation Science Section, British Columbia Ministry of Environment, Jordan.Rosenfeld@gov.bc.ca
3. Department of Forest and Conservation Sciences, University of British Columbia, John.Richardson@ubc.ca
* Authors listed in order of contribution

* Corresponding author: Naman@zoology.ubc.ca, 604-619-4274
4200-6270 University Blvd. Vancouver BC V6T 1Z4

Keywords: Invertebrate drift; streams; fish; review, drift-foraging

Abstract

Invertebrate drift, the downstream transport of aquatic invertebrates, is a fundamental ecological process in streams with important management implications for drift-feeding fishes. Despite longstanding interest, many aspects of drift remain poorly understood mechanistically, thereby limiting broader food web applications (e.g., bioenergetics-based habitat models for fish). Here, we review and synthesize drift-related processes, focusing on their underlying causes, consequences for invertebrate populations and broader trophic dynamics, and recent advances in predictive modelling of drift. Improving predictive models requires further resolving the environmental contexts where drift is driven by hydraulics (passive drift) vs. behaviour (active drift). We posit this can be qualitatively inferred by hydraulic conditions, diurnal periodicity and taxa-specific traits. For invertebrate populations, while the paradox of population persistence in the context of downstream loss has been generally resolved with theory, there are still many unanswered questions surrounding the consequences of drift for population dynamics. In a food web context, there is a need to better understand drift-foraging consumer-resource dynamics and to improve modeling of drift fluxes to more realistically assess habitat capacity for drift-feeding fishes.

Introduction

Invertebrate drift, the downstream transport of stream invertebrates, is a defining feature of running water systems at multiple levels of organization. For individuals, drifting may be a mode of patch selection for invertebrates balancing resource acquisition and predation risk (e.g., Kohler and Mcpeek 1989). At the population level, drift can influence spatial population structure by linking populations through dispersal (Townsend and Hildrew 1976; Mackay 1992) and may also represent a form of density-independent emigration or density-dependent self-thinning (Waters 1965). In a broader ecosystem context, drift constitutes a key trophic pathway in streams, providing the prey base for a diverse guild of fishes adopting a specialized central place drift-foraging strategy (Grossman 2014). The total energy flux available as drift is therefore a key determinant of the productive capacity of habitats to support populations of drift feeders, including iconic species such as salmon and trout (*Salmonidae*; Waters 1969; Poff and Huryn 1998).

Given its importance to the function and productivity of lotic ecosystems, drift has been the focus of considerable research (for earlier reviews see: Keupp 1988; Brittain and Eikeland 1988; Malmqvist 2002). Studies have generally fallen into two categories: theoretically-driven studies focused on the ecology and mechanisms of *why* animals drift, and descriptive studies aimed at explaining spatial and temporal patterns in drift dynamics. The underlying motivation differs between these two approaches. Theoretically-focused studies have been primarily concerned with both the proximate causes of drift and understanding the consequences of drift to taxon-specific populations and their resources; particularly the role of drift in the density-dependent regulation of benthic populations (e.g., Waters 1966; Turner and Williams 2000;

Humphries 2002). In contrast, descriptive empirical studies have primarily focused on describing bulk community fluxes of drift (e.g., Elliott 1967a; McLay 1970; Shearer et al. 2003), often with specific reference to predicting availability of prey for fish (e.g., Hayes et al. 2000; Weber et al. 2014).

Despite these parallel approaches, a general process-based understanding of invertebrate drift remains elusive. This may be due to the many context-dependent drivers of drift dynamics, for which the domains of importance of causative mechanisms remain poorly resolved. For empirical applications, predictive models of drift flux have lagged behind taxon-specific mechanistic studies, limiting the ability to quantitatively study the role of drift in an ecosystem context and to effectively account for variation in prey abundance when managing populations of drift-feeding fishes. In this review, we attempt to reconcile these contrasting mechanistic vs. descriptive approaches. Our goal is not to exhaustively review the topic of drift as this has been done elsewhere (e.g., Brittain and Eikeland 1988). Rather, we aim to synthesize processes related to drift in both theoretical and empirical contexts with the hope that our work leads to stronger linkages between these two lines of inquiry. We specifically address: 1) the processes generating drift and the domains over which they operate; 2) the spatial and temporal dynamics of drift; 3) the significance of drift for benthic invertebrate populations and trophic fluxes to fish; and 4) progress in the formulation of predictive models of drift dynamics and community drift fluxes. We close by highlighting several key areas of uncertainty that should be resolved if robust predictions of invertebrate drift are to be achieved. First we define the primary components of invertebrate drift.

Component processes of invertebrate drift

Invertebrate drift is composed of three distinct processes (Ciborowski 1987): the departure of an organism from the substrate and entrainment in the water column (henceforth drift entry); hydraulic transport downstream (drift transport); and removal from the drift (drift exit), which may occur through settlement back to the substrate, predation or emergence to the terrestrial life stage (Figure 1).

Drift Entry

Multiple drivers of drift entry have been identified and have led to various categorization schemes (reviewed in Brittain & Eikeland 1988). At a broad level, drift entry (number per area per time) can be partitioned into “passive drift”, where organisms accidentally lose purchase from the substrate due to hydraulic stress, and “active drift” where organisms deliberately leave the substrate to enter the water column (Table 1).

Passive drift occurs via mechanical dislodgement from the substrate due to near-bed shear stress and often results from increases in discharge or turbulence, which may be associated with substrate mobilization (Gibbins et al. 2007b). “Catastrophic drift” or “mass drift”, defined as a rapid increase in passive drift (Anderson and Lemkuhl 1968; Gibbins et al. 2007a), may result from several flow-related thresholds. First, the critical level of shear stress where organic matter becomes entrained increases the passive drift of animals using detritus or algal mats as substrate (Vinson 2001). A second threshold is reached as saltation of sand and fine organic matter scour exposed benthic invertebrates (Gibbins et al. 2007a), followed by a third threshold at bed-mobilizing flows as surface and near-surface invertebrates are entrained during mobilization of all particles on the stream bed (Anderson and Lemkuhl 1968). However, substrate mobilization may not be a crucial condition for mass drift if the critical shear stress for substrate entrainment

exceeds that for invertebrates. In this case, catastrophic drift may be frequently initiated by high discharge events not considered disturbances in geomorphic terms (Statzner et al. 1984; Gibbins et al. 2007a).

Passive drift below critical entrainment thresholds, has been termed “constant drift” (Brittain and Eikeland 1988). Unlike catastrophic drift, relationships between hydraulics and constant drift are less clearly defined, with multiple studies demonstrating incongruence between observed drift entry thresholds and those predicted based on hydraulic particle-transport relationships, which link entrainment and settling thresholds to particle size, density and hydraulic stress (Ciborowski 1987; Wilcox et al. 2008; Oldmeadow et al. 2010). Constant drift may relate to factors independent of velocity, such as accidental loss of footing on the substrate during periods of increased activity as well as variation in shear stress associated with turbulent flow. Turbulent flow associated with rough bed surfaces creates substantial variation in velocity (Davis and Barmuta 1989; Hart and Finelli 1999) and pulses of accelerating velocity (turbulent sweeps) may cyclically exceed critical shear stress for entrainment, resulting in elevated passive drift (Blanckaert et al. 2013).

Active drift, in contrast, results from deliberate behaviours including benthic predator avoidance (Peckarsky 1980; Malmqvist and Sjöström 1987; Kratz 1996; Huhta et al. 2000), active patch selection while foraging (Hildebrand 1974; Kohler 1985) or escape from unfavourable abiotic conditions (Lauridsen and Friberg 2005; Gibbins et al. 2007b; James et al. 2009; Larsen and Ormerod 2010). Density-dependence may also increase drift entry due to increased competition for space (Corkum 1978; Hildrew and Townsend 1980; Kohler 1992) or resource limitation (Dimand 1967; Richardson 1991; Fonseca and Hart 1996; Rowe and Richardson 2001; Siler et al. 2001). While mostly studied in isolation, these factors interact to

influence active drift. For instance, given the conflicting demands on benthic invertebrates to maximize foraging intake and minimize predation risk (Gilliam and Fraser 1987; Lima and Dill 1990), active drift is likely a joint response to both predation risk and local per capita resource availability. This trade-off between maximizing energy intake and minimizing mortality is exemplified by strong nocturnal peaks in drift (Bishop 1969), which are usually attributed to invertebrates searching for new foraging patches while avoiding predation from visually foraging, drift-feeding fishes (Allan 1978; Flecker 1992). In this case invertebrates drift at night to minimize predation risk from drift-feeding fishes, but the ultimate motivation for moving among habitats is likely resource limitation, although escape from nocturnally foraging benthic predators may also play a role (Hammock et al. 2012).

Drift Transport

The transport of drifting invertebrates has been treated similarly to suspended inert particles, where variation in water velocity and hydraulic heterogeneity (e.g., turbulence) imposed by physical habitat structure controls particle movement (Ciborowski 1983). However, multiple lines of evidence indicate a significant behavioural component to drift transport with invertebrates actively control their time in the drift. First, hydraulic particle-transport relationships adequately explain observed transport dynamics for only a limited subset of taxa (Lancaster, Hildrew & Gjerløv 1996); second, multiple studies have found disparities in drift transport between living and dead organisms (Townsend and Hildrew 1976; Ciborowski et al. 1977; Allan and Feifarek 1989); and third, a number of taxa possess behavioural and morphological adaptations to facilitate either settlement or prolonged drifting. These include the adhesive silk filaments of black fly larvae (Simuliidae) or swimming behaviour by mayflies (Ephemeroptera) (Fingerut et al. 2006), both of which allow rapid exit from the drift. As a result,

there is a wide variation among empirical estimates of transport distances (typically measured when animals were released or disturbed from the streambed at fixed locations (McLay 1970; Elliott 1971; Ciborowski 1983; Larkin and McKone 1985)). In general, however, despite some extreme distance estimates of over 100 m (see references in Brittain & Eikeland 1988), drift distances for given conditions (e.g., velocity, stream size) appear to be conserved for drift prone taxa and are relatively short, e.g., around 2-10 m on average (Elliott 1971, 2002, 2003; Townsend and Hildrew 1976).

Drift Exit

The exit of animals from the drift can occur through three discrete pathways: settlement back to the substrate (e.g., Fonseca 1999), predation (e.g., Wilzbach, Cummins & Hall 1986) or emergence to terrestrial adult life stages which occurs in short temporal pulses specific to the phenology of individual taxa (Reisen and Prins 1972). Settlement can occur passively, such as in hydraulic “dead zones” (depositional areas; e.g., Downes 1990; Lancaster et al. 1996), or actively through behaviours or morphological adaptations that increase settlement probability. The ability of drifting individuals to settle may also be contingent on hydraulic conditions imposed by local geomorphology (Holomuzki and Van Loan 2002; Oldmeadow et al. 2010). For example, Oldmeadow et al. (2010) found settling abilities differed between two species of mayfly in plane bed vs. turbulent environments in experimental flumes, suggesting that hydraulic constraints on drift settlement may have important consequences for the ability of some taxa to access otherwise suitable habitats, or to exit the drift in a timely manner once entrained. In a more general sense, abiotic or biotic constraints on drift settlement have the potential to affect distributional patterns and densities of benthic invertebrates (Fonseca and Hart 2001; Downes and Lancaster 2010; Oldmeadow et al. 2010).

In fish-bearing streams, the proportion of drift lost to predation may be substantial, but will depend on the total energetic demand of the drift-foraging assemblage, which is a function of fish density, size distribution, and ambient temperature (Smith and Li 1983). Depletion will be further affected by the efficiency of prey capture which is contingent on multiple factors including water velocity (Hill and Grossman 1993; Piccolo et al. 2008), turbidity (Harvey et al. 2009), canopy cover (Wilzbach et al. 1986), seasonal light levels (Fraser and Metcalfe 1997), the size composition of drift (Wankowski 1981; Dunbrack and Dill 1983; Wilzbach et al. 1986) and the availability of suitable foraging habitat which determines the proportion of stream discharge that drift-feeders can scan to intercept drifting prey (Hughes and Dill 1990; Rosenfeld and Ptolemy 2012).

Direct empirical estimates of drift depletion through fish predation in small streams have ranged widely but may be substantial. For instance, McLaughlin et al. (2000) estimated that less than 42% of available drifting prey was consumed by juvenile brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) while Wilzbach et al. (1986) estimated up to an 80% reduction in drift by cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki*). Leung et al. (2009) used a simple bioenergetics approach to estimate drift consumption by young-of-the-year and one year-old cutthroat trout feeding in pools at 25 and 50% of their maximum daily consumption and concluded that 36-71% of drift could be lost to fish predation in a small trout stream. While these estimates suggest predation on drift may be a large component of daytime drift depletion, foraging efficiency and activity are generally much lower at night (Allan 1978; Sagar and Glova 1988; but see Elliott 2011) when drift abundances generally peak in fish-bearing streams (Bishop 1969). Therefore, while fish may deplete a significant portion of diurnal drift in smaller streams, overall losses due to predation may be a negligible fraction of the total drift flux. Similarly, the fraction of drift consumed likely declines

in larger rivers, where a much smaller proportion of physical habitat may be available to drift-
foraging fishes of a given size (Rosenfeld et al. 2007).

Domains of passive vs. active drift dynamics

The relative contributions of active vs. passive processes to drift are highly context-specific and
often correlated (Figure 2). For example, hydraulic stress influences passive drift but may also
influence behaviour (e.g., Hoover and Richardson 2009). However, the general domains in
which drift is primarily active or passive can be inferred in a qualitative sense, based on
hydraulic conditions, diurnal periodicity, and taxonomic attributes.

Taxonomic Specificity and Drift Flux

Taxa and life stages differ greatly in their tendency to drift, often resulting in striking differences
in community and size structure between the drift and benthos (O' Hop and Wallace 1983;
Shearer et al. 2003). Predisposition to drift will vary among taxa depending on behavioural,
ecological and morphological traits (Wilzbach et al. 1988; Rader 1997; Elliott 2003). For
instance, differences in body morphology and habitat use may influence the susceptibility of taxa
to scouring flows. Rader (1997) used twelve behavioural and morphological traits to develop a
classification index to rank invertebrates by their drift propensity. This trait-based classification
approach has been integrated into broader functional classifications (e.g., Poff et al. 2006) and
may provide a mechanistic basis for anticipating taxa-specific drift responses to environmental
disturbance (e.g., Lancaster 2000). For example, taxa with high behavioural drift tendency may
be predicted to increase drift relative to less mobile taxa following the addition of an abiotic
stressor. Similarly, passive drift could be inferred if the drift composition is dominated by taxa
with a high drag potential (i.e., more susceptible to scour). Currently, the main limitation of trait-

based approaches is that the detailed natural history information required to generate the criteria for ranking drift propensity are unavailable for many taxa. Additionally, intra-specific studies in the family Baetidae suggest that drift behaviour may differ substantially even at fine taxonomic levels, (Peckarsky 1980, 1996), such that aggregating taxa into broader groups may generate misleading predictions.

Hydraulic Effects on Drift Flux

The underlying dynamics of drift entry, transport and exit are highly specific to local hydraulic conditions (e.g., Wilcox et al. 2008; Oldmeadow et al. 2010). Catastrophic drift is the most obvious case where hydraulic forces cause involuntary entrainment and transport of both invertebrates and bed particles. For example, (Gibbins et al. 2007a) found a clear threshold of shear stress at which catastrophic drift entry was initiated, where catastrophic drift was defined as rapid increases in suspended invertebrate abundance and a compositional shift in drifting taxa to resemble that of the benthos. Identifying a causal mechanism for drift at flows below a catastrophic threshold is more difficult, and requires careful experimentation. For example, Hammock and Wetzel (2013) demonstrated that herbivore drift changed eight-fold at stable flows when predators and food levels were manipulated relative to controls, suggesting that drift may be a predominantly active process during non-catastrophic flow. Much more work is needed, however, to fully resolve the context dependencies of active vs. passive drift at stable flows.

During flow reductions, behavioural drivers generally dominate drift dynamics. Despite a more hydraulically benign environment as flows decline (i.e., lower turbulence and shear stress), multiple studies have observed increases in drift following rapid experimental flow reductions

(e.g., Minshall and Winger 1968; Poff and Ward 1991; Dewson et al. 2007; James et al. 2009). Increased behavioural drift associated with declining flows likely results from several concurrent processes that influence fitness, including reduced habitat area and decreased water velocities. Shrinking wetted habitat area increases benthic densities, competition for resources, and potentially predator encounter rates (Dewson et al. 2007). Declining velocities reduce suspended and benthic particulate food transport and may shift abiotic conditions (e.g., depth, dissolved oxygen; James et al. 2009) beyond the suitable range for any particular taxon (Anderson et al. 2006b). Shrinking habitat area and reduced velocities on a declining hydrograph are confounded, but both appear to be important triggers of drift. James et al. (2008) reduced flows and observed short-term increases in drift with no change in habitat area, implying a reduction in area or quality of suitable microhabitats for drifting taxa despite constant wetted area, whereas Corrarino et al. (1983) found drift to increase only after 30% of habitat area was de-watered following flow reduction.

There are several important exceptions to drift increases at low flows. First, the timescale over which flow is reduced may be a critical determinant of whether behavioural drift increases. For instance, several studies have observed decreased drift flux and concentration across natural declines in flow (Leeseberg and Keeley 2014), or experimental declines over multiple weeks (Harvey et al. 2006). Second, there is some evidence that taxa may respond in different directions to flow declines (James et al. 2009; Kennedy et al. 2014). Taken together, these results suggest that increased drift following reduced flows may be a temporary response over short time-scales and vary across taxa.

Overall, we conceptualize a transition of domains from increasingly behaviourally dominated drift along a declining hydrograph to primarily passive drift on an increasing

hydrograph (Figure 3). This represents an example of hysteresis (Gunderson 2000), where the response of a system depends on prior conditions, i.e., drift magnitude for a given flow differs between the rising and falling limbs of the hydrograph. A key consequence of this conceptual model is that the absolute magnitude of hydraulic stress may be less important than its direction and rate of change in determining the response of invertebrate drift to flow variation (Imbert and Perry 2000). Empirical support for this model comes from drift observations during hydropeaking in regulated rivers, where differences in drift concentration between ascending and descending points along a hydrograph are regularly observed (Perry and Perry 1986; Patterson and Smokorowski 2011; Miller and Judson 2014).

Diurnal vs. Nocturnal Effects on Drift

Behavioural drift can be envisioned as a form of active patch selection under predation risk. Foraging theory generally predicts that animals will balance conflicting demands for energy acquisition and predator avoidance by minimizing the ratio of mortality risk to foraging opportunity (Sih 1980; Werner and Gilliam 1984; Fraser and Huntingford 1986; Gilliam and Fraser 1987; Lima and Dill 1990). In fish-bearing streams, invertebrates face predation risk from both benthic and drift-feeding predators while foraging in a spatially and temporally patchy environment. The fish avoidance hypothesis (Allan 1978) posits that nocturnal peaks in drift are a result of invertebrates optimizing foraging opportunities while minimizing mortality risk from visually feeding fish. There are multiple lines of evidence indicating strong effects of fish on invertebrate drift behaviour (reviewed in Allan & Castillo 2007), most notably that drift is generally aperiodic in fishless streams (Flecker 1992). Several studies have also demonstrated changes in the magnitude of photoperiodicity in response to manipulations of fish presence (e.g.,

Flecker 1992; McIntosh and Peckarsky 1996) and light levels (Perkin et al. 2014) suggesting that diurnal periodicity is a plastic behavioural adaptation to avoid fish predation.

If invertebrates actively minimize mortality relative to foraging gains, then drifting (searching for a new foraging patch) should occur under conditions where local resource abundance is low, benthic predation risk is high and drift predation risk is low. Nocturnal drifting appears to satisfy these conditions; drift-feeding fish are less active and efficient at night (Allan and Feifarek 1989), within-patch foraging opportunities may be reduced if algal resources are depleted during the day, and benthic predators are more active at night (Hammock et al. 2012). The importance of active vs. passive drift entry mechanisms may therefore be dependent on photoperiod, and it has been suggested that diurnal drift is entirely passive while volitional behavioural mechanisms dominate nocturnal drift entry (Huhta et al. 2000; Humphries 2002; Hammock et al. 2012).

Invertebrates can also use indicators of predation risk other than light levels to adjust their drift behaviour (e.g., Fraser & Huntingford 1986), in particular the presence of waterborne chemical cues from predators (Douglas et al. 1994; McIntosh and Peckarsky 1996; Crespo 2011). For instance, McIntosh & Peckarsky (2004) demonstrated that the mayfly *Baetis bicaudatus* adjusted its drift behaviour proportionally to the risk imposed by the odours of different fish predators. Studies have also shown *Baetis* to adjust its drift behaviour along gradients of fish density (Flecker 1992) and in response to simultaneous manipulations of predation and resources (Culp et al. 1991; Scrimgeour and Culp 1994a; Hoover and Richardson 2009). These results indicate that *Baetis*, a highly drift-prone taxa, has a moderately sophisticated response to balance foraging opportunities and predator avoidance using multiple environmental

cues. The levels of behavioural sophistication among other taxa are unclear, but likely comparable.

Spatial and temporal drift dynamics

Habitat Effects on Drift

Although streams are hydraulically diverse, spatial variation in drift dynamics across physical habitat gradients remains poorly understood. One reason for this is that drift is typically measured in the field as a concentration (the number or biomass of animals per volume of water; Allan and Russek 1985). Drift concentration is a measure of standing crop and an emergent property of drift entry, transport and exit rates. Consequently, spatial relationships are potentially confounded because multiple combinations of entry, transport and exit rates can generate the same drift concentration. In addition, due to the nature of downstream transport in running water, drift concentration will exhibit a spatial lag of unknown distance between the discrete location in which it was measured and the upstream patch where it was produced, resulting in a spatial mismatch between drift concentration at a given location and the habitat features to which it is causally linked. A more informative approach for characterizing drift-habitat relationships is to directly measure rates of entry, transport and exit in the field. However, due to logistic challenges, empirical measurements of these rates are rare.

Small streams show striking gradients in depth, velocity, and substrate among discrete habitat types such as pools, riffles, runs and glides (Montgomery and Buffington 1997). Invertebrates using these habitats are subjected to different biotic conditions and hydraulic forces (Peterson and Rabeni 2001; Walters et al. 2003) that can be expected to influence the dynamics

of drift entry, transport and exit. At one extreme, drift entry and transport may be highest in riffles, erosional habitats with greater turbulence and shear stress and often greater benthic densities (Scullion et al. 1982; Grubaugh et al. 1997; Grossman 2014). Alternatively, drift entry and transport would be expected to be low, and exit through settlement and predation high, in pools, low velocity depositional habitats. With these predictions in mind, streams can be envisioned as a continuous source-sink matrix composed of habitats where drift is produced and those where drift is depleted due to settlement and predation by drift-feeding fishes (Rosenfeld and Raeburn 2009).

A corollary of the source-sink framework is the inference that spatial variation in velocity is a primary driver of drift entry, transport and exit (Ciborowski 1983, 1987; Bond et al. 2000). However, empirical support for this assumption is mixed. In one of the only studies to directly measure drift distances *in situ* across different habitat configurations, Lancaster *et al.* (1996) found that reach-scale drift increased with mean velocity and decreased with the number of depositional microhabitats. Similarly, some studies have found drift to be consistently higher in riffles than other habitat types (Leung et al. 2009) and to increase with riffle length and area (Hansen and Closs 2007). Pools as drift sinks, however, has received less support. While several studies have found reduced drift concentration at the downstream end of pools (Waters 1965; Martin and Knight 1989), others have found no change or even increased drift concentration below pools (Elliott 1971; Kovalak 1978). Moreover, in contrast with Lancaster et al. (1996), there does not appear to be a consistent relationship between drift concentration and velocity *within* habitat types. Some studies have found significant correlations (Keeley and Grant 1997; Nislow et al. 1998; Hayes et al. 2012) while others have not (Hansen and Closs 2007; Leung et al. 2009).

Other aspects of habitat complexity may also modify the spatial dynamics of drift. In-stream wood can reduce drift concentration through direct entrapment (i.e., reducing transport; Bilby 1981), by increasing settlement through creation of hydraulic dead zones (Lancaster et al. 1996; Bond et al. 2000) or by increasing depletion through predation if fish densities are higher in complex habitats (e.g., Roni and Quinn 2001). Kiffney et al. (2014) found reduced drift concentration in experimental stream channels augmented with wood as well as decreased drift in reaches with higher wood abundance in a fourth-order stream. They also observed a positive relationship between wood abundance and local density of drift-feeding coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*), providing support for drift concentration reduction through both physical entrapment and predation. In contrast, Gustafsson et al. (2014) found increased drift following experimental wood additions, suggesting that enhanced benthic production on wood (Benke et al. 1984; Benke and Wallace 2003) may increase drift entry. In addition to wood, channel sinuosity, substrate heterogeneity and surface roughness may also influence the source-sink dynamics of drift but have received limited attention.

Ultimately, understanding spatial dynamics of drift requires characterizing the habitat dependency of each of the components of drift (entry, transport and exit rates), and the parameter space combination that generates observed drift concentrations. For instance, it is conceivable that drift production is relatively uniform among habitat types and spatial variation in concentration is primarily driven by heterogeneity in transport and exit dynamics (e.g., Anderson et al. 2013). Empirically, flume experiments and a small number of field observations have given limited insights into transport and exit rates (e.g., Lancaster et al. 1996). In contrast, field measurements of drift entry – expressed as a production rate per bed area – are virtually non-existent (but see Romaniszyn et al. 2007). Drift entry is a fundamental production parameter, the

measurement of which will likely generate key insights into physical controls underlying spatial variation in drift flux and concentration. While field measurements of drift entry, transport, and exit rates are logistically challenging, their quantification should be a goal of future drift research.

Seasonal Dynamics

While short-term drift dynamics are dominated by nocturnal peaks, drift shows important seasonal trends over longer temporal scales (Waters 1965; Keeley and Grant 1997; Jenkins and Keeley 2010). However, the direction and magnitude of seasonal trends varies among studies. For temperate streams, drift abundance appears to peak in spring and decline through the summer and fall (O' Hop and Wallace 1983; Hieber et al. 2003; Leeseberg and Keeley 2014), although fall (Stoneburner et al. 1979) and summer (Hayes et al. 2000) peaks have been observed. In contrast, tropical streams show generally less consistent seasonal patterns (Pringle and Ramirez 2001). This difference may be a result of biotic processes unique to tropical streams, i.e., continuous benthic invertebrate reproduction associated with reduced seasonality and precipitation-induced flood events, but also may reflect the deficit of studies in the tropics relative to temperate systems.

Seasonal trends in drift may reflect seasonal changes in discharge, suspended sediment (O'Hop & Wallace 1983), temperature (Dudgeon 1990), and photoperiod. Alternatively, seasonal variation in drift may be largely driven by temporal succession in benthic community structure (Elliott 1967b). Not surprisingly, a close match between the seasonal abundance and composition of drift and the benthos supports close linkages between invertebrate life history phenology, adult emergence, and seasonal drift patterns (O'Hop & Wallace 1983; Rincón &

Lobon-Cervia 1997). However, given their seasonal covariation, teasing apart abiotic constraints and phenology as drivers of seasonal drift patterns will require manipulative experiments that, to our knowledge, have yet to be performed.

Relevance of drift to invertebrate populations and energy flow to higher trophic levels

Benthic Density and Drift

Empirically relating drift to benthic abundance is critical for understanding the consequences of drift to benthic population dynamics. Drift may be directly proportional to benthic abundance (i.e., if it is passive) or density-dependent (if it is related to per capita resource abundance). Many studies have considered the role of density-dependence in benthic invertebrate population dynamics, either to test for general properties of population limitation or generalizable predictors of drift abundance (Shearer et al. 2003; Tonkin and Death 2013; Weber et al. 2014). Results to date have been equivocal. Density-dependence has been inferred directly in some studies (Dimand 1967; Fonseca and Hart 1996) based on a curvilinear relationship between drift concentration or flux and benthic abundance (Chang and Sell 1984). Moreover, ancillary evidence showing that drifting individuals are often smaller (Poff and Ward 1991; Richardson 1991), and exhibit higher frequency of injury and lower gut fullness than those in the benthos (Williams and Levens 1988; Turner and Williams 2000) is consistent with density-dependent self-thinning. In contrast, other studies have found drift to be either proportional or unrelated to benthic densities (Corkum 1978; Statzner et al. 1987; Humphries 2002; Shearer et al. 2003; Elliott 2003; Weber et al. 2014), and demonstrated no differences in individual condition between drifting and benthic individuals (Ploskey and Brown 1980; Wilzbach 1990). Based on

these variable results, broadly generalizable, quantitative relationships between drift and benthic density appear unlikely (e.g., Shearer and 2003).

These incongruent findings may reflect issues with sampling designs (e.g., inappropriate ranges of benthic densities), innate environmental or taxonomic specificity of density-dependence (e.g., Kerans et al. 2000), or a poor quantitative understanding of how environmental correlates, such as resource abundance, mediate the effects of benthic density on drift. For instance, benthic *per capita* resource intake depends on both consumer density and resource (e.g., algal and detrital) abundance. Because of variation in resource abundance, density *per se* will only be a coarse indicator of per capita resource availability. Consequently, density-dependent thresholds that are demonstrable experimentally are inevitably context-specific and therefore likely to be poorly transferrable between streams, or lack consistency in synoptic surveys. Studies that manipulated food resources directly have more consistently identified density-dependent thresholds, generally finding decreased drift entry following increases in resources (Hildebrand 1974; Kohler 1985; Richardson 1991; Siler et al. 2001; Hammock and Wetzel 2013). Likewise, experimental increases of herbivore densities leading to depleted periphyton also elevated drift (Hillebrand 2005). These findings provide evidence that density-dependent resource competition can be an important driver of drift, which would not have been obvious without explicit manipulation of resource levels.

Spatial scale further complicates interpretation of drift-benthos relationships. Given that the upstream spatial integration of a typical drift sample is unknown (see *Spatial Drift Dynamics* section), the appropriate scale at which benthic abundance and drift should be measured is poorly defined. This is a key methodological issue that is rarely considered. Density-dependent drift at different scales may also reflect different underlying processes. For example, density-

dependence at small scales (e.g., within a riffle) likely reflects within patch aggregation dynamics (e.g., resource competition) whereas density-dependence at larger scales may imply regional dispersal processes (e.g. recruitment limitation) more relevant to population dynamics (Anderson et al. 2006a). Spatial scale should therefore be given careful consideration when interpreting both descriptive and experimental studies of density-dependent drift (Englund and Cooper 2003; Melbourne and Chesson 2005).

Implications of Drift for Invertebrate Population dynamics

Historically, research has focused on benthic population persistence in the face of constant unidirectional losses of individuals through drift, i.e., the “drift paradox”(Müller 1954, 1982; Waters 1965; Humphries and Ruxton 2002). The core debate concerned whether compensatory upstream movement was necessary for population persistence or, alternatively, if drift represented surplus production in excess of carrying capacity. This debate appears to have been resolved theoretically as several studies have demonstrated population persistence in advective environments through the processes of density dependence, random directional benthic dispersal (e.g., through crawling), and high benthic productivity (Anholt 1995; Speirs and Gurney 2001; Lutscher et al. 2010). More recent work concerns the role of drift-mediated dispersal as a determinant of spatial variation in abundance within streams.

Given the large number of animals often found in drift, population dynamics of stream invertebrates have been traditionally thought to be dominated by emigration and immigration and drift was seen as a key dispersal agent linking spatially discrete population patches (Townsend 1989; Palmer et al. 1996; Winemiller et al. 2010). More recent work has posed an alternative view that widespread dispersal of freshwater invertebrates is not as pervasive as was assumed

(Bohonak and Jenkins 2003; Downes and Lancaster 2010; Lancaster et al. 2011). This shift in thinking has led to the idea that small scale movements (i.e., within patch aggregation) dominate local dynamics, but larger scale population processes primarily result from environmental variability in birth and death rates (Anderson et al. 2005). This viewpoint implies that drift, while important for individual habitat selection and distribution, may have minimal consequences to larger scale population dynamics of stream invertebrates.

We offer a more nuanced perspective, and suggest that drift may still be essential to spatial population dynamics, but the extent of its contribution depends on the broader life history adaptations of specific taxa (reviewed in Verberk et al. 2008), and whether a taxa is recruitment limited (at low densities below the capacity of the habitat). For taxa whose life history strategy is selected against strong nymphal dispersal, drift may be rare and have little consequence to population dynamics unless it is of sufficient magnitude to reduce a population below carrying capacity (e.g., catastrophic drift). Examples would include taxa like *Emephmerella ignita* that widely disperse their eggs when they broadcast oviposit in the stream water column (Lancaster et al. 2011). For these taxa, dispersal effectively happens during oviposition. For taxa that are limited to ovipositing in a limited subset of habitat types that may be rare or patchily distributed (e.g., *Baetis rhodani* restricted to ovipositing on emergent rocks in riffles; Lancaster et al 2011), dispersal will have to take place at either an adult or a nymphal life history stage (e.g., through drift or benthic movement), where it may be density-dependent (Fonseca & Hart 1996; but see Lancaster et al. 2011).

While this perspective has a theoretical basis (further discussed in *Population-Level Drift Models* section), the role of drift relative to other movement strategies based on empirical work is ambiguous. Numerous studies have quantified the relative contributions of contrasting

movement strategies to dispersal and spatial distribution of benthic populations (reviewed in Mackay 1992; Bilton et al. 2001; Malmqvist 2002); however, they have been primarily tax-specific (e.g., Downes and Lancaster 2010). Generalizing the extent to which life history traits mediate the effect of drift on invertebrate populations will require a thorough review and synthesis of the relative dispersal modes and their attendant fitness consequences for taxa across a gradient of life history characteristics. For example, taxa which vary in drift frequency, oviposition behaviour, or adult dispersal distance (e.g., Elliott 2003).

Broadening the context of drift dispersal to the whole life cycle of stream invertebrates will also require integrating drift measurements over the whole nymphal life stage of an organism (Anderson et al. 2005). While most estimates of drift distances have been measured over single drift events (e.g., Larkin & McKone 1985), lifetime drift distance provides a more meaningful measure of dispersal given that individuals may drift many times throughout their aquatic life stage (Humphries and Ruxton 2003). Similarly, drift-associated mortality risk is rarely assessed over timescales longer than single drift events. While logistical challenges to these measurements are steep, some researchers have managed to overcome them using a diversity of approaches. For example, lifetime dispersal has been directly estimated using mark-recapture to track movements over multiple dispersal events (Jackson et al. 1999; Elliott 2003). Others have used indirect correlative approaches, where dispersal distances or mortality risk is inferred from drift and/or settlement measured at different locations. For example, Lancaster et al. (2011) measured drift at downstream and upstream ends of adjacent riffles and estimated that few individuals drifting out of a riffle reached the next riffle downstream. This observation, coupled with a positive correlation between benthic densities of *Baetis* neonates and egg masses,

led them to conclude that long distance drift dispersal of this taxon was minimal on average and spatial distribution was primarily driven by aerial dispersal of adults.

Consequences of Drift Variation for Energy Flux to Fish

Drift-foraging predators are a large guild of riverine fishes that are particularly abundant in temperate zones (Grossman 2014). Although drift-foraging fish may have considerable dependence on terrestrial invertebrates (e.g., Wipfli 1997), drift of benthic origin constitutes the primary prey source for many, such as stream rearing salmonids (e.g., Nielson 1992), which are often food limited (Boss and Richardson 2002; McCarthy et al. 2009; Wipfli and Baxter 2010). Drift availability is therefore of great importance to drift-feeding fish production and the magnitude of drift flux to fishes has been directly linked to increased growth (Keeley 2001; Kiffney et al. 2014; Weber et al. 2014), abundance (Fausch et al. 1991), survival (Rosenfeld et al. 2005) and movement patterns (Hansen and Closs 2009). Drift is therefore an important determinant of fish habitat quality, and consequently is a key parameter in drift-foraging bioenergetic models (e.g., Hughes and Dill 1990), which are emerging as an increasingly common approach for assessing habitat capacity for drift-feeding fishes (Rosenfeld et al. 2014).

In this applied trophic dynamics context, fish biologists have focused on bulk drift concentration or total prey flux - rather than taxon-specific drift rates - because bulk drift metrics are more easily linked to fish consumption (Hansen and Closs 2009; Weber et al. 2014). While drift-foraging models have been successful in terms of exploring the energetic trade-offs involved in foraging position choices and behavioural strategies of drift-feeding fishes (Fausch 1984; Nielson 1992; Hughes 1998; Piccolo et al. 2014), absolute predictions are very sensitive to estimated drift abundance as an input parameter (e.g. Rosenfeld and Taylor 2009). Uncertainty in

how drift varies spatially and temporally complicates attempts to quantitatively predict drift concentration (see *Spatial and Temporal Variation in Drift* section above), and consequently also reduces confidence in predictions from drift-foraging models. As a result, most empirical applications have treated drift as a constant or fitted parameter when modelling habitat quality over a range of physical conditions or locations (Railsback et al. 2003; Urabe et al. 2010; Rosenfeld and Ptolemy 2012). Improved empirical predictions of fish biomass and production using drift-foraging models will require a much better understanding of the spatial and temporal drivers of variation in drift abundance.

Potential feedbacks between drift predation and drift production also remain poorly resolved. While it is known that predation may have localized effects on drift concentration (i.e., causes depletion immediately downstream of a fishes focal point (Hughes 1992; Hayes et al. 2007)), an implicit assumption of most drift-foraging models is that there are no active feedbacks from predation on drifting invertebrate behaviour or populations (i.e., drift-feeding is assumed to be donor controlled). Several studies have failed to detect an effect of drift-feeding fish on the benthos (Allan 1982; Dahl and Greenberg 1996); however, there is some evidence that predation on drift may have top-down effects (Forrester 1994; Diehl et al. 2000; Meissner and Muotka 2006), and the ability of trout to consume a significant fraction of benthic production is well documented (e.g., Huryn 1996). Incorporating a significant feedback between predation and drift production (entry rates) could substantially alter current drift-foraging modeling approaches. Overall, the controls on drift-foraging consumer-resource coupling remains a fundamental gap in our understanding of trophic dynamics in streams as well as the ability to accurately assess trophic interactions and habitat quality using drift-foraging models.

Predictive modeling of drift dynamics

Models describing drift dynamics generally fall into three categories: behavioural-based mechanistic or theoretical models rooted in individual decisions related to balancing predation risk and foraging opportunities; population-level models, generally focused on population persistence or spatial population distribution; and models of bulk community drift aimed at estimating the flux of invertebrate prey to drift-feeding fish. Individual and population models have been conceptually focused and less concerned with empirical prediction (but see Anderson et al. 2013), while bulk community models have generally ignored underlying biotic processes and focused on empirical prediction of drift concentration. Given this disparity in underlying motivation and minimal examples of model validation against field data, quantitative comparison among modelling frameworks is impractical. Instead we provide an objective overview of each approach and discuss the potential for integrated approaches in the future.

Individual Behavioural Models

Behaviourally induced drift has been modeled as a form of active patch selection and builds on the trade-off animals make between increasing energy intake and elevating predation risk while foraging (Werner and Gilliam 1984; Gilliam and Fraser 1987; Sih and McCarthy 2002). For example, Ruetz and Stephens (2003) formulated a predictive behavioural drift model using a probabilistic, discrete-time approach that envisions streams as a random configuration of patches varying in food availability and benthic predation risk. A transition matrix then describes the likelihood of animals shifting states (i.e., entering the drift or returning to the substrate). Given the assumption that invertebrates optimize foraging gain relative to predation risk, the model intuitively predicts that invertebrates should drift when benthic predation risk is high and when food availability and predation risk while drifting are low.

This type of individual drift model offers a promising avenue to generate and test hypotheses of behavioural drift dynamics, especially in an experimental context where both food and predation risk can be manipulated (e.g., Kohler and McPeck 1989; Scrimgeour and Culp 1994a; Hammock and Wetzel 2013). The main appeal of this approach is that it allows for multiple factors (foraging opportunities, benthic predation risk and predation risk while in the drift) to be simultaneously considered in a quantitative framework. While the approach of Ruetz and Stephens (2003) makes several simplifying assumptions including constant individual traits and environmental conditions, there are opportunities within this framework to incorporate additional realism.

The utility of behaviour-based modelling approaches in an empirical, predictive context may be limited however. Given that models are generated under the assumption that drifting is the primary anti-predator behaviour, predictions are extremely sensitive to other avoidance behaviours that modify predation risk such as burrowing (e.g., Peckarsky 1996). Addressing this assumption to correctly parameterize predation models requires detailed behavioural information that is absent for most taxa thereby preclude most predictive applications.

Population-level Drift Models

Population-level models have generally focused on the influence of drift on population persistence (Pachepsky et al. 2005; Lutscher et al. 2010) or spatial population distribution (Diehl et al. 2008). Persistence-focused approaches primarily describe drift with dispersal kernels, a temporally explicit probability distribution of an organism moving a given distance, which can be derived empirically (Humphries and Ruxton 2003) or through mechanistic movement models (Speirs and Gurney 2001; Lutscher et al. 2010). Conditions for population persistence are then

derived by simulating population dynamics over a range of demographic (e.g., birth and death rates) and dispersal parameters. Spatially focused population models are aimed at understanding the dynamics of populations in heterogeneous environments linked by movements. Specifically of interest is the transition of spatial domains in which local population dynamics dominated by drift-mediated dispersal shift to regional dynamics driven by birth and death rates (Anderson et al. 2005; Melbourne and Chesson 2005). Dispersal through drift is a key model parameter which has been either fitted from field data (Melbourne and Chesson 2006; Diehl et al. 2008) or modelled from an exponential distribution (discussed in following section; Anderson *et al.* 2005).

Modelling Bulk Community Drift

In contrast to individual and population models, bulk community drift modelling applications have broadly ignored individual behavioural decisions and population dynamics, and have focused on predicting total drift concentration with the goal of understanding both turbulent transport processes (McNair and Newbold 2001) and prey availability for drift-feeding fishes (e.g., Hayes et al. 2007). Empirical estimates of invertebrate transport and settling rates have been used to parameterize drift transport models (McLay 1970; Elliott 1971; Larkin and McKone 1985), which ultimately predict drift concentration and the total flux of drift to fish (Hayes et al. 2007). One general approach has been to model the proportion of released individuals remaining in suspension as a negative exponential function of distance below the release site (i.e., location of drift entry). This framework, originally described by McLay (1970), takes the form:

$$N_x = N_0 e^{-R_x}$$

Where N_x is the number of animals in the drift at x distance from their point of entry, N_0 is the initial density of animals, and R is the rate of settlement. R can be parameterized for different species based on empirical observations (Elliott 1971) or hydraulic settling relationships derived for inert particles (see references in Anderson *et al.* 2013; Kennedy *et al.* 2014). While exponential settling models have generally been well supported empirically (Larkin and McKone 1985), McNair & Newbold (2012) argue that this approach inaccurately predicts near-field (i.e., close to the entry site) settling dynamics and advocate an alternative local exchange model based on advection-diffusion fluid mechanics. The key advancement of the local exchange model is that it considers both longitudinal and vertical dimensions (as opposed to only longitudinal), resulting in the prediction that an exponential settling distribution will hold for far-field but not near-field settling. This was supported by a meta-analysis of empirical data, where McNair & Newbold (2012) concluded that exponential settling time and distance distributions were suitable for predicting far field drift but not accurate for describing drift dynamics close to release points, suggesting that local exchange modelling is a more accurate approach.

In addition to exponential and local exchange models, predictive drift models have also been developed based on Markov processes describing lateral and downstream dispersion in turbulent environments. This approach was pioneered by Ciborowski (1983), with the goal of predicting mayfly redistribution from drift. More recently the framework was extended by Hayes *et al.* (2007) as a component of a drift-foraging bioenergetics model. Using site-level entry and settling rates, and upstream drift concentration as inputs, their model makes spatially explicit predictions of drift concentration through a given area of stream (for more extensive review see Rosenfeld *et al.* 2014).

For both mechanistic dispersion- and exponential/local exchange-based models the parameterization of drift entry rate is a crucial source of uncertainty and limits their application and transferability. Drift entry rates are usually adjusted as part of the model fitting process; using settling rates as fixed parameters from the literature, entry rates are adjusted to generate observed drift concentrations (e.g., Hayes *et al.* 2007; Anderson *et al.* 2013 Railsback *et al.* 2003, 2009). Other applications have either assumed constant drift concentration (Rosenfeld and Taylor 2009) or that entry is directly proportional to benthic density (Kennedy *et al.* 2014). The predictive power of bulk community drift models may be contingent on the relative contribution of active vs. passive processes to drift dynamics. For example, community models may have high predictive power in large rivers, where drift may behave similarly to passive particles, i.e., accidental drift may dominate, with transport primarily controlled by discharge (Kennedy *et al.* 2014). Similar models, however, may be less applicable in smaller streams where entry and transport may have stronger behavioural controls and there may be substantial depletion through predation (Leung *et al.* 2009).

Comparison and Integration of Approaches

As with any modelling endeavor in ecology, there are trade-offs between the predictive ability of a model and its computational complexity and information requirements. For modelling drift flux, a key question moving forward is the extent to which prediction would be improved by incorporating taxon-specific behavioural and population-level processes (e.g., predator avoidance or density-dependence). It is currently unclear whether individual and population based approaches should remain conceptual exercises, or be integrated into a common framework with bulk hydraulic based drift flux models. To date, Anderson *et al.* (2013) is the only example we are aware of that combines benthic population dynamics with hydraulic and

particle tracking models. However, the predictive power gained from this added complexity is unclear given this model has yet to be tested against field data.

Conclusions

Invertebrate drift is a key process in running waters that affects benthic production, community structure and energy flow to higher trophic levels. An improved process-based knowledge of drift is fundamental to our basic understanding of stream ecosystem dynamics as well as the management and conservation of drift-feeding fishes. Like most developing fields in ecology, the challenge lies in moving beyond qualitative descriptions of processes to quantitative models that allow concrete predictions of rates, fluxes and their associated consequences for populations and communities (Table 2). Four broad themes emerge as priority research gaps: i) *quantitatively determining the relative influence of passive vs. active causes of drift and the domains where they operate*; this is fundamental to both theoretical and descriptive applications and will require controlled experiments with multiple causal factors; ii) *linking drift to broader population demographics*; creative experimental and field-based approaches should aim to measure drift at spatial and temporal scales relevant to regional population processes to resolve the role of drift in benthic population dynamics; iii) *characterizing how explicit components of drift (entry, transport and exit) vary spatially and temporally* and iv); synthesizing descriptive, experimental and theoretical approaches for *developing predictive models of drift, ranging from strictly empirical models to process models incorporating individual, population and community-level processes*.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada Research Grant #312110 to Jordan Rosenfeld. Kasey Moran (UBC) helped with Figure 3. Several anonymous reviewers provided helpful comments to earlier versions of this work.

References

- Allan, D., and Russek, E. 1985. The Quantification of Stream Drift. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **42**(1979): 210–215.
- Allan, J.D. 1978. Trout predation and the size composition of stream drift. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **23**(6): 1231–1237.
- Allan, J.D. 1982. The effects of reduction in trout density on the invertebrate community of a mountain stream. *Ecology* **63**(5): 1444–1455.
- Allan, J.D., and Castillo, M.M. 2007. *Stream Ecology: The Structure and Function of Running Waters*. In 2nd edition. Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands.
- Allan, J.D., and Feifarek, B.P. 1989. Distances travelled by drifting mayfly nymphs: factors influencing return to the substrate. *J. North Am. Benthol. Soc.* **8**(4): 322–330.
- Anderson, K.E., Harrison, L.R., Nisbet, R.M., and Kolpas, A. 2013. Modeling the influence of flow on invertebrate drift across spatial scales using a 2D hydraulic model and a 1D population model. *Ecol. Modell.* **265**: 207–220. Elsevier B.V. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2013.06.011.
- Anderson, K.E., Nisbet, R.M., and Diehl, S. 2006a. Spatial scaling of consumer-resource interactions in advection-dominated systems. *Am. Nat.* **168**(3): 358–72. doi: 10.1086/506916.
- Anderson, K.E., Nisbet, R.M., Diehl, S., and Cooper, S.D. 2005. Scaling population responses to spatial environmental variability in advection-dominated systems. *Ecol. Lett.* **8**(9): 933–943. doi: 10.1111/j.1461-0248.2005.00797.x.
- Anderson, K.E., Paul, A.J., Mccauley, E., Jackson, L.J., Nisbet, R.M., and Post, J.R. 2006b. Instream flow needs in streams and rivers: the importance of understanding ecological dynamics. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* **4**(6): 309–318.
- Anderson, N.H., and Lemkuhl, D.M. 1968. Catastrophic drift of insects in a woodland stream. *Ecology* **49**(2): 198–206.

- 724 Anholt, B.R. 1995. Density dependence resolves the stream drift paradox. *Ecology* **76**(7): 2235–
725 2239.
- 726 Benke, A.C., Van Arsell Jr., T.C., Gillepsie, D.M., and Parrish, F.K. 1984. Invertebrate
727 productivity in a subtropical Blackwater River: the importance of habitat and life history.
728 *Ecol. Monogr.* **54**(1): 25–63.
- 729 Benke, A.C., and Wallace, B. 2003. Influence of Wood on Invertebrate Communities in Streams
730 and Rivers. *In* The Ecology and Management of Wood in World Rivers. *Edited by* S. V.
731 Gregory and A.M. Gurnell. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, Maryland. pp. 149–177.
- 732 Bilby, R.E. 1981. Role of organic debris dams in regulating the export of dissolved and
733 particulate matter from a forested watershed. *Ecology* **62**(5): 1234–1243.
- 734 Bilton, D.T., Freeland, J.R., Okamura, B., and Freeland, R. 2001. Dispersal in freshwater
735 invertebrates. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **32**(2001): 159–181.
- 736 Bishop, J.E. 1969. Light control of aquatic insect activity and drift. *Ecology* **50**(3): 371–380.
- 737 Blanckaert, K., Garcia, X.-F., Ricardo, A.-M., Chen, Q., and Pusch, M.T. 2013. The role of
738 turbulence in the hydraulic environment of benthic invertebrates. *Ecohydrology* **6**(4): 700–
739 712. doi: 10.1002/eco.1301.
- 740 Bohonak, A.J., and Jenkins, D.G. 2003. Ecological and evolutionary significance of dispersal by
741 freshwater invertebrates. *Ecol. Lett.* **6**(8): 783–796. doi: 10.1046/j.1461-0248.2003.00486.x.
- 742 Bond, N.R., Perry, G.L.W., and Downes, B.J. 2000. Dispersal of organisms in a patchy stream
743 environment under different settlement scenarios. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **69**: 608–619.
- 744 Boss, S.M., and Richardson, J.S. 2002. Effects of food and cover on the growth, survival, and
745 movement of cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarki*) in coastal streams. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat.*
746 *Sci.* **59**: 1044–1053. doi: 10.1139/F02-079.
- 747 Brittain, J.E., and Eikeland, T.J. 1988. Invertebrate drift - a review. *Hydrobiologia* **166**(1): 77–
748 93. doi: 10.1007/BF00017485.
- 749 Chang, W.Y.B., and Sell, D.W. 1984. Determining the density dependence of immigration and
750 emigration of benthic stream invertebrates: theoretical considerations. *Hydrobiologia*
751 **108**(1): 49–55. doi: 10.1007/BF00028182.
- 752 Ciborowski, J.J.H. 1983. Downstream and lateral transport of nymphs of two mayfly species
753 (Ephemeroptera). *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **40**(573 12): 2025–2029.
- 754 Ciborowski, J.J.H. 1987. Dynamics of drift and microdistribution of two mayfly populations: a
755 predictive model. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **44**: 832–845.

- 756 Ciborowski, J.J.H., Pointing, P.J., and Corkum, L.D. 1977. The effect of current velocity and
757 sediment on the drift of the mayfly *Ephemerella subvaria* (Mcdunnough). *Freshw. Biol.*
758 **7**(6): 567–572. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2427.1977.tb01708.x.
- 759 Corkum, L.D. 1978. The influence of density and behavioural type on the active entry of two
760 mayfly species (Ephemeroptera) into the water column. *Can. J. Zool.* **56**: 1201–1206.
- 761 Corrarino, C.A., Brusven, M.A., Freshwater, S., Biology, I., and May, N. 1983. The effects of
762 reduced stream discharge on insect drift and stranding of near shore insects. *Freshw.*
763 *Invertebr. Biol.* **2**(2): 88–98.
- 764 Crespo, J.G. 2011. A review of chemosensation and related behavior in aquatic insects. *J. insect*
765 *Sci.* **11**(62): 1–39. doi: 10.1673/031.011.6201.
- 766 Culp, J.M., Glozier, N.E., and Scrimgeour, G.J. 1991. Reduction of predation risk under the
767 cover of darkness: avoidance responses of mayfly larvae to a benthic fish. *Oecologia* **86**(2):
768 163–169.
- 769 Dahl, J., and Greenberg, L. 1996. Impact on stream benthic prey by benthic vs drift feeding
770 predators: a meta-analysis. *Oikos* **77**(2): 177–181.
- 771 Davis, J.A., and Barmuta, L.A. 1989. An ecologically useful classification of mean and near-bed
772 flows in streams and rivers. *Freshw. Biol.* **21**: 271–282.
- 773 Dewson, Z.S., James, A.B.W., Death, R.G., and Dewson, S. 2007. A review of the consequences
774 of decreased flow for instream habitat and macroinvertebrates. *J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc.*
775 **26**(3): 401–415.
- 776 Diehl, S., Anderson, K.E., and Nisbet, R.M. 2008. Population Responses of Drifting Stream
777 Invertebrates to Spatial and Environmental Variability: an Emerging Conceptual
778 Framework. *In* *Aquatic Insects: Challenges to Populations*. Edited by J. Lancaster and R.
779 Briers. Wallingford. pp. 158–183.
- 780 Diehl, S., Cooper, S.D., Kratz, K.W., Nisbet, R.M., Roll, S.K., Wiseman, S.W., and Jenkins, Jr.,
781 T.M. 2000. Effects of multiple, predator-induced behaviors on short-term producer-grazer
782 dynamics in open systems. *Am. Nat.* **156**(3): 293–313. doi: 10.1086/303390.
- 783 Dimand, J.B. 1967. Evidence that drift of stream benthos is density related. *Ecology* **48**(5): 855–
784 857.
- 785 Douglas, P.L., Forrester, G.E., and Cooper, S.D. 1994. Effects of trout on the diel periodicity of
786 drifting in baetid mayflies. *Oecologia* **98**(June 1993): 48–56.
- 787 Downes, B.J. 1990. Patch dynamics and mobility of fauna in streams. *Oikos* **59**(3): 411–413.

- Downes, B.J., and Lancaster, J. 2010. Does dispersal control population densities in advection-dominated systems? A fresh look at critical assumptions and a direct test. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **79**(1): 235–48. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2009.01620.x.
- Dudgeon, D. 1990. Seasonal dynamics of invertebrate drift in a Hong Kong stream. *J. Zool. Soc. London* **222**: 187–196.
- Dunbrack, R.L., and Dill, L.M. 1983. A model of size dependent surface feeding in a stream dwelling salmonid. *Environ. Biol. Fishes* **8**(3-4): 203–216. doi: 10.1007/BF00001086.
- Elliott, J.M. 1967a. Invertebrate drift in a Dartmoor stream. *Arch. für Hydrobiol.* **63**: 202–237.
- Elliott, J.M. 1967b. The life histories of drifting Plecoptera and Ephemeroptera in a Dartmoor Stream. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **36**(2): 343–362.
- Elliott, J.M. 1971. The distances travelled by drifting invertebrates in a Lake District stream. *Oecologia* **6**(4): 350–379. doi: 10.1007/BF00389109.
- Elliott, J.M. 2002. The drift distances and time spent in the drift by freshwater shrimps, *Gammarus pulex*, in a small stony stream, and their implications for the interpretation of downstream dispersal. *Freshw. Biol.* **47**(8): 1403–1417. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2427.2002.00874.x.
- Elliott, J.M. 2003. A comparative study of the dispersal of 10 species of stream invertebrates. *Freshw. Biol.* **48**(9): 1652–1668. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2427.2003.01117.x.
- Elliott, J.M. 2011. A comparative study of the relationship between light intensity and feeding ability in brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) and Arctic charr (*Salvelinus alpinus*). *Freshw. Biol.* **56**(10): 1962–1972. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2427.2011.02627.x.
- Englund, G., and Cooper, S.D. 2003. Scale effects and extrapolation in ecological experiments. *Adv. Ecol. Res.* **33**: 161–213.
- Fausch, K. 1984. Profitable stream positions for salmonids: relating specific growth rate to net energy gain. *Can. J. Zool.* **62**: 441–451.
- Fausch, K.D., Nakano, S., and Khano, S. 1991. Experimentally induced foraging mode shift by sympatric charrs in a Japanese mountain stream. *Behav. Ecol.* **8**(4): 414–420.
- Fingerut, J.T., Hart, D.D., and McNair, J.N. 2006. Silk filaments enhance the settlement of stream insect larvae. *Oecologia* **150**(2): 202–12. doi: 10.1007/s00442-006-0517-x.
- Flecker, A.S. 1992. Fish predation and the evolution of invertebrate drift periodicity: evidence from neotropical streams. *Ecology* **73**(2): 438–448.

- 819 Fonseca, D.M. 1999. Fluid mediated dispersal in streams: models of settlement from the drift.
820 *Oecologia* **121**(2): 212–223.
- 821 Fonseca, D.M., and Hart, D.D. 1996. Density-dependent dispersal of black fly neonates is
822 mediated by flow. *Oikos* **75**(1): 49–58.
- 823 Fonseca, D.M., and Hart, D.D. 2001. Colonization history masks habitat preferences in local
824 distributions of stream insects. *Ecology* **82**(10): 2897–2910.
- 825 Forrester, G.E. 1994. Influences of predatory fish on the drift dispersal and local density of
826 stream insects. *Ecology* **75**(5): 1208–1218.
- 827 Fraser, F., and Huntingford, A. 1986. Feeding and avoiding predation hazard: the behavioral
828 response of the prey. *Ethology* **8**(73): 56–68.
- 829 Fraser, N.H.C., and Metcalfe, N.B. 1997. The costs of becoming nocturnal: feeding efficiency in
830 relation to light intensity in juvenile Atlantic Salmon. *Funct. Ecol.* **11**(3): 385–391. doi:
831 10.1046/j.1365-2435.1997.00098.x.
- 832 Gibbins, C.N., Vericat, D., and Batalla, R.J. 2007a. When is stream invertebrate drift
833 catastrophic? The role of hydraulics and sediment transport in initiating drift during flood
834 events. *Freshw. Biol.* **52**(12): 2369–2384. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2427.2007.01858.x.
- 835 Gibbins, C.N., Vericat, D., Batalla, R.J., and Gomez, C. 2007b. Shaking and moving: low rates
836 of sediment transport trigger mass drift of stream invertebrates. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **64**:
837 1–5.
- 838 Gilliam, J., and Fraser, D.F. 1987. Habitat selection under predation hazard: test of a model with
839 foraging minnows. *Ecology* **68**(6): 1856–1862.
- 840 Grossman, G.D. 2014. Not all drift feeders are trout: a short review of fitness-based habitat
841 selection models for fishes. *Environ. Biol. Fishes* **97**: 465–473. doi: 10.1007/s10641-013-
842 0198-3.
- 843 Grubaugh, J.W., Wallace, B.J., and Houston, E.S. 1997. Production of benthic macroinvertebrate
844 communities along a southern Appalachian river continuum. *Freshw. Biol.* **37**: 581–596.
- 845 Gunderson, L.H. 2000. Ecological resilience - in theory and application. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.*
846 **31**(2000): 425–439.
- 847 Gustafsson, P., Greenberg, L.A., and Bergman, E. 2014. Woody debris and terrestrial
848 invertebrates – effects on prey resources for brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) in a boreal stream.
849 *Environ. Biol. Fishes* **97**(5): 529–542. doi: 10.1007/s10641-014-0250-y.

- 850 Hammock, B.G., Krigbaum, N.Y., and Johnson, M.L. 2012. Incorporating invertebrate predators
851 into theory regarding the timing of invertebrate drift. *Aquat. Ecol.* **46**(2): 153–163. doi:
852 10.1007/s10452-012-9388-x.
- 853 Hammock, B.G., and Wetzel, W.C. 2013. The relative importance of drift causes for stream
854 insect herbivores across a canopy gradient. *Oikos* **122**: 1586–1593. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-
855 0706.2013.00319.x.
- 856 Hansen, E.A., and Closs, G.P. 2007. Temporal consistency in the long-term spatial distribution
857 of macroinvertebrate drift along a stream reach. *Hydrobiologia* **575**(1): 361–371. doi:
858 10.1007/s10750-006-0384-9.
- 859 Hansen, E.A., and Closs, G.P. 2009. Long-term growth and movement in relation to food supply
860 and social status in a stream fish. *Behav. Ecol.* **20**(3): 616–623. doi: 10.1093/beheco/arp039.
- 861 Hart, D.D., and Finelli, C.M. 1999. Physiobiological coupling in streams: the pervasive effects of
862 flow on benthic organisms. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **30**(1): 363–395. doi:
863 10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.30.1.363.
- 864 Harvey, B.C., Nakamoto, R.J., and White, J.L. 2006. Reduced Streamflow Lowers Dry-Season
865 Growth of Rainbow Trout in a Small Stream. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **135**(4): 998–1005. doi:
866 10.1577/T05-233.1.
- 867 Harvey, B.C., White, J.L., and Nakamoto, R.J. 2009. The effect of deposited fine sediment on
868 summer survival and growth of rainbow trout in riffles of a small stream. *North Am. J. Fish.*
869 *Manag.* **29**(2): 434–440. doi: 10.1577/M08-074.1.
- 870 Hayes, J.W., Goodwin, E., Hay, J., Shearer, K.A., and Kelly, L.H. 2012. Minimum flow
871 requirements of trout in the Mataura river: comparison of traditional habitat and net rate of
872 energy intake modelling. Prepared for Environment Southland. Cawthron Report No. 1957.
- 873 Hayes, J.W., Hughes, N.F., and Kelly, L.H. 2007. Process-based modelling of invertebrate drift
874 transport, net energy intake and reach carrying capacity for drift-feeding salmonids. *Ecol.*
875 *Modell.* **207**(2-4): 171–188. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2007.04.032.
- 876 Hayes, J.W., Stark, J.D., and Shearer, K.A. 2000. Development and test of a whole-lifetime
877 foraging and bioenergetics growth model for drift-feeding brown trout. *Trans. Am. Fish.*
878 *Soc.* **129**: 315–332.
- 879 Hieber, M., Robinson, C.T., and Uehlinger, U. 2003. Seasonal and diel patterns of invertebrate
880 drift in different alpine stream types. *Freshw. Biol.* **48**(6): 1078–1092. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-
881 2427.2003.01073.x.
- 882 Hildebrand, S.G. 1974. The relation of drift to benthos density and food level in an artificial
883 stream. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **19**(6): 951–957.

- 884 Hildrew, A.G., and Townsend, C.R. 1980. Aggregation, interference and foraging by the larvae
885 of *Plectrocnemia conspersa* (Trichoptera: Polycentropodinae). *Anim. Behav.* **28**: 553–560.
- 886 Hill, J., and Grossman, G.D. 1993. An energetic model of microhabitat use for rainbow trout and
887 rosyside dace. *Ecology* **74**(3): 685–698.
- 888 Hillebrand, H. 2005. Light regime and consumer control of autotrophic biomass. *J. Ecol.* **93**(4):
889 758–769. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2745.2005.00978.x.
- 890 Holomuzki, J.R., and Van Loan, A.S. 2002. Effects of structural habitat on drift distance and
891 benthic settlement of the caddisfly, *Ceratopsyche sparna*. *Hydrobiologia* **477**: 139–147.
- 892 Hoover, T.M., and Richardson, J.S. 2009. Does water velocity influence optimal escape
893 behaviors in stream insects? *Behav. Ecol.* **21**(2): 242–249. doi: 10.1093/beheco/arp182.
- 894 Hughes, N.F. 1992. Selection of positions by drift-feeding salmonids in dominance hierarchies:
895 model and test for arctic grayling (*Thymallus arcticus*) in subarctic mountain streams,
896 interior Alaska. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **49**: 1999–2008.
- 897 Hughes, N.F. 1998. A model of habitat selection by drift-feeding stream salmonids at different
898 scales. *Ecology* **79**(1): 281–294.
- 899 Hughes, N.F., and Dill, L.M. 1990. Position choice by drift feeding salmonids: a model and test
900 for arctic grayling. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **47**(1984): 2039–2048.
- 901 Huhta, A., Muotka, T., and Tikkanen, P. 2000. Nocturnal drift of mayfly nymphs as a post-
902 contact antipredator mechanism. *Freshw. Biol.* **45**(1): 33–42. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-
903 2427.2000.00615.x.
- 904 Humphries, S. 2002. Dispersal in drift-prone macroinvertebrates: a case for density-
905 independence. *Freshw. Biol.* **47**: 921–929.
- 906 Humphries, S., and Ruxton, G.D. 2002. Is there really a drift paradox? *J. Anim. Ecol.* **71**(1995):
907 151–154.
- 908 Humphries, S., and Ruxton, G.D. 2003. Drift distances and mortality risk for of intergenerational
909 estimation dispersal aquatic macroinvertebrates. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **48**(6): 2117–2124.
- 910 Huryn, A.D. 1996. An appraisal of the Allen paradox in a New Zealand trout stream. *Limnol.*
911 *Oceanogr.* **41**(2): 243–252. doi: 10.4319/lo.1996.41.2.0243.
- 912 Imbert, J., and Perry, J. 2000. Drift and benthic invertebrate responses to stepwise and abrupt
913 increases in non-scouring flow. *Hydrobiologia* **436**(1-3): 191–208. doi:
914 10.1023/A:1026582218786.

- 915 Jackson, J.K., McElravy, E.P., and Resh, V.H. 1999. Long-term movements of self-marked
916 caddisfly larvae (Trichoptera: Sericostomatidae) in a California coastal mountain stream.
917 *Freshw. Biol.* **42**: 525–536.
- 918 James, A.B.W., Dewson, Z.S., and Death, R.G. 2008. The effect of experimental flow reductions
919 on macroinvertebrate drift in natural and streamside channels. *River Res. Appl.* **35**: 22–35.
920 doi: 10.1002/rra.
- 921 James, A.B.W., Dewson, Z.S., and Death, R.G. 2009. The influence of flow reduction on
922 macroinvertebrate drift density and distance in three New Zealand streams. *J. North Am.*
923 *Benthol. Soc.* **28**(1): 220–232. doi: 10.1899/07-146.1.
- 924 Jenkins, A.R., and Keeley, E.R. 2010. Bioenergetic assessment of habitat quality for stream-
925 dwelling cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkii bouvieri*) with implications for climate
926 change and nutrient supplementation. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **67**(2): 371–385. doi:
927 10.1139/F09-193.
- 928 Keeley, E.R. 2001. Demographic responses to food and space competition by juvenile steelhead
929 trout. *Ecology* **82**(5): 1247–1259.
- 930 Keeley, E.R., and Grant, J.W. 1997. Allometry of diet selectivity in juvenile Atlantic salmon
931 (*Salmo salar*). *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **54**(8): 1894–1902. doi: 10.1139/f97-096.
- 932 Kennedy, T.A., Yackulic, C.B., Cross, W.F., Grams, P.E., Yard, M.D., and Copp, A.J. 2014. The
933 relation between invertebrate drift and two primary controls, discharge and benthic
934 densities, in a large regulated river. *Freshw. Biol.* **59**(3): 557–572. doi: 10.1111/fwb.12285.
- 935 Kerans, B.L., Chesson, P.L., and Stein, R.A. 2000. Assessing density-dependent establishment
936 and dispersal: an example using caddisfly larvae. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **57**(6): 1190–
937 1199. doi: 10.1139/cjfas-57-6-1190.
- 938 Keupp, L.E. 1988. Invertebrate fish food resources of lotic environments. Washington, DC.
- 939 Kiffney, P.M., Buhle, E.R., Naman, S.M., Pess, G.R., and Klett, R.S. 2014. Linking resource
940 availability and habitat structure to stream organisms: an experimental and observational
941 assessment. *Ecosphere* **5**(4): 39. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/ES13-00269.1>.
- 942 Kohler, S.L. 1985. Identification of stream drift mechanisms: an experimental and observational
943 approach. *Ecology* **66**(6): 1749–1761.
- 944 Kohler, S.L. 1992. Competition and the structure of a benthic stream community. *Ecol. Monogr.*
945 **62**(2): 165–188.
- 946 Kohler, S.L., and Mcpeek, M. 1989. Predation risk and the foraging behavior of competing
947 stream insects. *Ecology* **70**(6): 1811–1825.

- 948 Kovalak, W.P. 1978. Effects of a pool on stream invertebrate drift. *Am. Midl. Nat.* **99**(1): 119–
949 127.
- 950 Kratz, K. 1996. Effects of stoneflies on local prey populations: mechanisms of impact across
951 prey density. *Ecology* **77**(5): 1573–1585.
- 952 Lancaster, J. 2000. Geometric scaling of microhabitat patches and their efficacy as refugia during
953 disturbance. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **69**: 442–457.
- 954 Lancaster, J., Downes, B.J., and Arnold, A. 2011. Lasting effects of maternal behaviour on the
955 distribution of a dispersive stream insect. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **80**(5): 1061–9. doi:
956 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01847.x.
- 957 Lancaster, J., Hildrew, A.G., and Gjerlov, C. 1996. Invertebrate drift and longitudinal transport
958 processes in streams. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **53**: 572–582.
- 959 Larkin, P.A., and McKone, D.W. 1985. An evaluation by field experiments of the McLay model
960 of stream drift. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **42**(5): 909–918. doi: 10.1139/f85-115.
- 961 Larsen, S., and Ormerod, S.J. 2010. Low-level effects of inert sediments on temperate stream
962 invertebrates. *Freshw. Biol.* **55**(2): 476–486. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2427.2009.02282.x.
- 963 Lauridsen, R.B., and Friberg, N. 2005. Stream macroinvertebrate drift response to pulsed
964 exposure of the synthetic pyrethroid lambda-cyhalothrin. *Environ. Toxicol.* **20**(5): 513–21.
965 doi: 10.1002/tox.20140.
- 966 Leeseberg, C.A., and Keeley, E.R. 2014. Prey size, prey abundance, and temperature as
967 correlates of growth in stream populations of cutthroat trout. *Environ. Biol. Fishes* **97**: 599–
968 614. doi: 10.1007/s10641-014-0219-x.
- 969 Leung, E.S., Rosenfeld, J.S., and Bernhardt, J.R. 2009. Habitat effects on invertebrate drift in a
970 small trout stream: implications for prey availability to drift-feeding fish. *Hydrobiologia*
971 **623**(1): 113–125. doi: 10.1007/s10750-008-9652-1.
- 972 Lima, S.L., and Dill, L.M. 1990. Behavioral decisions made under the risk of predation: a review
973 and prospectus. *Can. J. Zool.* **68**(4): 619–640. doi: 10.1139/z90-092.
- 974 Lutscher, F., Nisbet, R.M., and Pachevsky, E. 2010. Population persistence in the face of
975 advection. *Theor. Ecol.* **3**(4): 271–284. doi: 10.1007/s12080-009-0068-y.
- 976 Mackay, R.J. 1992. Colonization by lotic macroinvertebrates: a review of processes and patterns.
977 *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **49**(1): 617–628.
- 978 Malmqvist, B. 2002. Aquatic invertebrates in riverine landscapes. *Freshw. Biol.* **47**: 679–694.

- 979 Malmqvist, B., and Sjoström, P. 1987. Stream drift as a consequence of disturbance by
980 invertebrate predators. *Oecologia* **74**: 396–403.
- 981 Martin, J.C., and Knight, A.W. 1989. The effect of long pools on the drift of macro-invertebrates
982 in a mountain stream. *Hydrobiologia* **185**: 63–70.
- 983 McCarthy, S.G., Duda, J.J., Emlen, J.M., Hodgson, G.R., and Beauchamp, D.A. 2009. Linking
984 habitat quality with trophic performance of steelhead along forest gradients in the south fork
985 Trinity River watershed, California. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **138**(3): 506–521. doi:
986 10.1577/T08-053.1.
- 987 McIntosh, A., and Peckarsky, B. 1996. Differential behavioural responses of mayflies from
988 streams with and without fish to trout odour. *Freshw. Biol.* **35**(1): 141–148. doi:
989 10.1046/j.1365-2427.1996.00489.x.
- 990 McIntosh, A.R., and Peckarsky, B.L. 2004. Are mayfly anti-predator responses to fish odour
991 proportional to risk? *Arch. für Hydrobiol.* **160**(2): 145–151. doi: 10.1127/0003-
992 9136/2004/0160-0145.
- 993 McLaughlin, R.L., Grant, J.W., and Noakes, D.L. 2000. Living with failure: the prey capture
994 success of young brook charr in streams. *Ecol. Freshw. Fish* **9**: 81–89.
- 995 McLay. 1970. A theory concerning the distance travelled by animals entering the drift of a
996 stream. *J. Fish. Res. Bd. Canada* **27**: 359–370.
- 997 McNair, J.N., and Newbold, J.D. 2001. Turbulent transport of suspended particles and dispersing
998 benthic organisms: the hitting-distance problem for the local exchange model. *J. Theor.*
999 *Biol.* **209**(3): 351–69. doi: 10.1006/jtbi.2001.2273.
- 1000 McNair, J.N., and Newbold, J.D. 2012. Turbulent particle transport in streams: can exponential
1001 settling be reconciled with fluid mechanics? *J. Theor. Biol.* **300**: 62–80. Elsevier. doi:
1002 10.1016/j.jtbi.2012.01.016.
- 1003 Meissner, K., and Muotka, T. 2006. The role of trout in stream food webs: integrating evidence
1004 from field surveys and experiments. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **75**(2): 421–33. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
1005 2656.2006.01063.x.
- 1006 Melbourne, B.A., and Chesson, P. 2005. Scaling up population dynamics: integrating theory and
1007 data. *Oecologia* **145**(2): 179–87. doi: 10.1007/s00442-005-0058-8.
- 1008 Melbourne, B.A., and Chesson, P. 2006. The scale transition: scaling up population dynamics
1009 with field data. *Ecology* **87**(6): 1478–1488.
- 1010 Miller, S.W., and Judson, S. 2014. Responses of macroinvertebrate drift, benthic assemblages,
1011 and trout foraging to hydropeaking. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **71**: 675–687.

- 1012 Minshall, W.G., and Winger, P. V. 1968. The effect of reduction in stream flow on invertebrate
1013 drift. *Ecology* **49**(3): 580–582.
- 1014 Montgomery, D.R., and Buffington, J. 1997. Channel-reach morphology in mountain drainage
1015 basins. *GSA Bull.* **109**(5): 596–611.
- 1016 Müller, K. 1954. Investigations on the organic drift in North Swedish streams. Rep. Inst.
1017 Freshwat. Res. Drottningholm **35**: 133–148.
- 1018 Müller, K. 1982. The colonization cycle of freshwater insects. *Oecologia* **52**(2): 202–207.
- 1019 Nielson, J.L. 1992. Microhabitat-specific foraging behavior, diet and growth of juvenile coho
1020 salmon. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **121**: 617–634.
- 1021 Nislow, K.H., Folt, C., and Seandel, M. 1998. Food and foraging behavior in relation to
1022 microhabitat use and survival of age-0 Atlantic salmon. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **127**: 116–
1023 127.
- 1024 O' Hop, J., and Wallace, J.B. 1983. Invertebrate drift, discharge and sediment relations in a
1025 southern Appalachian headwater stream. *Hydrobiologia* **98**: 71–84.
- 1026 Oldmeadow, D.F., Lancaster, J., and Rice, S.P. 2010. Drift and settlement of stream insects in a
1027 complex hydraulic environment. *Freshw. Biol.* **55**(5): 1020–1035. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
1028 2427.2009.02338.x.
- 1029 Pachepsky, E., Lutscher, F., Nisbet, R.M., and Lewis, M.A. 2005. Persistence, spread and the
1030 drift paradox. *Theor. Popul. Biol.* **67**(1): 61–73. doi: 10.1016/j.tpb.2004.09.001.
- 1031 Palmer, M.A., Allan, J.D., and Butman, C.A. 1996. Dispersal as a regional process affecting the
1032 local dynamics of marine and stream benthic invertebrates. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **11**(8): 322–
1033 326. Available from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21237862>.
- 1034 Patterson, R.J., and Smokorowski, K.E. 2011. Assessing the benefits of flow constraints on the
1035 invertebrate drifting community of a regulated river. *River Res. Appl.* **112**: 99–112. doi:
1036 10.1002/rra.
- 1037 Peckarsky, B.L. 1980. Predator-prey interactions between stoneflies and mayflies: behavioral
1038 observations. *Ecology* **61**(4): 932–943.
- 1039 Peckarsky, B.L. 1996. Alternative predator avoidance syndromes of stream-dwelling mayfly
1040 larvae. *Ecol. Monogr.* **77**(6): 1888–1905.
- 1041 Perkin, E.K., Hölker, F., Tockner, K., and Richardson, J.S. 2014. Artificial light as a disturbance
1042 to light-naïve streams. *Freshw. Biol.* **59**: 2235–2244. doi: 10.1111/fwb.12426.

- 1043 Perry, S.A., and Perry, W.B. 1986. Effects of experimental flow regulation on invertebrate drift
1044 and stranding in the. *Hydrobiologia* **134**: 171–182.
- 1045 Peterson, J.T., and Rabeni, C.F. 2001. Evaluating the physical characteristics of channel units in
1046 an Ozark stream. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **130**: 37–41.
- 1047 Piccolo, J.J., Frank, B.M., and Hayes, J.W. 2014. Food and space revisited: the role of drift-
1048 feeding theory in predicting the distribution, growth, and abundance of stream salmonids.
1049 *Environ. Biol. Fishes* **97**(5): 475–488. doi: 10.1007/s10641-014-0222-2.
- 1050 Piccolo, J.J., Hughes, N.F., and Bryant, M.D. 2008. Water velocity influences prey detection and
1051 capture by drift-feeding juvenile coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) and steelhead
1052 (*Oncorhynchus mykiss irideus*). *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **65**: 266–275. doi: 10.1139/F07-
1053 172.
- 1054 Ploskey, G.R., and Brown, A. V. 1980. Downstream drift of the mayfly *Baetis flavistriga* as a
1055 passive phenomenon. *Am. Midl. Nat.* **104**(2): 405–409.
- 1056 Poff, N.L., and Huryn, A.D. 1998. Multi-scale determinants of secondary production in Atlantic
1057 salmon (*Salmo salar*) streams. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **55**: 201–217.
- 1058 Poff, N.L., Olden, J.D., Vieira, N.K.M., Finn, D.S., Mark, P., and Kondratieff, B.C. 2006.
1059 Functional trait niches of North American lotic insects: traits-based ecological applications
1060 in light of phylogenetic relationships. *J. North Am. Benthol. Soc.* **25**(4): 730–755.
- 1061 Poff, N.L., and Ward, V. 1991. Drift responses of benthic invertebrates to experimental
1062 streamflow reduction in a hydrologically stable stream. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **48**: 1926–
1063 1936.
- 1064 Pringle, C.M., and Ramirez, A. 2001. Spatial and temporal patterns of invertebrate drift in
1065 streams draining a Neotropical landscape. *Freshw. Biol.* **46**: 47–62.
- 1066 Rader, R.B. 1997. A functional classification of the drift: traits that influence invertebrate
1067 availability to salmonids. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **54**(6): 1211–1234. doi: 10.1139/f97-025.
- 1068 Railsback, S., Stauffer, H., and Harvey, B. 2003. What can habitat preference models tell us?
1069 Tests using a virtual trout population. *Ecol. Appl.* **13**(6): 1580–1594.
- 1070 Reisen, W.K., and Prins, R. 1972. Some ecological relationships of the invertebrate drift in
1071 Praters Creek, Pickens County. *Ecology* **53**(5): 876–884.
- 1072 Richardson, J.S. 1991. Seasonal food limitation of detritivores in a montane stream: an
1073 experimental test. *Ecology* **72**(3): 873–887.
- 1074 Rincón, P.A., and Lobon-Cervia, J. 1997. Temporal patterns in macroinvertebrate drift in a
1075 northern Spanish stream. *Mar. Freshw. Res.* **48**: 455–464.

- 1076 Romaniszyn, E.D., Hutchens, J.J., and Wallace, B.J. 2007. Aquatic and terrestrial invertebrate
1077 drift in southern Appalachian Mountain streams: implications for trout food resources.
1078 *Freshw. Biol.* **52**(1): 1–11. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2427.2006.01657.x.
- 1079 Roni, P., and Quinn, T.P. 2001. Density and size of juvenile salmonids in response to placement
1080 of large woody debris in western Oregon and Washington streams. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.*
1081 **58**: 282–292.
- 1082 Rosenfeld, J.S., Bouwes, N., Wall, C.E., and Naman, S.M. 2014. Successes, failures, and
1083 opportunities in the practical application of drift-foraging models. *Environ. Biol. Fishes*
1084 **97**(5): 551–574. doi: 10.1007/s10641-013-0195-6.
- 1085 Rosenfeld, J.S., Leiter, T., Lindner, G., and Rothman, L. 2005. Food abundance and fish density
1086 alters habitat selection, growth, and habitat suitability curves for juvenile coho salmon
1087 (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*). *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **62**: 1691–1701. doi: 10.1139/F05-072.
- 1088 Rosenfeld, J.S., Post, J., Robins, G., and Hatfield, T. 2007. Hydraulic geometry as a physical
1089 template for the River Continuum: application to optimal flows and longitudinal trends in
1090 salmonid habitat. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **64**(5): 755–767. doi: 10.1139/f07-020.
- 1091 Rosenfeld, J.S., and Ptolemy, R. 2012. Modelling available habitat versus available energy flux:
1092 do PHABSIM applications that neglect prey abundance underestimate optimal flows for
1093 juvenile salmonids? *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **1934**: 1920–1934. doi: 10.1139/f2012-115.
- 1094 Rosenfeld, J.S., and Raeburn, E. 2009. Effects of habitat and internal prey subsidies on juvenile
1095 coho salmon growth: implications for stream productive capacity. *Ecol. Freshw. Fish* **18**(4):
1096 572–584. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0633.2009.00372.x.
- 1097 Rosenfeld, J.S., and Taylor, J. 2009. Prey abundance, channel structure and the allometry of
1098 growth rate potential for juvenile trout. *Fish. Manag. Ecol.* **16**(3): 202–218. doi:
1099 10.1111/j.1365-2400.2009.00656.x.
- 1100 Rowe, L., and Richardson, J.S. 2001. Community responses to experimental food depletion:
1101 resource tracking by stream invertebrates. *Oecologia* **129**(3): 473–480. doi:
1102 10.1007/S004420100748.
- 1103 Ruetz, C.R., and Stephens, D.W. 2003. Site selection under differential predation risks by
1104 drifting prey in streams. *Oikos* **102**(1): 85–94.
- 1105 Sagar, P.M., and Glova, G.J. 1988. Diel feeding periodicity, daily ration and prey selection of a
1106 riverine population of juvenile chinook salmon *Oncorhynchus tshawytscha* (Walbaum). *J.*
1107 *Fish Biol.* **33**: 643–653.
- 1108 Scrimgeour, G.J., and Culp, J.M. 1994a. Foraging and evading predators: the effect of predator
1109 foraging species on a behavioural trade-off by a lotic mayfly. *Oikos* **69**(1): 71–79.

- 1110 Scrimgeour, G.J., and Culp, J.M. 1994b. Feeding while evading predators by a lotic mayfly :
1111 linking short-term foraging behaviours to long-term fitness consequences. *Oecologia* **100**:
1112 128–134.
- 1113 Scullion, J., Parish, C.A., Morgan, N., and Edwards, R.W. 1982. Comparison of benthic
1114 macroinvertebrate fauna and substratum composition in riffles and pools in the impounded
1115 River Elan and the unregulated River Wye, mid-Wales. *Freshw. Biol.* **12**: 579–595.
- 1116 Shearer, K.A., Stark, J.D., Hayes, J.W., and Young, R.G. 2003. Relationships between drifting
1117 and benthic invertebrates in three New Zealand rivers: implications for drift-feeding fish.
1118 *New Zeal. J. Mar. Freshw. Res.* **37**: 809–820.
- 1119 Sih, A. 1980. Optimal behavior: can foragers balance two conflicting demands? *Science* (80-.).
1120 **210**(4473): 1041–1043.
- 1121 Sih, A., and McCarthy, T.M. 2002. Prey responses to pulses of risk and safety: testing the risk
1122 allocation hypothesis. *Anim. Behav.* **63**(3): 437–443. doi: 10.1006/anbe.2001.1921.
- 1123 Siler, E.R., Wallace, J.B., and Eggert, S.L. 2001. Long-term effects of resource limitation on
1124 stream invertebrate drift. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **58**(8): 1624–1637. doi: 10.1139/cjfas-58-
1125 8-1624.
- 1126 Smith, J.J., and Li, H.W. 1983. Energetic factors influencing foraging tactics of juvenile
1127 steelhead trout, *Salmo gairdneri*. In *Predators and prey in fishes. Edited by D. Noakes, D.*
1128 *Lindquist, D. Helfman, and J. Ward. Dr. W Junk Publishers, The Hague. pp. 173–180.*
- 1129 Speirs, D.C., and Gurney, W.S.C. 2001. Population persistence in rivers and estuaries. *Ecology*
1130 **82**(5): 1219–1237.
- 1131 Statzner, B., Dejoux, C., and Elouard, J. 1984. Field experiments on the relationship between
1132 drift and benthic densities of aquatic insects in tropical streams (Ivory Coast) I.
1133 Introduction: review of drift literature, methods and experimental conditions. *Rev. Trop.*
1134 *Hydrobiol.* **17**(2): 319–334.
- 1135 Statzner, B., Elouard, J., and Dejoux, C. 1987. Field experiments on the relationship between
1136 drift and benthic densities of aquatic insects in tropical streams (Ivory Coast). III.
1137 *Trichoptera. Freshw. Biol.* **17**: 391–404.
- 1138 Stoneburner, D.L., and Smock, L.A. 1979. Seasonal fluctuations of macroinvertebrate drift in a
1139 South Carolina Piedmont stream. *Hydrobiologia* **63**(1): 49–56.
- 1140 Tonkin, J.D., and Death, R.G. 2013. Macroinvertebrate drift-benthos trends in a regulated river.
1141 *Fundam. Appl. Limnol.* **182**(3): 231–245. doi: 10.1127/1863-9135/2013/0404.
- 1142 Townsend, C.R. 1989. The patch dynamics concept of stream community ecology. *J. North Am.*
1143 *Benthol. Soc.* **8**(1): 36–50.

- 1144 Townsend, C.R., and Hildrew, A.G. 1976. Field experiments on the drifting, colonization and
1145 continuous redistribution of stream benthos. *J. Anim. Ecol.* **45**(3): 759–772.
- 1146 Turner, D., and Williams, D. 2000. Invertebrate movements within a small stream: density
1147 dependence or compensating for drift? *Internat. Rev. Hydrobiol.* **85**(2-3): 141–156.
- 1148 Urabe, H., Nakajima, M., Torao, M., and Aoyama, T. 2010. Evaluation of habitat quality for
1149 stream salmonids based on a bioenergetics model. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* **139**(6): 1665–
1150 1676. doi: 10.1577/T09-210.1.
- 1151 Verberk, W.C.E.P., Siepel, H., and Esselink, H. 2008. Life-history strategies in freshwater
1152 macroinvertebrates. *Freshw. Biol.* **53**(9): 1722–1738. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-
1153 2427.2008.02035.x.
- 1154 Vinson, M.R. 2001. Long term dynamics of an invertebrate assemblage downstream of a large
1155 dam. *Ecol. Appl.* **11**(3): 711–730.
- 1156 Walters, D.M., Leigh, D.S., Freeman, M.C., Freeman, B.J., and Pringle, C.M. 2003.
1157 Geomorphology and fish assemblages in a Piedmont river basin, USA. *Freshw. Biol.* **48**:
1158 1950–1970.
- 1159 Wankowski, J. 1981. Behavioral aspects of predation by juvenile Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*)
1160 on particulate drifting prey. *Anim. Behav.* (29): 557–571.
- 1161 Waters, T.F. 1965. Interpretation of invertebrate drift in streams. *Ecology* **46**(3): 327–334.
- 1162 Waters, T.F. 1966. Production rate, population density, and drift of a stream invertebrate.
1163 *Ecology* **47**(4): 595–604.
- 1164 Waters, T.F. 1969. Invertebrate drift ecology and significance to stream fishes. *In* Symposium on
1165 Salmon and Trout in Streams. *Edited by* T.G. Northcote.
- 1166 Weber, N., Bouwes, N., and Jordan, C.E. 2014. Estimation of salmonid habitat growth potential
1167 through measurements of invertebrate food abundance and temperature. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat.*
1168 *Sci.* **71**(8): 1158–1170.
- 1169 Werner, E.E., and Gilliam, J.F. 1984. The ontogenic niche and species interactions in size-
1170 structured populations. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **15**: 393–425.
- 1171 Wilcox, A.C., Peckarsky, B.L., Taylor, B.W., and Encalada, A.C. 2008. Hydraulic and
1172 geomorphic effects on mayfly drift in high-gradient streams at moderate discharges.
1173 *Ecohydrology* **186**: 176–186. doi: 10.1002/eco.
- 1174 Williams, D.D., and Levens, G.P. 1988. Evidence that hunger and limb loss can contribute to
1175 stream invertebrate drift. *J. North Am. Benthol. Soc.* **7**(3): 180–187.

1176 Wilzbach, M. 1990. Nonconcordance of drift and benthic activity in Baetis. *Limnol. Oceanogr.*
1177 **35**(4): 945–952.

1178 Wilzbach, M., Cummins, K., and Hall, J. 1986. Influence of habitat manipulations on
1179 interactions between cutthroat trout and invertebrate drift. *Ecology* **67**(4): 898–911.

1180 Wilzbach, M.A., Cummins, K.W., and Knapp, R.A. 1988. Toward a functional classification of
1181 stream invertebrate drift. *Verh. Internat. Verein. Limnol.* **23**: 1244–1254.

1182 Winemiller, K.O., Flecker, A.S., and Hoeinghaus, D.J. 2010. Patch dynamics and environmental
1183 heterogeneity in lotic ecosystems. *J. North Am. Benthol. Soc.* **29**(1): 84–99. doi:
1184 10.1899/08-048.1.

1185 Wipfli, M.S. 1997. Terrestrial invertebrates as salmonid prey and nitrogen sources in streams:
1186 contrasting old-growth and young-growth riparian forests in southeastern Alaska, U.S.A.
1187 *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* (1981): 1259–1269.

1188 Wipfli, M.S., and Baxter, C. V. 2010. Linking ecosystems, food webs, and fish production:
1189 subsidies in salmonid watersheds. *Fisheries* **35**(8): 373–387.

1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202

1203

1204

1205

1206

1207

1208

Tables

Table 1. A summary of different active and passive mechanisms of drift entry and relevant references.

Table 2. A summary of some key areas of invertebrate drift deserving further study. References shown represent examples of approaches that may be appropriate to address each issue.

Draft

Table 1.

Mechanism of drift entry	Example references
<i>Passive</i>	
Accidental dislodgment at non-catastrophic flows	Corkum (1978); Humphries (2000); Elliott (2003)
Catastrophic dislodgment due to mobilization of organic substrate and detritus	Allan (1995); Vinson (2001)
Catastrophic dislodgment due to mobilization of inorganic substrate	Anderson & Lemkuhl (1968); Allan (1995); Gibbins <i>et al.</i> (2007)
<i>Active</i>	
Predator avoidance	Peckarsky (1980); Malmvquist & Sjoström (1987); Huhta 1999; Hammock <i>et al.</i> (2012)
Active foraging without density dependence	Hilenbrand (1974); Shearer <i>et al.</i> (2003); Wetzel <i>et al.</i> (2013)
Escape from unfavourable abiotic conditions	Gibbins <i>et al.</i> (2007); Larson & Ormerod (2010)
Density dependence - space limitation	Fonseca & Hart (1996)
Density dependence - food limitation	Kohler (1985); Richardson (1991); Siler <i>et al.</i> (2001); Hammock & Wetzel (2013)
Density dependence - predator avoidance	Kratz (1999)

Draft

Table 2.

	Description	Example References
<i>Individual</i>	Determine relative influence of active and passive causes of drift	Hammock and Wetzel 2013
	Predation risk assessment ability across taxa	McIntosh et al. (2004)
<i>Population</i>	Lifetime drift distances and mortality risk	Humphries and Ruxton 2003; Elliott (2003)
	Importance of rare long distance drift events	
	Population-level consequences of within-patch drift dynamics	
	The effects of selective drift on intra-specific population variation	
<i>Spatial and temporal variation in drift</i>	Field measurements of drift entry, transport and exit	Romaniszyn et al. (2007); Lancaster et al. (1996); Elliott et al. (2002)
	The effects of habitat complexity on drift rates	Kiffney et al. (2014); Gustafsson et al. (2014)
	The relative effects of discharge and phenology on seasonal changes in drift	
<i>Trophic dynamics</i>	What determines whether drift is donor controlled?	
<i>Predictive drift modelling</i>	Integrating individual and population-level processes within bulk community models	Humphries and Ruxton (2003); Anderson et al. (2013)
	Parameterization of drift entry rates	Hayes et al. (2007)

Figures

Figure 1. Schematic outlining the processes involved in drift. Drift entry is shown in A as an invertebrate departs the substrate and becomes entrained in the water column. Invertebrates exit drift through one of several processes including predation (B), passive settlement in hydraulic dead zones (C), active settlement into new patches (D) or emergence (E). Drift transport is the total distance an organism travels in the drift and is represented by vectors AB, AC, AD and AE.

Figure 2. Conceptual diagram illustrating the potential interactions and hierarchical relationships among causal drivers of invertebrate drift. In this model, larger scale biotic (population level) and abiotic (discharge, channel structure) drivers influence local active and passive individual-level drivers of drift. Many of these factors ultimately depend on the specific attributes of taxonomic groups. Dashed lines indicate that factors are not always interdependent or interact indirectly. For example, drift induced through predator avoidance occurs independent of discharge although changes in discharge can mediate predator foraging efficiency or frequency of encounter through changes in habitat area.

Figure 3. Conceptual figure illustrating the relationship between flow and the probability an invertebrate will drift. The top panels show hypothetical flow-related thresholds in drift entry. When flow is increasing (top left panel) there are several potential sequential entrainment thresholds that would initiate mass drift: (a) scouring of organic detritus, which is initiated at the lowest shear stress; (b) scouring of attached algal mats; and (c) scouring of inorganic substrates. When flow is decreasing (top right panel), drift decreases with flow reduction either due to acclimation to high flow conditions or depletion of benthos (i.e., fewer potential drifters). With continued decreasing flows, behavioural thresholds are reached (d) due to changing abiotic (e.g., velocity) or biotic conditions (e.g., competition or predation), causing an increase in drift entry. The overall response of drift to flow variation - shown in the bottom panel - can therefore take on two trajectories from the minimum (the origin in the bottom panel) or the maximum (e) flow depending on whether flow is increasing or decreasing. The colours in the bottom panel represent the domains where drift is primarily active (blue) and passive (green).

Figure 1.

Figure 2

Figure 3