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

Can Fishways Mitigate Fragmentation Effects on Great Plains Fish Communities?

Journal:	Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences
Manuscript ID	cjfas-2016-0466.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-Feb-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Pennock, Casey; Kansas State University, Division of Biology Bender, David; Stantec Inc; Kansas Department of Wildlife, Parks and Tourism Hofmeier, Jordan; Kansas Department of Wildlife, Parks and Tourism Mounts, Jessica; Kansas Alliance for Wetlands and Streams; Kansas Department of Wildlife, Parks and Tourism Waters, Ryan; Kansas Department of Wildlife, Parks and Tourism Weaver, Vaughn; SCS Engineers Gido, Keith; Kansas State University
Please Select from this Special Issues list if applicable:	
Keyword:	sand-bed river, fish passage, pelagic spawning minnows, community structure, DAMS < Environment/Habitat

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Can Fishways Mitigate Fragmentation Effects on Great Plains Fish Communities?

Casey A. Pennock^a, David Bender^{b1}, Jordan Hofmeier^b, Jessica A. Mounts^{b2}, Ryan Waters^b,
Vaughn D. Weaver^c, and Keith B. Gido^a

^aDivision of Biology, Kansas State University, 116 Ackert Hall, Manhattan, Kansas 66506

^bKansas Department of Wildlife, Parks and Tourism, 512 SE 25th Ave, Pratt, Kansas 67124

^cSCS Engineers, 11120 E 26th St N, Wichita, Kansas 67226

Corresponding author: 116 Ackert Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506,
Phone: (620) 213-3067, Fax: (785) 532-6653, Email: pennock@ksu.edu.

¹Current affiliation: Stantec Inc., 6800 College Blvd, Suite 750, Overland Park, KS 66211,
email: david.bender@stantec.com

²Current affiliation: Kansas Alliance for Wetlands and Streams, P.O. Box 5, 421 N. Washington,
Cheney, KS, email: jmounts@kaws.org

Abstract

Fishways are a common tool for mitigating the effects of habitat fragmentation on fish, but their utility in low-gradient, sand-bed rivers of the Great Plains is not well studied. The Lincoln Street Fishway on the Arkansas River became operational in 2015 and was built specifically to pass small-bodied threatened fishes. We compared current and historical surveys up- and downstream of the barrier to test the effect of the fishway on community structure and conducted tagging experiments to test the ability of fishes to move into and through the fishway. Differences in community structure and species richness between communities up- and downstream of the dam were reduced following construction of the fishway. Surveys within the fishway revealed 74% of species from the sampled community were using the fishway. Fishes marked with VIE downstream of the dam were recaptured in the fishway, qualitatively showing that small-bodied fishes could move into and upstream within the fishway. We further quantified upstream movement for three species of small-bodied minnow tagged with PIT tags during manipulations of flows through the fishway. Our results illustrate the potential for fishways to mitigate the effects of habitat fragmentation on fishes in sand-bed rivers.

Introduction

Anthropogenic alterations such as dams and water extraction that fragment river networks and prevent the upstream dispersal of fishes have resulted in reductions in populations across the Great Plains (Luttrell et al. 1999; Perkin and Gido 2011; Pennock et al. 2017). Dams in the Great Plains have caused changes in community structure through habitat alteration and interruption of recolonization events which, over time, result in extirpations (Winston et al. 1991; Gillette et al. 2005; Perkin and Gido 2012). The reproductive ecology of Great Plains fishes that evolved under harsh environmental stochasticity makes them particularly affected by fragmentation. For example, long-distance movement is often necessary to migrate from drying habitats during drought and serves as a means of repopulating upstream reaches during flooding (Fausch and Bestgen 1997; Dodds et al. 2004). Several small-bodied minnows endemic to the Great Plains also have evolved a reproductive strategy whereby they release and fertilize eggs into the water column (*i.e.*, pelagic-broadcast spawning) during seasonal spates (Moore 1944; Hoagstrom and Turner 2015). As they develop, fertilized eggs passively drift downstream in suspension above the constantly shifting substrate over a period of several days (Bottrell et al. 1964). This reproductive strategy requires extensive migrations to disperse into upstream habitats and subsequently long, intact reaches of free-flowing river to allow eggs to hatch and larvae to fully develop as they drift downstream (Cross et al. 1985; Dudley and Platania 2007; Wilde and Durham 2008). The presence of dams blocks both upstream colonization of drying habitats as well as migrations back to spawning habitats by pelagic spawning minnows. Research is necessary to develop and evaluate creative solutions to mitigate the ecological consequences associated with dam construction (Fullerton et al. 2010; O'Hanley et al. 2013).

Although building fishways allowing fish to swim around dams has been in use for more than a century, there remains a large gap in our knowledge of the effectiveness of fishways in restoring connectivity for non-salmonid, small-bodied (*i.e.*, <100 mm total length) species. This is especially the case in low-gradient, sand-bed rivers found in the Great Plains (Ficke and Myrick 2007). We are only aware of two studies conducted in this region, and both assessed the use of rock-ramp style fishways. Archdeacon and Remshardt (2012) documented successful use of a rock channel-type fishway by Rio Grande Silvery Minnow *Hybognathus amarus* on the Rio Grande in central New Mexico. Ficke and Myrick (2007) evaluated community use of a rock-ramp fishway on the St. Vrain River in the front range of Colorado, but did not recapture any marked fish upstream that had moved through the structure. Despite the sparse information on the effectiveness of fishways in the Great Plains, several studies of fishway passage by non-salmonids exist elsewhere in the world (Stuart et al. 2008; Pompeu et al. 2012; Benitez et al. 2015). Studies from river systems in Australia document community use of multiple fishway designs in low-gradient rivers (*e.g.*, Gilligan et al. 2003; Stuart et al. 2008). For example, Stuart et al. (2008) reported the successful ascension of a vertical-slot fishway by 11 species with individuals ranging in total length from 21-1030 mm. Given the potential for fishways to mitigate effects of fragmentation, there is a need to better understand the role these structures can play in regions such as the Great Plains because of the recognized importance of restoring connectivity for entire riverine communities (Benitez et al. 2015).

By increasing our understanding of the effects fishways have on fish communities, we can inform management decisions on best practices to conserve species in areas such as the Great Plains that are affected by anthropogenic alterations. The efficacy of a fishway on a Great Plains river might differ from the same design aimed to pass salmonids on a high-gradient

stream. Great Plains rivers typically consist of an alluvial sand-bed, have highly stochastic flow patterns, and are home to many small-bodied species (some endemic to the region) that have lower swimming and jumping abilities relative to large-bodied diadromous species. The objectives for this study were to: 1) compare fish community structure and species richness upstream and downstream of a dam on the Arkansas River in Kansas before and after construction of a fishway, 2) characterize temporal and spatial patterns of species occurrence, abundance, and size structure within the fishway, 3) determine if downstream fishes are moving into the fishway, and 4) assess the movement patterns of small-bodied minnows (Family: Cyprinidae) within the fishway across a gradient of flows.

Methods

Study Area-The Arkansas River begins in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado, flows east through Colorado, Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas before joining the Mississippi River. Upon entering Kansas, the Arkansas River channel remains predominantly dry between the Colorado border and Great Bend, KS in the central part of the state because of water diversions and groundwater extraction (Cross et al. 1985). The perennially flowing portion of the Arkansas River from Great Bend, KS to Kaw Reservoir (7 082 ha) in Oklahoma is divided into three fragments by low-head dams (Figure 1). The fragment upstream of Wichita to Great Bend is approximately 180 river kilometers (rkm), the fragment running through Wichita is isolated by two low-head dams, 9 rkm apart, and downstream of Wichita approximately 140 rkm flows freely before the river enters Kaw Reservoir, Oklahoma. The Lincoln Street Bridge in the City of Wichita was first built in 1970 and included an inflatable dam attached below the bridge to control water levels in the Arkansas River as it flowed through downtown portions of the city. The dam was built for beautification of the river as it runs through downtown Wichita (Pennock

2017). A permanent, low-head concrete structure replaced the inflatable dam in 1976. Construction began in 2010 to replace both the bridge and dam because of structural deficiencies. The new bridge and dam were built separately and include a 140 m long fishway on either side of a central boat passage (Figure 2). The dam is a run-of-the-river structure that is made up of four individually controllable panels that can be hydraulically raised and lowered to control water levels upstream and discharge within the fishway and boat passage. The fishways are both of a Dutch Pool and Orifice design (Boiten and Dommerholt 2006) that consist of 11 concrete weirs with 88 steel baffles, each with an orifice (0.2 m W x 0.3 m H) that is approximately 0.2 m up from the bottom of each baffle. The weirs consist of baffles grouped into sets of eight with orifices alternating from right to left, creating a sinuous flow pattern. There are 77 pools on each side of the fishway. The slope of individual weirs is highest towards the upstream exit of the fishway (4.1 %) and decreases towards the downstream entrance (2.5 %). The fishway at the Lincoln Street Dam was designed and built for the targeted passage of several small-bodied (Maximum total length: 64 – 150 mm; Kansas Fishes Committee 2014) species of conservation concern and is currently the only fishway in the state. Several high flow events (peak discharge: $419 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$) occurred in the two years following completion of fishway construction causing damage to the structure. Final repairs were completed in January 2015, thus the fishway became fully operational only a few months ahead of the beginning of contemporary sampling efforts.

Community Sampling-Pre-fishway and contemporary fish community data were used to assess the influence of the fishway on upstream and downstream community structure. The City of Wichita (hereafter, the City) conducted fish community sampling of the Arkansas River as part of a water-quality monitoring program from 1991-2008 (V. Weaver, unpublished data;

127 Weaver 1993). One site was sampled 7 rkm upstream of the Lincoln Street Dam in 1991 and
128 1995-2000. Two sites were sampled downstream of the dam, the first was located 300 m
129 downstream of the dam (sampled in 1991 and 1994-2008) and the second was located 3 rkm
130 downstream of the dam (sampled in 2002-2004 and in 2006). All sites were sampled from one to
131 four times per year and were located within 2 rkm of contemporary sampling locations.
132 Contemporary sampling was conducted at 12 sites distributed from 0 to 5 rkm upstream and
133 downstream of the dam and fishway at 1 km intervals. Sites were sampled once per month in
134 2015 and 2016 during March, May, June, July, August, and October. We sampled wadeable
135 portions of a site using a seine (4.6 x 1.8 m, 3.2 mm mesh) and limited our time at a site,
136 including fish processing, to no more than 1.5 h. The first three sites upstream of the dam are
137 impounded during normal dam operations and consist of a homogenous u-shaped channel lined
138 with rip-rap on both banks. Due to the coarse, rip-rap substrate we sampled 100 m of shoreline
139 using a combination of backpack electrofishing (Smith-Root LR24, 100-170 V, Freq: 60, Duty
140 Cycle: 30) and seining where possible (*i.e.*, if wadeable). If surveys occurred when the dam was
141 lowered (*e.g.*, for maintenance upstream), we sampled using seining only as at other sites. The
142 first site upstream of the dam started at the exit of the fishway. The first site downstream of the
143 dam was located approximately 500 m from the dam face where the first consistently forming
144 sand-bar reappeared; the point where the river regained its natural pattern of sand-bar formation.
145 Collected fishes were identified to species, counted, and total length (TL) measured for up to 30
146 individuals of each species per site.

147 We tested for differences in observed and rarified species richness among communities
148 up- and downstream of the fishway separately for both time periods with a One-Way ANOVA.
149 Observed richness was calculated for each site at each sampling date. We considered these

samples to be independent because turnover was high across space and time. Rarified richness was calculated using a sample size of 100 individuals. Differences in size-structure upstream and downstream of the dam for the three most common species (*i.e.*, cumulative relative abundance > 90%), Red Shiner *Cyprinella lutrensis*, Emerald Shiner *Notropis atherinoides*, and Sand Shiner *N. stramineus*, collected during contemporary sampling were tested with a Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA. To avoid inflating the power of statistical tests, we used mean length of each species for each visit to a site as our sample unit (Neumann and Allen 2007). We analyzed community structure upstream and downstream of the Lincoln Street Dam prior to and after fishway construction with a Bray-Curtis (B-C) dissimilarity index (Bray and Curtis 1957) using 4th root transformed abundance. Due to differences in sampling methodology, community structure was not directly compared between pre-fishway and contemporary sampling periods. To avoid erroneous results due to differences in sampling methodology during contemporary sampling we analyzed community structure including all samples first, and also excluding samples from the three sites directly upstream of the dam. We used permutational multivariate analysis of variance (pMANOVA, $N = 10,000$ iterations; Anderson 2001) on B-C dissimilarities to test the effects of location (*i.e.*, up- or downstream) on fish community structure. We visualized differences in community structure among locations using non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) ordinations. All analyses were completed using the vegan: Community Ecology Package, version 2.4-1 (Oksanen et al. 2016) in program R, version 3.3.1 (R Core Team 2016).

Fishway Sampling-To evaluate fishway use by different species, we sampled the structure once per month during March (2016 only), May, June, July (2015 only), and August in 2015 and 2016. Custom nets (0.5 m W x 1 m H, 3.22 mm mesh) were used to block baffle openings, trapping fish in pools between baffles. Trapped fish were scooped out with a custom

dip net (0.6 m W x 1.4 m H x 0.9 m D, 3.2 mm mesh). The number of pools sampled varied across sampling events (range: 112-154) due to the downstream end of the fishway filling with sediment. Species identity and abundance were recorded for each pool separately. In 2015, the first 30 individuals of each species from each side of the fishway were measured to the nearest mm TL. However, in 2016, we measured all individuals.

We analyzed species occurrence (richness) and number of individuals (abundance) within the fishway using generalized linear mixed models (GLMM). Richness and abundance were assessed as dependent variables in GLMMs with a Poisson distribution and log-link function (Zuur et al. 2009). We used weir as a fixed effect and month as a random effect. Due to a difference in which months were sampled during 2015 and 2016 each year was modeled separately. We examined residual plots of our data for potential auto-correlation. Turnover was high across samples in space and time, and residual plots showed no evidence of auto-correlation. Thus, we assumed samples were independent. Mixed models were constructed using the lme4 Package, version 1.1.12 (Bates et al. 2015) in Program R, version 3.3.1 (R Core Team 2016). Size-structure of common species captured within the fishway, Red Shiner, Emerald Shiner, Sand Shiner, and Bullhead Minnow *Pimephales vigilax*, was tested using linear regression. We tested if mean lengths of abundant species varied as a function of weir (*i.e.*, if larger fish were more likely to occur higher up in the fishway). Mean length was calculated for each weir across all samples of the fishway, and was then regressed as a function of weir number.

Movement Patterns in the Fishway-To determine if small-bodied fish could physically move upstream through the high flows of the fishway, we released fish tagged with passive integrated transponders (PIT) tags into the middle of a series of pools (between baffles) of weir 7

with an antenna array installed up- and downstream of the release pool (Figure 2). Six stationary antenna (1 m x 1 m) attached to a multiplexing reading station (QuBE-IS1001, Biomark, Boise, Idaho) were spaced out such that the release pool was bracketed by antenna immediately up- and downstream, two antenna were placed at the most upstream and downstream pools, and two antenna were placed at the first pool of the next upstream weir and at the last pool of the next downstream weir. In addition to the stationary antenna, we used a mobile wand antenna attached to a reader (BP Plus portable; HPR Plus reader, Biomark, Boise, Idaho) to scan each pool of the fishway every 2 h on the side where fish were released. Experimental fish releases occurred at three different water levels (treatments) within the fishway. The City operates the dam at a standard water level upstream, which we used as our baseline treatment. The second and third treatments involved lowering the water level in the fishway by -0.1 and -0.15 m, respectively. Following methods outlined in Pennock (*In press*), we tagged between 45-50 individuals from two species to be released during each water level treatment, including Red Shiner and Sand Shiner that ranged in size from 45-78 mm TL with full duplex 9 mm PIT tags (9 mm x 2.15 mm; Biomark, Boise Idaho). We chose these two species because they are some of the most abundant in our study area, and handle PIT tags relatively well for small-bodied minnows (Pennock *In press*; Pennock et al. 2016). We opted to not use Emerald Shiner in the experiment because we noticed over the course of our study that this species was sensitive to handling stress. We also tagged a minimum of 30 individuals to be released during each water level treatment of Plains Minnow *Hybognathus placitus*, a threatened species targeted for passage by the fishway, with full duplex 12 mm PIT tags (12 mm x 2.15 mm) due to their larger body size (65-117 mm). Plains Minnow were only compared between two water level treatments due to their scarcity in the system. Fish were tagged the day prior to release and held in aerated coolers overnight to

assess survival and tag retention. Prior to release, fishes were scanned to confirm presence of a PIT tag and measured to the nearest mm TL. Fishes were held in a net in the release pool for a minimum of 5 min to acclimate to flows before being released. Fish detections on antennas were monitored for an 8 h period after release for each water level treatment. Because of potential vandalism of equipment, 8 h was the longest we could effectively leave PIT antenna equipment running. During each water level treatment, we measured discharge in the boat passage and the maximum velocity for each orifice to assess how upstream water level affects flows in the boat passage and fishway. The experiment was conducted twice (May and June 2016) and water level treatments were manipulated over three consecutive days.

Movement into the Fishway-To determine if fishes moved from downstream into or through the fishway, we marked all fish species with visible implant elastomer (VIE, Northwest Marine Technology Inc., Shaw Island, WA) captured at three locations downstream of the fishway (*i.e.*, directly below dam/fishway, site 5, and site 4; Figure 1) in July 2015 and August 2016. All fishes were marked at the base of the dorsal fin with a different color for each tagging location. Crews of 4-12 people spent approximately 8 h at each tagging location. Tagging events occurred one week before standard community and fishway sampling in July 2015 and August 2016. All individuals from surveys taken after the initial tagging in 2015 were checked for marks. Recaptured individuals were measured to the nearest mm TL.

Results

Community Sampling-Prior to fishway construction, sampling by the City between 1991 and 2008 yielded 87 976 individuals representing 46 species (Table 1). Mean observed richness was twice as high downstream as upstream of the dam (ANOVA: $F_{1,39} = 19.8$, $P < 0.001$; Figure 3A) with 22 species collected only at downstream sites. Rarified richness was also

higher downstream compared to upstream (ANOVA: $F_{1,39} = 11.9$, $P = 0.001$). All species collected upstream were also collected downstream. Contemporary sampling after fishway construction yielded 123 898 individuals and 39 species (Table 1). Eight species were only collected downstream and 5 species only upstream. Mean observed species richness was significantly different up- and downstream of the dam (ANOVA: $F_{1,142} = 9.2$, $P < 0.01$); albeit only 16% higher downstream after fishway construction (Figure 3B). Rarified richness was not different between downstream and upstream (ANOVA: $F_{1,142} = 0.07$, $P = 0.791$).

Pre-fishway community structure was significantly different among upstream and downstream communities, which can be visualized by clear separation in ordination space (pMANOVA: *Psuedo* $F_{1,39} = 11.8$, $P < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.23$; Figure 4A). Contemporary fish communities in ordination space overlapped considerably among upstream and downstream sites, but significant differences still existed after fishway construction (pMANOVA: *Psuedo* $F_{1,142} = 15.2$, $P < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.10$; Figure 4B). Variable and low sampling efficacy at sites impounded by the dam (*i.e.*, 7, 8, and 9) prompted us to reanalyze community structure while excluding these sites, but significant differences still existed among sites upstream and downstream of the dam (pMANOVA: *Psuedo* $F_{1,106} = 7.2$, $P < 0.001$, $r^2 = 0.06$; Figure 4C). Community structure differences in contemporary samples were driven strongly by the disparity in Emerald Shiner abundance between upstream and downstream sites (Table 1). Statistical results remained unchanged when all but the two most abundant species, Red Shiner and Emerald Shiner, were excluded.

Several species were collected during contemporary sampling upstream of the dam that were restricted to only downstream during pre-fishway sampling (Table 1). Most notably, Emerald Shiner was never collected upstream of the dam pre-fishway construction, despite being

one of the most abundant species downstream. While they were consistently collected upstream of the dam during contemporary sampling (71% of surveys), their abundance was nearly 20 times higher downstream (ANOVA: $F_{1, 114} = 23.2$, $P < 0.001$). Emerald Shiners also were significantly larger upstream (ANOVA on Ranks: $H = 52.5$, $P < 0.001$) and median lengths differed by 14 mm between upstream and downstream (Figure 5). In comparison, Red Shiner (ANOVA on Ranks: $H = 4.01$, $P = 0.05$) were marginally smaller and Sand Shiner (ANOVA on Ranks: $H = 2.631$, $P = 0.10$) did not differ significantly in size structure between sites upstream and downstream of the dam.

Fishway Sampling-Sampling of the fishway yielded 39 767 individuals and 29 species (Table 1). Four species, Red Shiner, Emerald Shiner, Sand Shiner, and Bullhead Minnow, made up > 95% of all individuals sampled. Results from GLMM models showed a significant decline in richness and abundance with increasing distance upstream within the fishway ($P < 0.001$). Richness and abundance within the fishway declined over the course of the entire study (Figure 6). Sixty-six percent of all individuals collected in the fishway were caught in May 2015. The average number of individuals declined by more than 90% in both years with significantly fewer individuals towards the exit (upstream) of the fishway (Figure 6A, B). Average species richness declined by 60% moving upstream in the fishway in both 2015 and 2016 (Figure 6C, D). Size-structure regressions were not significant for Red Shiner ($df = 9$, $P = 0.98$), Sand Shiner ($df = 4$, $P = 0.81$), or Bullhead Minnow ($df = 4$, $P = 0.22$) although Bullhead Minnow were never collected past weir 6. Mean length of Emerald Shiner increased significantly with distance upstream in the fishway ($df = 6$, $P < 0.01$, $\text{adj. } r^2 = 0.82$).

Movement Patterns in the Fishway-Survival and PIT tag retention was high for all three species over 24 h (Table 2). Detection efficiency (*i.e.*, number of fish detected divided by

number released) averaged across treatments was 47% (range: 38-57%) for Red Shiner, 47% (41-53%) for Sand Shiner, and 52% (40-63%) for Plains Minnow. All three species were able to move upstream within the fishway (Table 3). The longest distances moved in both directions by individual Red Shiners and Plains Minnow occurred during the baseline treatment. Contrary to our expectations, these two species showed decreases in distance moved in both directions as water levels were lowered. Sand Shiner displayed the greatest downstream movement at the lowest water level (-0.15 m treatment), and the greatest upstream movement during the -0.1 m treatment. Average discharge in the boat passage decreased from the baseline of $1.7 \text{ m}^3 \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$ to 1.4 during the -0.1 m treatment to 0.8 during the -0.15 m treatment. This decrease in flow had no measured effect of lessening fishway velocities, and we observed a subtle increase in the -0.1 m and -0.15 m treatments (mean $\pm$ SE; baseline = $0.7 \pm 0.04 \text{ m} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$, -0.1 m = 0.8 ± 0.04 , and -0.15 m = 0.8 ± 0.04).

Movement into the Fishway-During VIE marking, we marked 20 404 fishes across all three tagging locations. The five most abundant species tagged were Emerald Shiner (number of individuals = 10 117), Red Shiner (8 797), Sand Shiner (956), Channel Catfish *Ictalurus punctatus* (196), and Bullhead Minnow (187). We recaptured a total of 111 individuals (<1%) consisting of three species, Red Shiner (91), Emerald Shiner (19), and Sand Shiner (1). Ninety-one fishes were recaptured across downstream sites (*i.e.*, sites 1-6). Marked individuals of two species were recaptured in the fishway. Eight Red Shiners were recaptured in the fishway with two individuals captured in weir 7 (39 and 45 mm TL) and the others in weirs 3, 4, and 5. Two Emerald Shiners were recaptured, one in weir 8 (50 mm TL) and the other in weir 4 (41 mm TL). All recaptured individuals from the fishway were marked directly downstream of the dam and fishway.

Discussion

Construction of the Lincoln Street Fishway has allowed for reduced differences between fish communities upstream and downstream of a dam that previously limited upstream colonization by fishes. Our data show that prior to construction of the fishway, species richness was lower upstream of the dam and 48% of all species collected only occurred downstream of the dam. Moreover, contemporary sampling indicated a decreased magnitude in difference between species richness and community structure (*i.e.*, Bray-Curtis dissimilarity) upstream and downstream of the dam. This, coupled with the consistent collection of Emerald Shiner that were not present in the upstream reach prior to fishway construction suggests the structure is allowing for improved continuity. However, differences in abundance and size-structure upstream and downstream of the dam are still present for some species and may reflect difficulties in navigating the fishway and/or impounded river upstream of the dam.

The renewed and consistent occurrence of Emerald Shiner upstream of the dam suggests this species (and likely others) can successfully pass through the fishway to move upstream. Emerald Shiner, a species that was historically present throughout the Arkansas River in Kansas, had been restricted to the reach downstream of Wichita since the construction of small dams within the City (Cross and Collins 1995; Pyron 2014). Although this species was caught regularly within the fishway in our surveys, there was a dominance of larger individuals upstream of the fishway, which might be a result of flows in the fishway reducing passage by smaller individuals due to their reduced swimming ability (Bunt et al. 2012). Alternatively (but not exclusively), sexually mature individuals of some species might be more mobile. Emerald Shiner do not reach sexual maturity until 55 mm TL (Flitner 1964) and the median size of fish upstream was 61 mm (IQR = 54-67 mm). Thus, these larger mature individuals might be more able or driven to move

upstream than their smaller conspecifics. Assessing the effects of the fishway on size-structure of other species is more ambiguous. Red Shiner and Sand Shiner displayed no difference (or marginally smaller fish upstream) in size-structure upstream and downstream of the dam. However, these species continuously occurred upstream of the dam prior to the fishway suggesting that connectivity might be less important for their persistence. Red Shiner and Sand Shiner can reach sexual maturity at 30 mm standard length (Kansas Fishes Committee 2014), and a marked 39 mm TL Red Shiner was collected in the upper portions of the fishway. The movement of this relatively small fish in the fishway suggests smaller individuals can navigate flows in the fishway.

The Lincoln Street Fishway is likely to pass many species in the community. Although our study did not directly measure successful ascension (*i.e.*, a marked fish released at the entrance recaptured at the exit or upstream), we did document 29 species within the structure showing that a majority (74 %) of the species in the entire sampled riverine community used the fishway in some fashion. Recently, the importance of multi-species fishways has been expressed, and several efforts documenting community use of fishways have taken place. A vertical-slot fishway (*i.e.*, a series of baffles each with a vertical slot) passed 11 species on a lowland river in Australia (Stuart et al. 2008). Two vertical-slot fishways in Belgium passed 14 and 22 species, respectively (Benitez et al. 2015). Both of these case studies provide evidence of successful ascension of fishways by multiple species within a fish community and a range of sizes within populations. Fishes ranging in size from 20-1150 mm TL were captured in the Lincoln Street Fishway, and Longnose Gar *Lepisosteus osseus* were observed moving upstream through the high velocities ($>2 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$) of the boat passage (C. Pennock, personal observation). Thus, this

fishway potentially has the capacity to restore connectivity for multiple species and for multiple life-stages.

Pre-fishway communities were different in community structure and richness because extirpations of several species occurred upstream of the dam (*e.g.*, Emerald Shiner, Plains Minnow; Perkin et al. 2015), but populations persisted downstream. The recent absence of Plains Minnow and Peppered Chub *Macrhybopsis tetranema* (Pennock et al. 2017) from downstream, and the recolonization of Emerald Shiner to upstream are contributing to the observed contemporary homogenization between upstream and downstream communities. Similar to our study, other works have shown delayed, albeit improving, changes in community structure following the installation of fishways (Gilligan et al. 2003). Whereas the Lincoln Street Fishway has allowed for improved continuity of the Arkansas River fish community, residual habitat deficiencies might be preventing full recovery of community integrity.

Fishways restore the structural connectivity of rivers for fishes (*i.e.*, allowing for the potential for movement), but whether they restore functional connectivity (*i.e.*, fish actually moving upstream without negative physiological or fitness consequences) requires more attention (McLaughlin et al. 2013). A potential problem with fishways is that they do not fully remedy the problem and habitat deficiencies upstream may still limit the restoration of functional connectivity (Brown et al. 2013; Kemp 2016). Moreover, if fishways entice fish (*e.g.*, fishway flows attract rheophilic fishes) to move into suboptimal habitat above dams, this can lead to reduced fitness for populations (*i.e.*, an ecological trap; Pelicice and Agostinho 2008). Specifically, the Lincoln Street Dam still impounds the river for 3 rkm upstream creating a lentic habitat in which we found overall decreased abundance and richness relative to sites with lotic habitat. This lacustrine zone upstream of the fishway might negatively impact fishes that have

successfully ascended the fishway by discouraging further upstream movement or allowing for increased predation risk by piscivorous fishes. Indeed in our study, sites in the impounded reach (*i.e.*, 7, 8, and 9) had the highest abundance of predatory fishes (*e.g.*, Largemouth Bass *Micropterus salmoides*, Green Sunfish *Lepomis cyanellus*, and Flathead Catfish *Pylodictis olivaris*). Thus, despite the fishway restoring movement corridors for adults, 3 rkm of impounded water might still be detrimental to egg or larval survival either through increased predation or allowing eggs and larvae to fall out of suspension. Additionally, another low-head dam exists 9 rkm upstream that likely impedes further upstream movement by fishes.

Over the course of our study it was clear that both water level management and maintenance of the fishway play critical roles in allowing effective passage of fishes. Specifically, obstruction of fishway entrances by debris and sediments can impact performance by changing hydrology, or creating behavioral or physical barriers. Thus, fishways require regular inspection and maintenance to confirm optimal functionality (O'Connor et al. 2015). A possible explanation for the decrease in abundance of individuals and species richness in the Lincoln Street Fishway over the course of our study might be attributed to the lower portions of the fishway filling with sediments after high flow events in 2015. Sediments completely filled the first 20-30 m on both sides of the fishway, effectively moving the entrance of the fishway upstream. Another aspect of the Lincoln Street Dam that might have influenced passage and community composition within the fishway is its hydraulically controllable panels. This feature of the dam allows the City to adjust impounded water levels upstream. Because the fishway is built alongside and is connected to the dam, flows through the fishway are linked to the impounded water level upstream. If the water level upstream is lowered beyond 1.2 m, flow ceases through the fishway. Over the course of our study the dam was lowered such that the fishway stopped flowing on 11 separate

occasions. During these occasions the fishway was dry for 1-76 consecutive days. The fishway was not flowing for a total of 106 days during 2015 (Jan.-Dec.) and 39 days in 2016 (Jan.-Aug.).

The Lincoln Street Fishway is a potential means to restore access to habitat for fishes that need long, connected reaches of river. In the Great Plains, pelagic-spawning minnows rely on connectivity and adequate seasonal flows to complete their life-history (Bottrell et al. 1964; Dudley and Platania 2007; Wilde and Durham 2008; Perkin and Gido 2011). There are many reaches where these fishes have been extirpated across the Great Plains, including our study reach (Perkin and Gido 2011; Perkin et al. 2015; Pennock et al. 2017). Thus, the Lincoln Street Fishway might have been constructed too late to recover these species. Although our data is suggestive that pelagic-spawning minnows could benefit from the installation of fishways at dams inhibiting their movement, repatriation in reaches where they have been extirpated is a necessary first step towards community recovery. Restoration of adequate riverine habitat and repatriation to reaches of river from which species have been extirpated is needed across the Great Plains to ensure the long-term persistence of endemic species reliant on connectivity and seasonal flow variation.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Jim Hardesty, Neil Vyff, Terry Kelley, Mark Hall, and Larry Hoetmer of the City of Wichita for their assistance throughout the study. Additionally, for help during data collection and tagging efforts we want to thank S. Hedden, M. Waters, R. Webber, Z. Cordes, J. Wellemeyer, C. Hedden, T. Fanshier, G. Hopper, B. Frenette, B. Scharping, B. Kerr, J. Conley, and the KDWPT Stream Survey and Assessment Crews of 2015 and 2016. P. MacKinnon and M. Brower provided valuable technical expertise and advice on PIT antenna operation. Funding for this project was provided by a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service State

Wildlife Grant administered through the Ecological Services Section, KDWPT. This study was approved by the Kansas State University Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (protocol #3676). M. Tobler, J. Perkin, the associate editor, and two anonymous reviewers provided insightful comments that improved this manuscript.

References

- Anderson, M.J. 2001. A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance. *Aust. Ecol.* **26**: 32-46.
- Archdeacon, T.P. and Remshardt, W.J. 2012. Observations of hatchery-reared Rio Grande Silvery Minnow using a fishway. *N. Am. J. Fish. Manage.* **32**: 648-655.
- Bates, D., Maechler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S. 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *J. Stat. Softw.* **67**: 1-48.
- Benitez, J.P., Matondo, B.N., Dierckx, A., and Ovidio, M. 2015. An overview of potamodromous fish upstream movements in medium-sized rivers, by means of fish passes monitoring. *Aquat. Ecol.* **49**: 481-497.
- Boiten, W. and Dommerholt, A. 2006. Standard design of the Dutch pool and orifice fishway. *International Journal of River Basin Management* **4**: 219-227.
- Bottrell, C.E., Ingersol, R.H., and Jones, R.W. 1964. Notes on the embryology, early development, and behavior of *Hybopsis aestivalis tetranemus* (Gilbert). *Trans. Am. Microsc. Soc.* **83**: 391-399.

- 445 Bray, J.R. and Curtis, J.T. 1957. An ordination of the upland forest communities of southern
446 Wisconsin. *Ecol. Monogr.* **27**: 325-349.
- 447 Brown, J.J., Limburg, K.E., Waldman, J.R., Stephenson, K., Glenn, E.P., Juanes, F. and Jordaan,
448 A. 2013. Fish and hydropower on the U.S. Atlantic coast: failed fisheries policies from
449 half-way technologies. *Conserv. Lett.* **6**: 280-286.
- 450 Bunt, C.M., Castro-Santos, T., and Haro, A. 2012. Performance of fish passage structures at
451 upstream barriers to migration. *River Res. Appl.* **28**: 457-478.
- 452 Cross, F.B. and Collins, J.T. 1995. *Fishes in Kansas*. University Press of Kansas, Lawrence.
- 453 Cross, F.B., Moss, R.E., and Collins, J.T. 1985. Assessment of dewatering impacts on stream
454 fisheries in the Arkansas and Cimarron rivers. Museum of Natural History University of
455 Kansas, Lawrence.
- 456 Dodds, W.K., Gido, K.B., Whiles, M.R., Fritz, K.M., and Matthews, W.J. 2004. Life on the edge:
457 the ecology of Great Plains prairie streams. *BioScience* **54**: 205-216.
- 458 Dudley, R.K. and Platania, S.P. 2007. Flow regulation and fragmentation imperil pelagic-
459 spawning riverine fishes. *Ecol. Appl.* **17**: 2074-2086.
- 460 Fausch, K.D. and Bestgen, K.R. 1997. Ecology of fishes indigenous to the central and
461 southwestern Great Plains. *In Ecology and conservation of Great Plains vertebrates*.
462 *Edited by* F.L. Knopf and F.B. Samson. Springer, New York. pp. 131-166.
- 463 Ficke, A.D. and Myrick, C.A. 2007. Fish barriers and small plains fishes: fishway design
464 recommendation and the impact of existing instream structures. Final Project Report,
465 Colorado Division of Wildlife Contract Number IA-CSU-1190-2004, CSU Number 5-

- 466 30216. Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Conservation Biology, Colorado State
467 University, Fort Collins.
- 468 Flitner, G.A. 1964. Morphometry and life history of the emerald shiner *Notropis atherinoides*
469 Rafinesque. PhD dissertation. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- 470 Fullerton, A.H., Burnett, K.M., Steel, E.A., Flitcroft, R.L., Pess, G.R., Feist, B.E., Torgersen,
471 C.E., Miller, D.J., and Sanderson, B.L. 2010. Hydrological connectivity for riverine fish:
472 measurement challenges and research opportunities. *Freshwater Biol.* **55**: 2215-2237.
- 473 Gillette, D.P., Tiemann, J.S., Edds, D.R., and Wildhaber, M.L. 2005. Spatiotemporal patterns of
474 fish assemblage structure in a river impounded by low-head dams. *Copeia* **2005**: 539-549.
- 475 Gilligan, D.M., Harris, J.H., and Mallen-Cooper, M. 2003. Monitoring changes in Crawford
476 River fish community following replacement of an ineffective fishway with a vertical-
477 slot fishway design: results of an eight year monitoring program. NSW Fisheries Final
478 Report Series No. 45, NSW Fisheries Office of Conservation, NSW Fisheries Centre,
479 Narrandera NSW, Australia.
- 480 Hoagstrom, C.W. and T.F. Turner. 2015. Recruitment ecology of pelagic-broadcast spawning
481 minnows: paradigms from the ocean advance science and conservation of an imperiled
482 freshwater fauna. *Fish and Fish.* **16**:282-299.
- 483 Kansas Fishes Committee. 2014. Kansas Fishes. University Press of Kansas, Lawrence.
- 484 Kemp, P.S. 2016. Meta-analyses, metrics and motivation: mixed messages in the fish passage
485 debate. *River Res. Appl.* **32**: 2116-2124.

- 486 Luttrell, G.R., Echelle, A.A., Fisher, W.L., and Eisenhour, D.J. 1999. Declining status of two
487 species of the *Macrhybopsis aestivalis* complex (Teleostei: Cyprinidae) in the Arkansas
488 River Basin and related effects of reservoirs as barriers to dispersal. *Copeia* **1999**: 981-
489 989.
- 490 McLaughlin, R.L., Smyth, E.R.B., Castro-Santos, T., Jones, M.L., Koops, M.A., Pratt, T.C., and
491 Vélez-Espino, L. 2013. Unintended consequences and trade-offs of fish passage. *Fish.*
492 *Fish.* **14**: 580-604.
- 493 Moore, G.A. 1944. Notes on the early life history of *Notropis girardi*. *Copeia* **1944**: 209-214.
- 494 Neumann, R. M. and Allen, M.S. 2007. Size structure. *In* Analysis and interpretation of
495 freshwater fisheries data. *Edited by* C.S. Guy and M.L. Brown. American Fisheries
496 Society, Bethesda, Maryland. pp. 375-421.
- 497 O'Connor, J., Mallen-Cooper, M., and Stuart, I. 2015. Performance, operation and maintenance
498 guidelines for fishway and fish passage works. Technical Report Series No. 262, Water
499 and Catchment Group, Department of Environment, Land, Water, and Planning, Arthur
500 Rylah Institute for Environmental Research, Heidelberg, Victoria, Australia.
- 501 O'Hanley, J.R., Wright, J., Diebel, M., Fedora, M.A., and Soucy, C.L. 2013. Restoring stream
502 habitat connectivity: a proposed method for prioritizing the removal of resident fish
503 passage barriers. *J. of Environ. Manage.* **125**:19-27.
- 504 Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F.G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., Minchin, P.R.,
505 O'Hara, R.B., Simpson, G.L., Solymos, P., Stevens, M.H.H., Szoecs, E., and Wagner, H.
506 2016. vegan: Community ecology package. R package version 2. 4-1. [http://CRAN.R-](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan)
507 [project.org/package=vegan](http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan).

- 508 Pelicice, F.M. and Agostinho, A.A. 2008. Fish-passage facilities as ecological traps in large
509 Neotropical rivers. *Conserv. Biol.* **22**: 180-188.
- 510 Perkin, J.S. and Gido, K.B. 2011. Stream fragmentation thresholds for a reproductive guild of
511 Great Plains fishes. *Fisheries* **36**: 371-383.
- 512 Perkin, J.S. and Gido, K.B. 2012. Fragmentation alters stream fish community structure in
513 dendritic ecological networks. *Ecol. Appl.* **22**: 2176-2187.
- 514 Perkin, J.S., Gido, K.B., Costigan, K.H., Daniels, M.D., and Johnson, E.R. 2015. Fragmentation
515 and drying ratchet down Great Plains stream fish diversity. *Aquat. Conserv. Mar. Freshw.*
516 *Ecosyst.* **25**: 639-655.
- 517 Pennock, C.A. 2017. Beautification of Great Plains rivers: a perspective on the use and
518 appreciate of aquatic resources. *Fisheries* **42**: 83-87.
- 519 Pennock, C.A. In press. Effects of PIT tags on Red Shiner *Cyprinella lutrensis* and Sand Shiner
520 *Notropis stramineus*. *Trans. Kans. Acad. Sci.*
- 521 Pennock, C.A., Frenette, B.D., Waters, M.J., and Gido, K.B. 2016. Survival of and tag retention
522 in Southern Redbelly Dace injected with two sizes of PIT tags. *N. Am. J. Fish. Manage.*
523 **36**: 1386-1394.
- 524 Pennock, C.A., Gido, K.B., Perkin, J.S., Weaver, V.D., Davenport, S.R., and Caldwell, J.M.
525 2017. Collapsing range of an endemic Great Plains minnow, Peppered Chub
526 *Macrhybopsis tetranema*. *Am. Midl. Nat.* **177**: 57-68.
- 527 Pompeu, P.S., Agostinho, A.A., and Pelicice, F.M. 2012. Existing and future challenges: the
528 concept of successful fish passage in South America. *River Res. Appl.* **28**: 504-512.

- 529 Pyron, M. 2014. Emerald Shiner, *Notropis atherinoides* Rafinesque 1818. In Kansas Fishes.
530 Edited by Kansas Fishes Committee. University Press of Kansas, Lawrence. pp. 199-200.
- 531 R Core Team. 2016. R: a language for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical
532 Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- 533 Stuart, I.G., Zampatt, B.P., and Baumgartner, L.J. 2008. Can a low-gradient vertical slot fishway
534 provide passage for a lowland river fish community? Mar. Freshwater Res. **59**: 332-346.
- 535 Weaver, V. D. 1993. Effects of urban pollution on sand shiners (*Notropis stramineus*) and the
536 use of genetic variation as a molecular bioindicator for aquatic ecosystems. Masters
537 thesis. Wichita State University, Kansas.
- 538 Wilde, G.R. and Durham, B.W. 2008. A life history model for Peppered Chub, a broadcast-
539 spawning cyprinid. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. **137**: 1657-1666.
- 540 Winston, M.R., Taylor, C.M., and Pigg, J. 1991. Upstream extirpation of four minnow species
541 due to damming of a prairie stream. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. **120**: 98-105.
- 542 Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Walker, N.J., Saveliev, A.A., and Smith, G.M. 2009. Mixed effects
543 models and extensions in ecology with R. Springer, New York.
- 544

Table 1: Number of individuals collected during sampling up- and downstream of the Lincoln Street Dam and pre- and post-fishway construction and in the fishway structure on the Arkansas River in Wichita, Kansas. Sampling pre-fishway used a combination of tote barge electrofishing and seining and post-fishway sampling only used seining. Species of conservation concern (*i.e.*, threatened or endangered) within Kansas are denoted with a T or E.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Time Period and Location				Fishway	
		Pre Down	Pre Up	Post Down	Post Up	2015	2016
Black Bullhead	<i>Ameiurus melas</i>	2				4	
Freshwater Drum	<i>Aplodinotus grunniens</i>	192		36	2	11	5
Goldfish	<i>Carassius auratus</i>	4	2	1	1	4	3
River Carpsucker	<i>Carpionodes carpio</i>	2319	61	51	62	14	12
Quillback	<i>Carpionodes cyprinus</i>	281	4	4	6	5	
Common Carp	<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>	866	58	11	18	5	4
Red Shiner	<i>Cyprinella lutrensis</i>	28889	12666	46632	31888	2347	2744
Gizzard Shad	<i>Dorosoma cepedianum</i>	3553	15	59	55	82	1
Northern Plains Killifish	<i>Fundulus kansae</i>	67	76	171	103		
Western Mosquitofish	<i>Gambusia affinis</i>	318	1385	11	29	2	
Plains Minnow (T)	<i>Hybognathus placitus</i>	41					
Smallmouth Buffalo	<i>Ictiobus bubalus</i>	108		5	2		
Black Buffalo	<i>Ictiobus niger</i>	67		5			
Channel Catfish	<i>Ictalurus punctatus</i>	1879	128	1792	1683	317	412
Brook Silverside	<i>Labidesthes sicculus</i>	20					
Green Sunfish	<i>Lepomis cyanellus</i>	238	18	1	94	11	2
Orangespotted Sunfish	<i>Lepomis humilis</i>	647	50	22	39	81	2
Bluegill	<i>Lepomis macrochirus</i>	270	6	22	25	89	1
Longear Sunfish	<i>Lepomis megalotis</i>	348	7	9	52	59	8
Longnose Gar	<i>Lepisosteus osseus</i>	41		17	6	1	1
Shortnose Gar	<i>Lepisosteus platostomus</i>	7		1			
Silver Chub (E)	<i>Macrhybopsis storeriana</i>	87		8			
Peppered Chub (E)	<i>Macrhybopsis tetranema</i>	118					
Largemouth Bass	<i>Micropterus salmoides</i>	80	11	4	14	2	1
White Perch	<i>Morone americana</i>	14				9	
White Bass	<i>Morone chrysops</i>	44		2			
Palmetto Bass (Wiper)	<i>Morone chrysops x saxatilis</i>	54		4			
Pealip Redhorse	<i>Moxostoma pisolabrum</i>	185	2	4	1		
Golden Shiner	<i>Notemigonus crysoleucas</i>	13	2		2		
Emerald Shiner	<i>Notropis atherinoides</i>	17548		20616	1046	8941	1858

Ghost Shiner	<i>Notropis buchanani</i>			2		4	
Sand Shiner	<i>Notropis stramineus</i>	7023	5587	11712	5229	3937	159
Ozark Logperch	<i>Percina caprodes</i>	12					6
Slenderhead Darter	<i>Percina phoxocephala</i>	112	1	20	11		12
Suckermouth Minnow	<i>Phenacobius mirabilis</i>	441	30	247	112	11	47
Fathead Minnow	<i>Pimephales promelas</i>	112	31	15	11	3	4
Bullhead Minnow	<i>Pimephales vigilax</i>	1466	196	736	1158	259	263
White Crappie	<i>Pomoxis annularis</i>	28		4	2	13	3
Flathead Catfish	<i>Pylodictis olivaris</i>	112	20	4	13	1	4
Other species captured ^a		14		2	4	2	1
Total Number of Individuals		67620	20356	82230	41668	34214	5553

^aSpecies with <5 individuals captured: Central Stoneroller *Campostoma anomalum*, Grass Carp *Ctenopharyngodon idella*, Arkansas Darter (T) *Etheostoma cragini*, Bigmouth Buffalo *Ictiobus cyprinellus*, Striped Bass *Morone saxatilis*, Golden Redhorse *Moxostoma erythrurum*, Carmine Shiner *Notropis percobromus*, Channel Darter *Percina copelandi*, Bluntnose Minnow *Pimephales notatus*, Black Crappie *Pomoxis nigromaculatus*, Walleye *Sander vitreus*.

550

551

Draft

552 Table 2: Number of fish released, percent tag retention, and percent survival of fish tagged with
 553 passive integrated transponder tags over 24 h. Fish were released in May and June.

Species	Water level treatment	Number released	Percent retention	Percent survival
Red Shiner	Baseline	92	100	93
	-0.1 m	96	100	100
	-0.15 m	93	99	100
Sand Shiner	Baseline	94	100	97
	-0.1 m	91	100	97
	-0.15 m	99	100	97
Plains Minnow	Baseline	65	100	98
	-0.1 m	30	100	100

Draft

554 Table 3: Mean distances (m; $\pm$ SD) moved from a release point by detected fish in the fishway during an experiment that manipulated
555 the water levels in the fishway. Numbers in parenthesis represent the maximum distance moved by any individual in a given direction
556 during each treatment.

Water level treatment	Red Shiner		Sand Shiner		Plains Minnow	
	Downstream	Upstream	Downstream	Upstream	Downstream	Upstream
Baseline	2.90 $\pm$ 3.14 (16)	2.85 $\pm$ 2.71 (13)	2.06 $\pm$ 1.06 (5)	1.11 $\pm$ 0.33 (2)	4.56 $\pm$ 5.86 (24)	3.65 $\pm$ 5.51 (26)
-0.10 m	2.91 $\pm$ 2.66 (13)	1 (1)	3.09 $\pm$ 2.38 (13)	8.5 $\pm$ 10.6 (16)	1.78 $\pm$ 0.67 (3)	1.56 $\pm$ 1.33 (5)
-0.15 m	1.91 $\pm$ 1.28 (7)	2.29 $\pm$ 1.36 (5)	2.39 $\pm$ 2.35 (18)	1.5 $\pm$ 0.71 (2)	---	---
<i>Grand Mean</i>	2.50 $\pm$ 2.39	2.50 $\pm$ 2.23	2.53 $\pm$ 2.13	2.31 $\pm$ 4.13	3.82 $\pm$ 5.16	3.11 $\pm$ 4.86

557

Figure 1: Study area map displaying the spatial arrangement and labeling scheme of sites (inset) sampled during 2015-2016 after construction of the Lincoln Street Dam and Fishway on the Arkansas River in Wichita, Kansas. Three sites sampled by the City of Wichita are also depicted. Within the study area the river is fragmented by two low-head dams, and flows into Kaw Reservoir upon entering Oklahoma.

Figure 2: Areal and lateral views of the Lincoln Street Dam and Fishway on the Arkansas River in Wichita, Kansas. Dutch Pool and Orifice fishways are located on either side of a central boat passage and the downstream entrance and upstream exit labeled in the top photograph. Stationary antenna were placed within the fishway during experiments that manipulated water levels upstream of the dam to assess the movement response of fishes. Weirs are numbered from the

entrance (downstream) to the exit (upstream) of the fishway. Photo credits: top) R. Schultheis, KDWPT; bottom) C.A. Pennock.

Figure 3: Comparison of mean ($\pm$ 95 CI) observed and rarified fish species richness upstream and downstream of the Lincoln Street Dam based on sampling by A) the City of Wichita prior to construction of the fishway and B) contemporary sampling from this study. Samples were rarified to 100 individuals. Asterisks denote significant ($P < 0.05$) differences.

Figure 4: Non-metric multidimensional scaling ordinations of Bray-Curtis dissimilarity (Bray and Curtis 1957) using 4th root transformed abundance from fish communities sampled downstream (Down) and upstream (Up) of the dam prior to (A) and after (B) a fishway was built on the Arkansas River at the Lincoln Street Dam in Wichita, Kansas. Statistical comparisons between downstream and upstream communities were all significant (pMANOVA: $P < 0.001$). Contemporary communities are significantly different regardless of whether all sites are considered (B) or if the lentic sites (7, 8, and 9), where sampling effort varied compared to lotic sites, are excluded (C).

Figure 5: Length-frequencies of Emerald Shiner collected from 12 sampling sites. Dam location relative to site locations is represented by the dashed line. The area of a circle is proportional to the relative catch of 5 mm size classes ranging from 20-90 mm TL across all sites. Horizontal bars represent the median length at each site. The number of individuals was significantly higher downstream ($P < 0.001$, mean = 314 fish) compared to upstream (mean = 37 fish). Median length was significantly higher upstream ($P < 0.001$, median = 61 mm) compared to downstream (median = 47 mm).

Figure 6: Number of individuals (abundance) declined significantly with increasing distance upstream (weir) within the fishway in both 2015 (A) and 2016 (B). Y-axes differ between panels. Species occurrence (richness) showed a similar trend in 2015 (C) and 2016 (D) as abundance. Lines and confidence regions represent marginal estimates with 95% confidence intervals from generalized linear mixed models with a Poisson distribution using Weir number as a fixed effect and Month as a random effect. All relationships were significant ($P < 0.001$).