EPA Public Access

Author manuscript

Sci Total Environ. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2019 September 01.

About author manuscripts

Submit a manuscript

Published in final edited form as:

Sci Total Environ. 2018 September 01; 635: 1267–1279. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.04.216.

Development and validation of an environmental fragility index (EFI) for the neotropical savannah biome

Diego R. Macedo^{1,2}, Robert M. Hughes³, Philip R. Kaufmann⁴, and Marcos Callisto²

¹Departamento de Geografia, Instituto de Geociencias, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Av. Antonio Carlos 6627, CEP 31270-901, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil

²Laboratorio de Ecologia de Bentos, Departamento de Biologia Geral, Instituto de Ciencias Biologicas, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Av. Antonio Carlos 6627, CP 486, CEP 31270-901, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil

³Amnis Opes Institute and Department of Fisheries and Wildlife, Oregon State University, 200 SW 35th Street, Corvallis, Oregon 97333, USA

⁴Western Ecology Division, National Health and Environmental Effects Laboratory, Office of Research and Development, United States Environmental Protection Agency, 200 SW 35th Street, Corvallis, Oregon 97333, USA

Graphical Abstract

Abstract

Augmented production and transport of fine sediments resulting from increased human activities are major threats to freshwater ecosystems, including reservoirs and their ecosystem services. To support large scale assessment of the likelihood of soil erosion and reservoir sedimentation, we developed and validated an environmental fragility index (EFI) for the Brazilian neotropical savannah. The EFI was derived from measured geoclimatic controls on sediment production (rainfall, variation of elevation and slope, geology) and anthropogenic pressures (natural cover, road density, distance from roads and urban centers) in 111 catchments upstream of four large hydroelectric reservoirs. We evaluated the effectiveness of the EFI by regressing it against a relative bed stability index (LRBS) that assesses the degree to which stream sites draining into the reservoirs are affected by excess fine sediments. We developed the EFI on 111 of these sites and validated our model on the remaining 37 independent sites. We also compared the effectiveness

EFI in predicting LRBS with that of a multiple linear regression model (via best-subset procedure) using 7 independent variables. The EFI was significantly correlated with the LRBS, with regression R^2 values of 0.32 and 0.40, respectively, in development and validation sites. Although the EFI and multiple regression explained similar amounts of variability ($R^2=0.32$ vs 0.36), the EFI had a higher F-ratio (51.6 vs 8.5) and better AICc value (333 vs 338). Because the sites were randomly selected and well-distributed across geoclimatic controlling factors, we were able to calculate spatially-explicit EFI values for all hydrologic units within the study area (~38,500 km²). This model-based inference showed that over 65% of those units had high or extreme fragility. This methodology has great potential for application in the management, recovery, and preservation of hydroelectric reservoirs and streams in tropical river basins.

Keywords

erosion; spatial analysis; analytic hierarchy process; sedimentation; ottobasins; Brazil

1. Introduction

Studies quantifying environmental properties, such as fragility, conservation status, resource exploitation, and rehabilitation needs, are essential for decision makers to make rational management decisions and conserve natural resources (Villa and McLeod, 2002). In a more direct sense, the environmental fragility of the landscape, here understood as the susceptibility of the environment to suffer major disruptions in its dynamic equilibrium, mainly in increased erosion and sedimentation rates (Burcher et al., 2007), should be studied to improve landscape management (Manfre et al., 2013). Further, it is necessary to develop analytical approaches that integrate interactions between anthropogenic and biogeophysical aspects of landscapes to support those studies (Angelstam et al., 2013) because anthropogenic pressures determine impacts, and some of those impacts are irreversible (Pavlickova and Vyskupova, 2015).

Current natural resource management tools can quantify the economic benefits of human appropriations of nature, or ecosystem services (Costanza et al., 1997), in which there is great emphasis on freshwater ecosystems (Egoh et al., 2007; Ringold et al., 2013; Vihervaara et al., 2010). Hydroelectric power generation is a key ecosystem service provided by water runoff in drainage networks, but it requires reservoirs for water storage.

Although 16% of the global electrical energy matrix is hydroelectric, it is about 70% in Brazil (Von Sperling, 2012). In addition to power generation, lakes and reservoirs provide other ecosystem services such as recreation, flood control, water supply, navigation, nutrient cycling, and food production (Baron et al., 2002; Von Sperling, 2012). Thus, it is necessary that these facilities operate as efficiently and as long as possible, to maximize their ecosystem services (Arias et al., 2011) and benefit/cost ratios. On the other hand, the ecological impacts of hydroelectric reservoirs can be very large, for example, altered flow regimes, siltation, habitat simplification, alien species presence, and reduced biodiversity (Becker et al., 2016; Callisto et al., 2014; Morais et al., 2017; Sanches et al., 2016; Uehara et al., 2015). Conservation actions that increase the useful life of the reservoir can have

conservation benefits at larger scales, by reducing the necessity for constructing new reservoirs.

Like all lacustrine ecosystems, reservoirs accumulate multiple influences from their drainage basins (Baron et al., 2002) and sediment deposition is a major threat to the operation and service life of reservoirs (Arias et al., 2011; Von Sperling, 2012). Because of reservoir construction and operation costs, there are currently financial subsidies for conserving the surrounding vegetation and discouraging other uses (e.g., agriculture, pasture, or urbanization) to help maintain reservoir quality (Arias et al., 2011). Further, reducing the anthropogenic sources of upland soil erosion and resultant siltation in streams and reservoirs is important for biodiversity conservation, because anthropogenic increases in fine sediment are identified as a major cause of biodiversity loss in streams (Bryce et al., 2010; Ferreira et al., 2014; Kaufmann et al., 2009) and reservoirs (Lenhardt et al., 2008; Molozzi et al., 2013).

In recent years, geographical information systems (GIS) have become powerful tools in environmental management, helping decision makers to rapidly and efficiently analyze spatial and temporal patterns in ecosystem services and potential project impacts on natural resources (Nemec and Raudsepp-Hearne, 2012). GIS spatial analysis tools are essential in studies where multiple spatial variables can be integrated to aid decision making (Malczewski, 2006). GIS, mathematical models, and ecological indicators are used increasingly to aid decision makers in evaluating the costs and benefits of large projects, such as hydroelectrical and industrial plants, major housing and transport systems (e.g. Pavlickova and Vyskupova, 2015) or in large-scale fragility studies (Manfre et al., 2013; Toro et al., 2012; Xiaodan et al., 2010). Those tools are especially useful for prioritizing the use of financial resources in an efficient and rational manner (Villa and McLeod, 2002). The novelty of our study was that we tested the environmental fragility index that we developed with strict analytical procedures (Villa and McLeod, 2002); to our knowledge this had not previously been done. Moreover, we validated our approach through comparison of model results with field data collected using state-of-science regional survey methods. Thus, the aim of our study was to construct and validate an environmental fragility index (EFI) for basins with hydroelectric reservoirs in the neotropical savannah biome.

2. Methods

2.1. Study Area

For the construction and testing of the EFI we sampled 148 wadeable streams of Strahler order 1–3 on 1:100 000 scale maps (Strahler 1957) between September 2010 and September 2013. We used 111 sites (75%) to develop the index and retained 37 independent sites (25%) as a well-distributed set of validation sites across the study area to test the effectiveness of the EFI. The sites were located within 35 km upstream of the reservoirs formed by four hydropower dams (Nova Ponte, Tres Marias, Volta Grande, São 99 Simão), considered as hydrologic units (*sensu* Seaber et al. 1987), in a total study area of 38,500 km². Those hydrologic units are situated in two major Brazilian river basins: Sao Francisco and Parana (Figure 1). The Sao Francisco and Parana River Basins have great hydroelectric potential, and four of the largest hydroelectric power plants operating in Brazil today are located in the Parana (e.g., Itaipu, Ilha Solteira) and Sao Francisco (e.g., Paulo Afonso, Xingo) Basins

(ANEEL 2018; Von Sperling 2012). The sampling network was defined following an approach developed by the USEPA-EMAP Wadeable Stream Assessment (Olsen and Peck, 2008), using a spatially balanced generalized random tessellation stratified (GRTS) design, which allowed extrapolating the EFI results to the entire study area (Olsen and Peck, 2008; Silva et al., 2017; Whittier et al., 2007).

2.2. Environmental Fragility Index (EFI)

Rates of sediment production in drainages are influenced by complex interactions among rainfall regime, soil and substrate properties, lithology, slope and terrain characteristics, vegetation cover, and land use and management (Guerra et al., 2017). Thus, useful EFI scores should express the fragility of drainages as the likelihood of fine sediment generation and transport. We defined fragility based on the interaction between vulnerability (the intrinsic or natural potential of catchments to yield fine sediment when disturbed) and anthropogenic influences that act on that vulnerability to augment or moderate erosion rates. We assessed vulnerability using natural landscape data from GIS coverages, and assessed influences that act on that vulnerability by vegetation cover and anthropogenic pressures as also indicated by GIS-derived data.

2.2.1. Acquisition of natural landscape data—We used existing digital maps to determine catchment characteristics. The 148 catchments were determined from the terrain model of the Shuttle Radar Topographic Mission – SRTM (~30m spatial resolution; USGS 2015). The rainfall data were calculated using the time series provided by the Brazilian National Agency of Waters (ANA 2017) and the Brazilian National Institute of Meteorology (INMET 2017). Sixty-seven rainfall stations had rainfall extracted, georeferenced, and interpolated using the thin plate spline procedure (Fick and Hijmans, 2017). We calculated mean annual rainfall for the year before, and the two years before each stream site was sampled to accommodate inter-annual differences in rainfall and lag effects between catchment erosion and stream sedimentation. We also calculated the rainfall intensity index, the ratio of the total annual precipitation (mm) and the duration of the rainy season (months), at the same temporal scale. For both data types, we calculated the mean of cell values for each of the 148 catchments. Morphometric variables for each of the 148 catchments also were extracted from the SRTM terrain model. To represent the degree of terrain dissection, we calculated the range, standard deviation and coefficient of variation of both elevation and slope in catchments. All the morphometric variables were calculated for every cell within each catchment. Finally, the prevalence of each geologic unit was extracted for each of the 148 catchments by extracting lithology data from the 1:250,000 Brazilian Geological Map (IBGE 2003). Each lithology type was assigned a vulnerability value according to Crepani et al. (2008), thereby converting a set of class variables into a single, continuous numerical variable that was more useful analytically.

2.2.2. Acquisition of anthropogenic pressures data—The mapping of land use and cover in the 148 catchments was performed by interpretation of multispectral images from the Landsat TM satellite sensor, aided by Google Earth fine resolution images (Macedo et al., 2014). The Landsat images used were acquired for the months of sampling and fine resolution images were used to support the interpretation. The Google images clearly show

the shape and texture of the elements, whereas the Landsat images have different spectral responses for the targets, enabling high mapping accuracy. Areas were identified with natural vegetation cover (woodland savanna, grassy-wood savanna, parkland savanna, palm swamp) and four anthropogenic uses (pasture, agriculture, urban, and eucalyptus reforestation). We measured the percentage of vegetation cover and agriculture within each catchment and used then as single variables, but also calculated a catchment disturbance index (CDI) based on weighted percentages of anthropogenic land use in the catchment. That is, urban areas were weighted more highly than agricultural areas, which were in turn weighted more highly than pasture areas (Ligeiro et al., 2013). To further characterize anthropogenic presence and influence, we calculated house and population densities within each catchment using 2010 Brazilian Census data (IBGE 2015). Catchment road density and road distance from each site were calculated from Open Street Map data (OpenStreetMap Foundation, 2017). The Euclidean distance between each sample site and the nearest cities provided an additional proxy for the intensity of human pressure.

2.2.3. Acquisition of local fragility impact response—To assess its validity and effectiveness, we compared catchment EFI scores to the site streambed stability. This impact was measured by assessing the physical characteristics of each site through use of physical habitat protocols (Peck et al., 2006). The sediment geometric mean diameter was determined by visual assessment of the diameter size class (e.g. silt, sand, gravel, cobble) of 105 particles observed at 5 points spread over each of 21 systematic cross sections in the wetted channel (Peck et al., 2006). The mean sediment critical diameter was calculated from the slope, bankfull flow, and the hydraulic roughness represented by the residual pools and the volume of wood in the site (Kaufmann et al., 2009).

The above field data were used to calculate a relative bed stability index (LRBS; Kaufmann et al., 2008) score for each site. The LRBS is the $\log_{10}$ of the ratio of bed surface geometric mean particle diameter divided by the estimated critical diameter at bankfull flow. Decreases in LRBS result when fine sediment supplies exceed the ability of streams to transport that sediment. Negative LRBS values indicate unstable beds, high sediment transport rates, and bed textural fining (Kaufmann et al., 2008). Unstable streambeds result from bedload deposition during low flow periods. Low LRBS values cannot persist in a stream without augmented sediment supply, so this index has been used to assess the effects of siltation produced by anthropogenic landscape pressures and the resulting stream responses (Benoy et al., 2012; Jessup et al., 2014; Kaufmann et al., 2009). Positive LRBS values indicate stable beds or sediment coarsening. Consequently, the LRBS is an indicator of increases or decreases in sediment supply relative to the ability of the stream to transport bedload sediments (Kaufmann et al., 2009). The LRBS has been used to evaluate regional patterns in bed stability and sedimentation and their general relationship to human disturbances and natural and anthropogenic landscape variables (Faustini et al., 2009; Kaufmann and Hughes, 2006; Kaufmann et al., 2009; Leal et al., 2016; Leitaó et al., 2018).

2.2.4. Environmental Fragility Index (EFI)—The EFI development involved six steps: variable selection, standardization, weighting, consistency, index calculation, and an efficiency test. We used only the development dataset of 111 sites to build the EFI. First, we

analyzed Pearson correlations among 20 candidate variables to identify those that were highly correlated ($r > 0.6$). Next, the natural landscape variables and anthropogenic pressures were standardized in the same numerical scale to aid aggregation. The values shown for each variable were converted to ordinal scores of 1 to 5, taking into account the variability encountered through visual inspection of scatterplots about EFI component variables versus LRBS.

To analyze the environmental fragility of an area, one must recognize that different variables have different importance in the index (Malczewski, 2006), so we needed to weight them. To do so, we used the Analytical Hierarchy Process method (AHP; Saaty, 1977), widely used in environmental analysis developments (e.g., Nguyen et al., 2016; Sahoo et al., 2016; Tian et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2008; Xiaodan et al., 2010). In this analytical method, we compared the variables in pairs, so that each interaction was given a weight, which aids organizing each variable in a hierarchy. The variables were arranged in a matrix and the relative importance of each variable relative to the other was assessed. For example, when variable A was more important than variable B, it received a score of x , and similarly, variable B received its reciprocal $1/x$. To calculate the scores, we ran ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions using all variables versus LRBS, two independent variables at a time, to compute the relative importance of each variable. We used the standardized β values to evaluate the proportional importance (ratio among lowest and highest β) of variables in each OLS regression. To determine significant OLS results ($p > 0.05$), we considered both variables equally important. To convert the β ratio (continuous values between 0 to 0.99) to degree of importance (ordinal scale 1 to 9), we divided them into 9 equal classes (Table 1). The final weight was the sum of the relative importance of each variable, and the sum of weights had a value of 1.0.

To check whether the matrix was consistent (e.g., if A was more important than B, and B more important than C, then C cannot be more important than A), we used the consistency ratio (CR; Equation 1).

$$CR = CI/RI \quad (1)$$

Where RI is the value given, referring to the size of the array and defined by Saaty (1977) and CI is the consistency index determined from Equation 2.

$$CI = (\lambda_{\max} - n)/(1 - n) \quad (2)$$

Where $\lambda_{\max}$ is the largest or principal eigenvalue of the matrix of variables, and n is the order of the matrix. A CR of 0.10 or less shows that the relationship among the variables is consistent (Saaty, 1977).

To calculate the environmental fragility index (EFI), we summed the variables (A_i), each weighted by its importance value (W_j), according to Equation 3.

$$EFI = \sum A_i W_j (i = 1, 2, \dots, n) \quad (3)$$

The EFI was divided into 6 fragility classes for map depiction: slight (< 2.0), light ($2.0 < 2.5$), moderate ($2.5 < 3.0$), high ($3.0 < 3.5$), very high ($3.5 < 4.0$), and extreme (> 4.0).

We evaluated the validity of the EFI by comparing results of linear regression predicting LRBS in the 111 development sites with those from the 37 validation sites not used in developing the EFI. We evaluated EFI model efficiency by comparing LRBS prediction performance with that for an ordinary least squares (OLS) regression model derived via the best-subset procedure using 7 independent variables. We compared the R^2 , F-ratio and AICc values of all three models.

2.2.5. EFI expansion for the entire reservoir hydrologic units—Because the EFI was developed and tested on a spatially-balanced probabilistic sampling network, it can be expanded by model-based inference to all the catchments of the study area (Olsen and Peck, 2008; Silva et al., 2017; Whittier et al., 2007). We used Ottobasin classification (Pfafstetter, 1989) to expand it in a manner easily applied by GIS procedures (Fontes and Pejon, 2008) and compatible with current Brazilian environmental law (Brazil, 2002a). Ottobasins are size-binned hierarchical classifications of all drainage areas and adjacent interstices, similar to the hydrologic unit (HU) classification used by U.S. Geological survey in the USA (Omernik et al., 2017). Although they are not true catchments, they still have some characteristics of catchments, in which the area upstream of a given point influences it to some degree (Figure 2), making them useful units for water resource analyses and which are used in other Brazilian studies (e.g., Fontes and Pejon, 2008; Moraes et al., 2013; Venturini et al., 2016). For our model-based expansion, we used level 7 of the Ottobasin hierarchy, extracted from the Brazilian Water Agency Ottobasin digital map (ANA 2017). Like HU's, Ottobasins split upstream and downstream portions of basins; depending on the size of these HU's, they ignore upstream conditions about half the time (Omernik et al., 2017). Consequently, they typically do not predict instream conditions as well as true catchments (Omernik et al., 2017; Thornbrugh et al., 2018). Despite their limitations, we used Ottobasins instead of true catchments to expand our EFI results to the entire study area for three reasons. 1) Unless one chooses a subset of the actual catchments along a stream network, the number of nested catchments that can be defined along a stream network is infinite. 2) One might choose a subset of catchments contributing to the nodes defined at the intersections of streams, but in Brazil, like many regions, the resolution of stream mapping is not consistent among regions. 3) Any subset of catchments draining to stream channels excludes the land areas draining directly into the reservoir, so would not allow assessment of the entire study area. Consequently, to assess how well our 148 model-development sample catchments represented the variables used to model EFI, we compared distributions of the set of EFI controlling factors in our sample catchments with those in the level 7 Ottobasins that make up the entire study area.

We calculated the EFI for the entire study area using the same variables used in Equation 3 but employed two data replacements. First, we used stable mean annual rainfall (last 30

years at the same meteorological stations) instead of the 2 last years mean rainfall, and we also used a vegetation cover map that covers the entire study area (Hansen et al., 2013). Those modifications were necessary to have a consistent, and easily replicated map that is not dependent on short term precipitation patterns. The expansion also used the 6 fragility classes.

3. Results

3.1. Characteristics of the 148 catchments

Topography, geoclimatic characteristics, and anthropogenic pressures generally known to affect erosion and sedimentation differed to varying degrees among the 148 catchments (Table 2). The range of elevation within the 148 catchments was predominantly between 100 and 200 m with coefficients of variation predominately <15%; average slopes were also low but with coefficients of variation as high as 30%. The mean rainfall of the two years prior to stream sampling was generally greater than that in the preceding year; rainfall intensity was moderate (<250 mm per rainy months in both periods. Over 25% of the catchments occur on volcanic rocks (dacite), just under 50% on sedimentary rocks (mudstones, sandstones, arkose, shale); and about 19% occur on metamorphic rocks (schists, phyllites). In addition, the catchments have great variation in anthropogenic pressures, showing natural cover and housing density (mostly farm homes) on average <30% and agriculture use near 50%. The catchments are generally far from urban centers, but relatively near to both paved and unpaved roads. Generally, LRBS was negative, indicating that at bankfull conditions, the study streams were actively transporting bedload sediments delivered to the stream channel, and deposited during low flow periods. There are low but significant correlations between half of the predictor variables and LRBS.

3.2. EFI development

Our variable screening and selection process yielded 8 variables, half in each category (natural landscape and anthropogenic pressures; Supplementary Material 1). The variables representing the intrinsic or natural potential of catchments to yield fine sediment when disturbed were rainfall erosivity (Rainfall_2y), terrain dissection (Elevation_cv, Slope_cv), and the erodibility of bedrock underlying soils (Geology_w). The anthropogenic pressure variables were degree of soil protection (% Natural_cover) and human infrastructure (road_den, road_dist, city dist). Visual inspection of scatterplots of EFI component variables versus LRBS in the 111 model development sites (Supplementary Material 2) facilitated standardization of those factors in an ordinal scale between 1 and 5 (Table 3).

The results of ordinary least squares regressions, two independent variables by turn with LRBS, showed significant relationships in most of them, with R^2 predominantly between 10% and 20% (Table 4). The results showed that natural cover was the key variable, because it was the best predictor in most regressions. The final weights, varying between 0.025 and 0.26, highlight anthropogenic pressure factors (~70% of weights; Table 5). Our analyses indicated an adequate consistency of importance rankings, with a consistency ratio (CR) of 0.049 (Table 5).

The EFI showed that about 35% of the model development sites had slight to moderate degrees of fragility, and 65% had high to extreme values. There was a clear fragility gradient in the study area (Figure 3).

3.3. EFI Efficiency

The three regression models produced similar results. The linear regression model based on the 111 developmental sites indicated significant correlation between the EFI and the LRBS ($R^2 = 0.322$, $p < 0.001$). The regression of the EFI versus the LRBS based on the 37 validation sites was similarly correlated ($R^2 = 0.40$) and had a slope similar to that for the developmental regression ($\beta = -0.57$ and -0.63 ; Figure 3). The best subset regression model explaining variance in LRBS based on 7 variables and 111 sites had a slightly higher R^2 (0.368; /KO.OO 1) than did the developmental regression of EFI versus LRBS, but a much lower F-ratio and a higher AICc (Table 6).

3.4. Expansion of EFI for the entire reservoir hydrologic units

There were no substantive differences in the distributions of the important EFI component variable values between the 148 sampled catchments and those of the entire study area, as represented by Ottobasins (Figure 5). This finding justifies applying the EFI calculation algorithm developed on the sample sites to the whole reservoir study landscape.

The six fragility classes were distributed across the entire study area, but most frequently in classes 4 and 5 (high and very high fragility), indicating a preponderance of land area with a high probability of abundant fine sediment delivery to stream channels under current conditions (Figure 6). The spatial distribution of classes allows us to clearly identify hydrologic units most and least likely to contribute fine sediment in sufficient abundance to result in low LRBS in receiving streams and consequent transport of augmented sediment inputs to their downstream reservoirs. Clearly, Sao Simao and Volta Grande Reservoirs and their streams have greater fragility (greater likelihood of sedimentation) than Nova Ponte and Tres Marias Reservoirs and their streams. Both of the latter hydrologic units have more catchments and more Ottobasins with slight, light or moderate fragility than the former two hydrologic units (Figure 7).

4. Discussion

4.1. Methodological approach

In general, environmental fragility studies have been based only on theoretical aspects of the factors studied, hindering validation of the methodology (Villa and McLeod, 2002). However, we used multi-criteria analysis (AHP) supported by local data relationships and spatial and open access GIS databases to build an environmental fragility index (EFI) at a detailed scale. We used 111 stream sites in four hydrologic units to build the index and 37 validation sites to rigorously test the response of relative bed stability (LRBS) to EFI scores. The relationship between the EFI and LRBS was moderately significant ($R^2 = 0.32$ and 0.40 , $p < 0.001$) and supported expansion of the EFI to the entire study area ($\sim 38,500 \text{ km}^2$) by model-based inference. Generally, aggregation of spatial data into a single index involves

considerable reduction in data dimensionality (e.g., multivariate analysis); however, our index performed slightly better than a multiple regression using 7 predictor variables.

The production and deposition of fine sediments is a major threat to the useful life of a reservoir (Arias et al., 2011; Von Sperling, 2012), but its monitoring can be very expensive because of the need to build and operate monitoring stations (Santos et al., 2014). Recently the Brazilian government installed 57 monitoring stations in the Rio Doce Basin, at a cost of US\$ 22,500 each and an estimated annual operating cost of US\$ 10,000 per station. However, our assessment was much less expensive in terms of field and analytical costs (approximately US\$ 2,000 per site), but effective to relate stream-bed sediment state with natural and anthropogenic influences, as has been demonstrated elsewhere in Brazil also (Leal et al., 2016; Leitao et al., 2018), as well as in North America (Griffith et al., 2005; Hughes and Peck, 2008; Kaufmann and Hughes, 2006; Kaufmann et al., 2009; Rowe et al., 2009). We relied on visual stream sediment size classification, which can be very effective if conducted with standardized methods that employ a systematic spatial design (Conroy et al., 2016; Faustini and Kaufmann, 2007; Roper et al., 2010). Our method of field data collection required only simple gear and was quantitative, inexpensive, and relatively fast (about 5 person-hours total for hundreds of physical habitat variables), and has been applied as a standard method throughout the U.S.A (Faustini et al., 2009; USEPA - United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2016), as well as in many state-scale surveys in the that country (e.g. Hubler et al., 2016; Rowe et al., 2009). The approach we used is adequate and appropriate for regional assessments (Bryce et al., 2010; Hughes and Peck, 2008; Lisle et al., 2015). The same field methods and gear were used in studies of 83 Amazon stream sites (Leal et al., 2017, 2016; Leitao et al., 2018) as well as 60 Alaskan wilderness sites (unpublished data), further indicating their usefulness as tools for rational environmental management of water resources (Asmus et al., 2009; Hughes and Peck, 2008). The novelty of our study was to use standardized methods widely used in continental scale surveys to test a simple index developed for environmental assessments of river basins. This integrated approach (GIS index development and *in situ* tests) facilitated the identification of critical areas of the basin where fragile landscape attributes (e.g., erodible soils, steep slopes) coincide with of human disturbance activities (resulting in excess sediments, siltation and riparian deforestation, and reduced water quality). This knowledge aids decision makers in defining key areas for future rehabilitation or mitigation. The survey of environmental variables for extrapolating EFI scores was also low cost, mainly because of the increased availability of free spatial data, satellite images at different resolutions, and free GIS software (Nemec and Raudsepp-Hearne, 2012).

The EFI expansion to the four hydrologic units was possible because of the spatially-balanced probability sampling design that yielded a set of field sample sites that were well-distributed across gradients of geoclimatic controls and anthropogenic pressures (Olsen and Peck, 2008; Whittier et al., 2007). We strongly recommend that environmental assessments employ probability sampling so that they can infer results to larger areas with known confidence limits and reduce bias in those results. Such water body sampling has proven much more useful than *ad hoc* sampling in the USA (Hughes et al., 2000). Because of the impossibility of studying 100% of any area, it is necessary that sampling designs be efficient, unbiased, and spatially balanced (Larsen et al., 2008). The network used in this

study was based on a spatially balanced sample design, using procedures developed by the USEPA in its National Aquatic Resources Surveys (Olsen & Peck, 2008). Similar probability sampling designs have also been applied successfully in southeast Brazil (Carvalho et al., 2017; Jimenez-Valencia et al., 2014; Silva et al., 2017) and in the USA states of Oregon (Anlauf et al., 2011), Maryland (Stranko et al., 2012), Washington (unpublished data), and Alaska (unpublished data).

4.2. Environmental degradation and potential loss of ecosystem services

Our study area analyses showed that about 65% of the hydrologic units have high to extreme EFI scores (Figures 2 and 5) and the most and least fragile areas are easily identified (Figure 6). Studies in other regions have shown similar results (Toro et al., 2012; Xiaodan et al., 2010), and this highlights the importance of knowing such areas to improve environmental management. Geoclimatic conditions and anthropogenic pressures within the four hydroelectric-dam hydrologic units we studied show spatial patterns that can be extended to other river basins with similar conditions. The neotropical savannah biome is currently one of the most threatened in the world, suffering from replacement of natural vegetation with agricultural uses such as crops and pastures (Diniz-Filho et al., 2008; Strassburg et al., 2017). Furthermore, modeling scenarios for the neotropical savanna project deforestation rates of 40,000 km² per decade until 2050 (Ferreira et al., 2013), and our results showed that vegetation cover, roads, and city proximity are the most important variables controlling the amount of excess fine sediment in streambeds and transported downstream to reservoirs. In other words, projected trends of anthropogenic development in the neotropical savannah biome seriously threaten its reservoirs and the ecosystem services they support. Moreover, most of the Brazilian hydroelectric matrix (outside of Amazonia) is located in this biome (Brazil, 2008). Therefore, there is a threat to continued hydropower generation, because about half the reservoir storage capacity will be lost to sedimentation in approximately 40 years (WCD 2000). The continuation of the current drought regime in southeastern Brazil will further exacerbate lost capacity.

In addition to generating electricity, reservoirs provide such ecosystem services as fisheries production, water supply, and recreation (Baron et al., 2002). The degradation of the basins upstream of the reservoirs brings economic losses to all those services. Although quantifying the monetary price of those services is a complex task (see de Groot et al., 2012), a specific study in the Brazilian Cerrado for this purpose is needed. Such a study could be used to compare the costs and benefits of preserving and rehabilitating areas upstream of the reservoirs against the costs and benefits of agricultural commodities having low added value and high dependence on foreign market prices susceptible to economic crises (O'Sullivan and Sheffrin, 2003).

4.3. Environmental management in hydroelectric reservoir basins

This methodology can be used to aid decision-makers to better spend financial and human resources for specific management actions, conserve natural resources, and consequently improve and preserve ecosystem services. Through our analytical approach, one can identify the co-varying natural landscape and anthropogenic pressure variables that most strongly control fine sediment delivery to streams in reservoir drainage basins and thereby the

usefulness of the reservoirs themselves. Although the natural landscape variables (e.g., geology, soils) may not be greatly influenced by human actions (Macedo et al., 2014), one can identify areas where natural landscape characteristics make recovery and conservation actions most likely to succeed, allowing greater returns on limited financial investments. For example, our results were recently presented to the electrical company that funded much of this research, and to local basin committees and schools. These results identified specific high-priority hydrologic units for reforestation by managers, thereby illustrating the general importance of effective environmental assessment to adults and children.

Our results corroborate other research emphasizing the importance of maintaining natural vegetation to conserve soil and extend reservoir life in tropical regions and elsewhere (e.g., Arias et al., 2011; Chen et al., 2015; Liu et al., 2014). The analytical perspective of integrating co-varying anthropogenic pressures and natural landscape factors in the context of river basins is increasingly applied in water body management (Magalhaes Jr, 2007). This approach also has value for biodiversity conservation, because excess fine sediments are associated with biodiversity losses in streams (Bryce et al., 2010; Ferreira et al., 2014; Kaufmann et al., 2009) as well as lakes (Lenhardt et al., 2008; Molozzi et al., 2013). For example, Becker et al. (2016) found markedly higher proportions of non-native species and individuals in Volta Grande, and Sao Simao Reservoirs than in Três Marias Reservoir.

The current Brazilian legal framework regarding management of water resources recognizes that water is a limited natural resource with great economic value (Brazil, 1997). Therefore, conservation actions for water resources and their ecosystem services must better reflect this legal framework. The management instruments created by legislation (e.g. Brazilian Water Resources Policy (Brazil, 1997) and Environmental Plan of Conservation and Use of Artificial Reservoirs - PACUERA (Brazil, 2002b) can employ the analytical approaches we describe to integrate the interactions between social and geobiophysical conditions and better conserve those water resources.

Many other tropical countries have landscape and economic characteristics similar to those in Brazil regarding the abundance of surface freshwater resources and ecosystem services focused on generating hydroelectricity (WCD, 2000). Our approach is potentially applicable to such countries as India, Indonesia, Bangladesh, China, Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, and Tanzania, which along with Brazil account for over 50% of global freshwater supplies (Gleick, 1998). In this context, India and China stand out, because together they own over half of the largest dams in the world (WCD 2000). In other words, our approach may be useful to more than 2 billion people in those two countries alone, who receive the ecosystem services provided by hydroelectric projects.

4.4. Potential uses and limitations of the methodology

The EFI has many potential applications, not only for neotropical savanna watersheds, but also as a methodological approach for better managing freshwater resources worldwide. The 37-site validation dataset indicated similar performance as the EFI developed using 111 sites, and it opens opportunities to apply the EFI in other reservoir basins, especially in the Brazilian neotropical savanna. Furthermore, our methodological approach can aid the development of environmental fragility indexes in other countries because decision methods

like the Analytical Hierarchy Process are a very useful and convenient tool to support and refine pairs comparisons (Sahoo et al., 2016). For example, Wang et al. (2008) and Xiaodan et al. (2010) both evaluated eco-environmental vulnerability of the Tibetan Plateau using the same AHP development procedures and almost the same types of GIS data; however, their data pairs comparisons differed from ours in four ways: 1) We used linear regressions by pairs as independent variables, whereas the other studies used only the authors' subjective evaluations and 2) an impact response (LRBS) as the dependent variable, whereas the other studies did not test their indices. In our study, we used a local site metric, but it is possible to use other proxy variables as indicators of excess sedimentation or environmental stress. Two other important aspects of our EFI are the 3) use of a validation data set and 4) its application to 1,777 Ottobasins (hydrologic units). Watersheds and hydrologic units are used for environmental management in continental areas, such as the USA (Hill et al., 2017; Omernik et al., 2017; Thornbrugh et al., 2018), and our approach can be used to rank and group watersheds in priority management groups (e.g., Herrmann et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2017; Thornbrugh et al., 2018). Another suggestion is to use a previously developed index, such as the EFI, for selecting potential areas upon which to focus monitoring and assessment.

There are several limitations to our approach. First, sediment indices, like the LRBS are better suited for determining regional patterns than monitoring a single river, because of the high covariance of possible predictors that drive it. In general, direct relationships between land use and sedimentation are weak, because of co-varying geoclimatic controls (Guerra et al., 2017; Leal et al., 2017; Lisle et al., 2015). For example, if the EFI underestimates the LRBS, the assessment is conservative, making it more protective, but also unnecessarily expensive for hydropower operators. If the EFI overestimates the LRBS, then areas that require better soil conservation will be missed, potentially affecting both environmental rehabilitation and the long-term commercial viability of the reservoir.

Another point is the quality of available GIS databases. Brazil still has great limitations in its digital maps, despite recent improvements resulting from the efforts of various government agencies (e.g. Brazilian Agricultural Research Corporation, Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics, Brazilian National Water Agency). Nonetheless, most national digital maps are large scale (1:250,000 or greater), dated (produced before the 1980s), or differ in quality across the nation. Other countries with more accurate geospatial databases should be better able to realize the potential of our approach. For example, the USA has a national environmental assessment with which it is possible to measure the LRBS for the entire country (Faustini et al., 2009) and high quality digital maps (e.g. TIGER census database; USDA soil assessment; USGS geological maps, etc.).

Limitations in the accuracy of both the sediment index and the geospatial data likely contribute to the unexplained variation in the LRBS (regression $R^2 \sim 30\text{--}40\%$). More specifically, we assume the following constraints of our study including: 1) It is very difficult to explain most site-scale streambed sedimentation variability even with relatively large data sets. 2) The geographic location of the study likely affects predictor-response relationships (Macedo et al., 2014) through differing hydrologic units in differing ecoregions (Omernik et al., 2017). 3) The quality of the GIS database affects the amount of variance in

LRBS that can be explained. Nonetheless, despite the moderate predictive capacity of our index, we believe our results are highly relevant for understanding how natural landscape patterns and anthropogenic pressure co-variances influence streambed sedimentation across large river basins.

5. Conclusions

Our results show that a methodological approach based on local-scale field measurements of excess sediment in streams and catchment-scale spatial data (satellite images, geology maps, terrain model, etc.) is efficient and cost-effective for assessing environmental fragility in streams, reservoir basins, and reservoirs. Our development and application of the EFI approach in Brazil, where freshwater resources and their ecosystem services are large but threatened by anthropogenic pressures, suggests the potential for advantageous applications in developing nations and other tropical areas.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgements

We received funding from Peixe-Vivo Program of Companhia Energetica de Minas Gerais (CEMIG), Pesquisa & Desenvolvimento of Agenda Nacional de Energia Eletrica and Companhia Energetica de Minas Gerais (P&D ANEEL-CEMIG - GT-487), Coordenacao de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nivel Superior (CAPES), Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Cientifico e Tecnologico (CNPq), and Fundacao de Amparo a Pesquisa do Estado de Minas Gerais (FAPEMIG). Colleagues from Centro Federal de Educaao Tecnologica de Minas Gerais (CEFET-MG), Pontificia Universidade Catolica de Minas Gerais (PUC-MG), Universidade Federal de Lavras (UFLA) and Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (UFMG) assisted with field collections and laboratory work. MC was awarded CNPq research productivity grants 303380/2015–2 and 446155/2014–4. DRM received a UFMG research grant (PRPq-ADRC-05/2016) and CNPq research project grant 402907/2016–7. RMH received a Fulbright Brasil grant. We are grateful for assistance in statistical design and site selection from Tony Olsen, Marc Weber, and Phil Larsen. This manuscript was subjected to review by the National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory's Western Ecology Division and approved for publication. Approval does not signify that the contents reflect the views of the Agency, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute endorsement or recommendation for use.

References

- ANA - Agencia Nacional de Aguas, 2017 Hidroweb: sistema de informa9oes hidrologicas. <http://hidroweb.ana.gov.br> (accessed 15 October 2017).
- ANA - Agencia Nacional de Aguas, 2017 Mapa digital de Ottobacias Scale 1:100,000 Brasilia, Brazil, <http://www.snirh.gov.br/portal/snirh/snirh-l/aceso-tematico/divisao-hidrografica> (accessed 15 October 2017).
- ANEEL - Agencia Nacional de Energia Eletrica, 2018 BIG - Banco de Informa9oes de Gera9ao. http://www.aneel.gov.br/outorgas/geracao/-/asset_publisher/mJhnKIi7qcJG/content/big-banco-de-informacoes-de-geracao/655808 (accessed 1 January 2018).
- Angelstam P, Grodzynskyi M, Andersson K, Axelsson R, Elbakidze M, Khoroshev A, Kruhlov I, Naumov V, 2013 Measurement, collaborative learning and research for sustainable use of ecosystem services: landscape concepts and europe as laboratory. *Ambio* 42, 129–45. 10.1007/s13280-012-0368-0 [PubMed: 23475651]
- Anlauf KJ, Gaeuman W, Jones KK, 2011 Detection of regional trends in salmonid habitat in coastal streams, Oregon. *Trans. Am. Fish. Soc.* 140,52–66. 10.1080/00028487.2010.550496

- Arias ME, Cochrane TA, Lawrence KS, Killeen TJ, Farrell TA, 2011 Paying the forest for electricity: a modelling framework to market forest conservation as payment for ecosystem services benefiting hydropower generation. *Environ. Conserv.* 38, 473–484. 10.1017/S0376892911000464
- Asmus B, Magner JA, Vondracek B, Perry J, 2009 Physical integrity: the missing link in biological monitoring and TMDLs. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 159, 443–463. 10.1007/s10661-008-0642-6 [PubMed: 19142740]
- Baron JS, LeRoy Poff N, Angermeier PL, Dahm CN, Gleick PH, Hairston NGJ, Jackson RB, Johnston CA, Richter BD, Steinman AD, 2002 Meeting ecological and societal needs for freshwater. *Ecol. Appl.* 12, 1247–1260.
- Becker B, Galhardo BDOS, Macedo DR, Hughes RM, Callisto M, Santos GB, 2016 Influence of limnological zones on the spatial distribution of fish assemblages in three Brazilian reservoirs. *J. Limnol.* 75, 156–168. 10.4081/jlimnol.2015.1266
- Benoy GA, Sutherland AB, Culp JM, Brua RB, 2012 Physical and ecological thresholds for deposited sediments in streams in agricultural landscapes. *J. Environ. Qual.* 41, 31. 10.2134/jeq2010.0251 [PubMed: 22218171]
- Brazil, 2008 Atlas de energia elétrica do Brasil, 3rd ed. Agenda Nacional de Energia Elétrica, Brasília, Brazil.
- Brazil, 2002a National Water Resources Council 30 Define metodologia para codificação de bacias hidrográficas, no âmbito nacional. Conselho Nacional de Recursos Hídricos http://www.cnrh.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=73 (accessed 12 December 2017).
- Brazil, 2002b National Environmental Council Resolution 302 Dispõe sobre os parâmetros, definições e limites de Áreas de Preservação Permanente de reservatórios artificiais e o regime de uso do entorno. Ministério do Meio Ambiente. Conselho Nacional do Meio Ambiente <http://www.mma.gov.br/port/conama/res/res02/res30202.html> (accessed 22 December 2017).
- Brazil, 1997 Federal Law 9433 Institui a Política Nacional de Recursos Hídricos, cria o Sistema Nacional de Gerenciamento de Recursos Hídricos, regulamenta o inciso XIX do art. 21 da Constituição Federal, e altera o art. 1º da Lei nº 8.001, de 13 de março de 1990, que modificou a Lei nº 7.990, de 28 de dezembro de 1989. Presidência da República. Casa Civil, http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/19433.htm (accessed 3 December 2017).
- Bryce SA, Lomnický GA, Kaufmann PR, 2010 Protecting sediment-sensitive aquatic species in mountain streams through the application of biologically based streambed sediment criteria. *J. North Am. Benthol. Soc.* 29, 657–672. 10.1899/09-061.1
- Burcher CL, Valett HM, Benfield EF, 2007 The land-cover cascade: relationships coupling land and water. *Ecology* 88, 228–42. 10.1890/0012-9658(2007)88[228:TLCRCL]2.0.CO;2 [PubMed: 17489471]
- Callisto M, Hughes RM, Lopes JM, Castro MA (Eds.), 2014 Ecological conditions in hydropower basins. *Série Peixe Vivo 3 Companhia Energética de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil.*
- Carvalho DR, Leal CG, Junqueira NT, de Castro MA, Fagundes DC, Alves CBM, Hughes RM, Pompeu PS, 2017 A fish-based multimetric index for Brazilian savanna streams. *Ecol. Indic.* 77, 386–396. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.02.032>
- Chen N, Chen M, Li J, He N, Deng M, Iqbal Tanoli J, Cai M, 2015 Effects of human activity on erosion, sedimentation and debris flow activity - A case study of the Qionghai Lake watershed, southeastern Tibetan Plateau, China. *The Holocene* 25, 973–988. 10.1177/0959683615574893
- Conroy E, Turner JN, Rymszewicz A, Bruen M, O'Sullivan JJ, Kelly-Quinn M, 2016 An evaluation of visual and measurement-based methods for estimating deposited fine sediment. *Int. J. Sediment Res.* 31, 368–375. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijsrc.2016.04.002>
- Costanza R, D'Arge R, de Groot R, Farber S, Grasso M, Hannon B, Limburg K, Naeem S, O'Neill RV, Paruelo J, Raskin RG, Sutton P, van den Belt M, 1997 The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature* 387, 253–260. 10.1038/387253a0
- Crepani E, Medeiros JS, Palmeiras AF, Silva EF, 2008 Zoneamento Ecológico- Econômico, in: Florenzano TG (Ed.), *Geomorfologia: Conceitos E Tecnologias Atuais*. Oficina de Textos, São Paulo, Brazil, pp. 285–318.

- de Groot R, Brander L, van der Ploeg S, Costanza R, Bernard F, Braat L, Christie M, Crossman N, Ghermandi A, Hein L, Hussain S, Kumar P, McVittie A, Portela R, Rodriguez LC, ten Brink P, van Beukering P, 2012 Global estimates of the value of ecosystems and their services in monetary units. *Ecosyst. Serv.* 1, 50–61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2012.07.005>
- Diniz-Filho J, Bini L, Vieira C, Blamires D, Terrible L, Bastos R, Oliveira G, Barreto B, 2008 Spatial patterns of terrestrial vertebrate species richness in the Brazilian Cerrado. *Zool. Stud.* 47, 146–157.
- Egoh B, Rouget M, Reyers B, Knight AT, Cowling RM, van Jaarsveld AS, Welz A, 2007 Integrating ecosystem services into conservation assessments: A review. *Ecol. Econ.* 63, 714–721. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2007.04.007>
- Faustini JM, Kaufmann PR, 2007 Adequacy of visually classified particle count statistics from regional stream habitat surveys. *J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc.* 43, 1293–1315. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2007.00114.x>
- Faustini JM, Kaufmann PR, Herlihy AT, Paulsen SG, 2009 Assessing stream ecosystem condition in the United States. *Eos, Trans. Am. Geophys. Union* 90, 309–310. 10.1029/2009E0360001
- Ferreira ME, Ferreira LG, Miziara F, Soares-Filho BS, 2013 Modeling landscape dynamics in the central Brazilian savanna biome: future scenarios and perspectives for conservation. *J. Land Use Sci.* 8, 403–421. 10.1080/1747423X.2012.675363
- Ferreira WR, Ligeiro R, Macedo DR, Hughes RM, Kaufmann PR, Oliveira LG, Callisto M, 2014 Importance of environmental factors for the richness and distribution of benthic macroinvertebrates in tropical headwater streams. *Freshw. Sci.* 33, 860–871. 10.1086/676951
- Fick SE, Hijmans RJ, 2017 WorldClim 2: new 1-km spatial resolution climate surfaces for global land areas. *Int. J. Climatol.* 10.1002/joc.5086
- Fontes SB, Pejon OJ, 2008 Proposal of a geo-environmental zoning method based on Ottobasin compartmentalization. *Bull. Eng. Geol. Environ.* 67, 555–563. 10.1007/s10064-008-0161-2
- Gleick PH, 1998 *The World's Water 1998–1999 (Volume 1): The biennial report on freshwater resources*. Island Press, Washington, DC.
- Griffith MB, Hill BH, McCormick FH, Kaufmann PR, Herlihy AT, Selle AR, 2005 Comparative application of indices of biotic integrity based on periphyton, macroinvertebrates, and fish to southern Rocky Mountain streams. *Ecol. Indic.* 5, 117–136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2004.11.001>
- Guerra AJT, Fullen MA, Jorge M. do C.O., Bezerra JFR, Shokr MS, 2017 Slope processes, mass movement and soil erosion: A review. *Pedosphere* 27, 27–41. 10.1016/S1002-0160(17)60294-7
- Hansen MC, Potapov PV, Moore R, Hancher M, Turubanova SA, Tyukavina A, Thau D, Stehman SVV, Goetz SJJ, Loveland TRR, Kommareddy A, Egorov A, Chini L, Justice COO, Townshend JRG, 2013 High-resolution global maps of 21st-century forest cover change. *Science* (80-,). 342, 850–853. 10.1126/science.1244693
- Herrmann G, Machado RB, Macedo DR, 2011 Planejamento para a Conservação da Biodiversidade Regional: uma proposta metodológica para a indicação de áreas prioritárias para a recuperação, formação de microcorredores e criação de unidades de conservação, in: Herrmann G (Ed.), Incorporando a Teoria ao Planejamento Regional da Conservação: A Experiência do Corredor Ecológico da Mantiqueira. Valor Natural, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, pp. 118–181.
- Hill RA, Fox EW, Leibowitz SG, Olsen AR, Thornbrugh DJ, Weber MH, 2017 Predictive mapping of the biotic condition of conterminous U.S. rivers and streams. *Ecol. Appl.* 27, 2397–2415. 10.1002/eap.1617 [PubMed: 28871655]
- Hubler S, Huff DD, Edwards P, Pan Y, 2016 The Biological Sediment Tolerance Index: Assessing fine sediments conditions in Oregon streams using macroinvertebrates. *Ecol. Indic.* 67, 132–145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.02.009>
- Hughes R, Paulsen S, Stoddard J, 2000 EMAP-Surface Waters: a multi-assemblage, probability survey of ecological integrity in the LISA. *Hydrobiologia* 422/423, 429–443.
- Hughes RM, Peck DV, 2008 Acquiring data for large aquatic resource surveys: the art of compromise among science, logistics, and reality. *J. North Am. Benthol. Soc.* 27, 837–859. <https://doi.org/10.1899/08-028.1>
- IBGE - Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística, 2015. Grade Estatística. ftp://geoftp.ibge.gov.br/malhas_digitais/censo_2010/grade_estatistica/ (accessed 2 February 2017).

- IBGE - Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística, 2003 Mapa geológico digital do Brasil Scale 1:250,000 Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, <https://www.ibge.gov.br/geociencias-novoportal/informacoes-ambientais/geologia/15822-geologia-l-250-OOO.html?&t=publicacoes> (accessed 20 December 2017)
- INMET - Instituto Nacional de Meteorologia, 2017 Rede Hidrometeorológica Nacional <http://www.inmet.gov.br/portal/index.php?r=bdmep/bdmep> (accessed 20 April 2017).
- Jessup BK, Kaufmann PR, John F, Guevara LS, Joseph S, 2014 Bedded Sediment Conditions and Macroinvertebrate Responses in New Mexico Streams: A First Step in Establishing Sediment Criteria. *J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc.* 50, 1558–1574. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jawr.12224>
- Jimenez-Valencia J, Kaufmann PR, Sattamini A, Mugnai R, Baptista DF, 2014 Assessing the ecological condition of streams in a southeastern Brazilian basin using a probabilistic monitoring design. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 186,4685–95. 10.1007/s10661-014-3730-9 [PubMed: 24829159]
- Kaufmann P, Hughes R, 2006 Geomorphic and anthropogenic influences on fish and amphibians in Pacific Northwest coastal streams. *Am. Fish. Soc. Symp.* 48, 429–455.
- Kaufmann PR, Faustini JM, Larsen DP, Shirazi MA, 2008 A roughness-corrected index of relative bed stability for regional stream surveys. *Geomorphology* 99, 1 SO-HO. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geomorph.2007.10.007>
- Kaufmann PR, Larsen DP, Faustini JM, 2009 Bed stability and sedimentation associated with human disturbances in Pacific Northwest streams. *JAWRA J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc.* 45, 434–459. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2009.00301.x>
- Larsen DP, Olsen AR, Stevens DL, 2008 Using a master sample to integrate stream monitoring programs. *J. Agric. Biol. Environ. Stat.* 13,243–254. 10.1198/108571108X336593
- Leal CG, Barlow J, Gardner TA, Hughes RM, Leitao RP, Mac Nally R, Kaufmann PR, Ferraz SFB, Zuanon J, de Paula FR, Ferreira J, Thomson JR, Lennox GD, Dary EP, Ropke CP, Pompeu PS, 2017 Is environmental legislation conserving tropical stream faunas? A large-scale assessment of local, riparian and catchment-scale influences on Amazonian fish. *J. Appl. Ecol.* 1–15. 10.1111/1365-2664.13028
- Leal CG, Pompeu PS, Gardner TA, Leitao RP, Hughes RM, Kaufmann PR, Zuanon J, de Paula FR, Ferraz SFB, Thomson JR, Mac Nally R, Ferreira J, Barlow J, 2016 Multi-scale assessment of human-induced changes to Amazonian instream habitats. *Landsc. Ecol.* 31, 1725–1745. 10.1007/s10980-016-0358-x
- Leitao RP, Zuanon J, Mouillot D, Leal CG, Hughes RM, Kaufmann PR, Villegier S, Pompeu PS, Kasper D, de Paula FR, Ferraz SFB, Gardner TA, 2018 Disentangling the pathways of land use impacts on the functional structure of fish assemblages in Amazon streams. *Ecography (Cop.)*. 41,219–232.<https://doi.org/10.1111/ecog.02845> [PubMed: 29910537]
- Lenhardt M, Markovic G, Gacic Z, 2008 Decline in the index of biotic integrity of the fish assemblage as a response to reservoir aging. *Water Resour. Manag.* 23, 1713–1723. 10.1007/s11269-008-9348-3
- Ligeiro R, Hughes RM, Kaufmann PR, Macedo DR, Firmiano KR, Ferreira WR, Oliveira D, Melo AS, Callisto M, 2013 Defining quantitative stream disturbance gradients and the additive role of habitat variation to explain macroinvertebrate taxa richness. *Ecol. Indic.* 25, 45–57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2012.09.004>
- Lisle TE, Buffington JM, Wilcock PR, Bunte K, 2015 Can rapid assessment protocols be used to judge sediment impairment in gravel-bed streams? A commentary. *J. Am. Water Resour. Assoc.* 51,373–387. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jawr.12255>
- Liu Y-J, Wang T-W, Cai C-F, Li Z-X, Cheng D-B, 2014 Effects of vegetation on runoff generation, sediment yield and soil shear strength on road-side slopes under a simulation rainfall test in the Three Gorges Reservoir Area, China. *Sci. Total Environ.* 485–486, 93–102. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2014.03.053> [PubMed: 24496022]
- Macedo DR, Hughes RM, Ligeiro R, Ferreira WR, Castro MA, Junqueira NT, Oliveira DR, Firmiano KR, Kaufmann PR, Pompeu PS, Callisto M, 2014 The relative influence of catchment and site variables on fish and macroinvertebrate richness in Cerrado biome streams. *Landsc. Ecol.* 29,1001–1016. 10.1007/s10980-014-0036-9

- Magalhaes AP, Jr, 2007 Indicadores ambientais e recursos hídricos: realidade e perspectivas para o Brasil a partir da experiência francesa. Bertrand Brasil, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- Malczewski J, 2006 GIS based multicriteria decision analysis: a survey of the literature. *Int. J. Geogr. Inf. Sci.* 20, 703–726. 10.1080/13658810600661508
- Manfre LA, da Silva AM, Urban RC, Rodgers J, 2013 Environmental fragility evaluation and guidelines for environmental zoning: a study case on Ibiuna (the Southeastern Brazilian region). *Environ. Earth Sci.* 69,947–957.10.1007/s12665-012-1979-2
- Molozzi J, Hepp LU, Callisto M, 2013 The additive partitioning of macroinvertebrate diversity in tropical reservoirs. *Mar. Freshw. Res* 64,609 10.1071/MF12354
- Moraes MMA, Albuquerque Filho BEM, Amorim Filho CAG, Silva GS, 2013 Spatial decision support system for river basin management incorporating hydroeconomic model for optimal water allocation, in: Gunkel G, Silva JAA, Sobral MC (Eds.), *Sustainable Management of Water and Land in Semiarid Areas*. Editora Universitaria, Recife, Brazil, pp.280–295. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4555.9289>
- Morais L, Sanches B. de O., Santos GB, Kaufmann PR, Hughes RM, Molozzi J, Callisto M, 2017 Assessment of disturbance at three spatial scales in two large tropical reservoirs. *J. Limnol* 76, 240–252. 10.4081/jlimnol.2016.1547 [PubMed: 30058005]
- Nemec KT, Raudsepp-Hearne C, 2012 The use of geographic information systems to map and assess ecosystem services. *Biodivers. Conserv.* 22,1–15. 10.1007/s10531-012-0406-z
- Nguyen AK, Liou YA, Li MH, Tran TA, 2016 Zoning eco-environmental vulnerability for environmental management and protection. *Ecol. Indie.* 69, 100–117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2016.03.026>
- O’Sullivan A, Sheffrin SM, 2003 *Economics: Principles in action*. Pearson Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- Olsen AR, Peck DV, 2008 Survey design and extent estimates for the Wadeable Streams Assessment. *J. North Am. Benthol. Soc.* 27,822–836. <https://doi.org/10.1899/08-050.1>
- Omernik JM, Griffith GE, Hughes RM, Glover JB, Weber MH, 2017 How misapplication of the hydrologic unit framework diminishes the meaning of watersheds. *Environ. Manage.* 10.1007/s00267-017-0854-z OpenStreetMap Foundation, 2017. Open Street Map. <http://www.openstreetmap.org> (accessed 20 December 2017).
- Pavlickova K, Vyskupova M, 2015 A method proposal for cumulative environmental impact assessment based on the landscape vulnerability evaluation. *Environ. Impact Assess. Rev.* 50, 74–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2014.08.011>
- Peck D, Herlihy A, Hill B, Hughes R, Kaufmann P, Klemm D, Lazorchak J, McCormick F, Peterson S, Ringold P, Magee T, Cappaert M, 2006 *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program-Surface Waters Western Pilot Study: field operations manual for wadeable streams* EPA/620/R-06/003. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.
- Pfafstetter O, 1989 *Classificação de bacias hidrográficas: metodologia de codificação*. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- Ringold PL, Boyd J, Landers D, Weber M, 2013 What data should we collect? A framework for identifying indicators of ecosystem contributions to human well-being. *Front. Ecol. Environ.* 11, 98–105. 10.1890/110156
- Roper BB, Buffington JM, Bennett S, Lanigan SH, Archer E, Downie ST, Faustini J, Hillman TW, Hubler S, Jones K, Jordan C, Kaufmann PR, Merritt G, Moyer C, Pleus A, 2010 A Comparison of the performance and compatibility of protocols used by seven monitoring groups to measure stream habitat in the Pacific Northwest. *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.* 30, 565–587. 10.1577/M09-061.1
- Rowe DC, Pierce CL, Wilton TF, 2009 Physical habitat and fish assemblage relationships with landscape variables at multiple spatial scales in wadeable Iowa streams. *North Am. J. Fish. Manag.* 29, 1333–1351. 10.1577/M08-193.1
- Saaty TL, 1977 A scaling method for priorities in hierarchical structures. *J. Math. Psychol.* 15, 234–281. 10.1016/0022-2496(77)90033-5

- Sahoo S, Dhar A, Kar A, 2016 Environmental vulnerability assessment using Grey Analytic Hierarchy Process based model. *Environ. Impact Assess. Rev.* 56, 145–154. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2015.10.002>
- Sanches BO, Hughes RM, Macedo DR, Callisto M, Santos GB, 2016 Spatial variations in fish assemblage structure in a southeastern Brazilian reservoir. *Brazilian J. Biol.* 76, 185–193. 10.1590/1519-6984.16614
- Santos HA, Cunha SF, Silva ITC, Martins MI, Siqueira CHIA, Barbosa AS, 2014 Stream sedimentological analyses based on the use of rapid evaluation protocols, in: Callisto M, Hughes RM, Lopes JM, Castro MA (Eds.), *Ecological Conditions in Hydropower Basins Serie Peixe Vivo 3*. Companhia Energetica de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Brazil, pp. 85–100.
- Seaber PR, Kapinos FP, Knapp GL, 1987 Hydrologic unit maps, U. S. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper. Denver, CO.
- Silva DRO, Herlihy AT, Hughes RM, Callisto M, 2017 An improved macroinvertebrate multimetric index for the assessment of Wadeable streams in the neotropical savanna *Ecol.Indie.*81,514–525. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.06.017>
- Stranko SA, Hilderbrand RH, Palmer MA, 2012 Comparing the fish and macroinvertebrate diversity of restored urban streams to reference streams. *Restor. Ecol.* 20, 747–755. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1526-100X.2011.00824.x>
- Strassburg BBN, Brooks T, Feltran-Barbieri R, Iribarrem A, Crouzeilles R, Loyola R, Latawiec AE, Oliveira Filho FJB, Scaramuzza C.A. de M., Scarano FR, Soares-Filho B, Balmford A, 2017 Moment of truth for the Cerrado hotspot. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* 1, 99 10.1038/s41559-017-0099 [PubMed: 28812670]
- Thornbrugh DJ, Leibowitz SG, Hill RA, Weber MH, Johnson ZC, Olsen AR, Flotemersch JE, Stoddard JL, Peck DV, 2018 Mapping watershed integrity for the conterminous United States. *Ecol. Indie.* 85,1133–1148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2017.10.070>
- Tian W, Bai J, Sun H, Zhao Y, 2013 Application of the analytic hierarchy process to a sustainability assessment of coastal beach exploitation: a case study of the wind power projects on the coastal beaches of Yancheng, China. *J. Environ. Manage.* 115, 251–6. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2012.11.015> [PubMed: 23262412]
- Toro J, Duarte O, Requena I, Zamorano M, 2012 Determining vulnerability importance in environmental impact assessment. The case of Colombia. *Environ. Impact Assess. Rev.* 32, 107–117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eiar.2011.06.005>
- Uehara W, Albieri RJ, Araujo FG, 2015 Structure of fish assemblages in seven tropical reservoirs in southeastern Brazil during the rainy season; what matters: physico-chemical or hydrological connectivity influences? *J. Appl. Ichthyol.* 31, 1034–1042. 10.1111/jai.12864
- USEPA - United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2016 National rivers and streams assessment 2008–2009: a collaborative survey. Office of Water and Office of Research and Development, Washington, DC EPA/841/R-16/007.
- USGS - United States Geological Survey, 2015 SRTMGL1: NASA Shuttle Radar Topography Mission Global 1 arc second V003. Washington, DC 10.5067/MEaSUREs/SRTM/SRTMGL1.003
- Venticinque E, Forsberg B, Barthem R, Petry P, Hess L, Mercado A, Canas C, Montoya M, Durigan C, Goulding M, 2016 An explicit GIS-based river basin framework for aquatic ecosystem conservation in the Amazon. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* 8, 651–661. 10.5194/essd-8-651-2016
- Vihervaara P, Ronka M, Walls M, 2010 Trends in ecosystem service research: Early steps and current drivers. *Ambio* 39, 314–324. 10.1007/s13280-010-0048-x [PubMed: 20799681]
- Villa F, McLeod H, 2002 Environmental vulnerability indicators for environmental planning and decision-making: Guidelines and applications. *Environ. Manage.* 29, 335–348. 10.1007/s00267-001-0030-2 [PubMed: 11830764]
- Von Sperling E, 2012 Hydropower in Brazil: Overview of positive and negative environmental aspects. *Energy Procedia* 18,110–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2012.05.023>
- Wang XD, Zhong XH, Liu SZ, Liu JG, Wang ZY, Li MH, 2008 Regional assessment of environmental vulnerability in the Tibetan Plateau: Development and application of a new method. *J. Arid Environ.* 72,1929–1939. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2008.06.005>

- WCD - World Commission on Dams, 2000 Dams and development - A new framework for decision-making. Earthscan Publications Ltd, London.
- Whittier TR, Stoddard JL, Larsen DP, Herlihy AT, 2007 Selecting reference sites for stream biological assessments: best professional judgment or objective criteria. J. North Am. Benthol. Soc. 26,349–360.10.1899/0887-3593(2007)26[349:SRSFSB]2.0.CO;2
- Xiaodan W, Xianghao Z, Pan G, 2010 A GIS-based decision support system for regional eco-security assessment and its application on the Tibetan Plateau. J. Environ. Manage. 91, 1981–1990. 10.1016/j.jenvman.2010.05.006 [PubMed: 20627541]

Highlights

- We developed an environmental fragility index (EFI) through GIS procedures.
- We tested its ability to predict excess fine sediment in 148 sample streams.
- Natural cover and anthropogenic pressures comprised 70% of metrics in the EFI
- Model-based expansion estimated high to extreme EFI in 65% of the study catchments.
- Contributing land area in the Sao Francisco Basin is less fragile than the Para Basin.

Figure 1.
Locations of the studied hydrologic units and sampling sites.

Figure 2.
Example of (A) catchment sampled sites and (B) level 7 ottobasin classification. Extrema Grande stream watershed, Tres Marias Hydrologic Unit.

Figure 3. Site cumulative distribution frequency and classification of environmental fragility index (EFI) scores across 111 catchments. Number of sites in parentheses.

Figure 4. Regression of the environmental fragility index (EFI) against the log of relative streambed stability (LRBS) for (A) 111 development sites and (B) 37 validation sites.

Figure 5.

Comparison of EFI component variable distributions in the 148 sample catchments vs. those in the level 7 Ottobasins used for expansion of EFI model results to the whole study area (Box plots show median, minimum, maximum, and interquartile range).

Figure 6. Histogram of the expanded environmental fragility index (EFI) scores across the 1777 Ottobasins in four hydrologic units.

Figure 7. Environmental fragility index (EFI) classes spatially distributed across 1777 Ottobasins in four hydrologic units. Histograms show EFI scores distribution in each Hydrologic Unit.

Table 1.

Degree of importance of relationships between environmental variables. Correspondence between degree of importance and β ratios in parentheses.

Degree of importance (β ratio)	Definition
1 (0.88–0.99)	Equal importance of two elements
2 (0.77–0.88)	Intermediate value between equal and weak importance
3 (0.66–0.77)	Weak importance of an element in comparison to the other
4 (0.55–0.66)	Intermediate value between weak and strong importance
5 (0.44–0.55)	Strong importance of an element in comparison to the other
6 (0.33–0.44)	Intermediate value between strong and certified importance
7 (0.22–0.33)	Certified importance of an element in comparison to the other
8 (0.11–0.22)	Intermediate value between certified and absolute importance
9 (0.00–0.11)	Absolute importance of an element in comparison to the other
1/2, 1/3, 1/4, 1/5, 1/6, 1/7, 1/8, 1/9	Reciprocal values of the previous factors

Table 2.

Landscape characteristics and relative bed stability of the 148 catchments

Factors		Mean±SD	Correlation with LRBS
Natural Landscape			
Rainfall_1y	Total rainfall (mm/year) at last hydrologic year	1387.56±323.26	-0.19 *
Rainfall_2y	Rainfall mean (mm/year) at 2 last hydrologic years	1483.24±231.49	-0.32 *
Rain_Int_1y	Rainfall intensity (mm/rainy months) of last hydrologic year	174.55±37.72	-0.11
Rain_Int_2y	Rainfall intensity (mm/rainy months) of 2 last hydrologic years	184.56±33.93	-0.12
Elev_std	Standard deviation value (mm) of all elevation cells inside each catchment	37.88±17.84	-0.05
Elev_range	Range value (m) of all elevation cells inside each catchment	178.64±74.53	-0.02
Elev_cv	Coefficient of variation value (%) of all elevation cells inside each catchment	5.35±2.93	-0.26 *
Slope_m	Mean value (%) of all slope cells inside each catchment	8.42±3.69	0.30 *
Slope_std	Standard deviation value (%) of all slope cells inside each catchment	5.45±2.51	0.14
Slope_range	Range value (m) of all elevation cells slope each catchment	43.78±20.59	-0.01
Slope_cv	Coefficient of variation value (%) of all slope cells inside each catchment	65.55±17.35	-0.15
Geology_w	Theoretical degree of fragility of predominant geology type in each catchment Geology type predominance (number of catchments): Dacite (39) Schist (20) Phyllite (9) Sandstone (15) Arkose (9) Mudstone (31) Shale (17) Alluvium (8)	2.09±0.68	-0.01
Anthropogenic pressures			
Road_den	Road density (km/km2) in each catchment	0.66±2.14	-0.13
Pop_den	Population density (inhabitants/km2) in each catchment	62.96±325.38	-0.11
House_den	Household density (house/km2) in each catchment	20.8±108.63	-0.11
Road_dist	Site distance (km) from nearest road	3.19±3.84	0.37 *
City_dist	Site distance (km) from nearest city	15.33±8.52	0.33 *
CDI	Catchment disturbance index	124.37±61.74	-0.32 *
%Natural_cover	Natural vegetation cover in each catchment (%)	28.12±21.04	0.41 *
%Agriculture	Agriculture use in each catchment (%)	47.78±33.55	-0.20 *
Sediment			
LRBS	Relative Bed Stability (Log ₁₀)	-0.967±1.241	

*
 $p < 0.05$

EPA Author Manuscript

EPA Author Manuscript

EPA Author Manuscript

Table 3.

Environmental variables and their fragility standardized values in the study area.

Factors	Rating				
	1	2	3	4	5
(1) Rainfall mean 2 last years (mm/year)	< 1225	1225–1350	1350–1475	1475–1600	> 1600
(2) Elevation coefficient of variation (%)	< 3	3–6	6–9	9–12	> 12
(3) Slope coefficient of variation (%)	< 50	50–65	65–80	80–95	>95
(4) Geology type (degree of fragility *)	Dacite(1.1) Granite(1.1)	Schist (1.7)	Phyllite(2.1)	Arkose(2.6) Sandstone(2.4)	Alluvium(3.0) Calcarenite(2.9) Shale(2.8) Mudstone(2.7)
(5) Road density (km/km ²)	< 0.1	0.1–0.2	0.2–0.5	0.5–1	> 1
(6) Road proximity (km)	> 10	6–10	3–6	1–3	< 1
(7) City proximity (km)	< 25	25–15	15–10	10–5	< 5
(8) Vegetation cover (%)	>50	50–30	30–20	10–20	< 10

* From Crepani et al. 2008

Ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions by pairs of factors.

[illegible]

Factors	r ²	Std β	Ratio	Factors	r ²	Std β	Ratio	Factors	r ²	Std β	Ratio
Road_dist	0.046	0.368	-	Road_dist	0.182	0.300	-	Road_dist	0.205	0.258	0.79
Road_den	0.105	-	0.80	Road_dist	0.193	0.258	0.71	Road_dist	0.205	0.258	0.79
City_dist	0.026	0.314	-	City_dist	0.193	0.258	0.71	Road_dist	0.205	0.258	0.79
Road_den	0.144	-	0.14	Road_dist	0.193	0.258	0.71	Road_dist	0.205	0.258	0.79
% Natural_cover	0.051	0.365	-	% Natural_cover	0.254	0.325	-	% Natural_cover	0.254	0.325	-

*
p < 0.05

**
p < 0.01

p < 0.001

Table 5.

Relative weights of the study variables.

Factors	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	Weights
(1) Rainfall mean 2 last years (mm)	-								0.137
(2) Elevation coefficient of variation (%)	1/3	-							0.108
(3) Slope coefficient of variation (%)	1/7	1/9	-						0.026
(4) Geology type (degree of fragility)	1/5	1/9	1	-					0.025
(5) Road density (km/km ²)	1/6	1/4	1	1	-				0.025
(6) Road proximity (km)	3	3	7	9	8	-			0.265
(7) City proximity (km)	1	2	5	7	9	1/3	-		0.146
(8) Vegetation cover (%)	4	4	8	7	8	1	2	-	0.268

Consistency ratio (CR): 0.049

Table 6.

Environmental fragility index (EFI) and multiple linear regression performances versus the log of relative bed stability (LRBS).

EFI vs LRBS (n=111)	Std β	r ²	F-Ratio	AICc	AAICc
Constant	0 ***	0.322 ***	51.676	333.26	-5.614
EFI	-0.567 ***				
All variables (best subsets) vs LRBS (n=111)					
Constant	0 ***	0.368 ***	8.585	338.88	
Rainfall_2y	-0.197 *				
Elev_cv	-0.356 ***				
Slope_cv	0.22 *				
Geology_w	-0.29 **				
Road_dist	0.167				
City_dist	0.226 **				
% Natural_cover	0.301 **				

*
p < 0.5

**
p < 0.01

p < 0.001