Macroinvertebrate Community Structure and Physicochemical Conditions of Desperado Spring

David Bass

Department of Biology, University of Central Oklahoma, Edmond, OK 73034 USA

Bobbie Gaskin

Department of Biology, University of Central Oklahoma, Edmond, OK 73034 USA

Kinsey Tedford

Department of Biology, University of Central Oklahoma, Edmond, OK 73034 USA

Abstract: Desperado Spring is a small rheocrene spring located in south-central Oklahoma that emerges from a rocky outcrop and flows into the nearby Blue River. Macroinvertebrate collections and water quality measurements were taken seasonally for an annual period at the springhead and in the springbrook. A total of 16,410 individuals representing 49 taxa were collected in Surber net samples while an additional four species were collected using a dip net. This spring fauna was dominated by insects, especially midges (Chironomidae). Shannon's species diversity values at the springhead differed significantly from those in the springbrook during all four seasonal collections, probably due to increasing levels of oxygen in the springbrook.

Introduction

Springs are described as naturally occurring sources of emerging groundwater that have unique properties unto themselves, such as discrete habitats with relatively constant conditions with respect to temperature, dissolved oxygen concentration, and flow (van der Kamp 1995). Investigations of springs are limited and only a few ecological studies of these unique environments have occurred in Oklahoma. Matthews et al. (1983) attempted to determine whether macroinvertebrate community compositions could be useful indicators of groundwater quality, but low similarities between the springs in the study led to inconclusive results. Varza and Covich (1995) concluded limited food availability and predation by crayfish limited macroinvertebrate abundance in Buckhorn Spring. Bass (2000) reported a combined total of 39 taxa of macroinvertebrates from two springs in the Pontotoc Ridge Nature Preserve sampled only once during 1995. Based on samples of invertebrates from springs along a southeast to

northwest gradient across Oklahoma, Gaskin and Bass (2000) concluded a unique spring fauna was generally not present in Oklahoma and the spring inhabitants were associated with populations from other nearby stream habitats. Rudisill and Bass (2005) reported 64 taxa, dominated by dipteran larvae, during a yearlong investigation from three adjacent springs in Roman Nose State Park. Graening et al. (2006) compiled a checklist of all amphipods known from Oklahoma, including Allocrangonyx sp., from Desperado Spring. In another annual study, Brown and Bass (2014) collected 114 invertebrate taxa, dominated by the species complex Hyalella azteca and Tanytarsus, from three springs in south-central Oklahoma.

The macroinvertebrate community of Desperado Spring was previously sampled by Gaskin and Bass (2000). Desperado Spring is a rheocrene spring located in the Blue River Wildlife Management Area of south-central Oklahoma in Johnston County (34.3319°N, 96.5993°W) (Fig. 1). The spring emerges from a rocky outcrop and flows approximately 15 meters before draining into the Blue River. The



Figure 1. Map showing location of Desperado Spring in Johnston County, Oklahoma.

substrate of this spring is composed primarily of cobble, gravel, and sand with an abundance of aquatic vegetation (Gaskin and Bass 2000).

Purposes of the current investigation were to 1) describe the macroinvertebrate community composition of Desperado Spring over an annual period, 2) compare composition of these communities to previously collected data on this and other springs, and 3) determine selected physicochemical conditions of Desperado Spring.

Methods

Desperado Spring was sampled seasonally (October, January, April, and July) beginning in 2002. Both physicochemical and macroinvertebrate samples were collected during each quarterly visit.

Two sampling sites (springhead and 12 m downstream in springbrook) were established within the springbrook and three Surber net samples were collected from each site. Qualitative samples were also collected, by examining microhabitats, to capture species that may have been missed by the Surber net. All samples were washed in a number 60 (0.250mm) U.S. standard sieve bucket, and preserved with a 10% mixture of formalin and Rose Bengal dye. The preserved macroinvertebrates were returned to the laboratory to be sorted, identified, and counted. Identification of macroinvertebrates was determined primarily using keys by

Proc. Okla. Acad. Sci. 97: pp 41 - 46 (2017)

Wiederholm (1983), Epler (1995), Smith (2001), Merritt et al. (2008), and Thorp and Covich (2009). All specimens were deposited in the Invertebrate Section of the University of Central Oklahoma Natural History Museum.

Shannon's (1948) diversity index was calculated for springhead samples and the springbrook samples for each spring for each collection period. Sorenson's index of similarity (Brower et al. 1997) was used to make comparisons between the species present at springhead and springbrook sites for each collection. Chi-square contingency analyses were performed to determine if there was a relationship in number of individuals between the springhead and springbrook during the different seasons. Furthermore, a Hutcheson t-test was used to compare species diversity between the springhead and springbrook samples. The Hutcheson *t*-test is a median test with a distribution-free procedure that assumes the two populations or samples have the same shape. It is a modified version of the classic t-test that provides a way to compare samples using Shannon's diversity index values (Zar 2010).

Water temperature, dissolved oxygen concentration, and pH were measured at both collecting sites within the springbrook, while alkalinity and flow were measured only at the springhead. In addition, a water sample collected from the head of each spring was used to determine turbidity, conductivity, and concentrations of ammonia, nitrites, nitrates,

Parameter/Collection	Oct. 2002	Jan. 2003	Apr. 2003		
Water Temp °C	17.9 (17.6)	17.1 (16.7)	16.6 (16.7)		
Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l)	4.5 (4.8)	6.6 (9.4)) 5.3 (8.2)		
DO Percent Saturation (%)	45 (48)	66 (95)	53 (83)		
pH	6.5 (6.5)	7.2 (7.2)	7.2 (7.6)		
Alkalinity (mg/l)	463	486	380		
Turbidity (JTU)	1	1	1		
Specific Conductivity (µmhos/cm)	630	486	397		
Ammonia (mg/l)	0.62	0.38	0.43		
Nitrates (mg/l)	0.11	0.04	0.11		
Nitrites (mg/l)	2	2	2		
Orthophosphates (mg/l)	0.22	0.1	0.04		
Flow (m/sec)	0.4	0.4	0.4		

Table 1. Physicochemical conditions for near the springhead in Desperado Spring, Blue River Wildlife Management Area, Johnston County, Oklahoma. Values in parentheses describe conditions in springbrook.

and orthophosphates in the laboratory using a Bausch & Lomb Spectrophotometer 20 (Hach 1987).

Results & Discussion

Results from the analysis of these physicochemical conditions indicated whether the water quality would be sufficient to support aquatic macroinvertebrates (Table 1). Both dissolved oxygen concentration and percent oxygen saturation values increased between the springhead and springbrook sites as atmospheric oxygen diffused into the water below the emergence point (van der Kamp 1995). The values of most other parameters were relatively constant.

A total of 16,410 individuals representing 49 species were collected in the Surber net samples during the four seasonal sampling periods from Desperado Spring (Table 2). Four additional species of hemipterans and coleopterans were collected only in the qualitative samples, so they were not included in the statistical analyses. Hexapods made up 94.4% of the individuals and 34 taxa, while non-hexapods formed 5.6% of the individuals and 15 species. This overwhelming dominance by hexapods is a different finding than what was reported by Brown and Bass (2014) in nearby Pontotoc Ridge springs where non-hexapods were the most abundant group. Although it is well known that many springs often support more non-insects than insects (Webb et al. 1995, Brown and Bass 2014), hexapods were much more abundant in Desperado Spring. This is most likely due to the close proximity of the Blue River, an environment only about 15 meters from the springhead, that supports many aquatic insects. Blue River fauna may also colonize the spring run during periods of flooding. Over half of the insect species found in Desperado Spring were previously reported in an investigation of invertebrate drift occurring in the Blue River by Matzinger and Bass (1995).

Four genera of Chironomidae larvae Desperado dominated the Spring macroinvertebrate community making up 81.8% of the individuals present in the collections. These included Sublettea (33.7%), Eukiefferiella (24.3%), Paratendipes (13.0%), Corynoneura Sublettea. (10.7%). and Eukiefferiella, Corynoneura and always occurred in higher numbers at the springhead, while Paratendipes was usually more abundant in the springbrook (Table 2). It is possible these distributions reflected preferences for different microhabitats - the springhead substrate was composed primarily of cobble and gravel, while the springbrook substrate contained more sand and leaf debris overlying rock.

Comparisons of the species present at the springhead and those present at the springbrook sites using Sorensen's index of similarity ranged from 0.40 - 0.62 during the four collection periods. Specifically, those values were 0.50 during October, 0.52 during January, 0.62 during April, and 0.40 during July. Although some overlap of species did occur at both sites, other species were limited to either the springhead or

Payle lensingsDesc	Taxa	Oct. 2002 Springhead	Oct. 2002 Springbrook	Jan. 2003 Springhead	Jan. 2003 Springbrook	Apr. 2003 Springhead	Apr. 2003 Springbrook	Jul. 2003 Springhead	Jul. 2003 Springbrook	Totals
Lakows Dventofin 1 8 1 6 1 2 1	Platyhelminthes	Springheuu	Springbrook	Springheau	Springbrook	Springheuu	Springbrook	Springheuu	Springbrook	
NonmoleImageImageImageImageImageImageImageObjecture113113111Objecture11311223Develop328028011 <td>Unknown Turbellaria</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td>8</td> <td></td> <td>14</td> <td>2</td> <td>112</td> <td>3</td> <td>140</td>	Unknown Turbellaria	1		8		14	2	112	3	140
Ubahow Normatola Image of the second se	Nematoda									
ObjechesiaIII	Unknown Nematoda		1		1		7			9
Banchan soverhyi I	Oligochaeta									
Days 9, Image/law	Branchiura sowerbyi		1	1	3		13			18
Jamochko sp. 30 28 9 25 17 166 1 52 3.8 Praters sp. 4 1 1 1 1 1 2 Baylan 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 Galaxia 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 Galaxia 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 Galaxia 1 1 1 1 1 1 2 1 1 2 1	Dero sp.				1		2		2	5
Landbreckung sp. 4	Limnodrilus sp.	30	28	9	25	17	166	1	52	328
Printing op. Image Image <thimage< th=""> Image Image</thimage<>	Lumbriculus sp.	4								4
Barbar Image: Creations of the second s	Pristina sp.						1		1	2
Optimizing 0, I <	Bivalvia						1		1	2
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Sphaerium sp.						1		1	2
Cacheboor 0 100 20 0 100 </td <td>Crustacea Caacidotaa sp</td> <td>6</td> <td></td> <td>107</td> <td></td> <td>22</td> <td></td> <td>5</td> <td>1</td> <td>152</td>	Crustacea Caacidotaa sp	6		107		22		5	1	152
Imprecision in the interval of a second complex Imprecision in the interval of a second complex Imprecision interval of a second com	Cladocera	0		107	2	55		5	1	2
investigation investig	Harpacticoida	1	4		7		5	16	44	77
Outsouch Image: state of the s	Hvalella azteca complex				,	1		10		1
Proceedings p. 1 6 3 13 23 Hadrachnide 2 3 16 14 17 52 Collembola 2 1 2 3 66 104 Isotomidu 2 1 2 3 96 104 Sectionary p. 2 1 2 3 96 104 Extenceme syn. 2 2 2 3 10 1 1 10	Ostracoda			4		38	2	25		69
Acarina Image: Solution of the sector of the s	Procambarus sp.		1		6		3		13	23
Hydrachniake 2 3 16 14 17 52 Sotomidae 2 1 2 3 96 104 Sotomidae 2 1 2 3 96 104 Switcerur ap 1 2 3 96 104 1 Ephermorptera 1 2 1 3 3 1 </td <td>Acarina</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Acarina									
Collembia Collembia <thcollembia< th=""> Collembia <thcollembia< th=""> Collembia <thcolembia< th=""> <thcolembia< th=""> Cole</thcolembia<></thcolembia<></thcollembia<></thcollembia<>	Hydrachnidae	2		3	16	14		17		52
Isotomicale 2 3 96 10 Fphemorypera 2 3 96 10 1 Sonicerra psy. 2 8 85 19 16 7 26 2 42 Odonath 2 8 85 19 16 7 26 2 42 Argin sp. 25 8 85 19 16 7 26 2 42 Breciman/gag sp. 25 8 85 19 16 7 26 2 42 Trichopera -	Collembola									
Somicorura sp. Image: Constraint of the spectra spectr	Isotomidae	2			1	2	3	96		104
Ephensoptera Image of the second	Semicerura sp.								1	1
Bacidae 1 2 6 3 Argia sp. 25 8 85 19 16 7 265 2 427 Argia sp. 25 8 85 19 16 7 265 2 427 Trichogters 1 <td< td=""><td>Ephemeroptera</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Ephemeroptera									
Odomatu	Baetidae	1			2					3
Argic sp. 25 8 85 19 16 7 265 2 427 Breckmortogs sp. 1 1 6 7 Tickoptera 2 6 7 Trickoptera 2 1 5 47 Hwingtia sp. 7 30 2 2 1 5 47 Hemiptera 1	Odonata									
Brechmorbage sp. I	Argia sp.	25	8	85	19	16	7	265	2	427
Unknown Zygopten I 6 7 Hydropilla sp. 2 1 5 47 Hydropilla sp. 7 30 2 2 1 5 47 Hemiptera 30 2 2 1 5 47 Maurichi sp. 7 30 2 2 1 5 47 Macorkia sp.* 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 Necorkia sp.* 1	Brechmorhoga sp.			1						1
Incompera Image of the sp. Image of the sp. <thimage of="" sp.<="" th="" the=""></thimage>	Unknown Zygoptera			1				6		7
Production Sp. 7 30 2 2 1 5 47 Hemiptera 1 1 1 Aquarias sp. 1 1 1 Newcriza sp.* 1 1 1 Regovelia sp. 1	Trichoptera			2						2
Mathema dp. j <th< td=""><td>Matrichia cp</td><td>7</td><td></td><td>20</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>5</td><td></td><td>47</td></th<>	Matrichia cp	7		20	2	2	1	5		47
Interpreta Image of a sp. Image of a sp. <thimage a="" of="" s<="" td=""><td>Homintore</td><td>,</td><td></td><td>50</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>5</td><td></td><td>4/</td></thimage>	Homintore	,		50	2	2	1	5		4/
Autom Sp.* Image: Sp.* <thimage: sp.*<="" th=""> <thimage: sp.*<="" th=""></thimage:></thimage:>	Aquarius sp								1	1
Rhagavella sp. Image of the sp. <thimage of="" sp.<="" th="" the=""> <thimage of="" sp.<="" th="" the=""></thimage></thimage>	Neocorixa sp.*								1	*
Trepobates sp.*	Rhagovelia sp.								1	1
Trichocoriza sp. 8 Trichocoriza sp. 2 8 8 Trichoptera 2 1 5 47 Metrichia sp. 7 30 2 2 1 5 47 Coleoptera 47 47 Dineutus sp.* 47 47 Diptera 47 47 47 Arichopogon sp. 1 48 47 Corononeurs sp. 1 11 1	Trepobates sp.*									*
Trichoptera 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 1 2 2 2 1 2 2 1 2 2 1 5 7 2 3 2 2 1 5 7 7 30 2 2 1 5 7 7 7 30 2 2 1 5 7 7 7 30 2 2 1 7	Trichocorixa sp.								8	8
Hydroptila sp. 2 1 5 47 Odleoptera 0 1 5 47 Dineutus sp.* 1 1 1 1 1 Dineutus sp.* 1 1 1 1 1 1 Dineutus sp.* 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 Atrichopogon sp. 1	Trichoptera									
Metrichia sp. 7 30 2 2 1 5 47 Coleoptera Dineutus sp.* * * Diptera * * Diptera 1 * * Concorporta sp. 1 3 34 37 Conchapelopia sp. 2 16 1772 Cricotopus sp. 21 38 22 48 26 116 1772 Cricotopus sp. 11 38 22 48 26 115 109 Dixa sp. 14 92 2 1 109 Dixa sp. 131 2 688 22 3090 131 54 4018 Georthocladius sp. 18 8 15 181 13 563 798 Hemerodromia sp. 1 1 1 1	Hydroptila sp.			2						2
Colespitera Image: Sp.* Image: Sp.* <thimage: sp.*<="" th=""> <thimage: sp.*<="" th=""></thimage:></thimage:>	Metrichia sp.	7		30	2	2	1	5		47
Dineurs sp.* Image: Constraint of the sp.* <thimage: consp.*<="" th=""> Image: Consp.* Ima</thimage:>	Coleoptera									
Laccophilus sp.* * Diptera 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 Chrinopogor sp. 1 2 3 34 37 Conchapelopia sp. 2 3 34 37 Conchapelopia sp. 2 2 10 22 Cricotopus sp. 21 38 22 48 26 155 Dasyhelea sp. 14 92 2 1 109 109 Dixa sp. 1 9 10 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Dineutus sp.*									*
Diptera Image: Chironomic sp. Image: Ch	Laccophilus sp.*							-		*
Altrichopogon sp. 1 1 1 1 1 Chronomus sp. 2 3 34 37 Conchapelopia sp. 2 2 2 2 Corynoneura sp. 67 24 1147 161 74 57 126 116 1772 Cricotopus sp. 21 38 22 48 26 155 199 109 Dixa sp. 1 92 2 1 109 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 109 109 11 <td>Diptera</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Diptera									
Chronomia sp. 3 34 37 Conchapelopia sp. 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 116 1772 2 116 1772 126 116 1772 157 126 116 1772 157 126 116 1772 158 18 125 138 22 48 26 1 109 109 109 109 109 109 109 109 11 <td< td=""><td>Atrichopogon sp.</td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td><td></td><td>2</td><td></td><td>24</td><td>1</td></td<>	Atrichopogon sp.			1			2		24	1
Contrajectiviti sp. 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 1	Conchanglonia en				2		3			3/
Surveyence O/ 24 114 101 74 37 1120 110 1172 Dasyhelea sp. 21 38 22 48 26 155 Dasyhelea sp. 14 92 2 1 109 Dixa sp. 14 92 2 1 1 109 Dixa sp. 12 688 22 3090 131 54 4018 Georthocladius sp. 18 8 15 181 13 563 798 Hemerodromia sp. 1	Corvnoneura sp.	67	24	1147	161	74	57	126	116	1772
Dasyhele sp. 14 92 20 11 109 Dixa sp. 1 92 1 109 99 99 Ephydridae 1 1 1 11 11 11 Eukiefferiella sp. 31 2 688 22 3090 131 54 4018 Georthocladius sp. 18 8 15 181 13 563 798 Hemerodromia sp. 1	Cricotonus sn	21	24	28	101	/4	26	120	110	1//2
Dixa sp. Image: Constraint of the sp. Image: Consp. Image: Constraint of the sp.	Dasyhelea sp.	14		92	22		20		1	109
Ephydridae 1 1 1 Eukiefferiella sp. 31 2 688 22 3090 131 54 4018 Georthocladius sp. 18 8 15 181 13 563 798 Hemerodromia sp. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 Larsia sp. 23 35 13 71 1	Dixa sp.			,2				9		9
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Ephydridae							1		1
Georthocladius sp. 18 8 15 181 13 563 798 Hemerodromia sp. 1 1 23 35 13 71 Larsia sp. 23 35 13 71 1	Eukiefferiella sp.	31	2	688	22	3090	131	54		4018
Hemerodromia sp. 1 1 1 1 1 Larsia sp. 23 35 13 71 Linnophila sp. 1 1 1 1 1 Ormosia sp. 1 1 1 1 1 1 Paratendipes sp. 15 3 96 19 207 1813 2153 Rheotanytarsus sp. 1 11 11 11 11 11 Sinulum sp. 2 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 8 5566 3 8 368 224 483 5566 3 8	Georthocladius sp.	18	8	15		181	13	563		798
Larsia sp. 23 35 13 71 Limnophila sp. 1 1 1 1 Ormosia sp. 1 1 1 1 Paratendipes sp. 15 3 96 19 207 1813 2153 Rheotanytarsus sp. 1 11 11 111 111 111 Sinulum sp. 2 11 17 82 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 5566 3 8 368 224 483 5566 3 8 77 3 8 77 3 8 77 3 8 77 3 8 77 3 8 77 3 8 77 3 8 77 3 8 77 3 8 77 3 8 77 16,410 9 16,410 9 21 49 41 9 21 49 41 9 21 49 41	Hemerodromia sp.			1						1
Limnophila sp. I	Larsia sp.						23	35	13	71
Ormosia sp. 1 1 1 1 1 Paratendipes sp. 15 3 96 19 207 1813 2153 Rheotanytarsus sp. 1 11 11 111 111 Simulium sp. 2 3 8 368 224 4833 5566 3 8 368 224 4233 3 8 77 3 8 77 3 2 42 32 77 3 8 3932 940 6216 2159 16,410 3 8 3 8 3932 940 6216 2159 16,410 3 48 3932 940 6216 2159 16,410 3 48 3932 940 6216 2159	Limnophila sp.						1			1
Paratendipes sp. 15 3 96 19 207 1813 2153 Rheotanytarsus sp. 11 11 11 11 11 Simulium sp. 2 2 2 2 2 Sublettea sp. 43 2 58 38 368 224 4833 5566 Tanytarsus sp. 3 2 2 2 3 8 Tipula sp. 1 2 42 32 77 Number of Individuals 299 83 2333 448 3932 940 6216 2159 16,410 Species Richness 20 12 23 23 18 24 19 21 49 + (4*) Species Diversity 2.437 1.834 1.516 2.116 0.912 2.102 0.957 0.777	Ormosia sp.			1						1
Rheotanytarsus sp. 11 11 11 Simulium sp. 2 11 11 Simulium sp. 2 2 2 Stictochironomus sp. 1 9 14 41 17 82 Sublettea sp. 43 2 58 38 368 224 4833 5566 Tanytarsus sp. 3 2 2 42 32 77	Paratendipes sp.	15	3		96	19	207		1813	2153
Similariti in sp. 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 2 5 8 3 3 5 5 6 7 82 3 5 5 6 7 82 5 5 6 7 82 3 8 7 7 82 8 3 8 8 7 7 82 3 8 8 7 82 3 8 7 7 82 3 8 8 7 7 82 3 8 8 7 <td>Rheotanytarsus sp.</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>11</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>11</td>	Rheotanytarsus sp.					11				11
Success Richness 20 1 9 14 41 17 82 Sublettea sp. 43 2 58 38 368 224 4833 5566 Tanytarsus sp. 3 2 2 42 32 77 Mumber of Individuals 299 83 2333 448 3932 940 6216 2159 16,410 Species Richness 20 12 23 18 24 19 21 49 + (4*) Species Diversity 2.437 1.834 1.516 2.116 0.912 2.102 0.957 0.777	Simulium sp.			^	2					2
Subletied sp. 443 2 58 36 224 4835 5566 Tanytarsus sp. 3 2 3 8 3 8 Tipula sp. 1 2 42 32 77 Number of Individuals 299 83 2333 448 3932 940 6216 2159 16,410 Species Richness 20 12 23 23 18 24 19 21 49 + (4*) Species Diversity 2.437 1.834 1.516 2.116 0.912 2.102 0.957 0.777	Stictochironomus sp.	1		9	14	2(0	41	4022	17	82
Tanyana sp. 5 2 3 8 Tipula sp. 1 2 42 32 77 Number of Individuals 299 83 2333 448 3932 940 6216 2159 16,410 Species Richness 20 12 23 23 18 24 19 21 49 + (4*) Species Diversity 2.437 1.834 1.516 2.116 0.912 2.102 0.957 0.777	Tanytarsus en	43	2	58	38	368	224	4833	2	5366
Number of Individuals 299 83 2333 448 3932 940 6216 2159 16,410 Species Richness 20 12 23 23 18 24 19 21 49 + (4*) Species Diversity 2.437 1.834 1.516 2.116 0.912 2.102 0.957 0.777	Tipula sp	3	1		2	2		10	22	8
Number of Individuals 299 83 2333 448 3932 940 6216 2159 16,410 Species Richness 20 12 23 23 18 24 19 21 49 + (4*) Species Diversity 2.437 1.834 1.516 2.116 0.912 2.102 0.957 0.777	Pana sp.		1					42	52	
Species Richness 20 12 23 23 18 24 19 21 49 + (4*) Species Diversity 2.437 1.834 1.516 2.116 0.912 2.102 0.957 0.777	Number of Individuals	299	83	2333	448	3932	940	6216	2159	16.410
Species Diversity 2.437 1.834 1.516 2.116 0.912 2.102 0.957 0.777	Species Richness	20	12	23	23	18	24	19	21	49 + (4*)
	Species Diversity	2.437	1.834	1.516	2.116	0.912	2.102	0.957	0.777	

 Table 2. Macroinvertebrates collected in Desperado Spring, Blue River Wildlife Management

 Area, Johnston County, Oklahoma.

* indicates taxa were not present in Surber net samples; found only in quantitative samples.

the springbrook.

Results from the chi-square analyses indicated there was a statistically significant relationship between the number of individuals in the springhead and springbrook collections for all four seasons (χ^2 contingency test, p<0.001). Shannon's diversity values at the springhead ranged from 0.912 - 2.437 while these values in the springbrook were 0.777 - 2.116 (Table 2). Species diversity between the springhead and springbrook was significantly different during each collection month (Hutcheson *t*-test, October *t*=4.88, p<0.001, January *t*=9.47, p<0.001, April t=29.39, p<0.001, July t=5.01, p<0.001. This was expected because dissolved oxygen concentrations increased, presumably from atmospheric diffusion, as water flowed from the springhead into the springbrook, thus allowing the springbrook to support more species of macroinvertebrates.

Placement of taxa into trophic categories, based on information from Merritt et al. (2008) and Thorp and Covich (2009), revealed collectors dominated at the spring sites. Collectors were composed of 31 taxa, 66% of the species, and made up 94.6% of the individuals present. Predators (14 species, 4.5% of the individuals) and detritivores (two species, 0.9% of the individuals) composed the remaining trophic groups present. It should be noted that some of these species have different trophic roles as they grow and mature, so these proportions may change through time.

A large fraction of insect nymphs and larvae were found in the samples (Table 2). Gaskin and Bass (2000) also observed many immature insects were present in Desperado Spring and suggested that much reproduction must have been occurring there. This may be the case, but there is another possibility to be considered. Individuals making up the spring populations may have originated in the river and later moved into the springbrook, using it as a refuge from predators, such as larger fishes that would have difficulty existing in the spring's shallow water. It is unknown which, if either, of these hypotheses correctly explains the high number of immature individuals in Desperado Spring, but they are both possibilities.

Conclusion

Springs are unique and often over-looked aquatic environments. While many springs are reported to contain fauna found nowhere else, the Desperado Spring invertebrate community is mostly composed of species also found in the nearby Blue River. Non-insects are the dominant groups in many springs, but insects are the prevalent group in Desperado Spring, most likely due to its close proximity to the Blue River. Results of the physicochemical conditions in Desperado Spring indicate the water quality is capable of supporting a diverse biota, and this was confirmed by the intolerant taxa present in the samples.

Acknowledgments

The University of Central Oklahoma provided financial support to complete this study. Permission to access the property was granted by the Blue River Wildlife Management Area personnel. B. Easton assisted sorting and counting invertebrates in the laboratory.

References

- Bass D. 2000. A preliminary study of aquatic macroinvertebrates from two springs in the Pontotoc Ridge Nature Preserve, Oklahoma. Proc. Okla. Acad. Sci. 80:105-109.
- Brower JE, Zar JH, von Ende CN. 1997. Field and Laboratory Methods for General Ecology. Boston (MA): WCB/McGraw-Hill. 273 pp.
- Brown K, Bass D. 2014. Macroinvertebrate community structure and physicochemical conditions of three southeastern Oklahoma springs. Proc. Okla. Acad. Sci., 94:28-38.
- Epler JH. 1995. Identification Manual for the Larval Chironomidae (Diptera) of Florida. Bureau of Water Resources Protection, Florida Department of Environmental Protection Tallahassee (FL): 317 pp.
- Gaskin B, Bass D. 2000. Macroinvertebrates collected from seven Oklahoma springs. Proc. Okla. Acad. Sci. 80:17-23.

- Graening GO, Holsinger JR, Fenolio DB, Bergey EA, Vaughn CC. 2006. Annotated checklist of the amphipod crustaceans of Oklahoma, with emphasis on groundwater habitats. Proc. Okla. Acad. Sci.86:65-74.
- Hach Chemical Company. 1987. Procedures for Water and Wastewater Analysis. 2nd edition. Loveland (CO): Hach Chemical Co. 119 pp.
- Matthews WJ, Hoover JJ, and Milstead WB. 1983. The biota of Oklahoma springs: natural biological monitoring of ground water quality. Final Report. Stillwater (OK): Oklahoma Water Resources Research Institute. 64 pp.
- Matzinger M, Bass D. 1995. Downstream drift of aquatic insects in the Blue River of southcentral Oklahoma. Proc. Okla. Acad. Sci. 75:13-19.
- Merrit RW, Cummins KW, Berg MB. 2008. An Introduction to the Aquatic Insects of North America. 4th edition. Dubuque (IA): Kendall/ Hunt Publishing. 1158 pp.
- Smith DG. 2001. Pennak's Freshwater Invertebrates of the United States. 4th edition. New York (NY): John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 638 pp.
- Rudisill T, Bass D. 2005. Macroinvertebrate community structure and physicochemical conditions of the Roman Nose spring system. Proc. Okla. Acad. Sci. 85:33-42.

- Shannon CE. 1948. A mathematical theory of communication. Bell Syst. Tech. J. 27:379-423, 623-656.
- Thorp J, Covich A. 2009. Ecology and Classification of Freshwater Invertebrates. 3rd edition. San Diego (CA): Academic Press. 1021 pp.
- Varza, D, Covich A. 1995. Population fluctuations within a spring community. J. Kan. Entomol. Soc. 68:42-29.
- Webb DW, Wetzel MJ, Reed PC, Phillips LR, Harris MA. 1995. Aquatic biodiversity in Illinois springs. J. Kan. Entomol. Soc. 68(2):93-107.
- Wiederholm T. (ed.). 1983. Chironomidae of the Holarctic region. Keys and Diagnoses. Part 1-Larvae. Ent. Scand Supple. No. 19. 457 pp.
- van der Kamp G. 1995. The hydrogeology of springs in relation to the biodiversity of spring fauna: a review. J. Kan. Entomol. Soc. 68:4-17.
- Zar JH. 2010. Biostatistical Analysis. 5th edition. Upper Saddle River (NJ): Pearson. 960 pp.
- Submitted August 21, 2017 Accepted November 17, 2017