DR. JONATHAN G. KENNEN (Orcid ID : 0000-0002-5426-4445)

DR. ANGUS WEBB (Orcid ID : 0000-0003-0857-7878)

Article type : Special Issue

Evaluating and Managing Environmental Water Regimes in a Water-Scarce and Uncertain Future

Jonathan Kennen¹, Eric D. Stein², J. Angus Webb³

¹ U.S. Geological Survey, 3450 Princeton Pike, Suite 110, Lawrenceville, NJ 08648, United States

² Southern California Coastal Water Research Project, 3535 Harbor Blvd., Suite 110, Costa Mesa, CA 92626-1437, United States

³ The University of Melbourne, Department of Infrastructure Engineering, Parkville 3010, Australia

Correspondence: Jonathan G. Kennen, U.S. Geological Survey, 3450 Princeton Pike, Suite 110, Lawrenceville, NJ 08648, United States.

E-mail: jgkenn@usgs.gov

ABSTRACT

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1111/fw.13104](https://doi.org/10.1111/fw.13104)

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved

1. While the number of environmental flows and water science programs continues to grow across the globe, there remains a critical need to better balance water availability in support of human and ecological needs and to recognize the environment as a legitimate user of water. In water-stressed areas this recognition has resulted in friction between water users in the public and private sectors. An opportunity exists for practitioners to be on the forefront of the science determining best practices for supporting environmental water regimes.
2. This Special Issue brings together a collection of environmental flows science and water management papers organized around three major themes: 1. Method development and testing; 2. Application case studies; and 3. Efficacy evaluation. Contents of this Special Issue are intended to foster collaboration and broaden transferability of the information, technical tools, models, and methods needed to support environmental water management programs.
3. The technical sophistication of methods and modelling tools, while important to the advancement of environmental water science, may come at the expense of easily interpretable outcomes that positively influence management decisions. Researchers need to be more proactive in translating the results of advanced modelling methodologies into user-friendly tools and methods. This will allow stakeholders and water managers to proactively test alternative water allocation scenarios to help address growing human water demands in the face of droughts and changes in climatic patterns.
4. The application of environmental flows science and water management strategies cannot be done in isolation. Implementation involves a complex decision-making process that integrates ecological, hydrologic and social science across diverse multifaceted governance systems and requires active stakeholder involvement. Scientists and managers must strengthen partnerships at multiple scales to develop sensible science investment strategies so that collective knowledge can be translated into wise environmental water management decisions.

Key words: environmental flows science, environmental water management, modelling, ecohydrological investigations, case studies

INTRODUCTION

The tension between consumptive water use and ecological needs of rivers and estuaries has been a mainstay in the freshwater science literature for nearly 30 years. Over the years there have been synthesis articles, journal special issues and books devoted to various aspects of the science, implementation, and management of environmental flows to sustain species and ecosystems (Annear et al., 2004; Poff & Zimmerman, 2010; Arthington, Naiman, McClain, & Nilsson, 2010; Arthington, 2012; Hirji & Davis, 2012; Kendy et al., 2012; Webb et al., 2013; Acreman et al., 2014; Richter, 2014; Novak et al., 2016; Horne, Webb, Stewardson, Richter, & Acreman, 2017; Webb, Watts, Allan, & Conallin, 2018). Despite this attention, growing water demands, coupled with recent droughts and changes in climatic patterns, have produced increasingly widespread water scarcity in many regions throughout the world (Meybeck, 2003; Trenberth, Overpeck, & Solomon, 2004; Vörösmarty et al., 2010; Famiglietti et al., 2011; Estrela, Pérez-Martin, & Vargas, 2012; Dettinger, Udall, & Georgakakos, 2015; Veldkamp, Eisner, Wada, Aerts, & Ward, 2015; Williams et al., 2015). These shortages emphasize that there are critical limits on the amount of water available to support human and ecological needs. These shortages have motivated many federal and provincial governments (Fig. 1a) to establish environmental flow rules and criteria (e.g., instream or minimum flow requirements) for the protection of biological resources and ecosystem integrity (Le Quense, Kendy, & Weston, 2010; Hart, 2016; Novak et al., 2016). The cumulative number of programs establishing environmental flows and water management criteria in the US and across the globe has risen substantially just in the last decade (Fig. 1b), emphasizing the importance of retaining water in streams, rivers, estuaries and lentic systems for ecological use and ecosystem services. However, recognition of 'the environment' as a legitimate user of water has led to legal confrontations among water users in the public and private sectors (Poff et al., 2003; Capon & Capon, 2017), and increased

scrutiny of the methods used to determine, implement, and evaluate environmental water regimes.

Various approaches for assessing environmental flows and water regimes have been developed over the past two and half decades, including those based on species life-history requirements (e.g., instream flow incremental methods; Bovee et al., 1998), flows that determine requisite habitats (e.g., physical habitat simulations; Milhous, Updike, & Schneider, 1989), holistic methods aimed at supporting biological communities and ecosystem functions (e.g., Ecological Limits of Hydrologic Alteration, ELOHA: Poff et al., 2010), and targets based on deviation from unaltered hydrographs (e.g., presumptive standards approach, Richter, Davis, Apse, & Konrad, 2011). Furthermore, the field of environmental flows is entering a transition phase from a focus on lotic waters to one that includes the water requirements of all freshwater bodies.

Accommodating this important shift may require more flexible or new terminology as discussed in recent synthesis works (Horne et al., 2017; Arthington, Kennen, Stein, & Webb, 2018). This means that environmental water assessment methods, as well as implementation approaches and strategies, can differ with waterbody type and across political jurisdictions, continents and even across individual basins that traverse multiple states, provinces or countries. These jurisdictional differences exacerbate the challenges of managing and regulating environmental water regimes.

Moreover, as technical sophistication in the methods used to assess and evaluate environmental water regimes increase, researchers need to be more proactive in translating the results of advanced modelling methodologies into user-friendly tools. These may include web-based applications and decision support systems that provide easily navigable graphical user interfaces, with options for flow scenario testing and insight into the effects of climate change or changes in water availability (e.g., Williamson et al., 2015; Cartwright, Caldwell, Nebiker, & Knight, 2017). Such tools need to be adaptable to local conditions and needs, but also highly transferable across river basins or political jurisdictions, thus allowing the broader exchange of ecological and hydrologic / hydraulic information and models to support the balancing of water management decisions for human and ecosystem needs.

This Special Issue builds on previous work by providing broad example applications and case studies that illustrate implementation of ecohydrological approaches and provide empirical observations on the efficacy of these approaches. The previous Special Issue on “Environmental Flows: Science and Management” published in *Freshwater Biology* in 2010 strongly moved the field forward by introducing new methods and analytical techniques such as the ELOHA framework, ecological trait analysis, Bayesian hierarchical modelling, and Integrated Basin Flow Assessment (Arthington et al., 2010). In this Special Issue we continue that legacy by including studies from Australia, Europe, and North America that cover the development of novel technical tools, models, and methods necessary for implementation of environmental water regimes, as well as examples of how these tools can be integrated into water management programs.

Papers in this Special Issue are organized around three major themes:

1. Method development and testing. Research on the development of methods used to support stronger flow-ecology relationships and establish environmental water recommendations intended to maintain ecologically sustainable flow patterns for diverse biological endpoints. Papers in this theme explore the transferability of flow-ecology relationships (Chen & Olden, 2018), advances in assemblage-level assessments (Cuffney & Kennen, 2018), hydrologic modelling (Sengupta et al., 2018), development of hydraulic habitat models (Mierau et al., 2018) and advanced analytical methods (Webb, de Little, Miller, & Stewardson, 2018), and development of biological response models that relate changes in hydrology and hydraulics to an ecological outcome or effect (Bond et al., 2018; Mazor et al., 2018).
2. Application case studies. Case studies that present application of flow-ecology response models designed to help environmental water science practitioners to better understand how alterations in streamflow and increasing levels of water scarcity affect the viability and integrity of aquatic ecosystems. Papers in this theme discuss case study examples including assessment of snowmelt conditions (Steel, Peek, Lusardi, &

Yarnell, 2018), identification of high risk watersheds (Zimmerman et al., 2018), and tools with improved capacity and diagnostic resolution (Monk et al., 2018; McKenna, Reeves, & Seelbach, 2018) that can be integrated into water resource management programs at the local, state, provincial, regional and national levels.

3. Efficacy evaluation. Research and case studies that evaluate the effectiveness of environmental water programs at achieving their desired hydrological and ecological objectives or evaluating complex scenarios with multiple interacting stressors. Papers in this theme illustrate successes, challenges, and provide evaluations of how well current programs have worked (Stewardson & Guarino, 2018); how well conceptual models have performed relative to expectations (Gendaszek, Burton, Magirl, & Konrad, 2018); the influence of drought on flow-ecology relationships (Lynch, Leasure, & Magoulick, 2018); and recommendations for ways to improve both the science and implementation of environmental water practice (Wheeler, Wenger, & Freeman, 2018). This theme also includes recommendations for refinements that can improve the ability of flow-ecology tools to distinguish anthropogenic effects from changes due to climate variability (Hain et al., 2018).

Also included are several conceptual papers that actively look to the future of environmental water science and management, and provide recommendations on how this discipline needs to evolve. Topics covered include the challenges associated with evaluating legacy effects and long-term trends (Thompson, King, Kingsford, Mac Nally, & Poff, 2018); the challenge of incorporating non-stationarity principles into ecohydrological investigations, and therefore calling for a fundamental shift in environmental water regime studies from managing for variability (of historical conditions) to managing for ecological resilience (Poff, 2018); and proposals for how scientific research might better interact with aquatic ecosystem management to more effectively translate knowledge into action and foster sensible scientific investment strategies so that collective knowledge can be translated into wise environmental water management decisions (Stoffels, Bond, & Nicol, 2018).

The Special Issue concludes with a synthesis of recent advances in environmental flows science and water management and a look ahead at some of the challenges still facing environmental water science practitioners (Arthington et al., 2018). Not all the challenges identified in the 2010 Special Issue of *Freshwater Biology* on environmental flows science and water management (Arthington et al., 2010) have been met. For example, “integrated water resource management” that incorporates ground- and surface-water regimes in support of river conservation and restoration, or “adaptive environmental management” approaches that address uncertainties and risk and facilitate follow-up interaction among scientists and managers, are only beginning to emerge. However, as greater diversity and transferability are achieved, environmental water science will continue to progress and support the needs of water managers and decision makers around the globe.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank David L. Strayer of the Cary Institute of Ecosystems Studies for inviting us to advance the discussion on environmental water regimes by developing a Special Issue. We earnestly thank the many environmental water practitioners who submitted thoughtful and timely papers as part of this Special Issue and David Dudgeon and Emma Boxer for their support and expertise in guiding this Special Issue through the review and publication process. Jason May of the U.S. Geological Survey provided many helpful suggestions that improved this manuscript. Etymological insights from Angela Arthington on early drafts of this paper were greatly appreciated. The use of trade, product, or firm names is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

REFERENCES CITED

Acreman M. C., Overton I. C., King J., Wood P. J., Cowx I. G., Dunbar M. J., Kendy E. & Young, W.J. (2014) The changing role of ecohydrological science in guiding environmental flows. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, **59**, 433–450. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2014.886019>

192 Annear T., Chisholm I., Beecher H., Locke A., Aarrestad P., Coomer C., Estes C., Hunt J., Jacobson
 193 R., Jöbsi G., Kauffman J., Marshall J., Mayes K., Smith G., Wentworth R., and Stalnaker C. (2004)
 194 Instream Flows for Riverine Resource Stewardship, Revised Edition, Instream Flow Council,
 195 Cheyenne, WY, 268 p. Available at: [https://www.instreamflowcouncil.org/resources/ifc-](https://www.instreamflowcouncil.org/resources/ifc-publications/instream-flows-for-riverine-resource-stewardship/)
 196 [publications/instream-flows-for-riverine-resource-stewardship/](https://www.instreamflowcouncil.org/resources/ifc-publications/instream-flows-for-riverine-resource-stewardship/)
 197 Arthington A. H. 2012. Environmental flows: saving rivers in the third millennium. University of
 198 California press, Berkeley, CA. 424 p. (ISBN 978-0-520-27369-6). Available at:
 199 <http://www.ucpress.edu/book.php?isbn=9780520273696>
 200 Arthington A. H., Kennen J. G., Stein E. D. & Webb J. A. (2018) Recent advances in
 201 environmental flows science and water management – innovation in the Anthropocene.
 202 *Freshwater Biology*.
 203 Arthington, A. H., Naiman, R. J., McClain, M. E. & Nilsson, C. (2010) Preserving the biodiversity
 204 and ecological services of rivers: New challenges and research opportunities. *Freshwater*
 205 *Biology*, **55**, 1–16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2009.02340.x>
 206 Bond N. R., Grigg N., Roberts J., McGinness H., Nielsen D., O'Brien M., Overton I., Pollino C.,
 207 Reid J. R. W., & Stratford D. (2018) Assessment of environmental flow scenarios using state-
 208 and-transition models. *Freshwater Biology*, 00:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13060>
 209 Bovee K. D., Lamb B. L., Bartholow J. M., Stalnaker C. B., Taylor J. & Henriksen J. (1998) Stream
 210 habitat analysis using the instream flow incremental methodology. U.S. Geological Survey,
 211 Biological Resources Division Information and Technology Report, USGS/BRD-1998-0004. viii
 212 +131 pp. Available at:
 213 <https://www.fort.usgs.gov/sites/default/files/products/publications/3912/3912.pdf>
 214 Capon S. J. & Capon T. R. (2017) An impossible prescription: Why science cannot determine
 215 environmental water requirements for a healthy Murray-Darling basin. *Water Economics and*
 216 *Policy*, **03**, 1650037. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1142/S2382624X16500375>

217 Cartwright J., Caldwell C., Nebiker S., & Knight R. (2017) Putting flow–ecology relationships into
 218 practice: A decision support system to assess fish community response to water management
 219 scenarios. *Water*, **9**, 196. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/w9030196>

220 Chen W. & Olden J. D. (2018) Evaluating transferability of flow-ecology relationships across
 221 space, time, and taxonomy. *Freshwater Biology*, 00:1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13041>

222 Cuffney T. C. & Kennen J. G. (2018) Potential pitfalls of aggregating aquatic invertebrate data
 223 from multiple agency sources: Implications for detecting aquatic assemblage change across
 224 alteration gradients. *Freshwater Biology*, 00:1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13031>

225 Dettinger M., Udall B. & Georgakakos A. (2015) Western water and climate change. *Ecological*
 226 *Applications*, **25**, 2069–2093. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1890/15-0938.1>

227 Estrela T., Pérez-Martin M. A. & Vargas E. (2012) Impacts of climate change on water resources
 228 in Spain. *Hydrological Sciences Journal*, **57**, 1154–1167
 229 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02626667.2012.702213>

230 Famiglietti J., Lo M., Ho S. L., Bethune J., Anderson K. J., Syed T. H., Swenson S. C., de Linage C.
 231 R. & Rodell M. (2011) Satellites measure recent rates of groundwater depletion in California’s
 232 Central Valley. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **38**, L03403.
 233 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2010GL046442>

234 Gendaszek A. S., Burton C. S., Magirl C. S. & Konrad C. P. (2018) Streambed scour of salmon
 235 spawning habitat in a regulated river influenced by management of peak discharge. *Freshwater*
 236 *Biology*, 00:1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12987>

237 Hain E. F., Kennen J. G., Caldwell P. V., Nelson S. A. C., Sun G. & McNulty S. G. (2018) Using
 238 regional scale flow-ecology modeling to identify catchments where fish assemblages are most
 239 vulnerable to changes in water availability. *Freshwater Biology*, 00:1–18.
 240 <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13048>

241 Hart, B. T. 2016. The Australian Murray-Darling Basin Plan: Factors leading to its successful
 242 development. *Ecohydrology & Hydrobiology*, **16**, 229–241.
 243 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecohyd.2016.09.002>

244 Hirji R. and Davis R. (2012) Environmental Flows in Water Resources, Policies, Plans, and
 245 Projects. The World Bank, Washington, DC. 189 p. Available at:
 246 <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/2635>

247 Horne, A. C., Webb J. A., Stewardson M. J., Richter B. D. & Acreman M., editors. (2017) Water
 248 for the Environment: from Policy and Science to Implementation and Management. Elsevier,
 249 Cambridge MA.

250 Kendy E., Apse C., Blann K. L., Smith M. P. & Richardson, A. (2012) A practical guide to
 251 environmental flows for policy and planning—With nine case studies in the United States. The
 252 Nature Conservancy. Available at:
 253 http://www.oregon.gov/owrd/docs/SB839/2012_9_Case_Studies_Practical_Guide.pdf

254 Le Quesne T., Kendy E. & Weston D. (2010) The Implementation Challenge: Taking stock of
 255 government policies to protect and restore environmental flows. The Nature Conservancy &
 256 World Wildlife Fund. Available at:
 257 http://d2ouvy59p0dg6k.cloudfront.net/downloads/the_implementation_challenge.pdf

258 Lynch D. T., Leasure D. R. & Magoulick D. D. (2018). The influence of drought on flow-ecology
 259 relationships in Ozark Highland streams. *Freshwater Biology*.

260 Mazor R. D., May J. T., Sungupta A., McCune K. S., Bledsoe B. P. & Stein, E. D. (2018) Tools for
 261 managing hydrological alteration on a regional scale: Setting targets to protect stream health.
 262 *Freshwater Biology*, 00:1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13062>

263 McKenna J. E., Reeves, H. W. & Seelbach P. W. (2018) Measuring and evaluating ecological
 264 flows from streams to regions: steps toward national coverage. *Freshwater Biology*, 00:1–17.
 265 <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13086>

266 Meybeck M. (2003) Global analysis of river systems: From earth system controls to
 267 anthropocene syndromes. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, **B 358**,
 268 1935–1955. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2003.1379>

269 Mierau D. W., Trush W. J., Rossi G. J., Carah J. K., Clifford M. O. & Howard J. K. (2018) Managing
 270 water diversions in unregulated streams using a modified percent-of-flow approach. *Freshwater*
 271 *Biology*, 00:1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12985>

272 Milhous R., Updike M. & Schneider D. (1989) Physical Habitat Simulation System Reference
 273 Manuel – Version II. Instream Flow Information Paper No. 26. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
 274 Biological Report 89(16), Fort Collins, CO. Available at:
 275 <https://www.fort.usgs.gov/sites/default/files/products/publications/3912/3912.pdf>

276 Monk W. A., Compson Z. G., Armanini D. G., Orlofske J. M., Curry C. J., Peters, D. L., Crocker J. B.
 277 & Baird D. J. (2018) Flow-velocity thresholds in Canadian rivers: A comparison of trait and
 278 taxonomy-based approaches. *Freshwater Biology*, 00:1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13030>

279 Novak R., Kennen J. G., Abele R. W., Baschon C. F., Carlisle D. M., Dlugolecki L., Eignor D. M.,
 280 Flotemersch J. E., Ford P., Fowler J., Galer R., Gordon L. P., Hansen S. E., Herbold B., Johnson T.
 281 E., Johnston J. M., Konrad C. P., Leamond B. & Seelbach P.W. (2016) Final EPA-USGS Technical
 282 Report: Protecting Aquatic Life from Effects of Hydrologic Alteration. U.S. Geological Survey
 283 Scientific Investigations Report 2016–5164, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency EPA–822–R–
 284 156–007, 58 p. Available at: [https://www.epa.gov/wqc/final-epausgs-technical-report-](https://www.epa.gov/wqc/final-epausgs-technical-report-protecting-aquatic-life-effects-hydrologic-alteration-documents)
 285 [protecting-aquatic-life-effects-hydrologic-alteration-documents](https://www.epa.gov/wqc/final-epausgs-technical-report-protecting-aquatic-life-effects-hydrologic-alteration-documents)

286 Poff N. L. (2018). Beyond the natural flow regime? Broadening the hydro-ecological foundation
 287 of environmental flows challenges in a non-stationary world. *Freshwater Biology*, 00:1–11.
 288 <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13038>

289 Poff N. L., Allan J. D., Palmer M. A., Hart D. D., Richter B. D., Arthington A. H., Rogers K. H.,
 290 Meyers J. L., & Stanford J. A. (2003) River flows and water wars: Emerging science for
 291 environmental decision making. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, **1**, 298-306.
 292 [https://doi.org/10.1890/1540-9295\(2003\)001\[0298:RFAWWE\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/1540-9295(2003)001[0298:RFAWWE]2.0.CO;2)

293 Poff L. N., Richter B. D., Arthington A. H., Bunn S. E., Naiman R. J., Kendy E, Acreman M., Apse
 294 C., Bledsoe B. P., Freeman M. C., Henriksen J. A., Jacobson R. B., Kennen J. G., Merritt D. M.,
 295 O’Keeffe J. H., Olden J. D., Rogers K., Tharme R. E. & Warner A. (2010) The ecological limits of
 296 hydrologic alteration (ELOHA)—A new framework for developing regional environmental flow
 297 standards. *Freshwater Biology*, **55**, 147–170. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2009.02204.x)
 298 [2427.2009.02204.x](http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2009.02204.x)
 299 Poff N. L. & Zimmerman J. K. H. (2010) Ecological responses to altered flow regimes—A
 300 literature review to inform the science and management of environmental flows. *Freshwater*
 301 *Biology*, **55**, 194–205. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2009.02272.x>
 302 Richter B. D. (2014). Chasing Water – A Guide for Moving from Scarcity to Sustainability. Island
 303 Press, (ISBN: 9781610915380). Available at: <https://islandpress.org/book/chasing-water>
 304 Richter B. D., Davis M. M., Apse C., and Konrad C. 2011. A presumptive standard for
 305 environmental flow protection. *River Research and Applications*, **28**, 1,312–1,321.
 306 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/rra.1511>
 307 Sengupta A., Stein E. D., McCune K. S., Mazor R. D., Adams S., Bledsoe B. P. & Konrad C. (2018)
 308 Tools for managing hydrological alteration on a regional scale: Estimating changes in flow
 309 characteristics at ungauged sites. *Freshwater Biology*, 00:1–17.
 310 <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13074>
 311 Steel A., Peek R. A., Lusardi R. A. & Yarnell S. M. (2018) Associating metrics of hydrologic
 312 variability with benthic macroinvertebrate communities in regulated and unregulated
 313 snowmelt-dominated rivers. *Freshwater Biology*, 00:1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12994>
 314 Stewardson M. & Guarino E. (2018) Basin-scale environmental water delivery in the Murray-
 315 Darling, Australia: A hydrological perspective. *Freshwater Biology*, 00:1–17.
 316 <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13074>
 317 Stoffels R. J., Bond N. R. & Nicol S. (2018) Science to support the management of riverine flows.
 318 *Freshwater Biology*, 00:1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13061>

319 Thompson R. M., King A. J., Kingsford R. M., Mac Nally R. & Poff N. L. (2018) Legacies, lags, and
320 long term trends: Effective flow restoration in a changed and changing world. *Freshwater*
321 *Biology*, 00:1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13029>

322 Trenberth K. E., Overpeck J. T. & Solomon S. (2004) Exploring drought and its implications for
323 the future. *Eos*, **85**, 27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1029/2004EO030004>

324 Veldkamp T. I. E., Eisner S., Wada Y., Aerts J. C. J. H. & Ward P. J. (2015) Sensitivity of water
325 scarcity events to ENSO-driven climate variability at the global scale. *Hydrology and Earth*
326 *System Sciences*, **19**, 4081–4098. <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-19-4081-2015>

327 Vörösmarty C. J., McIntyre P. B., Gessner M. O., Dudgeon D., Prusevich A., Green P., Glidden S.,
328 Bunn S. E., Sullivan C. A., Reidy Liermann C. A. & Davies P. M. (2010) Global threats to human
329 water security and river biodiversity. *Nature*, **467**, 555–561.
330 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature09440>

331 Webb J. A., de Little S. C., Miller K. A. & Stewardson M. J. (2018) Quantifying and predicting the
332 benefits of environmental flows: Combining large-scale monitoring data and expert knowledge
333 within hierarchical Bayesian models *Freshwater Biology*, 00:1–13.
334 <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13069>

335 Webb J. A., Miller K. A., King E. L., Little S. C. de, Stewardson M. J., Zimmerman J. K. H. & Poff N.
336 L. (2013) Squeezing the most out of existing literature—A systematic re-analysis of published
337 evidence on ecological responses to altered flows. *Freshwater Biology*, **58**, 2439–2451.
338 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12234>

339 Webb, J. A., Watts, R. J., Allan, C. & Conallin, J. C. (2018) Adaptive management of
340 environmental flows. *Environmental Management*, **61**, 339–346.
341 <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00267-017-0981-6>

342 Wheeler K., Wenger S. J. & Freeman M. C. (2018) States and rates: Complementary approaches
343 to developing flow-ecology relationships. *Freshwater Biology*; 00:1–11.
344 <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13001>

- Williams A. P., Seager R., Abatzoglou J. T., Cook B. I., Smerdon J. E. & Cook E. R. (2015), Contribution of anthropogenic warming to California drought during 2012–2014. *Geophysical Research Letters*, **42**, 6819–6828. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2015GL064924>
- Williamson T. N., Lant J. G., Claggett P. R., Nystrom E. A., Milly P. C. D., Nelson H. L., Hoffman S. A., Colarullo S. J., & Fischer J. M. (2015) Summary of hydrologic modeling for the Delaware River Basin using the Water Availability Tool for Environmental Resources (WATER). U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2015–5143, 68 p. Available at: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3133/sir20155143>
- Zimmerman, J. K. H., Carlisle, D. M., May J. T., Howard J. K., Klausmeyer K. R., Brown L. R. & Grantham T. (2018) Patterns and magnitude of flow alteration in California, USA. *Freshwater Biology*, 00:1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13058>

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. A representative subset of federal and provincial governments showing approximate inception and length of environmental water science programs (a) and cumulative growth in number of environmental water science programs in the US compared to programs worldwide (b). Information presented in this figure was obtained from numerous published sources including The Nature Conservancy, and a series of governmental reports from Australia, Canada, China, the European Union, South Africa, the United States, as well as several individual U.S. States.

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Kennen, JG;Stein, ED;Webb, JA

Title:

Evaluating and managing environmental water regimes in a water-scarce and uncertain future

Date:

2018-08-01

Citation:

Kennen, J. G., Stein, E. D. & Webb, J. A. (2018). Evaluating and managing environmental water regimes in a water-scarce and uncertain future. FRESHWATER BIOLOGY, 63 (8), pp.733-737. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13104>.

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/284321>