

**Reach-scale biogeochemistry within agricultural streams:  
interactions with riparian vegetation, channel  
geomorphology and hydrology.**

**May 2012**

Morag Stewart  
B.Sc. Hons. (University of Melbourne)

*A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
The University of New England*

## Acknowledgements

This thesis would not have evolved or been completed without the dedication and assistance of my supervisors: Drs. Darren Ryder, Ivor Grown and Paul Frazier. I would like to sincerely thank Darren for the continued support, encouragement and the plethora of advice throughout the project. I thank Ivor for statistics advice and making field work easier with access to equipment and assistance with funding, as well as accompanying me on several occasions. I also thank Paul for his help analysing hydrological data. Their helpful advice on many thesis drafts is greatly appreciated.

This project was generously supported by the Border Rivers-Gwydir CMA and the University of New England. I am thankful to the University of New England for the opportunity to receive an Australian Postgraduate Award. I would like to acknowledge the Office of Water and would particularly like to thank Sally Croker for assistance with funding, Andrew Brisset for access to hydrological records, and Dr. Simon Mitrovic for the loan of field equipment. I sincerely thank the following landholders for allowing on-going access to their properties and their expression of interest in this project: Chris Strahle, Joan Mitchell, and Duncan and Jo Clyde-Smith.

I am grateful for the support, technical assistance and travelling tales of Marion Costigan in the water chemistry laboratory. Many thanks go to Paul Lisle for on-going advice and technical assistance, as well as enthusiastic conversations on how to fix all the world's problems during the many agar pot pouring hours. I would like to thank Dr. Pierre Moens for access and technical assistance with the fluorometer and Leanne Lisle for assistance with nutrient analyses. I am grateful to Cate McGregor, Martin Dillon and Dr. Carlos Muñoz-Robles for their helpful advice about all things ARCGIS related. I am also grateful to Professor Felix Bärlocher for collaborative research opportunities and his interest in this project.

I am indebted to all my comrades at UNE including: Sarah Mika, Munique Webb and Karlie McDonald for many hours of fieldwork help and gossip; Melissa Danks, Subhashni Taylor and Peter Berney for their encouragement; Rhiannon Smith, Laura Vary, Megan Good and Nick Shultz who provided me with many meals, music, places of refuge and good giggling. The Marlborough wine region greatly assisted in relaxing and the good giggling.

I would like to express my warmth and gratitude for those friends who are not members of the UNE community including Jasmin Keidge and Rebecca Page. I thank Leila Brook, who has offered much support despite the distance between us. In light of our PhD projects taking place at the same time, I think our telephone conversations would make excellent podcasts. I greatly thank my family, Sandra Stewart, Peter Laws, Bill Stewart, Dianne Williams, Elsie Dingwall and Fiona Stewart, who have always been there with words of kindness. This thesis is dedicated to my mother, Sandra Stewart, and my grandmother, Elsie Dingwall, who have been a pillar of support, love and inspiration during this experience. Their encouragement for learning will always be remembered.

## **Abstract**

Biogeochemical processes represent the mass-balance and cycling of key elements (carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus) in aquatic systems, providing basal resources to aquatic foodwebs, as well as being an important indicator of ecosystem function. The rate at which autotrophic and heterotrophic processes occur and the carbon:nutrient stoichiometry within reaches can be influenced by abiotic parameters linked to channel geomorphology and hydrology. In agricultural streams, the removal of riparian vegetation has led to a decline in nutrient retention through reduced geomorphic complexity. Stream restoration projects commonly use riparian revegetation techniques at a reach scale to reinstate structural complexity with the aim of restoring biogeochemical processes such as organic matter and nutrient retention. However, there has been little research into the success and outcomes of these projects, particularly at spatial scales relevant to restoration. This thesis examines in-stream biogeochemical processes in vegetated and non-vegetated reaches within intermittent streams in an agricultural setting, located within the Gwydir River catchment, NSW, Australia. I predicted that there would be an increase in geomorphic complexity at vegetated reaches compared to non-vegetated reaches, which would lead to an increase in nutrient and organic matter retention within the vegetated reaches. I also predicted that enhanced nutrient and organic matter retention would be linked to increased rates of ecosystem respiration at vegetated reaches compared to non-vegetated reaches. To explore the interaction of hydrology on biogeochemical processes in intermittent streams, the study took place during four different magnitudes of discharge including a cease-to-flow period.

On-ground surveying techniques were employed to develop high-resolution digital elevation models (DEMs), and spatially explicit habitat maps that identified channel morphology and key geomorphic features. There was no difference in the number of geomorphic features present between vegetated and non-vegetated reaches. However, there were differences in the types of geomorphic features present with flood debris accumulation points only found at vegetated reaches and a larger number of macrophyte beds present within non-vegetated reaches. Non-

vegetated reaches also had a larger wetted areas compared to vegetated reaches, which led to lower surface area:volume ratios and surface water velocities.

Nutrient stoichiometry and retention within vegetated and non-vegetated reaches was explored through mass-balance techniques. There were no significant differences in nutrient stoichiometry and retention between vegetated and non-vegetated reaches during any of the four different sampling periods. There was an increase in nutrient loads imported to each reach during high-flow periods, however, this was not always related to an increase in nutrient retention. Correlation analyses showed that only retention of soluble reactive phosphorus was correlated to hydro-geomorphic variables including surface area:volume ratio and wetted area in the non-vegetated reaches. Nutrient retention was not correlated with any hydro-geomorphic parameters within the vegetated reaches.

Benthic organic matter surveys showed that there were no significant differences in organic matter mass or composition between vegetated and non-vegetated reaches during the four different sampling periods. Exploration of organic matter retention using mass-balance techniques and experimental organic matter releases showed that all reaches could retain organic matter, but the mechanism of retention differed between vegetated and non-vegetated reaches. At vegetated reaches, flood debris accumulation points and bank edges were the main geomorphic features responsible for organic matter retention, while pools and macrophytes were the features responsible for retention in the non-vegetated reaches. Litterbag experiments were used to explore the fate of retained organic matter, again showing no significant difference in organic matter breakdown between treatments, however, there was a significant negative effect of discharge on mass loss within vegetated reaches.

The dominant sources of dissolved organic carbon (DOC) within vegetated and non-vegetated reaches across the different sampling periods were investigated using extracellular enzyme techniques. The analyses showed that during the low and no-flow periods the main sources of DOC available to heterotrophs were high-quality low-molecular weight DOC from allochthonous and autochthonous sources, while during the high-flow periods the DOC pool was dominated by low-quality high-molecular weight substrates from allochthonous sources.

As the quality of DOC can alter rates of ecosystem respiration (ER), the shift to low-quality DOC during the high-flow periods suggested an increase in the rates of ER within reaches. During the low and no-flow periods, the majority of DOC was derived from algal sources in vegetated reaches, while within the non-vegetated reaches, the majority of DOC was derived from both algal and macrophyte sources. These results suggest that different pathways are contributing to ecosystem gross primary productivity (GPP) between vegetated and non-vegetated reaches during the low and no-flow periods.

Whole-reach rates of GPP and ER were not significantly different between vegetated and non-vegetated reaches. However, macrophyte biomass, but not chlorophyll *a* concentration, was significantly greater within non-vegetated reaches. This suggests that although the overall metabolic rates were not significantly different, the dominant pathways contributing to metabolism were different between vegetated and non-vegetated reaches. Both vegetated and non-vegetated reaches were predominantly net autotrophic during the no-flow period but shifted to a heterotrophic state during the high-flow periods. There was a significant decrease in rates of GPP and ER, as well as chlorophyll *a* concentration with increased discharge. These significant relationships and the shift in trophic state highlight the importance of hydrology in controlling ecosystem metabolism in these streams.

The findings of this study show that reach-scale riparian vegetation did alter the types of geomorphic features present, but there was no overall difference in the quantity of organic matter retained within reaches. In addition, the process of organic matter retention was further complicated by the interaction of hydrology. In contrast to the predictions, the quantity and quality of organic matter was not important in controlling nutrient retention or rates of metabolism, which would suggest that riparian vegetation did not have a dominant effect on these biogeochemical processes. However, although there was no overall effect of riparian vegetation on rates of metabolism, there was a significant negative effect on macrophyte biomass. Therefore, the presence of riparian vegetation in intermittent upland streams in agricultural landscapes do not impact rates of dominant biogeochemical processes, but will alter the mechanisms that regulate reach-scale processing of nutrients and organic matter.

## Table of Contents

<b>Certification</b>	i
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	ii
<b>Abstract</b>	iv
<b>Table of Contents</b>	vii
<b>List of Figures</b>	xi
<b>List of Tables</b>	xvi
<b>List of Plates</b>	xxiv

### **Chapter 1: General Introduction**

1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Anthropogenic effects to upland streams	3
1.3 Riparian vegetation	4
1.4 Hydrology	7
1.5 Stream restoration	10
1.6 Thesis aims and structure	12

### **Chapter 2: Hydrogeomorphic features of vegetated and non-vegetated reaches.**

2.1 Introduction	15
<i>Aims</i>	17
2.2 Methods	16
<i>Study area</i>	16
<i>Study design</i>	20
<i>Digital elevation models and habitat mapping</i>	20
<i>Hydrological parameters</i>	22
2.3 Results	23
<i>Moredun Creek</i>	23
<i>Gwydir River</i>	29
<i>Roumalla Creek</i>	35
<i>Booralong Creek</i>	41
<i>Laura Creek</i>	47
2.4 Discussion	53
<i>Reach morphology and features</i>	53
<i>Hydrological parameters</i>	55
<i>Interaction of hydrology with channel morphology and features</i>	56
<i>Control streams</i>	56
<i>Methodology considerations</i>	57
2.5 Summary	58

**Chapter 3: Nutrient dynamics within vegetated and non-vegetated reaches.**

3.1	Introduction	59
	<i>Nutrient concentrations and stoichiometry</i>	59
	<i>Nutrient retention and export</i>	61
	<i>Aims</i>	63
3.2	Methods	64
	<i>Experimental design</i>	64
	<i>Nutrient retention and stoichiometry surveys</i>	64
	<i>Nutrient enrichment experiment</i>	65
	<i>Statistical analyses</i>	68
3.3	Results	74
	<i>Nutrient concentrations</i>	74
	<i>Nutrient stoichiometry</i>	84
	<i>Nutrient enrichment experiment</i>	90
	<i>Nutrient retention and export</i>	95
3.4	Discussion	110
	<i>Nutrient concentrations</i>	110
	<i>Nutrient stoichiometry</i>	114
	<i>Autotrophic nutrient limitation</i>	114
	<i>Nutrient retention</i>	116
	<i>Variation in mass-balance</i>	118
	<i>Variation in retention</i>	
3.5	Summary	121

**Chapter 4: Organic matter dynamics within vegetated and non-vegetated reaches.**

4.1	Introduction	123
	<i>Organic matter retention and storage</i>	123
	<i>Organic matter breakdown</i>	125
	<i>Aims</i>	128
4.2	Methods	129
	<i>Organic matter standing stocks</i>	129
	<i>Particulate organic matter mass-balance and retention</i>	129
	<i>Processing of organic matter fractions</i>	130
	<i>Experimental organic matter releases</i>	130
	<i>Organic matter breakdown experiment</i>	132
	<i>Statistical analyses</i>	135
4.3	Results	140
	<i>Organic matter standing stocks</i>	140
	<i>Particulate organic matter mass-balance and retention</i>	153

<i>Experimental organic matter releases</i>	166
<i>Organic matter breakdown experiment</i>	169
4.4 Discussion	180
<i>Organic matter standing stocks</i>	180
<i>Particulate organic matter mass-balance and retention</i>	186
<i>Processes important in retaining organic matter</i>	188
<i>Organic matter breakdown</i>	190
4.5 Summary	194

**Chapter 5: Sources of dissolved organic matter and extracellular enzyme activity in vegetated and non-vegetated reaches.**

5.1 Introduction	196
<i>Extracellular enzymes</i>	196
<i>Anthropogenic disturbances</i>	197
<i>Hydrology</i>	199
<i>Aims</i>	200
5.2 Methods	201
<i>Analysis of extracellular enzyme activity</i>	201
<i>Statistical analyses</i>	204
5.3 Results	207
<i>Activity of C-hydrolysing enzymes</i>	208
<i>Activity of AP and LAP nutrient acquiring enzymes</i>	214
<i>Relationship between individual EEA and biogeochemical variables</i>	218
5.4 Discussion	228
<i>Patterns in C-hydrolysing enzymes</i>	228
<i>Patterns in AP and LAP nutrient acquiring enzymes</i>	231
<i>EEA as a method of determining DOC sources</i>	233
<i>Correlation of hydro-geomorphic and biochemical variables to variation in enzyme activity</i>	235
5.5 Summary	236

**Chapter 6: Ecosystem metabolism dynamics within vegetated and non-vegetated reaches.**

6.1 Introduction	238
<i>Anthropogenic disturbances</i>	239
<i>Hydrology</i>	241
<i>Aims</i>	242
6.2 Methods	243
<i>Ecosystem metabolism</i>	243
<i>Determination of reaeration coefficient</i>	243
<i>Analysis of dissolved oxygen change</i>	244

<i>Light measurements</i>	245
<i>Chlorophyll a surveys and analysis</i>	245
<i>Macrophyte biomass surveys and processing</i>	245
<i>Statistical analyses</i>	247
6.3 Results	251
<i>Metabolic parameters</i>	251
<i>Light</i>	261
<i>Chlorophyll a surveys</i>	263
<i>Macrophyte biomass</i>	267
<i>Correlation of hydro-geomorphic and biochemical variables with metabolic parameters</i>	270
6.4 Discussion	281
<i>Rates of ecosystem metabolism</i>	281
<i>Riparian vegetation</i>	282
<i>Net ecosystem production</i>	284
<i>Hydrology</i>	287
<i>Methodology considerations</i>	288
<i>Effects of vegetation and hydrology on functional groups</i>	290
<i>Correlation of hydro-geomorphic and biochemical variables with metabolic parameters</i>	293
6.5 Summary	295
<b>Chapter 7: Synthesis</b>	
7.1 Introduction	296
7.2 Riparian vegetation	297
7.3 Hydrology	302
7.4 Advantages and limitation of study design	306
7.5 Implications for restoration	310
7.6 Conclusion	311
References	313
<b>Appendix 1: Abstracts of co-authored papers</b>	349
<b>Appendix 2: Summary of physico-chemical parameters</b>	353
<b>Appendix 3: Tables of formula for unbalanced PERMANOVA location tests</b>	355
<b>Appendix 4: Tables of location tests</b>	361
<b>Appendix 5: Tables of formula for unbalanced PERMANOVA main factor tests</b>	370
<b>Appendix 6: Macrophyte biomass coefficient of correlations</b>	379

## List of figures

Figure 2.1	(A) The Gwydir River Catchment and field location area and (B) distribution of vegetated (green) and non-vegetated (red) reaches within the field area.	19
Figure 2.2	Mean monthly rainfall (mm) recorded at the Bundarra Post Office, from November 2008 to December 2010.	20
Figure 2.3	Mean monthly discharge ( $m^3$ ) of the Gwydir River at Bundarra, from November 2008 to January 2011.	20
Figure 2.4	DEM of Moredun non-vegetated reach, riparian zone and channel features including bedrock (grey), logs (brown) and macrophyte beds (green).	26
Figure 2.5	DEM of Moredun vegetated reach, riparian zone and channel features including bedrock (grey), logs (brown), flood debris accumulation points (orange) and macrophyte bed (green).	28
Figure 2.6	DEM of Gwydir non-vegetated reach, riparian zone and channel features including bedrock (grey), logs (brown) and macrophyte bed (green). Contours are set to 1 m interval.	32
Figure 2.7	DEM of Gwydir vegetated reach, riparian zone and channel features including bedrock (grey), logs (brown) and flood debris accumulation points (orange).	34
Figure 2.8	DEM of Roumalla non-vegetated reach, riparian zone and channel features including bedrock (grey), logs (brown) and macrophyte beds (green).	38
Figure 2.9	DEM of Roumalla vegetated reach, riparian zone and channel features including bedrock (grey), logs (brown) and flood debris accumulation points (orange).	40
Figure 2.10	DEM of the upstream vegetated control, Booralong CS, reach, riparian zone and channel features including bedrock (grey), logs (brown) and flood debris accumulation points (orange).	44
Figure 2.11	DEM of the downstream vegetated control, Booralong Bridge, reach, riparian zone and channel features including bedrock (grey), logs (brown) and flood debris accumulation point (orange).	46
Figure 2.12	DEM of the upstream non-vegetated control, Laura HD, reach, riparian zone and channel features including bedrock (grey) and logs (brown).	50
Figure 2.13	DEM of the downstream non-vegetated control, Laura Bridge, reach, riparian zone and channel features including bedrock (grey), logs (brown) and macrophyte bed (green).	52

Figure 3.1	Mean surface water NO <sub>x</sub> concentration (mg L <sup>-1</sup> ) for each stream during (A) February, (B) May, (C) September, and (D) November sampling periods.	75
Figure 3.2	Mean surface water SRP concentration (mg L <sup>-1</sup> ) for each stream during (A) February, (B) May, (C) September, and (D) November sampling periods.	77
Figure 3.3	Mean surface water TN concentration (mg L <sup>-1</sup> ) for each stream during (A) February, (B) May, (C) September, and (D) November sampling periods.	79
Figure 3.4	Mean surface water TP concentration (mg L <sup>-1</sup> ) for each stream during (A) February, (B) May, (C) September, and (D) November sampling periods.	81
Figure 3.5	Mean surface water DOC concentration (mg L <sup>-1</sup> ) for each stream during (A) February, (B) May, (C) September, and (D) November sampling periods.	83
Figure 3.6	MDS of molar C:N:P ratio calculated from the dissolved nutrient fraction.	86
Figure 3.7	MDS of molar C:N:P ratio calculated from the particulate nutrient fraction.	89
Figure 3.8	Mean chlorophyll <i>a</i> mass (g m <sup>-2</sup> ) recovered from each of the eight nutrient treated agar pots at the vegetated (white background, A and C) and non-vegetated (grey background, B and D) reaches, during the February and May deployments.	91
Figure 3.9	Mean chlorophyll <i>a</i> mass (g m <sup>-2</sup> ) recovered from each of the eight nutrient treated agar pots at the vegetated (white background, A and C) and non-vegetated (grey background, B and D) reaches, during the September and November deployments.	92
Figure 3.10	MDS of chlorophyll <i>a</i> mass (g m <sup>-2</sup> ) using all eight nutrient enrichment treatments.	94
Figure 3.11	Total loads (g day <sup>-1</sup> ) of NO <sub>x</sub> (A) and SRP (B) retained (negative values) or exported (positive values) by each reach (vegetated – white background, non-vegetated – grey background) during February, September and November sampling times.	97
Figure 3.12	Total loads (g day <sup>-1</sup> ) of TN (A) and TP (B) retained (negative values) or exported (positive values) by each reach (vegetated – white background, non-vegetated – grey background) during February, September and November sampling times.	103
Figure 3.13	Total loads (g day <sup>-1</sup> ) of DOC retained (negative values) or exported (positive values) by each reach (vegetated – white background, non-vegetated – grey background) during February, September and November sampling times.	108
Figure 4.1	Mean FBOM mass (g m <sup>-2</sup> ) for each stream during (A) February, (B) May, (C) September, and (D) November sampling periods.	142
Figure 4.2	Total FBOM mass (g) for each reach during (A) February, (B) May, (C) September, and (D) November sampling periods.	143

Figure 4.3	Mean CBOM mass ( $\text{g m}^{-2}$ ) at the vegetated (white background, A and C) and non-vegetated (grey background, B and D) reaches during February (A-B) and May (C-D).	145
Figure 4.4	Mean CBOM mass ( $\text{g m}^{-2}$ ) at the vegetated (white background, A and C) and non-vegetated (grey background, B and D) reaches during September (A-B) and November (C-D).	146
Figure 4.5	Total CBOM mass (g) present at the vegetated (white background, A and C) and non-vegetated (grey background, B and D) reaches during February (A-B) and May (C-D).	149
Figure 4.6	Total CBOM mass (g) present at the vegetated (white background, A and C) and non-vegetated (grey background, B and D) reaches during September (A-B) and November (C-D).	150
Figure 4.7	Total loads ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) of FPOM retained (negative values) or exported (positive values) by each reach (Vegetated – white background, Non-vegetated – grey background) during February, September and November.	155
Figure 4.8	MDS of imported CPOM composition including: needles, wood, Casuarina reproductive structures, leaf/bark, macrophytes, and unidentified fractions ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ).	157
Figure 4.9	Total COM load ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) retained or exported at the vegetated (white background, A, C, and E) and non-vegetated (grey background, B, D, and F) reaches during February (A-B), September (C-D) and November (E-F).	161
Figure 4.10	The total proportion (%) of twigs (A) and needles (B) retained by each reach for the first (dark grey) and second (light grey) releases.	166
Figure 4.11	The MDS of proportions of twigs (A) and needles (B) retained by different habitats within each reach. Individual points represent a single release at vegetated (triangles) and non-vegetated (squares) reaches.	168
Figure 4.12	Mean proportion mass loss (%) from the <i>C. cunninghamiana</i> litterbags during (A) February, (B) May, (C) September and (D) November.	171
Figure 4.13	Mean and standard error (n=3) of remaining litterbag AFDM versus days for vegetated (A, C, E, G) and non-vegetated (B, D, F, H) reaches for each deployment period: February (A-B), May (C-D), September (E-F) and November (G-H).	173
Figure 4.14	The mean total inorganic mass (g) present on litterbags at the final collection times (time 3) at vegetated (A) and non-vegetated reaches (B). Patterning on bars corresponds to the deployment periods: February (hatching), May (diagonal stripes), September (light grey) and November (dark grey). Error bars represent the standard error of the mean (n=3).	178

Figure 5.1	MDS of mean (n=3) EEA of all five enzymes ( $\mu\text{M } 4\text{-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ).	208
Figure 5.2	Mean surface water extracellular enzyme activity of the nutrient acquiring enzymes ( $\mu\text{M } 4\text{-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ), $\beta$ -glu (A-B), $\alpha$ -glu (C-D), and xylo (E-F) sampled from vegetated (white background) and non-vegetated (grey background) reaches.	210
Figure 5.3	Mean surface water extracellular enzyme activity of the nutrient acquiring enzymes ( $\mu\text{M } 4\text{-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ), AP (A-B) and LEU (C-D), sampled from vegetated (white background) and non-vegetated (grey background) reaches.	215
Figure 6.1	Reach GPP ( $\text{mg L}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$ ) for each stream during (A) February, (B) May, (C) September, and (D) November sampling periods.	252
Figure 6.2	Reach ER ( $\text{mg L}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$ ) for each stream during (A) February, (B) May, (C) September, and (D) November sampling periods.	254
Figure 6.3	Reach net change in DO concentration ( $\text{mg DO L}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$ ) for each stream during (A) February, (B) May, (C) September, and (D) November sampling periods.	256
Figure 6.4	Reach net change in C ( $\text{mg C L}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$ ) for each stream during (A) February, (B) May, (C) September, and (D) November sampling periods.	257
Figure 6.5	Reach P/R ratio for each stream during (A) February, (B) May, (C) September, and (D) November sampling periods.	260
Figure 6.6	Mean surface water chlorophyll $\alpha$ concentration ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ ) for each stream during (A) February, (B) May, (C) September, and (D) November sampling periods.	264
Figure 6.7	Total macrophyte biomass (kg) for each stream during (A) September and (B) November sampling periods.	268

## List of Tables

Table 2.1	Details of location, substrate type, channel slope and number of features present at the Moredun Creek reaches.	24
Table 2.2	Hydro-geomorphic features of Moredun non-vegetated reach during the four different sampling periods.	25
Table 2.3	Hydro-geomorphic features Moredun vegetated reach during the four different sampling periods.	27
Table 2.4	Details of location, substrate type, channel slope and number of features present at the Gwydir River reaches.	30
Table 2.5	Hydro-geomorphic features of Gwydir non- vegetated reach during the four different sampling periods.	31
Table 2.6	Hydro-geomorphic features of Gwydir vegetated reach during the four different sampling periods.	33
Table 2.7	Details of location, substrate type, channel slope and number of features present at the Roumalla Creek reaches.	36
Table 2.8	Hydro-geomorphic features of Roumalla non- vegetated reach during the four different sampling periods.	37
Table 2.9	Hydro-geomorphic features of Roumalla vegetated reach during the four different sampling periods.	39
Table 2.10	Details of location, substrate type, channel slope and number of features present at the Booralong Creek reaches.	42
Table 2.11	Hydro-geomorphic features of vegetated upstream control reach, Booralong CS, during the four different sampling periods.	43
Table 2.12	Hydro-geomorphic features of vegetated downstream control reach, Booralong Bridge, during the four different sampling periods.	45
Table 2.13	Details of location, substrate type, channel slope and number of features present at the Laura Creek reaches.	48
Table 2.14	Hydro-geomorphic features of non-vegetated upstream control reach, Laura HD, during the four different sampling periods.	49
Table 2.15	Hydro-geomorphic features of non-vegetated downstream control reach, Laura Bridge, during the four different sampling periods.	51
Table 3.1	List of the seven different nutrient treatments (C = carbon, N = nitrogen, P = phosphorus) and the combination of salts used to amend the 1% agar.	66

Table 3.2	Table of formulae for a balanced statistical design. Treatment is a fixed factor and has two levels (a=2), stream is a random factor and has five levels (b=5), and time is a random factor with four levels (c=4).	73
Table 3.3	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in NOx concentration ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	74
Table 3.4	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in SRP concentration ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	76
Table 3.5	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in TN concentration ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	78
Table 3.6	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in TP concentration ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	80
Table 3.7	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in DOC concentration ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	82
Table 3.8	Molar C:N:P ratios of dissolved nutrient fractions. N and P values were calculated from mean NOx and SRP concentrations respectively. C values were calculated from mean DOC concentrations.	85
Table 3.9	Results of PERMANOVA test for significant differences in dissolved molar C:N:P ratios between treatment (Tr), streams (St), and time (Ti).	86
Table 3.10	Molar C:N:P ratios of particulate nutrient fractions. N and P values were calculated from mean TN and TP concentrations respectively. C values were calculated from mean DOC concentrations.	88
Table 3.11	Results of PERMANOVA test for significant differences in particulate molar C:N:P ratios between treatment (Tr), streams (St), and time (Ti).	89
Table 3.12	Results of PERMANOVA test for significant differences in chlorophyll <i>a</i> mass ( $\text{g m}^{-2}$ ) using all eight nutrient enrichment treatments (n=3 for each reach at each deployment time).	93
Table 3.13	The imported and exported loads of NOx ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) at each reach during the February, September and November sampling periods. Values in parentheses are the standard error of the sample mean (n=3).	95
Table 3.14	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in NOx retention/export ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	96

Table 3.15	The imported and exported loads of SRP ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) at each reach during the February, September and November sampling periods. Values in parentheses are the standard error of the sample mean (n=3).	99
Table 3.16	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in SRP retention/export ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	100
Table 3.17	The imported and exported loads of TN ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) at each reach during the February, September and November sampling periods. Values in parentheses are the standard error of the sample mean (n=3).	101
Table 3.18	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in TN retention/export ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (Ri), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	102
Table 3.19	The imported and exported loads of TP ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) at each reach during the February, September and November sampling periods. Values in parentheses are the standard error of the sample mean (n=3).	104
Table 3.20	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in TP retention/export ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	105
Table 3.21	The imported and exported loads of DOC ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) at each reach during the February, September and November sampling periods. Values in parentheses are the standard error of the sample mean (n=3).	106
Table 3.22	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in DOC retention/export ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	107
Table 3.23	Results of the BEST analyses between nutrient retention data from the vegetated reaches and their corresponding hydro-geomorphic variables.	109
Table 3.24	Results of the BEST analyses between nutrient retention data from the non-vegetated reaches and their corresponding hydro-geomorphic variables.	109
Table 3.25	Range of nutrient concentrations in this study and the suggested ANZECC trigger value nutrient concentrations.	111
Table 4.1	Discharges ( $\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$ ) for each of the ten study reaches during the experimental CPOM releases.	131
Table 4.2	The collection schedule for each of the four deployment periods.	134

Table 4.3	Table of formulae for a balanced statistical design. Treatment is a fixed factor and has two levels (a=2), stream is a random factor and has five levels (b=5), and time is a random factor with four levels (c=4). Tables of correct formulae for the unbalanced design are listed in Appendix 5 and will be referred to in the results section.	139
Table 4.4	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in total FBOM mass ( $\text{g m}^{-2}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	141
Table 4.5	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in total CBOM mass ( $\text{g m}^{-2}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	144
Table 4.6	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in CBOM composition ( $\text{g m}^{-2}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions. The multivariate dataset included masses of: needles, wood, Casuarina reproductive structures, leaf/bark, macrophytes, and unidentified fractions.	147
Table 4.7	Results of the BEST analyses between total (whole-reach, g) organic matter data from the vegetated reaches and their corresponding hydro-geomorphic variables.	151
Table 4.8	Results of the BEST analyses between total (whole-reach, g) organic matter data from the non-vegetated reaches and their corresponding hydro-geomorphic variables.	152
Table 4.9	The mean imported and exported loads of FPOM ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) during the low-flow (February) and high-flow (September and November) periods.	153
Table 4.10	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in total FPOM retention ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St) and time (Ti), and their interaction.	155
Table 4.11	The mean imported and exported loads of CPOM ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) during the low-flow (February) and high-flow (September and November) periods.	156
Table 4.12	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in the composition of CPOM imported ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St) and time (Ti), and their interactions. The multivariate dataset included loads of: needles, wood, Casuarina reproductive structures, leaf/bark, macrophytes, and unidentified fractions.	158
Table 4.13	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in <i>Casuarina</i> CPOM imported ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St) and time (Ti), and their interactions.	158
Table 4.14	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in total CPOM retention ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), and time (Ti), and their interaction.	163

Table 4.15	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in the composition of CPOM retained ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St) and time (Ti), and their interactions. The multivariate dataset included loads of: needles, wood, Casuarina reproductive structures, leaf/bark, macrophytes, and unidentified fractions.	163
Table 4.16	Results of the BEST analyses between organic matter retention data ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) from the non-vegetated reaches and their corresponding hydrogeomorphic variables.	164
Table 4.17	Results of the BEST analyses between organic matter retention data ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) from the vegetated reaches and their corresponding hydrogeomorphic variables.	164
Table 4.18	Results of PERMANOVA tests for significant differences in analogue retention (% retained) between treatments (Tr), and releases (Rel).	165
Table 4.19	Results of PERMANOVA tests for significant differences in method of retention (% retained by each habitat) between treatments (Tr).	167
Table 4.20	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in litterbag mass loss (% mass lost, determined from area under the curve) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), and time (Ti), and their interactions.	170
Table 4.21	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in mean litterbag mass loss (% mass lost, determined from area under the curve, n=3) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), and time (Ti), and their interactions.	170
Table 4.22	Summary of breakdown rates and coefficient of determination for each reach during each deployment time.	174
Table 4.23	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in average daily water temperature ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ , n=24) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions. The multivariate dataset included mean daily temperature for the three collection times.	175
Table 4.24	Average daily water temperatures and average daily minimum and maximum temperatures ( $^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) for each vegetated and non-vegetated reaches during each deployment time (February n = 53 , May n = 41, September n = 41, November n = 31).	176
Table 4.25	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in mean total inorganic mass accumulated on litterbags (g, n=3) between treatment (Tr), streams (St) and time (Ti), and their interactions.	177
Table 4.26	Results of marginal tests from DISTLM for total litterbag mass loss (% mass lost, determined from area under the curve, n=3) from vegetated and non-vegetated reaches with their respective biophysical variables.	179

Table 4.27	Results of conditional test from DISTLM for total litterbag mass loss (%) mass lost, determined from area under the curve, n=3) from the vegetated reaches with biophysical variables.	179
Table 4.28	Results of conditional test from DISTLM for total litterbag mass loss (%) mass lost, determined from area under the curve, n=3) from the non-vegetated reaches with biophysical variables.	179
Table 4.29	Standing stocks of CBOM (g m <sup>-2</sup> ) reported in other studies.	181
Table 5.1	List of substrates used to examine the activity of different extracellular enzymes.	202
Table 5.2	Table of formulae for a balanced statistical design. Treatment is a fixed factor and has two levels (a=2), stream is a random factor and has five levels (b=5), and time is a random factor with four levels (c=4). Tables of correct formulae for the unbalanced design are listed in Appendix 5 and will be referred to in the results section.	205
Table 5.3	List of predictor variables and their respective transformations used in the regression analyses.	206
Table 5.4	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in mean EEA activity using all five substrates ( $\mu\text{M } 4\text{-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions (n=3).	207
Table 5.5	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in mean $\beta$ -glu activity ( $\mu\text{M } 4\text{-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions (n=3).	209
Table 5.6	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in mean $\alpha$ -glu activity ( $\mu\text{M } 4\text{-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions (n=3).	211
Table 5.7	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in mean $\beta$ -xylo activity ( $\mu\text{M } 4\text{-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions (n=3).	212
Table 5.8	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in mean AP activity ( $\mu\text{M } 4\text{-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions (n=3).	214
Table 5.9	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in mean LAP activity ( $\mu\text{M } 4\text{-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions (n=3).	216
Table 5.10	Slope (m) and squared multiple r ( $r^2$ ) values of significant regression analyses between mean individual EEA activities ( $\mu\text{M } 4\text{-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ).	217

Table 5.11	Slope (m) and squared multiple r ( <i>r</i> ) values of significant regression analyses between mean individual EEA activity ( $\mu\text{M 4-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) and hydro-geomorphic variables.	220
Table 5.12	Slope (m) and squared multiple r ( <i>r</i> ) values of significant regression analyses between mean individual EEA activity ( $\mu\text{M 4-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) and mean nutrient concentrations ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ ).	220
Table 5.13	Slope (m) and squared multiple r ( <i>r</i> ) values of significant regression analyses between mean individual EEA activity ( $\mu\text{M 4-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) and retained nutrient loads ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ).	221
Table 5.14	Slope (m) and squared multiple r ( <i>r</i> ) values of significant regression analyses between mean individual EEA activity ( $\mu\text{M 4-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) and nutrient ratios.	221
Table 5.15	Slope (m) and squared multiple r ( <i>r</i> ) values of significant regression analyses between mean individual EEA activity ( $\mu\text{M 4-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) and organic matter variables ( $\text{g m}^{-2}$ ).	222
Table 5.16	Slope (m) and squared multiple r ( <i>r</i> ) values of significant regression analyses between mean individual EEA activity ( $\mu\text{M 4-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) and organic matter variables (whole-reach total, g).	223
Table 5.17	Slope (m) and squared multiple r ( <i>r</i> ) values of significant regression analyses between mean individual EEA activity ( $\mu\text{M 4-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) and retained organic matter fractions ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ).	224
Table 5.18	Results of conditional test from DISTLM for mean $\beta$ -glu activity ( $\mu\text{M 4-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) from the vegetated reaches with significant biophysical variables.	225
Table 5.19	Results of conditional test from DISTLM for mean $\alpha$ -glu activity ( $\mu\text{M 4-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) from the vegetated reaches with significant biophysical variables.	225
Table 5.20	Results of conditional test from DISTLM for mean xylo activity ( $\mu\text{M 4-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) from the vegetated reaches with significant biophysical variables.	225
Table 5.21	Results of conditional test from DISTLM for mean LAP activity ( $\mu\text{M 4-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) from the non-vegetated reaches with significant biophysical variables.	226
Table 5.22	Results of conditional test from DISTLM for mean $\beta$ -glu activity ( $\mu\text{M 4-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) from the non-vegetated reaches with significant biophysical variables.	226
Table 5.23	Results of conditional test from DISTLM for mean $\alpha$ -glu activity ( $\mu\text{M 4-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) from the non-vegetated reaches with significant biophysical variables.	226

Table 5.24	Results of conditional test from DISTLM for mean xylo activity ( $\mu\text{M } 4\text{-MUB L}^{-1} \text{ h}^{-1}$ ) from the non-vegetated reaches with significant biophysical variables.	227
Table 6.1	Table of formulae for a balanced statistical design. Treatment is a fixed factor and has two levels ( $a=2$ ), stream is a random factor and has five levels ( $b=5$ ), and time is a random factor with four levels ( $c=4$ ). Tables of correct formulae for the unbalanced design are listed in Appendix 5 and will be referred to in the results section.	249
Table 6.2	List of predictor variables and their respective transformations used in the regression analyses.	250
Table 6.3	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in reach GPP ( $\text{mg L}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	252
Table 6.4	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in reach ER ( $\text{mg L}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	253
Table 6.5	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in reach net change ( $\text{mg L}^{-1} \text{ day}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	255
Table 6.6	Whole-reach estimates of net C-fixation and consumption ( $\text{mg day}^{-1}$ ).	258
Table 6.7	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in reach P/R ratio between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	259
Table 6.8	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in average daily light values ( $\text{lumens m}^{-2}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	262
Table 6.9	Average daily light values ( $\text{lumens m}^{-2}$ ) for each vegetated and non-vegetated reaches during each deployment time ( $n = 96$ ).	262
Table 6.10	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in chlorophyll $a$ concentration ( $\text{mg L}^{-1}$ ) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	264
Table 6.11	The mass-balance and retained loads of chlorophyll $a$ ( $\text{g day}^{-1}$ ) at each reach during the February, September and November sampling periods.	266
Table 6.12	Results of PERMANOVA main test for significant differences in total macrophyte biomass (kg) between treatment (Tr), streams (St), time (Ti), and their significant interactions.	267

Table 6.13	Results of the BEST analyses between chlorophyll <i>a</i> and macrophyte data from the vegetated reaches and their corresponding hydro-geomorphic variables.	269
Table 6.14	Results of the BEST analyses between chlorophyll <i>a</i> and macrophyte data from the non-vegetated reaches and their corresponding hydro-geomorphic variables.	269
Table 6.15	Slope (m) and squared multiple r ( <i>r</i> ) values of significant regression analyses between reach metabolic parameters and hydro-geomorphic variables.	272
Table 6.16	Slope (m) and squared multiple r ( <i>r</i> ) values of significant regression analyses between reach metabolic parameters and mean nutrient concentrations (mg L <sup>-1</sup> ).	272
Table 6.17	Slope (m) and squared multiple r ( <i>r</i> ) values of significant regression analyses between reach metabolic parameters and nutrient ratios.	273
Table 6.18	Slope (m) and squared multiple r ( <i>r</i> ) values of significant regression analyses between reach metabolic parameters and EEA.	273
Table 6.19	Slope (m) and squared multiple r ( <i>r</i> ) values of significant regression analyses between organic matter variables, chlorophyll <i>a</i> concentration, macrophyte biomass, mean daily surface water temperature and TSS concentration with reach metabolism variables.	274
Table 6.20	Slope (m) and squared multiple r ( <i>r</i> ) values of significant regression analyses between retained organic matter fractions and chlorophyll <i>a</i> (g day <sup>-1</sup> ) with reach metabolism variables.	275
Table 6.21	Slope (m) and squared multiple r ( <i>r</i> ) values of significant regression analyses between organic matter variables (whole-reach total, g) with reach metabolism variables.	276
Table 6.22	Results of conditional test from DISTLM for GPP (mg L <sup>-1</sup> day <sup>-1</sup> ) from the vegetated reaches with significant biophysical variables.	277
Table 6.23	Results of conditional test from DISTLM for ER (mg L <sup>-1</sup> day <sup>-1</sup> ) from the vegetated reaches with significant biophysical variables.	278
Table 6.24	Results of conditional test from DISTLM for P/R ratio from the vegetated reaches with significant biophysical variables.	278
Table 6.25	Results of conditional test from DISTLM for net change in DO (mg L <sup>-1</sup> day <sup>-1</sup> ) from the non-vegetated reaches with significant biophysical variables.	279
Table 6.26	Results of conditional test from DISTLM for GPP (mg L <sup>-1</sup> day <sup>-1</sup> ) from the non-vegetated reaches with significant biophysical variables.	280
Table 6.27	Results of conditional test from DISTLM for ER (mg L <sup>-1</sup> day <sup>-1</sup> ) from the non-vegetated reaches with significant biophysical variables.	280

## List of Plates

Plate 2.1	Photograph of Moredun non-vegetated reach looking downstream.	25
Plate 2.2	Photograph of Moredun vegetated reach looking downstream.	27
Plate 2.3	Photograph of Gwydir non-vegetated reach during May 2010, the low-flow sampling period, looking downstream.	31
Plate 2.4	Photograph of Gwydir vegetated reach, looking downstream.	33
Plate 2.5	Photograph of Roumalla non-vegetated reach, looking downstream.	37
Plate 2.6	Photograph of Roumalla vegetated reach, looking downstream.	39
Plate 2.7	Photograph of vegetated upstream control reach, Booralong CS, looking downstream.	43
Plate 2.8	Photograph of vegetated downstream control reach, Booralong Bridge, looking downstream.	45
Plate 2.9	Photograph of non-vegetated upstream control reach, Laura HD, looking downstream.	49
Plate 2.10	Photograph of non-vegetated downstream control reach, Laura Bridge, looking downstream.	51
Plate 4.1	Photograph of <i>C. cunninghamiana</i> needles attached to branch.	131
Plate 4.2	Photograph of the downstream nets used to collect the CPOM analogues. Nets were stretched across the whole stream channel and held in place with steel posts.	132