MACROINVERTEBRATE COMPOSITION OF THE UPPER GEORGES RIVER, WITH REFERENCE TO URBAN, INDUSTRIAL AND AGRICULTURAL IMPACTS.

By

DEAN JARVIS

Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Science at the University of Technology, Sydney.

DECLARATION

This thesis is submitted in accordance with regulations of the University of Technology, Sydney in fulfilment of the requirements of Masters of Science (Course work Ecotoxicology). The work described in this thesis was carried out by me and has not been submitted to any other university or institution.

Dean Jarvis

April 1998

ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates the water quality of the Upper Georges River with respect to macroinvertebrate community structure and physical and water chemistry variables.

Four replicate macroinvertebrate samples were collected from two habitats, pool and edge at each of nine sites, for six surveys. The macroinvertebrates were sampled using standard kick net sampling. Samples were preserved, picked and identified to species level where possible. Physical measurements and water samples were taken at each site for every survey. The physical variables measured include turbidity, temperature, dissolved oxygen, pH and conductivity. The water samples were analysed in the laboratory for ammonia, nitrate, nitrite, orthophosphate and sulphide.

Data analysis included graphing, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Two Way Indicator Species Analysis (TWINSPAN) and Semi-strong Hybrid MultiDimensional Scaling (MDS), Principal Axis Correlation (PCC) and Monte-Carlo sampling (MCAO) in PATN. The data were fourth root transformed and a Bray-Curtis Dissimilarity Matrix was used in MDS.

The reference sites had the lowest abundance for five of six surveys for the pool habitat and all surveys for the edge habitat. The highest abundance was at the impacted site 5 for most surveys, for both habitats. The lowest diversity was recorded at one of the reference sites for four of six surveys for both habitats. The highest diversity was recorded at site 5 for both habitats, for the most surveys. TWINSPAN and MDS separated the sites into similar groups. MDS separated the reference sites and the downstream sites along a physical or water chemistry gradient, for all six surveys, for the pool habitat, and for five surveys for the edge habitat. pH correlated with the ordination of sites on the most number of occasions, with five surveys for the pool habitat and four surveys for the edge habitat. Conductivity and turbidity correlated the next highest. Ammonia and nitrate did not correlate with the macroinvertebrate ordination. Excessive algal growth at sites 5 and 6 appeared to indicate that nutrients were entering the Georges River above these sites. Low pH values found at the reference sites 1 and 2 were natural and were not influencing the abundance and species richness at sites 1 and 2; except for the pool habitat and only for abundance. An orange scum was present at sites 1 and 2 and this could have affected the function of macroinvertebrates and macrophytes in this habitat. The Baetidae mayfly was found to be intolerant to low pH values, as was the Ephemeroptera <u>Caenidae</u> which had a vector gradient similar to the pH vector gradients for three of the four times pH was correlated. The Leptophlebiidae mayflies (Ulmerophlebia, Thraulus and Genus s) were tolerant to the low pH values and only the <u>Ulmerophlebia</u> had a gradient which was similar to pH on two occasions. The <u>Hydrophilidae</u> coleopteran also had correlation gradients similar to both pH and conductivity.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express my sincere thanks to all those who have had a part in helping me complete this thesis.

I thank my supervisor Richard Lim for his helpful advise and experience which lead to me doing and completing this work.

Sincere thanks to Peter Jones for useful comments, assistance in the earlier stages and his friendship.

Thanks also to other staff and postgraduates at UTS and the EPA for their friendship. Specifically Anne, Hertien, Narelle, Ricardo, Denise and Peta.

Thanks to the team out at LWC including Monica and particularly Julie for help with ID work.

Thanks to Mick Gregory and Wollongong University for Statistical analysis.

Thanks to Ben and his wife at Morning Glory Conference Centre for allowing me access through the centres land.

A big thanks to Phill Glass for his friendship, helpful advise and encouragement. Byron Bay here we come.

A big thanks to my brother Mark for his friendship, and support on those days when the computer just would not do what it was suppose to do. You kept the wheels rolling.

A big thanks to my mum and dad for their love, support, friendship and for being there for me.

Thanks to my many friends especially Megs, Morto, Sal, Matt, Silvia, Justin and my house mates Matt, Troy and Ryan.

Thanks also to the staff at Holy Spirit College for their friendship.

I also dedicate this thesis to the Earth:

"All things are connected, whatever befalls the Earth, befalls the children of the Earth".

I liked it so much mate that I had to put it in as well.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRAC	т		i
ACKNOW	LEDG	EMENTS	ii
	F CON	ITENTS	iii
LIST OF T	ABLE	ES	viii
LIST OF F	IGUR	ES	ix
Chapter	1	INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES	1
	1.1	SOURCES OF IMPACT	1
	1.2	Community Monitoring	4
	1.3	Experimental Design	6
	1.4	Interpretation Impediments	7
	1.5	Statistical Analysis	7
	1.6	Study Requirement	8
	1.7	Upper Georges River	9
	1.8	Objective	13
Chapter	2	MATERIALS AND METHOD	12
	2.1	Description of the Study Area	12
	2.2	Site Descriptions	15
	2.3	Physical and Chemical measurements	17

	2.5	Mac	roinvertebrate sampling	17
	2.6	Sup	plementary Information	18
	2.7	Data	Analysis	18
Chapter	3	RES	SULTS AND DISCUSSION	21
	3.1	PHYSICAL AND WATER CHEMISTRY CHARACTERISTICS		
		3.1.1	Turbidity	21
		3.1.2	Water Temperature	22
		3.1.3	Dissolved Oxygen	24
		3.1.4	рН	26
		3.1.5	Conductivity	27
		3.1.6	Ammonia	29
		3.1.7	Nitrate	30
		3.1.8	Nitrite	32
		3.1.9	Orthophosphate	32
		3.1.10	Sulphide	33
	3.2		AQUATIC MACROINVERTEBRATE ABUNDANCE AND TAXONOMIC RICHNESS	34
		3.2.1	Pool Habitat - Abundance	35
		3.2.2	Edge Habitat - Abundance	35
		3.2.3	Pool Habitat - Diversity	35
		3.2.4	Edge Habitat - Diversity	36

.

3.3	3.3 COMPARISON OF MACROINVERTEBRA ABUNDANCE AND TAXONOMIC RICHNE IN RELATION TO PHYSICAL AND WATE			
		EMISTRY CHARACTERISTICS	41	
3.4	MAG	MPARISON OF CROINVERTEBRATE ABUNDANCE D DIVERSITY BETWEEN THE POOL D EDGE HABITATS	42	
3.5	TO CO	MPARISON OF SITES IN RELATION MACROINVERTEBRATE MMUNITY STRUCTURE AND TAXA RIABLES	43	
	3.5.1	SURVEY 1 - POOL	43	
	3.5.2	SURVEY 1 - EDGE	44	
	3.5.3	SURVEY 2 - POOL	44	
	3.5.4	SURVEY 2 - EDGE	45	
	3.5.5	SURVEY 3 - POOL	45	
	3.5.6	SURVEY 3 - EDGE	46	
	3.5.7	SURVEY 4 - POOL	46	
	3.5.8	SURVEY 4 - EDGE	46	
	3.5.9	SURVEY 5 - POOL	47	
	3.5.10	SURVEY 5 - EDGE	47	
	3.5.11	SURVEY 6 - POOL	48	
	3.5.12	SURVEY 6 - EDGE	48	
3.6	CO	NCLUSIONS - POOL	74	
3.6	CO	NCLUSIONS - EDGE	74	

v

	3.6		RAINFALL MEASUREMENTS		74
	3.7		SEASONAL TRENDS IN PHYSICAL AND WATER CHEMISTRY VARIABLES		74
	3.8		SEASONAL COMPARISON OF SITES FOR MACROINVERTEBRATE COMMUNITY STRUCTURE		81
	3.9		SEASONAL COMPARISON OF MACROINVERTEBRATE ABUNDANCE AND DIVERSITY WITH REFERENCE TO SITES		81
	3.10		SAMPLING VARIABILITY		81
Chapter	4		GENERAL DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS		87
	4.1		INTRODUCTION		87
	4.2		LARGE SCALE SPATIAL VARIATION		87
		4.2.1	рН		87
		4.2.2	Conductivity and Turbidity		89
		4.2.3	Nutrients		89
		4.2.4	Coal Particles		90
		4.2.5	Temporal Variation		93
		4.2.6	Small Scale Spatial Variation		93
	4.3		INDICATOR TAXA		94
	4.4		CONCLUSION		95
	4.5	UPPER G	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EORGES RIVER WATER QUALITY STUDY	vi	

.

	FURTHER STUDY	96
	RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE CONSERVATION OF THE UPPER GEORGES RIVER CATCHMENT	96
		97
Α	PHOTOGRAPHS	106
B	PHYSICAL AND WATER	
	CHEMISTRY PARAMETERS TABLES	124
С	ABUNDANCE AND DIVERSITY TABLES	129
D	ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE	
	- ABUNDANCE	
	- DIVERSITY	132
Ε	MONTHLY RAINFALL GRAPHS	
F	MACROINVERTEBRATE SURVEY DATA	137
	B C D	 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE CONSERVATION OF THE UPPER GEORGES RIVER CATCHMENT A PHOTOGRAPHS PHYSICAL AND WATER CHEMISTRY PARAMETERS TABLES C ABUNDANCE AND DIVERSITY TABLES D ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ABUNDANCE DIVERSITY MONTHLY RAINFALL GRAPHS

•

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Legend	Page
2.1	Summary of major monthly rainfall variations	13
3.1a	Measurements taken along Brennans Creek	27
3.1 - 3.12	Correlation coefficients and significances for chemical variables with macroinvertebrate derived ordination vectors	50 - 61
3.13 - 3.24	Correlation coefficients and significances for taxa variables with macroinvertebrate derived ordination vectors	62 - 73
4.2	Correlated variables with similar gradients to correlated taxa for the pool habitat.	91
4.3	Correlated variables with similar gradients to correlated taxa for the edge habitat.	92

LIST OF FIGURES

igure No.	Legend	Page
2.1	Location map for sampling sites on the Upper georges River	16
5.1	Turbidity graph	21
5.2	Temperature graph	23
8.3	Dissolved Oxygen graph	25
3.4	pH graph	26
8.5	Conductivity graph	28
3.6	Ammonia graph	29
3.7	Nitrate graph	30
3.8	Nitrite graph	32
3.9	Orthophosphate graph	33
3.10	Sulphide graph	34
3.11	Macroinvertebrate Abundance graphs for the pool habitat, for all six surveys and all nine sites.	37
3.12	Macroinvertebrate Abundance graphs for the edge habitat, for all six surveys and all nine sites.	38
3.13	Macroinvertebrate Diversity graphs for the pool habitat, for all six surveys and all nine sites.	39
3.14	Macroinvertebrate Diversity graphs for the edge habitat, for all six surveys and all nine sites.	40
3.15(A) - 3.26(A)	TWINSPAN analysis of taxa abundances, pool and edge habitat, six surveys.	50 - 6 ⁻
3.15(B) - 3.26(B)	MDS analysis of taxa abundances, pool and edge habitat, six surveys, with correlated chemical vectors.	50 - 6 ⁻
3.27 - 3.38	MDS analysis of taxa abundances, pool and edge habitat, six surveys, with correlated taxa vectors.	62 - 73
3.39 - 3.44	Daily rainfall graph for both Cataract and Appin rain gauges, for all six surveys.	75 - 80
3.45	Combined TWINSPAN analysis for all six surveys	82

3.46	Mean macroinvertebrate abundance + 1SD (r=4) for the pool habitat, for all six surveys.	83
3.47	Mean macroinvertebrate abundance + 1SD (r=4) for the edge habitat, for all six surveys.	84
3.47	Mean macroinvertebrate diversity + 1SD (r=4) for the pool habitat, for all six surveys.	85
3.47	Mean macroinvertebrate diversity + 1SD (r=4) for the edge habitat, for all six surveys.	86

.