

Usefulness of Macroinvertebrates for *In Situ* Testing of Water Quality

Louisa Jane Oswald
B. Sc. Hons. (Monash)

Institute for Applied Ecology
Faculty of Applied Science
University of Canberra, ACT 2601 AUSTRALIA

The thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Canberra.

October 2008

“One thing to my mind was certain, that to make any laboratory experiments that would compare in any measure to what goes on in a river, it was absolutely necessary that the water experimented upon should be running, and not merely exposed to light and air in a bottle.”

Tidy (1880)

ABSTRACT

For various reasons, existing methods for the assessment of aquatic pollution do not always adequately address the way in which contaminants affect receiving environments and their component ecosystems. The main advantage of biological assessment over the measurements of physical and chemical aspects of water quality is that biota provide an integrated response to all prevailing influences in their environment. Biological assessment protocols have been developed for a range of test organisms, from bacteria to mammals using measurement from molecular biomarkers to indicators at the population or community level of organisation. Macroinvertebrates in particular have been popular for ecological assessment of habitat and water quality because they are small and straight forward to sample and identify using relatively simple and inexpensive equipment and readily available taxonomic keys.

However, various biological assessment techniques also have their limitations. Field-based assessment of biological communities does not provide direct evidence to determine underlying causal relationships, while laboratory or mesocosm toxicity tests are criticised for their limited ability to extrapolate to natural field conditions. To help bridge the gap, this thesis aims to investigate the efficacy of using caged macroinvertebrates *in situ* to assess the ecological condition of aquatic environments, and whether a causal relationship can be established when macroinvertebrates are deployed *in situ* at sites known to have impaired water quality. Endpoints employed in this thesis include survival, measurements of morphology (as a surrogate for growth) and condition and, for trials assessing sites that receive mine drainage, the tissue concentration of certain trace metals.

Development of an *in situ* approach to water quality monitoring and assessment will potentially provide methods for use by resource managers, community groups and aquatic researchers that are less expensive and faster to run than existing methods and will complement other approaches employed in the assessment of water quality.

In situ testing of water quality using macroinvertebrates requires the collection, handling, caging, deployment and retrieval of test organisms at sites of suspected pollutant impact. As such procedural factors may affect test organisms and potentially confound their responses, it is important to consider and understand as many of these factors as possible. Aquatic macroinvertebrates held in finer mesh cages had larger heads than in coarser mesh cages. This was likely due to increased substrate available for growth of epilithon and periphyton on

which the caged organisms could graze. Caging density had no effect on amphipod mortality over the trial period, however, individuals held at higher densities increased in size (as indicated by longer dorsal lengths) more than those held at lower or intermediate densities. Temporary storage of test organisms in laboratory aquaria may facilitate the collection of abundances required for *in situ* trials, however, tanked individuals were smaller and had lower biomasses than individuals collected and deployed immediately. While this is likely to result from differences in feeding during the storage period, it is also possible that tank storage and the “double handling” deleteriously affected them, or reduced their tolerance.

The effects of transplanting macroinvertebrates between sites varied considerably depending on the characteristics of “source” and “transplant” sites. Certain taxa suffered marked mortality within 24 hours even at their source site, indicating an adverse effect of the caging itself, or perhaps via the change in food, shelter or microclimate which could potentially render them unsuitable as test organisms in caging studies. Other taxa did not differ in survival or body size when relocated between sites, with some evidence of increased growth at sites dissimilar from their source site. In general, organisms relocated to sites that are “similar” to their source environment performed less well at the transplant site. However, organisms transplanted to “dissimilar” sites were found to be bigger than those caged and deployed back to the source site.

When employed to assess known pollution scenarios in and around Canberra, macroinvertebrate responses were, in some instances, able to be linked to specific environmental parameters or combinations thereof. In Case Study 1, findings varied in relation to the response endpoint being examined, and between test species, although concentrations of metals were significantly higher in tissue of macroinvertebrates deployed at the impact site downstream of the abandoned Captains Flat mine and increased with time exposed. In Case Study 2, freshwater shrimp suffered significant mortality within 24 hours of deployment at the impact sites, with larger individuals more susceptible at sites receiving urban stormwater runoff. While various biological effects were most closely correlated with ammonia concentrations at the site, different body size endpoints were affected in opposite ways. In Case Study 3, body size endpoints for one test organism varied consistently with respect to site and time factors, but none of the changes could be linked to any of the environmental data collected. Response variables for a different test species also indicated significant effects arising from both deployment site and time, however, each endpoint

responded in a different way to the treatment factors, and aligned with different combinations of environmental data.

In general, linking of macroinvertebrate responses with environmental data was difficult because of the high variability in the environmental data. However, it was further complicated by the mismatch in the level of replication between the two datasets. As a consequence of this, the macroinvertebrate data had to be collapsed to a lower level for comparison with the environmental data, resulting in a loss of natural variability and analytical power. Since only the strongest treatment effects, which could be detected above the background “noise”, were detected and modelled against the environmental data, it is possible that other “cause” and “effect” relationships may have been overlooked.

From these results, it is clear that many macroinvertebrate taxa are suitable for use as bioindicators in *in situ* trials, but that criteria used for selection of test species should definitely include more than just impact-sensitivity and abundance. However, there are several aspects associated with the experimental set up of field-based protocols involving caged macroinvertebrates that may limit their usefulness as a rapid and reliable bioassessment tool, and need to be considered when designing and undertaking these kinds of trials. It is also apparent that choice of endpoint can greatly influence conclusions, with detection of treatment effects reported in this thesis varying greatly depending on which morphological endpoint was examined.

This study clearly demonstrated that there may be significant difficulties in establishing causal relationships between environmental data and biotic responses of macroinvertebrates deployed under field conditions. However, it has also shown that deployment of caged macroinvertebrates *in situ* may assist in the determination of biological effects arising from impaired water quality, which can then serve as the basis for more focussed laboratory or mesocosm studies in which environmental conditions can be more readily controlled or monitored.

COPYRIGHT

Copyright in relation to this thesis:

Under Section 35 of the Copyright Act of 1968, the author of this thesis is the owner of any copyright subsisting in the work, even though it is unpublished.

Under Section 31(I)(a)(i), copyright includes the exclusive right to “reproduce the work in a material form”. Thus, copyright is protected by a person who, not being the owner of the copyright, reproduces or authorises the reproduction of the work, or of more than a reasonable part of the work, in material form, unless the reproduction is a “fair dealing” with the work “for the purpose of research or study” as further defined under Section 40 and 41 of the Act.

This thesis must therefore be copied or used only under the normal conditions of scholarly fair dealing for the purposes of research, criticism or review, as outlined in the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968. In particular, no results or conclusions should be extracted from it, nor should it be copied or closely paraphrased in whole or in part without the written consent of the author. Proper written acknowledgement should be made for any assistance obtained from this thesis.

Copies of this thesis may be made by a library on behalf of another person provided the officer in charge of the library is satisfied that the copy is being made for the purposes of research or study.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly I would like to challenge those that believe postgraduate research is a solo pursuit...that this document now appears in this form is a testament to “Team PhD” and all those that have participated along the way.

In particular I would like to thank the following:

- My supervisors Professor Richard Norris, Professor Bill Maher and Associate Professor Martin Thoms for their commitment to this project, me personally, and their contributions to the field of aquatic ecology. They have helped me broaden my strengths, but also acknowledge my limitations, and afforded me with much strength to overcome numerous hurdles. YMCA holds special memories for me !
- Land and Water Australia (formerly Land and Water Resources Research and Development Corporation) for research funding, and University of Canberra (UC) and the Cooperative Research Centre (CRC) for Freshwater Ecology who supported the research and my candidature in many ways. Special thanks to Divisional Higher Degree Committee members who have been particularly helpful.
- All those that braved Canberra’s weather extremes, in particular Angie and Dan, and to Amina and Bron for endless hours spent capturing digital images of over 10,000 mostly uncooperative macroinvertebrates. Thanks also to technical staff from the UC and the CRC for Freshwater Ecology, in particular the analysts associated with the Ecochemistry laboratory.
- Ross Cunningham from Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies, Australian National University (ANU), and Christine Donnelly at the ANU’s Statistical Consulting Unit for assistance with statistical analyses.
- Paul Sheahan for arranging access to the ever-elusive hydrological records and Jim Longworth for assistance with GIS interfaces.
- Australian Government Natural Resource Management Team for their investment in me while completing this thesis, in particular the Monitoring and Evaluation section.

There are also numerous people “behind the scenes” who have expended considerable energy coaxing me through the most difficult times, and whose efforts have greatly lightened the load.

I would particularly like to mention:

- Carol and Danielle with whom I share the most incredible camaraderie. I miss you both and look forward to sharing way too many beverages after we all make it up “the hill”.
- My family for their dent-less enthusiasm, encouragement and the occasional “home truth” especially in the final throes.
- The amazing Pam who helped me work my way through my mysterious inner workings and just let me vent irrationally on occasion !
- Linda, David and Mike for your attempts at being interested in bugs, and for not pushing your views on me too hard !
- Those friends who have politely avoided asking the “death question”, and also those rude blighters who made it their personal mission to badger me constantly !
- Rupert and Abigail for light relief, and for companionship when the rest of the world was asleep.
- Peter for his generosity and endless enthusiasm, and for not questioning my irrational mood swings and idiosyncrasies at critical times during my candidature.

“I’ve finished now do you want to use your computer ?”

Addendum

And now that, despite some significant hurdles, the thesis revisions are finally complete, I would like to extend my acknowledgements to the following:

- Two anonymous examiners whose comments and suggestions greatly improved this thesis.
- My treatment team whose expertise has helped me on the road to recovery over the last 18 months, especially Debbie Douglas, Anne Davies and Tom Sutton.
- My partner Peter for his endurance, and darling baby girl Charlotte Jane for arriving at exactly the right time ! Thankyou for reminding me of the things that matter most !

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	i
Certificate of Authorship of Thesis.....	iv
Copyright.....	v
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	viii
List of Tables.....	xi
List of Figures.....	xv
Chapter 1: PREAMBLE.....	1
1.1 Aquatic Pollution.....	1
1.1.1 Chemical and Physical Monitoring of Aquatic Pollution.....	1
1.1.2 Use of Biota for Assessing Pollution.....	2
1.1.3 Rationale for this Thesis.....	12
1.2 Objective.....	13
1.2.1 Overall Aim.....	13
1.2.2 Structure of the Thesis.....	13
Chapter 2: METHODS AND MATERIALS.....	15
2.1 Introduction.....	15
2.2 Taxon Selection Criteria.....	15
2.3 Cage Development.....	16
2.4 Experimental Set-up.....	16
2.4.1 Harvesting of Test Organisms.....	17
2.4.2 Caging.....	17
2.4.3 Deployment.....	18
2.5 Overall Experimental Design.....	18
2.6 Site Selection Process.....	20
2.6.1 Laboratory Trials.....	20
2.6.2 Field Trials.....	20
2.7 <i>In Situ</i> Macroinvertebrate Trials.....	24
2.7.1 Preparation of Sampling Containers.....	24
2.7.2 Retrieval of Macroinvertebrates on Collection Days.....	25
2.7.3 Assessment of Survival.....	25
2.8 Sub-Lethal Endpoint Responses.....	26
2.9 Environmental Site Data.....	28

2.9.1	Field Measurements	28
2.9.2	Laboratory Analysis	29
2.10	Data Analysis	31
Chapter 3:	STUDY REGION AND TRIAL SITES	33
3.1	Upper Murrumbidgee Catchment	33
3.2	Study Sites	33
3.3	Climate	33
Chapter 4:	IN THE ABSENCE OF IMPAIRED WATER QUALITY, DOES EXPERIMENTAL SET-UP AFFECT MACROINVERTEBRATE RESPONSES?	39
4.1	Introduction.....	39
4.1.1	Rationale.....	39
4.1.2	Background.....	39
4.1.3	Objective of this Chapter.....	40
4.2	Additional Methods.....	41
4.3	Results	41
4.3.1	Experiment 1: Effect of Caged Deployment on Macroinvertebrates.....	43
4.3.2	Experiment 2: Effect of Temporary Tank Storage on Macroinvertebrates.....	45
4.3.3	Experiment 3: Effect of Stocking Density on Macroinvertebrates.....	48
4.4	Discussion.....	50
4.4.1	Experimental Results.....	50
4.4.2	Conclusion.....	57
Chapter 5:	HOW DO MACROINVERTEBRATES RESPOND TO SITE RELOCATION?	59
5.1	Introduction.....	59
5.1.1	Rationale.....	59
5.1.2	Background.....	59
5.1.3	Objective of this Chapter.....	60
5.2	Additional Methods.....	61
5.3	Results	64
5.3.1	Deployment to Sites of a Similar Nature.....	64
5.3.2	Deployment to Sites of a Different Nature.....	68
5.4	Discussion.....	81
5.4.1	Experimental Results.....	81
5.4.2	Conclusion.....	92

Chapter 6: HOW DO MACROINVERTEBRATES RATE AS BIOMONITORS WHEN CAGED AND DEPLOYED <i>IN SITU</i> TO ASSESS SITES WITH IMPAIRED WATER QUALITY ?	96
6.1 Introduction.....	96
6.1.1 Rationale.....	96
6.1.2 Background.....	96
6.1.3 Description of Pollution Scenarios	97
6.1.4 Objective of this Chapter.....	100
6.2 Additional Methods.....	101
6.2.1 Methods Common for all Case Study Trials	101
6.2.2 Trace Metal Analysis for Case Study 1.....	102
6.2.3 Comparison of Macroinvertebrate Responses with Environmental Variables.....	108
6.3 Results	109
6.3.1 Case Study 1: Acid Mine Drainage.....	109
6.3.2 Case Study 2: Urban Stormwater Runoff.....	143
6.3.3 Case Study 3: Persistently High Turbidity	151
6.4 Discussion.....	162
6.4.1 Case Study 1 – Mine Drainage	162
6.4.2 Case Study 2 – Urban Stormwater Runoff.....	171
6.4.3 Case Study 3 – Persistently High Turbidity	178
6.4.4 Conclusion	182
Chapter 7: SYNTHESIS	184
7.1 Conclusions.....	194
REFERENCES	196
Appendix 3	239
Appendix 4	245
Appendix 5	253
Appendix 6	275

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1:	Predictor variables used by the AUSRIVAS ACT spring riffle predictive model to classify sites used in this study.	22
Table 2.2:	Predictor variables used by the AUSRIVAS ACT spring edge predictive model to classify sites used in this study.	22
Table 2.3:	Predictor variables used the AUSRIVAS ACT autumn edge predictive model to classify sites used in this study.	23
Table 2.4:	Operating conditions for the Perkin-Elmer Elan 6000 ICP-MS.	31
Table 3.1:	Details for sites employed in this study.	35
Table 4.1:	Experimental detail of the three separate trials examining macroinvertebrate response to aspects of experimental set-up.	42
Table 4.2:	Paired t-test comparing body size at deployment on trial day 0 of <i>Paratya australiensis</i> for wild and “tanked” treatments in Experiment 2.	46
Table 4.3:	Analysis of Variance table for regression between average wet weight and stocking density within deployment cages during Experiment 3.	50
Table 4.4:	Results of probability tests for fixed factors affecting macroinvertebrate morphology in experimental logistics trials.	51
Table 5.1:	Experimental detail of the trials examining macroinvertebrate response to relocation. Part A: Relocation of test organisms between sites of a similar nature.	62
Table 5.2:	Experimental detail of the trials examining macroinvertebrate response to relocation. Part B: Relocation of test organisms between sites that are dissimilar in nature.	63
Table 5.3:	Results of probability tests for fixed factors affecting macroinvertebrate morphology in relocation trials.	82
Table 5.4:	Morphological measurements for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved from source and transplant sites in Experiment 5.	86
Table 5.5:	Mean values for macroinvertebrate response variables found to differ between sites and/or site types when deployed between source and dissimilar transplant sites.	93
Table 6.1:	Experimental detail of the trials used to test the usefulness of macroinvertebrates for <i>in situ</i> testing of water quality – Case Study 1 – Mine Drainage.	103

Table 6.2:	Experimental detail of the trials used to test the usefulness of macroinvertebrates for <i>in situ</i> testing of water quality – Case Study 2 – Urban Stormwater Runoff.	104
Table 6.3:	Experimental detail of the trials used to test the usefulness of macroinvertebrates for <i>in situ</i> testing of water quality – Case Study 3 – Persistently High Turbidity.....	105
Table 6.4:	Operating conditions for the Perkin-Elmer Elan 6000 ICP-MS.....	106
Table 6.5:	Metal concentrations in the tissue of <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	115
Table 6.6:	Analysis of Variance table for regression between trial day and log ₁₀ -transformed metal concentrations in the tissue of <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	116
Table 6.7:	Metal concentrations in the tissue of <i>Austrolestes cingulatum</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	120
Table 6.8:	Analysis of Variance table for regression between trial day and log ₁₀ -transformed metal concentrations in the tissue of <i>Austrolestes cingulatum</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	121
Table 6.9:	Mixed model significance tests for body size endpoints measured for <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	128
Table 6.10:	Mixed model significance tests for mean head width and log ₁₀ -transformed freeze dried weight for <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	128
Table 6.11:	Metal concentrations in the tissue of <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	132
Table 6.12:	Analysis of Variance table for regression between trial day, season and log ₁₀ -transformed metal concentrations in the tissue of <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	133
Table 6.13:	Analysis of Variance table for simplified regression between trial day and log ₁₀ -transformed metal concentrations in the tissue of <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	137

Table 6.14:	Details of regression equations for log ₁₀ -transformed metal concentrations in the tissue of <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	138
Table 6.15:	Correlation co-efficients for linear regressions between aqueous metal concentrations and bioaccumulated metal concentrations in the tissue of <i>Austrolestes cingulatum</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	142
Table 6.16:	Correlation co-efficients for linear regressions between aqueous metal concentrations and bioaccumulated metal concentrations in the tissue of <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	143
Table 6.17:	Results of probability tests for interactions between fixed factors affecting <i>Notalina</i> sp. wet weight for Case Study 3 trials.	157
Table 6.18:	Restricted Maximum Likelihood table outlining tests estimating the significance of the variation between environmental measurements collected, and survival of <i>Notalina</i> sp. retrieved after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 3.	159
Table 6.19:	Analysis of Variance for regression between survival of <i>Notalina</i> sp. retrieved after deployment, and the strongest environmental covariates measured at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 3.	160
Table 6.20:	Restricted Maximum Likelihood table outlining tests estimating the significance of the variation between environmental measurements collected, and average head width of <i>Notalina</i> sp. retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 3.	161
Table 6.21:	Analysis of Variance for regression between average head width of <i>Notalina</i> sp. retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1, and the strongest environmental covariates.	161
Table 6.22:	Results of probability tests for fixed factors assessing the effects of mine drainage on various biological endpoints of the macroinvertebrate test species <i>Paratya australiensis</i> , <i>Austrolestes cingulatum</i> and <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at field sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	163

Table 6.23:	Relationships between dissolved aqueous metal concentrations and bioaccumulated metal concentrations in the tissue of <i>Austrolestes cingulatum</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	169
Table 6.24:	Results of probability tests for fixed factors assessing the effects of urban stormwater runoff on various biological endpoints for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at field sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 2.	173
Table 6.25:	Average carapace dimensions and wet weight for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive and dead after deployment at urban impact sites only on each of the first three trial days during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 2.	176
Table 6.26:	Results of probability tests for fixed factors assessing the effects of persistent turbidity on various biological endpoints for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> and <i>Notalina</i> sp. retrieved alive after deployment at field sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 3.	179
Table 6.27:	Relationships between <i>Notalina</i> sp. response variables, measured after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 3, and the water quality parameters (measured on retrieval day) with which they had the strongest covariance.	182

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1:	Design of cages used to hold macroinvertebrates for all <i>in situ</i> deployment experiments of this study.....	17
Figure 2.2:	Random factors associated with set-up of deployment experiments.	19
Figure 2.3:	Measurements of body size for some of the test organisms deployed in this study.....	27
Figure 3.1:	Study area in and around the Australian Capital Territory, Australia.	34
Figure 3.2:	Long term annual rainfall at Canberra (Holt) from 1887 to 2003..	37
Figure 3.3:	Monthly rainfall throughout the study area during A) 1997 and B) 1998.....	38
Figure 4.1:	Percent survival of test organisms retrieved after deployment in holding cages during Experiment 1.....	43
Figure 4.2:	Mean head width for <i>Austrolestes cingulatum</i> and <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> deployed in cages at their source site for 24 days during Experiment 1.....	44
Figure 4.3:	Mean head width for <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> collected on trial day 0 and retrieved alive after deployment at their source site for up to 24 days in holding cages with 500 μm or 800 μm mesh panels during Experiment 1.....	45
Figure 4.4:	(A) Mean carapace length and (B) mean \log_n -transformed wet weight for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at their source site for 10 days during Experiment 2.....	47
Figure 4.5:	Mean dorsal length for <i>Austrochiltonia</i> sp. retrieved alive after deployment in cages for 13 days at different densities during Experiment 3.....	49
Figure 5.1:	Percent survival of <i>Cheumatopsyche</i> sp.6 retrieved after deployment at source and transplant sites from the same AUSRIVAS site group during Experiment 4.	65
Figure 5.2:	Percent survival of <i>Cheumatopsyche</i> sp.6 retrieved over time after deployment at sites from the same AUSRIVAS site group during Experiment 4.....	65
Figure 5.3:	Mean \log_n -transformed wet weight for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive over time after deployment at sites from the same AUSRIVAS site group during Experiment 5.	68

Figure 5.4:	Percent survival of <i>Cherax destructor</i> retrieved after deployment at source and transplant sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 6.....	70
Figure 5.5:	Percent survival of <i>Cherax destructor</i> retrieved over time after deployment at sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 6.....	70
Figure 5.6:	(A) Mean head width and (B) mean log _n -transformed wet weight for <i>Austrolestes cingulatum</i> retrieved alive after deployment at source and transplant sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 6.....	72
Figure 5.7:	Mean head width for <i>Austrolestes cingulatum</i> retrieved alive over time after deployment at sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 6.	72
Figure 5.8:	Mean log _n -transformed wet weights for <i>Rhadinosticta simplex</i> retrieved alive over time after deployment at sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 6.....	73
Figure 5.9:	Mean head width for <i>Triplectides australicus ciuskus</i> retrieved alive after deployment at source and transplant sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 6.....	73
Figure 5.10:	Mean carapace length for <i>Cherax destructor</i> retrieved alive after deployment at source and transplant sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 6.....	74
Figure 5.11:	Percent survival of <i>Notalina</i> sp. retrieved after deployment at source and transplant sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 7.....	75
Figure 5.12:	Percent survival of <i>Cloeon</i> sp. retrieved over time after deployment at sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 7.....	76
Figure 5.13:	Percent survival of <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved after deployment at source and transplant sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 7.....	76
Figure 5.14:	Percentage of <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved with broken frontal rostra after deployment at source and transplant sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 7.....	77
Figure 5.15:	Percentage of <i>Cloeon</i> sp. that escaped from holding cages over time after deployment at sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 7.	78
Figure 5.16:	Mean head width for <i>Notalina</i> sp. retrieved alive after deployment at source and transplant sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 7.	79

Figure 5.17: Mean head width for <i>Cloeon</i> sp. retrieved after deployment at source and transplant sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 7. Error bars indicate one standard deviation.	80
Figure 5.18: Mean log _n -transformed orbital carapace length for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive over time after deployment at sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 7.	80
Figure 5.19: Percent survival of test organisms deployed for a period of 12 days at their source site and transplant sites of a “similar” nature.	84
Figure 5.20: Body size endpoints for (A) <i>Archicaulioides</i> sp., (B) <i>Cheumatopsyche</i> sp.6 and (C) <i>Notalina</i> sp. retrieved alive after deployment at source and transplant sites from the same AUSRIVAS site group.	85
Figure 5.21: Percent survival of test organisms deployed for a period of 12 days at their source site and transplant sites with “dissimilar” characteristics.	87
Figure 5.22: Mean mortality, carapace length and wet weight for <i>Cherax destructor</i> retrieved alive after deployment at (A) source and (B) transplant sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during Experiment 6.	89
Figure 5.23: Mean head widths, log ₁₀ -transformed wet weights and survival for <i>Cheumatopsyche</i> sp.6 retrieved alive after deployment at source and transplant sites from the same AUSRIVAS site group in Experiment 4.	90
Figure 5.24: Mean (A) head width and (B) log _n -transformed wet weight for <i>Rhadinosticta simplex</i> retrieved alive after deployment at source and “dissimilar” transplant sites during Experiment 6.	94
Figure 6.1: Percent survival of <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	109
Figure 6.2: Percentage of <i>Paratya australiensis</i> with dark patches on carapaces when retrieved after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	110
Figure 6.3: Percentage of <i>Paratya australiensis</i> with dark patches on carapaces when retrieved over time after deployment at sites sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	111
Figure 6.4: Mean log ₁₀ -transformed carapace length for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	112

Figure 6.5:	Mean log ₁₀ -transformed orbital carapace length for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	112
Figure 6.6:	Mean log ₁₀ -transformed wet weight for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive over time after deployment at sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	113
Figure 6.7:	Mean log ₁₀ -transformed freeze dried weight for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive over time after deployment at sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	114
Figure 6.8:	Mean weight measurements for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	114
Figure 6.9:	Average concentration of iron in <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	117
Figure 6.10:	Average concentration of iron in <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive over time after deployment at sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	117
Figure 6.11:	Average concentration of copper in <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive from the source site on trial day 0, and after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	118
Figure 6.12:	Average concentration of zinc in <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive from the source site on trial day 0, and after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	118
Figure 6.13:	Average concentration of zinc in <i>Austrolestes cingulatum</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	122
Figure 6.14:	Average concentration of iron in <i>Austrolestes cingulatum</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	122
Figure 6.15:	Average concentration of iron in <i>Austrolestes cingulatum</i> retrieved alive over time after deployment at sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	123
Figure 6.16:	Percent survival of <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	124

Figure 6.17: Percent survival of <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved over time after deployment at sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	124
Figure 6.18: Percentage of <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> that escaped from holding cages after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	126
Figure 6.19: Percentage of <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> that escaped from holding cages after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	126
Figure 6.20: Percentage of <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> that molted after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	127
Figure 6.21: Mean head width for <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	129
Figure 6.22: Mean log ₁₀ -transformed freeze dried weight for <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	129
Figure 6.23: Mean head width for <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	130
Figure 6.24: Mean log ₁₀ -transformed freeze dried weight for <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	130
Figure 6.25: Average concentration of copper in <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	134
Figure 6.26: Average concentration of copper in <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	135
Figure 6.27: Average concentration of zinc in <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	135
Figure 6.28: Average concentration of zinc in <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	136
Figure 6.29: Average concentration of cadmium in <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	136

Figure 6.30: Relationship between tissue concentration of zinc and dissolved zinc concentrations from <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	140
Figure 6.31: Relationship between tissue concentration of cadmium and dissolved cadmium concentrations from <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at the impact site only during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	140
Figure 6.32: Relationship between tissue concentration of zinc and dissolved zinc concentrations from <i>Austrolestes cingulatum</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	141
Figure 6.33: Relationship between tissue concentration of lead and dissolved lead concentrations from <i>Austrolestes cingulatum</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	141
Figure 6.34: Relationship between tissue concentration of iron and dissolved iron concentrations from <i>Austrolestes cingulatum</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.	142
Figure 6.35: Percent survival of <i>Paratya australiensis</i> after deployment at control and urban impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 2.	144
Figure 6.36: Percent survival of <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved over time after deployment at sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 2.	144
Figure 6.37: Mean carapace length and mean orbital carapace length for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and urban impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 2.	145
Figure 6.38: Mean carapace length for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive over time after deployment at sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 2.	146
Figure 6.39: Mean log _n -transformed wet weight for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive over time after deployment at sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 2.	147
Figure 6.40: Mean log _n -transformed wet weight for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and urban impact sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 2.	147

Figure 6.41: Mean \log_n -transformed wet weight for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive over time after deployment at sites for three days during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 2.	148
Figure 6.42: Mean \log_n -transformed wet weight for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and urban impact sites from different AUSRIVAS site groups for three days during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 2.	149
Figure 6.43: Mean orbital carapace length of <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and urban impact sites with levels of ammonia above and below the method analytical detection limit ($0.5 \mu\text{gL}^{-1} \text{NH}_3$) during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 2.	150
Figure 6.44: Mean carapace length and mean orbital carapace length for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment for three days at control and impact sites with levels of ammonia above and below the method detection limit ($0.5 \mu\text{gL}^{-1} \text{NH}_3$) during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 2.	151
Figure 6.45: Mean \log_{10} -transformed carapace length for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites known to have high suspended solids during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 3.	152
Figure 6.46: Mean \log_{10} -transformed carapace length for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive over time after deployment at sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 3.	153
Figure 6.47: Mean \log_{10} -transformed orbital carapace length for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites known to have high suspended solids during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 3.	153
Figure 6.48: Mean \log_{10} -transformed orbital carapace length for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive over time after deployment at sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 3.	154
Figure 6.49: Mean \log_{10} -transformed wet weight for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites known to have high suspended solids during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 3.	155
Figure 6.50: Mean \log_{10} -transformed wet weight for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive over time after deployment at sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 3.	155
Figure 6.51: Percent survival of <i>Notalina</i> sp. retrieved after deployment at control and impact sites known to have high suspended solids during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 3.	156

Figure 6.52: Percentage of <i>Notalina</i> sp. individuals that escaped after deployment at control and impact sites known to have high suspended solids during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 3.....	157
Figure 6.53: Average wet weight of <i>Notalina</i> sp. retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites known to have high suspended solids during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 3.....	158
Figure 6.54: Mean head width of <i>Notalina</i> sp. retrieved alive after deployment at control and impact sites known to have high suspended solids during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 3.....	159
Figure 6.55: Percent survival and log ₁₀ -transformed carapace length for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at the downstream impact site during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	167
Figure 6.56: Relationship between tissue concentration of copper and dissolved copper concentrations from <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at the downstream impact site during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	170
Figure 6.57: Relationship between tissue concentration of zinc and dissolved copper concentrations from <i>Atalophlebia australis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at the downstream impact site during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 1.....	171
Figure 6.58: Percent survival of <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved over time after deployment at sites from different AUSRIVAS site groupings during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 2.....	175
Figure 6.59: Average body size measurements for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive and dead after deployment at urban impact sites during <i>in situ</i> assessment trials for Case Study 2.....	175
Figure 7.1: Mean body size measurements for <i>Paratya australiensis</i> retrieved alive after deployment at unimpacted test sites in two component experiments of this study.....	191