

**Infaunal Communities in
South Australian Temperate Mangrove Systems**

Indarjani

Environmental Biology

School of Earth and Environmental Sciences

Adelaide University

Thesis submitted for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

November 2003

Declaration

This thesis contains no material, which has been submitted or accepted for the award of any degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution. To the best of my knowledge and belief the thesis also contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I consent to the thesis being made available for copying or loan if accepted for the award of the degree

Indarjani

Abstract

South Australian mangroves consist of only one single species *Avicennia marina* (Forsk.) Vierh. var *australasica* (Walp) Moldenke, 1960. They are distributed discontinuously within St. Vincent Gulf and Spencer Gulf and provide significant valuable habitat both in economical and ecological terms. The Fisheries Act 1971-1982 protected the existence of mangroves and the Harbour Act 1936-1981 controlled removal of mangrove areas in coastal development. To date very few ecological studies have been conducted in the South Australian mangroves, particularly on the infaunal organisms that have an important role in maintaining the ecological dynamic within the estuaries systems. As this is the first study on infaunal mangrove communities in the inverse estuaries of South Australia, there was no prior data for ecological comparison. The study was conducted at three mangroves location (Garden Island, Middle Beach and Saint Kilda) close to Adelaide in May 2000 and 2001.

Overall the study has reported that the infaunal mangrove assemblages of South Australian mangroves were comparable to other temperate mangroves. The infaunal communities were characterised by lower diversity and abundance compared to the tropical or subtropical mangroves. The infaunal zonation related to the tidal gradient and habitat variation was detected. Most infauna organisms occupied the surface layers and substantially decreased towards the deeper layers. The study also suggested that sediment structure of mangrove systems were complex and infaunal communities responded differently to the change of environmental conditions both in small scale and larger scale. Thus, assessing the infaunal communities structure in mangrove systems should be based on ecological characteristics rather than geographical positions. The examination of dominant polychaetes families showed that different species have different responses to the environmental cues within mangrove systems. The study did not find that any polychaete species was restricted to mangroves only as they all were also found in the habitat adjacent mangrove forest.

Acknowledgments

With thanks to the Almighty God who always lifts my spirit up, finally, I have finished my thesis. With Your mercy you gave me some people who have great patience and dedication. Without them “the research story” would be reversed. There were many people and institutions involved during my study whom I sincerely want to thank:

Professor Anthony Cheshire and Associate Professor Michael Geddes for supervision, guidance and inspiration in finding the path through the infaunal mangrove world; Peri Coleman, Delta Environment Consultant, for introducing me to the local mangrove knowledge and sharing the enchantment of the mangrove world; Colin Rivers, Soil and Water Laboratory, Waite Campus, for teaching and helping me in sediment analysis; Dr Greg Rouse, South Australian Museum, for teaching and inspiring me about polychaetes; Dr Penny Greenslade, Entomology Division, CSIRO, for very helpful advice about tiny-spring tail insects; Dr Peter Hudson, Aridflo, Adelaide University, for sharing his knowledge of insect identifications.

I would also like to thank those who dedicated their time consistently helping me during field work, especially during the harsh summer time: Helen Brown, David Ladd, Ian Macgrath. Also helpful was the former Marine group, especially Grant Westphalen, Maylene Loo, David Turner, Anne Fairhead, Margaret Copertino, Tim Kildea, and Stephani Seddon for their assistance with the first and biggest piece of field work, with nasty statistical problems, with material, and with teaching me computer skills.

I want to thank two Russes who also contributed their time during my study: Dr Russell Shield, to whom I could not keep my promise not to bother him again in sharing my infaunal laboratory work problems, and Dr Russell Sinclair, for editing my thesis which, through his efforts, became more smooth, flowing and

readable. In addition, Marilyn Saxon has been a caring person with whom I always shared my feelings, especially when I felt down.

I also would like to thank the Head and all the staff of Environmental Biology for their hospitality which made me feel at home. I am grateful to Water and Soil Science, Waite Campus, who allowed me to use their lab facility to analyse hundreds of sediment samples, at any time and any day, holiday or weekend. Waite became my second campus. I also would like to thank AusAid for their generosity in giving me a scholarship to pursue my PhD-everybody's dream.

My study was conducted in unusual circumstances. The euphoria of East Timor, 11 September 2001, and the tragic event of 11 October 2002 in Bali might have had psychological effects on others, but I was fortunate to be surrounded by people who have mutual respect and friendship. I received a number of sympathetic letters, and phone calls that were very comforting. As a result of the support I received, my study and social life could continue as normal. I feel fortunate to have been a member of the Benham Building, a student of Adelaide University, and to have been living in Adelaide city

I would like to give thanks to my family where I always find my strength and comfort. This thesis would not have been produced without high commitment, hard work and sacrifice from you. This thesis I dedicate to you; my future success will pay back your sacrifice.

For everybody : "You might think that what you did for me was a little thing because you do so much for others all the time, but it is rare to find people as considerate and thoughtful as you".

In the sunny, beautiful spring,

Indarjani Komarudin

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-------------|
| Declaration | i |
| Abstract | ii |
| Acknowledgments | iii |
| Table of Contents | v |
| List of Figures | ix |
| List of Tables | xii |
| List of Plates | xiii |
| Chapter 1 The Status of South Australian Mangrove Estuaries | 1 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 2. ECOSYSTEM DYNAMIC OF THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MANGROVE SYSTEMS | 2 |
| 2.1. Habitat characteristics..... | 2 |
| 2.2. Energy flow within the mangrove systems..... | 6 |
| 2.3. Dynamic of mangrove sediment..... | 9 |
| 3. INFAUNA ASSOCIATED WITH MANGROVE SYSTEMS..... | 11 |
| 3.1. Definition..... | 11 |
| 3.2. The role of benthic infauna..... | 12 |
| 4. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES | 14 |
| Chapter 2 The Biology of Benthic Infauna | 16 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 16 |
| 2. POLYCHAETA | 16 |
| 3. MOLLUSCA..... | 21 |
| 4. CRUSTACEA..... | 25 |
| 5. INSECTA | 26 |
| 6. PREDICTIONS..... | 29 |
| Chapter 3 Response of Benthic Infaunal Assemblages to Spatial and Geomorphological Differences between three South Australian Mangrove Systems | 31 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 31 |
| 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS..... | 33 |
| 2.1. Study sites..... | 33 |
| 2.2. Sample collection | 36 |
| 2.3. Sample processing..... | 37 |
| 2.4. Data analyses | 39 |
| 3. RESULTS..... | 42 |
| 3.1. Taxa composition | 42 |
| 3.2. Benthic distribution patterns within the systems..... | 44 |
| 3.3. Abiotic characteristics | 48 |
| 3.4. Linking biotic and abiotic factors..... | 49 |
| 3.5. Indicator Species Analysis..... | 51 |
| 4. DISCUSSION..... | 52 |
| 4.1. Infaunal characteristics | 52 |
| 4.2. Infaunal zonation | 53 |
| 4.3. Sediment characteristics associated with infauna..... | 55 |
| Chapter 4 Temporal and Spatial Variation of Infaunal Communities : | |
| Garden Island Mangrove Case Study | 57 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 57 |
| 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS | 58 |
| 2.1. Study site | 58 |
| 2.2. Sampling design | 60 |
| 2.3. Samples processing..... | 61 |
| 2.4. Data analysis..... | 61 |
| 4. RESULTS..... | 63 |
| 4.1. Infaunal composition..... | 63 |
| 4.2. Abiotic characteristics | 66 |
| 4.3. Temporal and spatial variation of benthic community structure..... | 67 |
| 4.4. The role of major taxa | 71 |
| 4.5. Linking abiotic factors with infaunal communities..... | 72 |
| 5. DISCUSSION..... | 74 |
| 5.1. Infaunal characteristics..... | 74 |
| 5.2. Inter annual differences..... | 75 |
| 5.3. Abiotic factors and distributions..... | 76 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 5.4. Spatial patterns of infaunal distribution in relation to habitat characteristics | 76 |
| | 76 |
| Chapter 5 Infaunal Distribution within Mangrove Sediments | 81 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 81 |
| 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS..... | 82 |
| 2.1. Sampling design | 82 |
| 2.2. Data analysis:..... | 83 |
| 3. RESULTS..... | 84 |
| 3.1. The distribution of benthic organisms..... | 84 |
| 3.2. Vertical distribution within substrates..... | 86 |
| 3.3. Temporal variation of infaunal vertical distribution..... | 87 |
| 3.4. The dominant taxa | 88 |
| 3.5. Abiotic characteristics | 89 |
| 4. DISCUSSION..... | 90 |
| 4.1. Abiotic characteristics | 90 |
| 4.2. Infaunal communities | 91 |
| 4.3. Vertical distribution patterns. | 91 |
| 4.3. Temporal variations of infaunal distribution within sediments..... | 92 |
| Chapter 6 Taxonomy and Biology of Important Polychaetes in South | |
| Australian Mangroves..... | 94 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 94 |
| 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS..... | 96 |
| 2.1. Sampling sites..... | 96 |
| 2.2. Specimen preparations..... | 97 |
| 2.3. Polychaete assessments | 97 |
| 3. BIOLOGY AND TAXONOMY OF CAPITELLIDAE | 98 |
| 3.1. Taxonomical assessment | 99 |
| 3.2. Spatial variation of Capitellidae | 103 |
| 3.3. Inter-annual variations of Capitellidae | 105 |
| 3.4. Feeding behavior of Capitellidae..... | 107 |
| 3.5. Burrowing behaviour of Capitellidae | 107 |
| 4. TAXONOMY AND BIOLOGY OF NEREIDIDAE | 108 |
| 4.1. Taxonomical assessment | 109 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 4.2. Spatial variation of Nereididae | 113 |
| 4.3. Seasonal variations of Nereididae | 115 |
| 4.4. Feeding Behaviour..... | 116 |
| 4.5. Burrowing behaviour | 116 |
| 5. TAXONOMY AND BIOLOGY OF SPIONIDAE..... | 117 |
| 5.1. Taxonomy assessment | 118 |
| 5.2. Spatial and temporal variation of Spionidae..... | 120 |
| 5.3. Feeding behaviour | 123 |
| 6. DISCUSSION..... | 125 |
| Chapter 7 Research Synthesis | 128 |
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 128 |
| 2. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS..... | 129 |
| 3. RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH..... | 132 |
| 4. CONCLUSION | 134 |
| References | 135 |
| Appendix I Sediment Analysis | 153 |
| Appendix 2 Data Transformation..... | 158 |
| Appendix 3 Taxonomy resolution..... | 160 |

List of Figures

| | |
|--|----|
| Figure 1.1. Interrelationship of environmental factors and a mangrove community (after Oliver, 1982 which adapted from Clarke and Hannon, 1970)..... | 3 |
| Figure 1.2. Schematic of nutrient (---) and energy (—) flows (E=export, I=import) and storages in South Australian mangroves estuaries (After Butler <i>et.al.</i> , 1975)..... | 7 |
| Figure 3.1. The study sites, showing the 3 locations of mangrove forests (Garden Island, Middle Beach and Saint Kilda). | 34 |
| Figure 3.2. Schematic sampling design at each location showing a cross section of the four transects (HO=Higher Outer, HI=Higher Inner, LI=Lower Inner, LO=Lower Outer)..... | 37 |
| Figure 3.3. Mean abundance and diversity index (\pm SD) in the upper part of the 3 mangrove systems showing a spatial trend between saltmarsh and inside the mangroves. | 45 |
| Figure 3.4. A two dimensional ordination based on raw abundance of taxa per sample (stress=0.18) showing a distinct separation between locations. Distance between symbols approximate dissimilarities between infaunal composition (\blacklozenge : Garden Island, \blacklozenge : Middle Beach and \blacklozenge : Saint Kilda) | 46 |
| Figure 3.5. Dendrogram (using flexible beta=-0.25) based on family raw abundance per sample showed that with about 33% Bray-Curties similarities information remaining, infauna was grouped into 8. (\blacklozenge : Garden Island, \spadesuit : Middle Beach and \circ : Saint Kilda) | 47 |
| Figure 3.6. Mean abiotic parameters (\pm SD) of the three location of mangrove systems | 49 |
| Figure 3.7. CCA ordination showing the effect of environmental variables on the distribution pattern of infauna across the 3 locations (\blacklozenge : Garden Island, \blacklozenge : Middle Beach, \blacklozenge : Saint Kilda) A. Ordination with axis 2 and axis 3 : B. Ordination with axis 1 and axis 3 | 50 |
| Figure 4.1. Garden Island Mangrove Area, 30 km north of Adelaide, South Australia, shows location of study sites. The tidal channels around the mangrove areas and a causeway blocked the tidal channel in the eastern part of the island. On the landward side (higher part), it was noted that the mangrove was backed up by saltmarsh communities. On the seaward side, it was noted that a narrow band of mudflat backed up the mangrove communities at the lower part. The center of the map shows land use developments that resulted a reduction of the mangrove and samphire areas. | 59 |
| Figure 4.2. Schematic sampling procedure in Garden Island Mangrove sites | 60 |
| Figure 4.3 Comparison of mean (\pm SD) infaunal abundance and diversity (H' (<i>in italics</i>)) during two consecutive sampling periods and e summary of nested | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| and multifactorial analysis comparing the year sampling period and transects. Significance: *) $\alpha < 0.05$; **) $\alpha < 0.01$; ***) $\alpha < 0.001$ | 64 |
| Figure 4.4. Mean abiotic parameters (\pm SD) at Garden Island during two consecutive sampling periods and summary of multifactorial analysis comparing time and spatial treatments. The value of significance level : *) $\alpha < 0.05$: **) $\alpha < 0.01$: ***) $\alpha < 0.001$ | 66 |
| Figure 4.5. NMS ordination showed different results when infaunal samples were pooled into different categories (stress=0.16). A : year category (♦ 2000, ♦ 2001), B: tidal category (♦ high tidal mark, ♦ low tidal mark)..... | 67 |
| Figure 4.6. Ordination of infauna when samples were pooled into different transect categories relative to the mangrove forest (stress=0.18) . A: 2000, B: 2001, C: 2000 and 2001, ♦ higher outer (HO), ♦ higher inner (HI), O lower inner, ♦ lower outer (LO) | 68 |
| Figure 4.7. Average-linkage dendrogram based on infaunal raw abundance per sample unit using flexible beta ($\beta = -0.25$) as linkage method on Bray-Curtis similarities distance measures. The resulting dendrogram was scaled by Whishart's objective function converted to a percentage of information remaining. A: samples was grouped into year (♦ 2000, ♦ 2001) and B: samples were grouped into transects (♦ HO, ♦ HI, O LI, ♦ LO) | 70 |
| Figure 4.8. Ordination of sample unit in environmental space as defined by CCA. The biplot overlay shows vector related to the strongest environmental variables which drove the separation of infaunal distribution in this system. A. Sites; B. Taxa(♦ HO, ♦ HI, OLI, ♦ LO)..... | 73 |
| Figure 5.1. Mean of sum of infaunal abundance (raw and $\sqrt{\sqrt{\quad}}$ transformed: \pm SD) within sediment showing a vertical distribution pattern..... | 86 |
| Figure 5.2. Mean of infaunal abundance ($\sqrt{\sqrt{\quad}}$ transformed \pm SD) during three consecutive sampling periods..... | 88 |
| Figure 5.3. Mean TOC and salinity at every depths during 3 consecutive sampling periods, clay and silt content in November season and redox potential in May season (bars denote the standard deviation). <i>There was no further statistical analysis of the data presented.</i> | 89 |
| Figure 6.1. Mean abundance/ core (\pm SD) and total abundance collected of Capitellidae in the three mangrove locations | 103 |
| Figure 6.2. Sediment characteristics (mean \pm SD) at the 3 location of SA mangroves | 104 |
| Figure 6.3. The sum abundance of <i>Capitella</i> sp. density and variation of sediment parameters (mean \pm SD) where <i>Capitella</i> sp. were caught (HO: samphire, HI : mangrove upper part, LO; mudflat) in Garden Island..... | 105 |
| Figure 6.4. Mean abundance (\pm SD) and total abundance of <i>Neanthes vaalii</i> in the 3 location of mangrove systems showing a spatial variation. | 114 |
| Figure 6.5. Edaphic characteristics where Nereididae occur in the 3 mangrove locations (HI=higher inner (mangrove), HO : higher outer (samphire), LI=lower inner (mangrove), LO=lower outer mudflat), GI=Garden Island, MB=Middle Beach, SK=Saint Kilda). | 114 |

Figure 6.6. Mean abundance/core (\pm SD) and total abundances collected of *Neanthes vaalii* at lower inner Garden Island mangroves showing a temporal variation..... 115

Figure 6.7. Mean abiotic parameters (\pm SD) at lower outer (LO=mudflat) of Garden Island 121

Figure 6.8. The mean abundance/core (\pm SD) and total abundance of *Pseudopolydora paucibranchiata* showing an inter annual variation..... 121

List of Tables

| | |
|--|-----|
| Table 1.1. Percentage of various animals retained on graded mesh screen sieve. 11 | 11 |
| Table 2.1. The occurrence of insect marine by taxonomic grouping and habitat (P=Pelagic, C= Coastal water, I= Intertidal, M= Mangrove, S= Saltmarsh). 28 | 28 |
| Table 3.1. List of taxa collected during the study from 3 difference locations... 43 | 43 |
| Table 3.2. Summary of Indicator Species Analysis when samples were grouped into; A.different locations B. different tidal height (high and low). List of taxa only includes those that make significant contribution. 51 | 51 |
| Table 4.1. Infaunal status in Garden Island, regard to spatial and temporal variation..... 63 | 63 |
| Table 4.2. Summary of statistics for rank-transformed MRPP where the samples were grouped into various categories (year, tidal height, in/out and transects). A value (range from 0-1) shows the level of homogeneity/correlation within groups, while p is statistical significance. δ value is under null hypothesis 69 | 69 |
| Table 4.3. Summary of two-way factorial analysis for important infaunal taxa in the mangrove system. The stars indicate significant : *) $\alpha < 0.05$: **) $\alpha < 0.01$: ***) $\alpha < 0.0001$ 72 | 72 |
| Table 4.4. Summary of Monte Carlo test result to test the null hypothesis and eigen value to evaluate which axis is more connected to the environmental variables..... 73 | 73 |
| Table 4.5. Correlation among measured abiotic factors..... 73 | 73 |
| Table 5.1. List of taxa collected at every section of the core (depth) during three consecutive sampling periods..... 85 | 85 |
| Table 5.2. Summary of pair t test statistics for the important taxa in regard to the variation of depth using sum abundances of every depth mentioned (* sign of significance). 87 | 87 |
| Table 5.3. Summary of Welch ANOVA test of the important taxa using the abundance differences (delta) value (*sign of significance)..... 88 | 88 |
| Table 5.4. Mean abiotic characteristics during three consecutive sampling periods. 89 | 89 |
| Table 6.1. Sediment characteristics where polychaete samples were collected.... 97 | 97 |
| Table 6.2. Species of <i>Capitella</i> where number of capillary-bearing segment ≥ 6 and shows the arrangement of thoracic chaetal formula (C=capillary, H= hooded hook, M= mixed cap and hook) (After Warren, 1991)..... 102 | 102 |
| Table 6.3. Comparison of paragnath arrangement in species <i>Neanthes</i> which are considered close to the present collected specimens; I-VIII refer to pharyngeal areas (after Hutchings and Turvey, 1982) 113 | 113 |

List of Plates

- Plate 1.1. Drift *Ulva sp.* has detrimental effects on mangrove by smothering pneumatophores and young seedlings 2
- Plate 6.1. Main body of *Capitella sp.* A: head with fused prostomium, B: thorax , showing capillary chaetae both notopodial and neuropodial, C: abdomen, showing hooked chaetae D: pygidium 100
- Plate 6.2. Genital spine shows at 8th segments, simple, heavily pointed and slightly recurved. Located dorsally from genital pore have role in copulation..... 101
- Plate 6.3. Anterior end of dorsal view of head of *Neanthes vaalii* (Nereididae), showing that prostomium and first segment fused. A: pair of palps with palpostyle B : Pair of antennae, C: Four pairs of tentacular cirri, D: prostomium, E: parapodium F: two pairs of eyes 110
- Plate 6.4. Anterior end of *Neanthes vaalii* with proboscis erected showing a continuous paragnath in oral ring. A: maxilla ring showing area I and II, B: oral ring showing area V and VI, C : Jaws..... 111
- Plate 6.5. Ventral view of *Neanthes vaalii* showing irregular rows of chitinous paragnath band A: maxilla ring showing area III and IV , B: oral ring showing area VII 112
- Plate 6.6. Biramous parapodia 10th setiger of *Neanthes vaalii*. A: aciculum, B: neuropodium with neurochaetae B1: ventral neuropodial heterogomph falciger, B2: ventral neuropodial heterogomph spiniger, C: notopodium with notochaetae homogomph spiniger..... 112
- Plate 6.7. *Pseudopolydora paucibranchiata* showing the feeding palp and pygidium like disc. 119
- Plate 6.8. *Pseudopolydora paucibranchiata* showing setiger 5th with specialized spine arranged in U shaped line. 120