

Stable isotope tests of the trophic role of estuarine habitats for fish

Andrew J. Melville BSc (Hons) BEd

School of Environmental and Applied Sciences
Griffith University

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Master of Philosophy

March 2005

Abstract

The role of autotrophic production in different coastal habitats in the production of fish in estuaries is an important consideration in coastal management and conservation. In the estuarine waters of the Australian east coast, many economically important fish species occur over mudflats lacking conspicuous vegetation. I used stable isotope analysis to examine where such fish ultimately derived their nutrition, in the subtropical waters of southern Moreton Bay, Queensland, Australia.

I first tested traditional processing methodologies of autotroph samples, in this case of mangrove leaves, and examined variability in mangrove isotope values at different spatial scales. Mangrove leaves processed using time-consuming grinding showed no significant difference in isotope values than coarsely broken leaf fragments. Isotope values of green leaves were not meaningfully different from yellow or brown leaves that would normally be the leaves that actually dropped on to the sediment. Future analyses therefore can use green leaves, since they are more abundant and therefore more easily collected, and can simply be processed as whole leaf fragments rather than being ground to a powder. Carbon and nitrogen isotope values varied at several spatial scales. The proportion of variability partitioned at different scales varied depending on the species of mangrove and element (C or N) analysed. To properly represent a geographic area, isotope analysis should be done on leaves collected at different locations and, especially, from different trees within locations.

The autotrophic source(s) supporting food webs leading to fish production on mudflats might be either *in situ* microphytobenthos or material transported from adjacent habitats dominated by macrophytes. I tested the importance of these sources by measuring $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values of 22 fish species and six autotroph taxa (microphytobenthos on mudflats, and seagrass, seagrass epiphytic algae, mangroves, saltmarsh succulents and saltmarsh grass in adjacent habitats) in Moreton Bay. I calculated the distribution of feasible contributions of each autotroph to fishes. All fish $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values lay in the enriched half of the range for autotrophs. For over 90% of fishes, the top three contributing autotrophs were seagrass, epiphytes and saltmarsh grass, with median estimates of approximately 60-90% from these sources combined. Seagrass was typically ranked as the main contributor based on medians, while epiphytic algae stood out based on 75th percentile contributions. The other three sources, including MPB, were ranked

in the top three contributors for only a single fish. Organic matter from seagrass meadows is clearly important at the base of food webs for fish on adjacent unvegetated mudflats, either through outwelling of particular organic matter or via a series of predator-prey interactions (trophic relay). Modelling results indicate that saltmarsh grass (*Sporobolus*) also had high contributions for many fish species, but this is probably a spurious result, reflecting the similarity in isotope values of this autotroph to seagrass. Carbon from adjacent habitats and not *in situ* microphytobenthos dominates the nutrition for this suite of 22 fishes caught over mudflats.

The ultimate autotrophic sources supporting production of three commercially important fish species from Moreton Bay were re-examined by further analysing carbon and nitrogen stable isotope data. Mean isotope values over the whole estuary for fish and autotroph sources were again modelled to indicate feasible combinations of sources. Variability in isotope values among nine locations (separated by 3-10 km) was then used as a further test of the likelihood that sources were involved in fish nutrition. A positive spatial correlation between isotope values of a fish species and an autotroph indicates a substantial contribution from the autotroph. Spatial correlations were tested with a newly developed randomisation procedure using differences between fish and autotroph values at each location, based on carbon and nitrogen isotopes combined in two-dimensional space. Both whole estuary modelling and spatial analysis showed that seagrass, epiphytic algae and particulate organic matter in the water column, potentially including phytoplankton, are likely contributors to bream (*Acanthopagrus australis*) nutrition. However, spatial analysis also showed that mangroves were involved (up to 33% contribution), despite a very low contribution based on whole estuary modelling. Spatial analysis for sand whiting (*Sillago ciliata*) demonstrated the importance of two sources, mangroves and microalgae on the mudflats, considered unimportant based on whole estuary modelling. No spatial correlations were found between winter whiting (*Sillago maculata*) and autotrophs, either because fish moved among locations or relied on different autotrophs at different locations. Spatial correlations between consumer and source isotope values provide a useful analytical tool for identifying the role of autotrophs in foodwebs, and were used here to demonstrate that organic matter from adjacent habitats, and in some cases also *in situ* production of microalgae, were important to fish over mudflats.

Whilst recognising that production from several habitats is implicated in the nutrition of fishes over mudflats in Moreton Bay, clearly the major source is from seagrass meadows. Organic

matter deriving from seagrass itself and/or algae epiphytic on seagrass is the most important source at the base of fisheries food webs in Moreton Bay. The importance of seagrass and its epiphytic algae to production of fisheries species in Moreton Bay reinforces the need to conserve and protect seagrass meadows from adverse anthropogenic influences.

Declaration

This work has not previously been submitted for a degree or diploma in any university. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the thesis itself.

Andrew Melville

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	I
LIST OF TABLES.....	VI
LIST OF FIGURES.....	VII
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	VIII
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: MANGROVE SAMPLE PROCESSING AND SPATIAL VARIABILITY	6
INTRODUCTION	6
METHODS	8
RESULTS	10
DISCUSSION.....	14
CHAPTER 3: WHOLE ESTUARY ANALYSIS OF CARBON SOURCES FOR FISH OVER SUBTROPICAL MUDFLATS	16
INTRODUCTION	16
METHODS	19
RESULTS	23
DISCUSSION.....	28
CONCLUSION	32
CHAPTER 4: SPATIAL ANALYSIS TO DETERMINE PRIMARY SOURCES OF NUTRITION FOR FISH OVER SUBTROPICAL MUDFLATS	33
INTRODUCTION	33
METHODS	35
RESULTS	39
DISCUSSION.....	46
CONCLUSION	51
REFERENCES	52

List of tables

Table 2.1: Differences between ground and unground treatments of a leaf of <i>Avicennia marina</i> . Isotope values shown are means, with SE and precision (SE / mean). n = 5 in all cases.....	10
Table 2.2: Variation in isotope signatures explained at different levels, calculated from the nested ANOVA, as % of variance explained.	11
Table 3.1: List of fish species analysed, including feeding groups, sample sizes and size ranges. Feeding groups listed as: benthic carnivores, detritivores, omnivores with a strongly herbivorous tendency (labelled “Omnivores”), pelagic carnivores, and piscivores. Feeding group is correct for ontogenetic stage used.	25
Table 3.2: Results of Isosource modelling. For each fish species, autotrophs are ranked by median contribution (1, 2 and 3). Where more than one autotroph is shown for a rank, this indicates a tied ranking. EPI – seagrass epiphytes, MAN – mangroves, MPB – microphytobenthos, SG – seagrass, SMG – Saltmarsh grass, SMS – saltmarsh succulents.	26
Table 3.3: Summary of Isosource modelling results for each autotroph based on median contributions. Values represent the number of fish species out of 22 in total for which the contribution of a particular autotroph is important, ranked by median contribution (1, 2 or 3).	27
Table 3.4: Summary of Isosource modelling results for each autotroph based on 75 th percentile contributions. Values represent the number of fish species out of 22 in total for which the contribution of a particular autotroph is important, ranked by 75 th percentile contribution (1, 2 or 3).....	27
Table 4.1: Results of spatial analysis for <i>Acanthopagrus australis</i> , <i>Sillago ciliata</i> and <i>S. maculata</i> . Numbers are the percentage of possible D values smaller than observed D; low numbers indicate locational tracking of autotroph isotope signatures by that fish species. Values in bold are significant ($p < 0.1$). na = fish occurred at insufficient locations ($n < 4$) where autotroph was present.....	45
Table 4.2: Summary of results of a single element (carbon) mixing model for <i>Acanthopagrus australis</i> and <i>Sillago ciliata</i> , using mangroves and seagrass. CL = confidence limit.	45

List of Figures

Figure 2.1: Map showing the four study locations used in the survey of variation over spatial scales.....	9
Figure 2.2: Isotopic ratios of green, yellow and brown leaves of <i>Avicennia marina</i> , a) $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, b) $\delta^{13}\text{C}$. Columns represent means (± 1 SE).....	12
Figure 2.3: Isotopic differences among individual leaves from one <i>Avicennia marina</i> tree, a) $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, b) $\delta^{13}\text{C}$. Columns represent means (± 1 SE).	13
Figure 3.1: Map of southern Moreton Bay indicating sampling sites. No site-specific work is reported in this chapter.	20
Figure 3.2: Mean $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values of fish overlaid on autotroph values. Values are mean \pm SE for fish and autotrophs.	24
Figure 4.1: Location of the 9 study sites in southern Moreton Bay	36
Figure 4.2: Mean (\pm SE) carbon and nitrogen isotope values of <i>Acanthopagrus australis</i> , <i>Sillago ciliata</i> and <i>S. maculata</i> and 7 autotrophs (seagrass – SG; seagrass epiphytes – EPI; mangroves – MAN; microphytobenthos – MPB; particulate organic matter – POM; saltmarsh grass – SMG; saltmarsh succulents – SMU).....	39
Figure 4.3: Histograms of the distribution of feasible contributions of the 7 autotrophs for <i>Acanthopagrus australis</i> , after correcting fish values for ^{15}N trophic level fractionation. Values in boxes are 1%ile and 99%ile ranges for these distributions.	41
Figure 4.4: Histograms of the distribution of feasible contributions of the 7 autotrophs for <i>Sillago ciliata</i> , after correcting fish values for ^{15}N trophic level fractionation. Values in boxes are 1%ile and 99%ile ranges for these distributions.	42
Figure 4.5: Histograms of the distribution of feasible contributions of the 7 autotrophs for <i>Sillago maculata</i> , after correcting fish values for ^{15}N trophic level fractionation. Values in boxes are 1%ile and 99%ile ranges for these distributions.	43
Figure 4.6: $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values at seven joint locations for a) <i>Acanthopagrus australis</i> and mangroves, and b) <i>A. australis</i> and POM. Lines join <i>A. australis</i> and the autotroph from the same location. \square = <i>A. australis</i> , \blacksquare = mangroves or POM. <i>A. australis</i> values adjusted for fractionation.....	44

Acknowledgements

Firstly I would like to thank Emma Cronin for getting me to the starting line.

I would also like to thank Bonnie Thomas for fieldwork, her love of saltmarsh, lab organisation and beating me at fishing; Gen Mount for crushing and grinding and for driving the boat; Keith Preston for processing the MPB samples and grinding; Pierre Ratt for inspiration, and the Coopers family for assistance in the field.

I thank Amy Koch for keeping me going in the early stages and keeping me interested in things outside.

My supervisor Rod Connolly deserves special thanks, praise and after getting me to the line, a long rest. Rod and I had stimulating discussions about the nature of science, the field of stable isotope research and of this project in particular. At all times Rod was helpful. This project was funded by a Fisheries Research and Development Corporation grant to Rod.

This thesis was advanced by the very helpful comments on the manuscript by Troy Gaston.

Lastly I would like to thank Michaela Guest for her unswerving support during a seemingly never-ending Masters Degree.