MR. ANDREW JOHN BROOKS (Orcid ID : 0000-0003-2866-3773)

Article type : Standard Paper

Title

Do pools impede drift dispersal by stream insects?

Andrew J. Brooks^{1,2}, Benjamin Wolfenden¹, Barbara J. Downes² and Jill Lancaster²

¹Department of Primary Industries - Water, Wollongong, NSW, Australia

²School of Geography, The University of Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Correspondence: Department of Primary Industries – Water, PO Box 53, Wollongong, NSW, Australia. E-mail: andrew.brooks@dpi.nsw.gov.au

Running title: Do pools impede drift dispersal by stream insects?

Keywords: dispersal, drift, stream insects, pools, connectivity

Summary

1. Drift of stream insects is one of the most ubiquitous forms of downstream dispersal and

thought to be a key factor influencing the persistence of local populations. Identifying the

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as [doi: 10.1111/fwb.12969](#)

factors that limit drift dispersal between habitat patches is needed to understand the connectivity of insect populations along river channels.

2. We determined whether insects drifting between riffle habitats (i.e. patches of suitable habitat) were impeded by natural, slow-moving pools (i.e. unsuitable habitat), limiting dispersal to the next downstream riffle, by estimating drift rates entering and exiting pools. We also investigated whether the frequency of drift dispersal between riffle habitats decreased with increasing pool size (length, width, depth), resulting from increasing areas of low or zero current velocity and/or distance between habitat patches. We then used this information to estimate drift distances of each taxon by modelling the distances downstream that a proportion of individuals arising from a source riffle will remain in the drift.

3. We found that for the majority of study taxa (7 of 8 taxa), drift dispersal between riffles was significantly hindered by the intervening pool habitat, supporting our prediction that natural, large slow-moving pools impede the number of invertebrates drifting between riffle habitats. There were three taxa whose drift rates were significantly reduced by increasing pool depth or width – *Offadens hickmani*, *Austrophlebioides* spp. and *Austrosimulium* spp., and weak relationships ($P < 0.10$) were also found for *Coloburiscoides munionga* and *Asmicridea edwardsii*. Drift was not associated with pool length for any species, suggesting that hydraulic conditions within a pool limit drift dispersal and not the total distance between riffle habitat patches.

4. Overall, our results suggest drift dispersal seems unlikely to be a major mechanism of long distance dispersal, for at least some common insects. These findings indicate that drift may play a more limited role in stream insect dispersal than is commonly considered and that flying adults may therefore have much greater influence on connectivity amongst populations.

Introduction

Dispersal of biota is one of the key factors influencing the spatial structure and persistence of local populations. This is because local extinctions following natural and anthropogenic disturbances can be overcome by recolonisation from other populations that are linked by dispersal (Hanski, 1998; Leibold *et al.*, 2004). Within riverine systems, dendritic network structure and strong unidirectional water flow can restrict dispersal, particularly for organisms with life stages that are strictly aquatic (Grant, Lowe & Fagan, 2007; Heino *et al.*, 2015).

The drift of stream insects, downstream movement while entrained in stream currents, is common in many lotic species (Waters, 1972; Brittain & Eikeland, 1988). Drift is thought to be

initiated by interacting biotic and abiotic factors including discharge and its associated hydraulic forces (e.g. O'Hop & Wallace, 1983; Gibbins, Vericat & Batalla, 2007), resource limitation (e.g. Kohler, 1985; Siler, Wallace & Eggert, 2001), predation (e.g. Peckarsky, 1980; McIntosh & Townsend, 1998) and competition (e.g. Fonseca & Hart, 1996). Drift occurs both in juvenile stages as larvae or nymphs (e.g. baetid mayflies: Wilcox *et al.*, 2008) and also in adults that are predominately aquatic (e.g. elmids: Elliott, 2008b). Consequently, drift is thought to be one of the main dispersal mechanisms for the redistribution of some stream insects (Mackay, 1992).

While drift has the potential to exert an overarching unidirectional control on population connectivity, recent evidence suggests dispersal by drift of aquatic insects within a stream may be minimal. For example, genetic differentiation of juvenile insect populations between sites within a stream is often greater than between streams and catchments, but if drift was widespread, there should be little genetic difference at this scale (Bunn & Hughes, 1997; Hughes, Huey & Schmidt, 2013). Studies of baetid larvae have also found dispersal distances can be shorter than routinely assumed (Lancaster, Downes & Arnold, 2011). For stream insects, it is unclear at what spatial scale populations are connected within river networks. To help resolve these uncertainties, measuring the rates of movement of stream insects between patches of suitable habitat is necessary (Downes & Reich, 2008). Therefore, identifying the factors that limit drift dispersal between habitat patches is critical for greater understanding of the connectivity of insect populations at broader spatial scales.

Natural river features can influence drift dispersal, potentially limiting connectivity within rivers (Alp *et al.*, 2012). In particular, the spatial configuration of low and zero flow areas throughout a stream channel will have a strong influence on drift dispersal distances (Lancaster, Hildrew & Gjerlov, 1996; Bond, Perry & Downes, 2000). Pools are regions of deeper, slower moving water and have been suggested as areas of drift deposition (Martin & Knight, 1989). The patterns of low velocity areas throughout a pool will be determined by the morphology of the pool, in particular its depth and width (Emery *et al.*, 2003; Gordon, McMahon & Finlayson, 2004). Pool length could also affect drift dispersal rates because successful movement between habitats is expected to reduce as the costs of movement (e.g. exposure to predation, energy expenditure) increase (Bowler & Benton, 2005). The degree to which pool morphology affects drift dispersal will be dependent on species behaviours such as altering body posture and swimming ability, and decisions about whether to continue or exit the drift (Allan & Feifarek, 1989; Oldmeadow, Lancaster & Rice, 2010).

The aim of this study was to determine whether stream insect drift is constrained by natural river features, potentially limiting connectivity within rivers. Specifically, we determined whether lotic insects drifting between riffle habitats (i.e. patches of suitable habitat) were impeded by natural, slow-moving pools (i.e. unsuitable habitat) that limited or prevented dispersal between riffle habitats. Whether or not pools impede drift dispersal is expected to be related to the hydraulic conditions experienced by the organism while attempting to traverse the pool and the distance between riffle habitat patches

We investigated the drift dispersal of stream insects between riffle habitat patches by testing two *a priori* predictions. (i) If natural, large slow-moving pools impede the number of drifters, there will be greater numbers of drifting insects entering a pool from an upstream riffle (immigrants) than leaving the same pool (emigrants). This would indicate that drift dispersal between riffle habitat patches is limited. Alternatively, if pools do not impede drift then dispersal and emigration will equal or sometimes exceed immigration. To further explore the mechanisms that may influence the drift dispersal between riffles, we predicted, (ii) the frequency of drift dispersal between riffle habitats will decrease with increasing pool size (length, mean width, mean depth). This would result from the increasing areas of slow- or non- flowing water and increasing distance between habitat patches limiting drift dispersal distances (Lancaster *et al.*, 1996; Bond *et al.*, 2000).

Methods

Study area and sites

In order to test our predictions, drift entering and exiting thirteen natural pools were sampled in the Mowamba (6 pools) and Thredbo (7 pools) rivers. These rivers are located mostly within Kosciuszko National Park, in the Snowy Mountains region of south-east Australia (Fig. 1) and are snowmelt driven systems with highest discharge during spring (September-November). The catchment area of Mowamba River is 222 km² and Thredbo River is 243 km². The study pools in both rivers ranged in length from 36 m to 352 m, mean depth ranged from 0.5 m to 1.79 m and mean width ranged from 7.3 m to 33.4 m.

Field sampling

Sites were sampled on two occasions: early autumn (April) and early summer (December) of 2011. Discharge in Mowamba River sites ranged from 0.97 m³s⁻¹ – 1.23 m³s⁻¹ during autumn sampling and 0.85 m³s⁻¹ – 1.01 m³s⁻¹ during summer sampling. In the Thredbo River sites, discharge ranged

117 $3.61 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} - 6.75 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ during autumn and $2.28 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1} - 4.27 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ during summer. These flows
118 equated to the 50-60th percentile in both rivers (see Fig. S1 in Supporting Information).
119 Invertebrate drift was sampled using drift nets (25 x 25 cm opening) fitted with 1.5 m long nets
120 with 250 μm mesh. Drifting invertebrates were sampled entering and exiting each pool using six
121 nets located along a transect above the upstream margin of each pool and immediately below the
122 upstream riffle (immigration) and six nets at the downstream end of each pool and above the next
123 downstream riffle (emigration). We expected there may be differences in the composition and
124 density of drifting insects throughout the water column (see Fenoglio *et al.*, 2004). To ensure we
125 collected a representative sample of drift, drift nets were stratified with three completely
126 submerged at approximately 0.6 of maximum depth and at least 3 cm from the bottom, and three
127 sampling the top 10-15 cm of the water column. For each pool, drift was collected on a single
128 night over three hours starting fifteen minutes prior to sunset. Sunset was defined as the instant
129 the upper edge of the sun's disk was coincident with the horizon. This time period was chosen
130 because the majority of invertebrate drift occurs just after dusk (Brittain & Eikeland, 1988). All
131 samples were preserved in 70% ethanol for laboratory sorting and identification.

132 Stream discharge was calculated at each sampling transect (entering and exiting each pool)
133 on the day of sampling using standard river gauging methods (Gordon *et al.*, 2004). The
134 bathymetry of each pool was measured using a Lowrance Elite-5 HDI chartplotter fitted to a kayak.
135 Between 700 and 2000 measures of depth and position were taken in each pool by multiple
136 longitudinal and diagonal passes of the pool. Mean depth and mean width were calculated and
137 FRAGSTATS v4 was used to calculate length of pool between riffle habitat patches (McGarigal,
138 Cushman & Ene, 2012). These three pool morphological measures were not significantly
139 correlated (Pearson correlation, $P > 0.05$).

140 *Laboratory procedures*

141 In this study design, individual pools are replicates, not individual drift nets, and the *Statistical*
142 *analysis* section will explain this in greater detail. Therefore for each transect, the contents of the
143 6 individual nets were composited. Each composited sample was 30% subsampled using the
144 methods and equipment described by Marchant (1989) and identified to species level where
145 possible and enumerated.

146 *Study species*

147 We limited our analysis to 8 taxa from the families Baetidae, Coloburiscidae, Elmidae,
148 Gripopterygidae, Hydropsychidae, Leptophlebiidae and Simuliidae (Table 1) that were commonly

found across all sites and on the majority of sample occasions. These taxa are more prevalent in riffle habitats than pools in the study rivers (Brooks *et al.*, 2011), and more generally the focal genera are found in fast-flowing, well oxygenated waters such as riffles (CSIRO Division of Entomology, 1991), indicating riffles are a more suitable habitat than pools for these organisms. Some of the study taxa comprised multiple species, but we expected support for our hypotheses if drift behaviours were consistent within such taxonomic groups. Alternatively, non-support of hypotheses (i.e. no effect of pools on drift) implies either that species drift consistently through pools or that species respond in various ways, producing an average response that does not support our hypotheses.

Statistical analysis

For drift, the proportion of the cross-sectional area of the water column that was sampled by drift nets was calculated, and total drift numbers of each taxa were multiplied by its inverse to estimate total numbers drifting past each sampling location. Thus, drift rates were the total number of insects drifting past the total cross-sectional area of the river per three hours. We did not use volume of water passing through the nets in our calculations for two reasons. First, our hypotheses require us to estimate the numbers of insects drifting into or out of pools per unit time; the volume of water in which they travel is not directly relevant to our hypotheses. Secondly, while it is commonly assumed that it is necessary to correct drift numbers because of the different volumes of water that pass through nets, in actuality this correction requires there to be a tight and largely linear relation between drift numbers and volumes (Downes, 2010). Such relations may be poor given that drift nets have to be placed in flows sufficient for them to function i.e. drift nets cannot sample drifters in slow flows. If there is no relation between drift numbers and volume (e.g. as shown in Downes, 2010), then dividing the former by the latter adds a lot of noise that can blur any underlying patterns. We deemed it simpler to work with drift rates.

For each study species, drift rates from a riffle into a pool (immigration, N_I) and drift rates exiting the same pool to the next downstream riffle (emigration, N_E) were calculated. Using these estimates we calculated a source/sink index (SS) for each pool after Lancaster *et al.* (2011):

$$SS = (N_E - N_I) / N_E \text{ if } N_I < N_E, \text{ and } SS = (N_E - N_I) / N_I \text{ if } N_I > N_E$$

This index ranges between -1 and 1. Pools are sinks if $SS < 0$ (immigration > emigration) and SS represents the proportion of immigrating insects that did not drift through the pool. In contrast, pools are a source of drifting insects if $SS > 0$ (i.e. emigration > immigration) and SS reflects the proportion of emigrants that originated in the pool. Values of $SS = 0$ indicate comparable

181 immigration and emigration rates. Therefore, if pools impede drift dispersal between riffles for a
182 particular species, then SS averaged over all pools will be < 0 . Alternatively, drift dispersal between
183 riffle patches is not impeded by pools when the average SS > 0 .

184 To test prediction (i), t -tests were used to determine whether the mean SS for each study
185 species was significantly less than 0, and thus whether large natural pools impeded drift dispersal
186 between riffle habitats. One-tailed tests ($P < 0.05$) were used because we were only interested in
187 determining if SS was less than 0 to test this hypothesis.

188 To determine whether increasing pool size affected dispersal between riffles (prediction (ii)),
189 we tested for associations between SS values for each species and each of the pool morphological
190 measures. Associations between SS values and mean depth and mean width were tested using
191 least squares linear regression. Associations between pool length and SS were tested as a non-
192 linear relationship using a negative exponential function. This form was chosen because
193 exponential models of drift – distance relationships have been supported empirically (see McLay,
194 1970).

195 Results

196 There were no significant differences between SS and time of sampling or between rivers for all
197 taxa except for *Coloburiscoides munionga*, which had a significantly lower SS in March (mean SS = -
198 0.62) compared to December (mean SS = -0.07). We found that a significant proportion of drifters
199 for 7 of the 8 focal taxa failed to disperse from the upstream riffle through the pools to the next
200 riffle (t -tests: mean SS values < 0 , $P < 0.05$; Table 1; Fig. 2). These results indicate that on average,
201 there was between 29% and 60% fewer drifters exiting a pool than entering a pool. The exception
202 was *Austrophlebioides* spp. where the number of drifters entering a pool equalled the number
203 exiting (mean SS = -0.13). *Offadens hickmani* had the lowest mean SS (SS = -0.6; Fig. 2, Table 1) and
204 significantly lower than *Austrophlebioides* spp. (Tukey HSD test, $P < 0.05$). For neither of these
205 taxa, however, was SS significantly different from any other species (Fig. 2).

206 There were three taxa that had significant relationships between SS and mean depth –
207 *Offadens hickmani*, *Austrophlebioides* spp. and *Austrosimulium* spp (Table 1). Additionally, mean
208 depth was associated with *Coloburiscoides munionga* and *Asmicridea edwardsii*, but more weakly
209 ($P < 0.10$: Table 1). The direction of all relationships (with slopes significantly less than zero)
210 indicated the proportion of individuals drifting between riffles was reduced as pool depth
211 increased. *Austrophlebioides* spp. had the strongest relationship ($\beta = -0.83$) with mean depth

(Table 1, Fig. 3). Even though SS for *Austrophlebioides* spp. was approximately zero when averaged across all pools (Table 1), deeper pools strongly reduced the proportion of individuals drifting between riffles (Fig. 3). The simuliids, *Austrosimulium* spp., was the only species to be significantly related to mean width (Fig. 3, Table 1). Length was not significantly related to the drift dispersal of any study species (e.g. Fig. 3e).

Discussion

Identifying the limits or constraints to successful dispersal remains a critical issue for the understanding of connectivity patterns across landscapes (Vasudev *et al.*, 2015). In freshwater systems, understanding the degree of connectivity between populations is fundamental to population ecology (Fagan & Lutscher, 2006; Hughes, Schmidt & Finn, 2009). A key piece of information is the distances insects disperse via drift, which is dependent on the dispersal capabilities of an insect, the frequency of dispersal and barriers to dispersal. We asked a number of questions that investigated stream insect drift between riffle habitats and the possible mechanisms by which intervening pool habitats could constrain dispersal between these habitat patches.

Are stream insects drifting between riffle habitats impeded by pools?

We found that for the majority of study taxa, drift dispersal between riffles (i.e. patches of suitable habitat) was hindered by the intervening pool habitat. These findings supported our first prediction that natural, large slow-moving pools impede the number of invertebrates drifting between riffle habitats.

The baetid, *Offadens hickmani*, showed the greatest reduction in drift (60% reduction). Lancaster *et al.* (2011) studied drift rates of the baetid, *Baetis rhodani*, through seven pools and found similar declines in drift numbers, suggesting that pools were sinks for this species. In general, for our study taxa, there are few published studies of drift of stream insects between riffles separated by pools, and therefore limited results with which to compare our findings. The few relevant studies rarely sampled more than one or two pools and the results were often contradictory. For example, Kovalak (1978) found that a pool was a source of a number of rheophilic invertebrates (*Baetis*, *Simulium*, *Hydropsyche*). Similarly, Campbell (1985) concluded that drift of *Baetis* through a pool was not reduced. However, their study pools were relatively short (<17 m) compared to our study where the pool lengths were >35 m and mean depths >0.5 m. In contrast, Martin & Knight (1989) showed two long pools (45 m and 90 m) were barriers to

243 drift for *Simulium* and *Baetis* and it was hypothesised that low water velocities through the pools
244 limited drift distances of insects.

245 *Is drift affected by pool morphology?*

246 Drift dispersal between riffle habitats for many of the study species (5 of 8 taxa) were associated
247 with one aspect of pool morphology - mean depth. For each of these species, the direction of the
248 relationship indicated that drift was reduced with deeper pools. *Austrosimulium* spp. drift was also
249 significantly reduced with increasing mean width. Pool cross-sectional area increases with
250 increasing depth, and therefore pool velocity also declines with increasing depth in accordance
251 with the continuity equation (discharge = velocity*area; see Gordon et al., 2004). Therefore, our
252 findings were consistent with the prediction that dispersal was increasingly impeded by declining
253 velocity associated with increasing pool depth (prediction (ii)). Interestingly, there were few
254 significant relationships between drift and pool length. The lack of associations was because
255 velocity at any location within a pool is a function of discharge, width and depth (i.e. discharge /
256 cross sectional area), and length will have minimal influence on velocity through a pool. This
257 further supports our hypothesis that the area and arrangement of low and zero flow zones within
258 a pool limit drift dispersal between riffles, and not the total distance between riffle habitat
259 patches. The lack of any length-SS relationships also suggests that these species ability to drift
260 through pools independently of velocity patterns within pools is limited and drift distances are
261 highly dependent on water current.

262 Variations in SS - pool morphology relationships between the study insects may be
263 attributed to differences in a species' body morphology, drift behaviours and swimming abilities
264 (Lancaster & Downes, 2013). For baetid mayflies, a combination of swimming and body posturing
265 is used to manage drift time and distances (Oldmeadow *et al.*, 2010). These behaviours can both
266 prolong drift and also allow exit the drift (Allan & Feifarek, 1989). The baetid, *Offadens hickmani*, is
267 likely to use similar mechanisms when drifting. *O. hickmani* may have actively chosen to exit the
268 drift when initially exposed to slow or zero velocity areas by swimming to the substrate (Otto &
269 Sjöström, 1986), possibly to avoid the risk of settlement in slow flow habitats where the risk of
270 predation can be greater (Wellnitz, 2014). Actively settling from the drift may well have increased
271 when encountering progressively slower flows in deeper pools. *Austrosimulium* spp., a simuliid,
272 increase their chances of transiting pools using silk threads, which diminish their fall velocities,
273 making them more likely to drift through a pool before being deposited (Fingerut *et al.*, 2009). This
274 may explain why proportionally more *Austrosimulium* spp. (SS = -0.29) drifted through pools

275 compared to any other study species, but the effectiveness of silk threads helping larvae moving
276 between riffles was reduced in deeper, slower flowing pools. Drift of *Austrophlebioides* spp. was
277 not significantly reduced by pools on average, but was greatly reduced by the deeper pools and
278 associated low and zero flow areas. Leptophlebiids use dorso-ventral undulations to swim in low
279 velocity areas (Otto & Sjöström, 1986; Barmuta, Mckenny & Swain, 2001), and presumably
280 swimming was used to disperse across the shallower pools, but was less effective when drifting
281 into the deepest pools in our study.

282 We found the ability of hydropsychids (*Asmicridea* AV1, *Cheumatopsyche* AV4), mayfly
283 (*Coloburiscoides munionga*), stonefly (*Dinotoperla* spp.) and adult elmids (*Simsonia* spp.) to drift
284 through pools was limited, but the degree of impediment did not increase with increasing pool
285 size (Table 1). Hydropsychidae larvae are inefficient swimmers (e.g. *Hydropsyche* sp.; Otto &
286 Sjöström, 1986) and avoid areas of slow flow and move to areas of faster flow by walking (e.g.
287 *Asmicridea* AV1; Sharpe & Downes, 2006). Elmid adults also predominantly disperse by walking
288 rather than drifting (Elliott, 2008a). The capacity to walk from pool habitats after settlement to
289 seek faster flowing riffle areas may explain why there was no association between pool size and
290 drift for these species. Stonefly nymphs have the capability to swim in still water using lateral
291 undulations (Otto & Sjöström, 1986). Similarly, Coloburiscidae mayfly nymphs have some capacity
292 to swim, albeit poorly (Phillips, 1931). Despite the potential for both these taxa to swim, drift was
293 reduced by pool habitats, and shallower pools did not increase their likelihood of drifting to the
294 next downstream riffle.

295 Our results also highlight questions about the fate of the individuals that unsuccessfully
296 drifted from a source riffle to the next downstream riffle. There are a number of potential
297 explanations for the loss of drifters. An unlikely reason for the reductions is fish predation during
298 drift. In our study rivers, the major fish predators were heavily stocked non-native rainbow and
299 brown trout (NSW Department of Primary Industries - Fisheries, 2014) with few native fish.
300 However, trout feeding generally does not occur after twilight (Angradi & Griffith, 1990) when
301 drift numbers are at their highest, and overall losses of invertebrates are likely to be only a
302 negligible fraction of the drift (Naman, Rosenfeld & Richardson, 2016). A more likely explanation is
303 that an individual will settle from the drift in the lateral margins of the river (Ciborowski, 1983) and
304 crawl or swim upstream, returning to the upstream riffle, as small-scale upstream movements of
305 benthic invertebrates are reasonably common (Elliott, 2003). Alternatively the adverse

306 environmental conditions and/or increased predation may result in many of these individuals
307 dying before moving out of pools (Wellnitz, 2014).

308 Most measurements of drift distances of stream insects have been experimental studies in
309 depths <0.5m (e.g. McLay, 1970; Elliott, 1971; Larkin & McKone, 1985), with settlement estimates
310 subsequently used to model drift distances (e.g. Anderson *et al.*, 2013). Our study has shown that
311 deep, slow moving pools can substantially limit drift dispersal distances. Therefore, accurate
312 models of drift dispersal need to incorporate the influence of pools, otherwise drift distances may
313 be substantially overestimated.

314 Gathering information about dispersal rates between habitat patches, and distinguishing the
315 major mechanisms that insects use to disperse between them, is key to predicting and
316 understanding population dynamics (Downes & Reich, 2008; Hughes *et al.*, 2008). We found drift
317 dispersal seems unlikely to be a major mechanism of long distance dispersal, with a significant
318 proportion of drifters failing to disperse between riffles separated by a deep pool. Our findings
319 support recent observations that dispersal of freshwater insects is not as wide-spread as was
320 assumed, and that drift may have a limited role in defining the large-scale population structure of
321 stream insects (Bohonak & Jenkins, 2003; Downes & Lancaster, 2010; Lancaster *et al.*, 2011;
322 Naman *et al.*, 2016). This is consistent with mounting evidence that the larval distribution patterns
323 within rivers may be more influenced by adult behaviours (successful mating and oviposition of
324 adult females) than drift (Encalada & Peckarsky, 2012; Lancaster & Downes, 2014). As a
325 consequence, connectivity amongst populations over large spatial scales is most probably
326 determined by movements of flying adults (Hughes *et al.*, 2013). However, for insects with adult
327 stages that are fully aquatic or poor fliers, the spatial extent of their population may be even more
328 limited. We acknowledge that our results and conclusions are limited to stream systems with well-
329 defined pool-riffle sequences. Drift patterns may vary strongly between rivers with different
330 geomorphological characteristics and is an area that is in need of further research.

331 Detailed knowledge of the primary mechanisms of stream insect dispersal is also vital to
332 understand how populations may be restored following anthropogenic disturbances (Palmer,
333 Ambrose & Poff, 1997; Parkyn & Smith, 2011). Dams and weirs can fragment populations and alter
334 the ability of animals to move through river networks (Dudgeon *et al.*, 2006; Lake, Bond & Reich,
335 2007; Erős & Campbell Grant, 2015). If stream insect dispersal between habitat patches is
336 impeded by natural river features such as pools, then weir pools and dam lakes may obstruct drift
337 dispersal to an even greater extent, and any attempts at downstream river restoration may

338 become predominantly reliant on dispersal of flying adults from populations elsewhere within the
339 river system. Therefore, a key area of research is understanding how these structures affect the
340 major pathways and mechanisms of successful stream insect dispersal (both aquatic and
341 terrestrial), and will be critical to successful river restoration.

342 **Acknowledgements**

343 Many thanks to Tim Haeusler and Matthew Russell for working long days and late nights during
344 field sampling. We are also grateful for the assistance of Dan Coleman in the field and laboratory.
345 Snowy Hydro kindly provided access to many of the sampling locations. This project was funded by
346 NSW Department of Primary Industry – Water. Additional funding was provided by the University
347 of Melbourne - School of Geography and a grant from the Holsworth Wildlife Research
348 Endowment awarded to A. Brooks.

349 **References**

- 350 Allan J.D. & Feifarek B.P. (1989) Distances travelled by drifting mayfly nymphs: factors influencing
351 return to the substrate. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **8**, 322–330.
- 352 Alp M., Keller L., Westram A.M. & Robinson C.T. (2012) How river structure and biological traits
353 influence gene flow: a population genetic study of two stream invertebrates with differing
354 dispersal abilities. *Freshwater Biology* **57**, 969–981.
- 355 Anderson K.E., Harrison L.R., Nisbet R.M. & Kolpas A. (2013) Modeling the influence of flow on
356 invertebrate drift across spatial scales using a 2D hydraulic model and a 1D population
357 model. *Ecological Modelling* **265**, 207–220.
- 358 Angradi T.R. & Griffith J.S. (1990) Diel feeding chronology and Diet selection of rainbow trout
359 (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) in the Henry's Fork of the Snake River, Idaho. *Canadian Journal of*
360 *Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **47**, 199–209.
- 361 Barmuta L.A., Mckenny C.E.A. & Swain R. (2001) The responses of a lotic mayfly *Nousia* sp.
362 (Ephemeroptera: Leptophlebiidae) to moving water and light of different wavelengths.
363 *Freshwater Biology* **46**, 567–573.
- 364 Bohonak A.J. & Jenkins D.G. (2003) Ecological and evolutionary significance of dispersal by
365 freshwater invertebrates. *Ecology Letters* **6**, 783–796.
- 366 Bond N.R., Perry G.L.W. & Downes B.J. (2000) Dispersal of organisms in a patchy stream
367 environment under different settlement scenarios. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **69**, 608–619.

- 368 Bowler D.E. & Benton T.G. (2005) Causes and consequences of animal dispersal strategies: relating
369 individual behaviour to spatial dynamics. *Biological Reviews* **80**, 205–225.
- 370 Brittain J.E. & Eikeland T.J. (1988) Invertebrate drift — A review. *Hydrobiologia* **166**, 77–93.
- 371 Brooks A.J., Russell M., Bevitt R. & Dasey M. (2011) Constraints on the recovery of invertebrate
372 assemblages in a regulated snowmelt river during a tributary-sourced environmental flow
373 regime. *Marine and Freshwater Research* **62**, 1407–1420.
- 374 Bunn S.E. & Hughes J.M. (1997) Dispersal and recruitment in streams: evidence from genetic
375 studies. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* **16**, 338–346.
- 376 Campbell R.N.B. (1985) Comparison of the drift of live and dead Baëtis nymphs in a weakening
377 water current. *Hydrobiologia* **126**, 229–236.
- 378 Ciborowski J.J.H. (1983) Downstream and Lateral Transport of Nymphs of Two Mayfly Species
379 (Ephemeroptera). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **40**, 2025–2029.
- 380 CSIRO Division of Entomology (1991) *The Insects of Australia : a textbook for students and research*
381 *workers*, 2nd ed. Melbourne University Press, Carlton, Victoria.
- 382 Downes B.J. (2010) Back to the future: little-used tools and principles of scientific inference can
383 help disentangle effects of multiple stressors on freshwater ecosystems. *Freshwater*
384 *Biology* **55**, 60–79.
- 385 Downes B.J. & Lancaster J. (2010) Does dispersal control population densities in advection-
386 dominated systems? A fresh look at critical assumptions and a direct test. *Journal of Animal*
387 *Ecology* **79**, 235–248.
- 388 Downes B.J. & Reich P. (2008) What is the spatial structure of stream insect populations? Dispersal
389 behaviour at different life-history stages. In: *Aquatic insects: challenges to populations*.
390 (Eds J. Lancaster & R.A. Briers), pp. 184–203. CAB International, Wallingford, UK.
- 391 Dudgeon D., Arthington A.H., Gessner M.O., Kawabata Z.-I., Knowler D.J., Lévêque C., *et al.* (2006)
392 Freshwater biodiversity: importance, threats, status and conservation challenges.
393 *Biological Reviews* **81**, 163–182.
- 394 Elliott J.M. (2003) A comparative study of the dispersal of 10 species of stream invertebrates.
395 *Freshwater Biology* **48**, 1652–1668.
- 396 Elliott J.M. (2008a) Ontogenetic changes in the drifting of four species of elmids elucidate
397 the complexity of drift-benthos relationships in a small stream in Northwest England.
398 *Freshwater Biology* **53**, 159–170.
- 399 Elliott J.M. (1971) The distances travelled by drifting Invertebrates in a Lake District stream.
400 *Oecologia* **6**, 350–379.

- 401 Elliott J.M. (2008b) The Ecology of Riffle Beetles (Coleoptera: Elmidae). *Freshwater Reviews* **1**,
402 189–203.
- 403 Emery J.C., Gurnell A.M., Clifford N.J., Petts G.E., Morrissey I.P. & Soar P.J. (2003) Classifying the
404 hydraulic performance of riffle–pool bedforms for habitat assessment and river
405 rehabilitation design. *River Research and Applications* **19**, 533–549.
- 406 Encalada A.C. & Peckarsky B.L. (2012) Large-scale manipulation of mayfly recruitment affects
407 population size. *Oecologia* **168**, 967–976.
- 408 Erős T. & Campbell Grant E.H. (2015) Unifying research on the fragmentation of terrestrial and
409 aquatic habitats: patches, connectivity and the matrix in riverscapes. *Freshwater Biology*
410 **60**, 1487–1501.
- 411 Fagan W.F. & Lutscher F. (2006) Average dispersal success: linking home range, dispersal, and
412 metapopulation dynamics to reserve design. *Ecological Applications* **16**, 820–828.
- 413 Fenoglio S., Bo T., Gallina G. & Cucco M. (2004) Vertical distribution in the water column of
414 drifting stream macroinvertebrates. *Journal of Freshwater Ecology* **19**, 485–492.
- 415 Fingerut J., Schamel L., Faugno A., Mestrinaro M. & Habdas P. (2009) Role of silk threads in the
416 dispersal of larvae through stream pools. *Journal of Zoology* **279**, 137–143.
- 417 Fonseca D.M. & Hart D.D. (1996) Density-dependent dispersal of black fly neonates is mediated by
418 flow. *Oikos* **75**, 49–58.
- 419 Gibbins C., Vericat D. & Batalla R.J. (2007) When is stream invertebrate drift catastrophic? The role
420 of hydraulics and sediment transport in initiating drift during flood events. *Freshwater*
421 *Biology* **52**, 2369–2384.
- 422 Gordon N.D., McMahon T. & Finlayson B. (2004) *Stream hydrology: an introduction for ecologists*.
423 John Wiley and Sons, Chichester.
- 424 Grant E.H.C., Lowe W.H. & Fagan W.F. (2007) Living in the branches: population dynamics and
425 ecological processes in dendritic networks. *Ecology Letters* **10**, 165–175.
- 426 Hanski I. (1998) Metapopulation dynamics. *Nature* **396**, 41–49.
- 427 Heino J., Melo A.S., Siqueira T., Soininen J., Valanko S. & Bini L.M. (2015) Metacommunity
428 organisation, spatial extent and dispersal in aquatic systems: patterns, processes and
429 prospects. *Freshwater Biology* **60**, 845–869.
- 430 Hughes J.M., Huey J.A. & Schmidt D.J. (2013) Is realised connectivity among populations of aquatic
431 fauna predictable from potential connectivity? *Freshwater Biology* **58**, 951–966.
- 432 Hughes J.M., Schmidt D.J. & Finn D.S. (2009) Genes in streams: Using DNA to understand the
433 movement of freshwater fauna and their riverine habitat. *BioScience* **59**, 573–583.

- 434 Hughes J.M., Schmidt D.J., McLean A. & Wheatley A. (2008) Population Genetic Structure in
435 Stream Insects: What Have We Learned? In: *Aquatic Insects: Challenges to Populations*.
436 (Eds J. Lancaster & R.A. Briers), pp. 268–288. CABI International, Wallingford, UK.
- 437 Kohler S.L. (1985) Identification of stream drift mechanisms: an experimental and observational
438 approach. *Ecology* **66**, 1749–1761.
- 439 Kovalak W.P. (1978) Effects of a pool on stream invertebrate drift. *American Midland Naturalist*
440 **99**, 119.
- 441 Lake P.S., Bond N. & Reich P. (2007) Linking ecological theory with stream restoration. *Freshwater*
442 *Biology* **52**, 597–615.
- 443 Lancaster J. & Downes B.J. (2013) Locomotion in and on water. In: *Aquatic Entomology*. (Eds J.
444 Lancaster & B.J. Downes), pp. 119–135. Oxford University Press, Oxford, GBR.
- 445 Lancaster J. & Downes B.J. (2014) Maternal behaviours may explain riffle-scale variations in some
446 stream insect populations. *Freshwater Biology* **59**, 502–513.
- 447 Lancaster J., Downes B.J. & Arnold A. (2011) Lasting effects of maternal behaviour on the
448 distribution of a dispersive stream insect. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **80**, 1061–1069.
- 449 Lancaster J., Hildrew A.G. & Gjerlov C. (1996) Invertebrate drift and longitudinal transport
450 processes in streams. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **53**, 572–582.
- 451 Larkin P.A. & McKone D.W. (1985) An Evaluation by Field Experiments of the McLay Model of
452 Stream Drift. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **42**, 909–918.
- 453 Leibold M.A., Holyoak M., Mouquet N., Amarasekare P., Chase J.M., Hoopes M.F., *et al.* (2004) The
454 metacommunity concept: a framework for multi-scale community ecology. *Ecology Letters*
455 **7**, 601–613.
- 456 Mackay R.J. (1992) Colonization by lotic macroinvertebrates: a review of processes and patterns.
457 *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **49**, 617–628.
- 458 Marchant R. (1989) A subsampler for samples of benthic macroinvertebrates. *Bulletin of the*
459 *Australian Society for Limnology* **12**, 49–52.
- 460 Martin J.C. & Knight A.W. (1989) The effect of long pools on the drift of macro-invertebrates in a
461 mountain stream. *Hydrobiologia* **185**, 63–70.
- 462 McGarigal K., Cushman S. & Ene E. (2012) *FRAGSTATS v4: Spatial Pattern Analysis Program for*
463 *Categorical and Continuous Maps*. University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- 464 McIntosh A.R. & Townsend C.R. (1998) Do different predators affect distance, direction, and
465 destination of movements by a stream mayfly? *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic*
466 *Sciences* **55**, 1954–1960.

- McLay C. (1970) A theory concerning the distance travelled by animals entering the drift of a stream. *Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada* **27**, 359–370.
- Naman S.M., Rosenfeld J.S. & Richardson J.S. (2016) Causes and consequences of invertebrate drift in running waters: from individuals to populations and trophic fluxes. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **73**, 1292–1305.
- NSW Department of Primary Industries - Fisheries (2014) Snowy Lakes Trout Strategy 2012-2017. *NSW Department of Primary Industries - Fisheries*.
- O'Hop J. & Wallace J.B. (1983) Invertebrate drift, discharge, and sediment relations in a southern Appalachian headwater stream. *Hydrobiologia* **98**, 71–84.
- Oldmeadow D.F., Lancaster J. & Rice S.P. (2010) Drift and settlement of stream insects in a complex hydraulic environment. *Freshwater Biology* **55**, 1020–1035.
- Otto C. & Sjöström P. (1986) Behaviour of drifting insect larvae. *Hydrobiologia* **131**, 77–86.
- Palmer M.A., Ambrose R.F. & Poff N.L. (1997) Ecological theory and community restoration ecology. *Restoration Ecology* **5**, 291–300.
- Parkyn S.M. & Smith B.J. (2011) Dispersal constraints for stream invertebrates: setting realistic timescales for biodiversity restoration. *Environmental Management* **48**, 602–614.
- Peckarsky B.L. (1980) Predator-prey interactions between stoneflies and mayflies: behavioral observations. *Ecology* **61**, 932–943.
- Phillips J.S. (1931) Studies of New Zealand Mayfly Nymphs. *Transactions of the Royal Entomological Society of London* **79**, 399–422.
- Sharpe A.K. & Downes B.J. (2006) The effects of potential larval supply, settlement and post-settlement processes on the distribution of two species of filter-feeding caddisflies. *Freshwater Biology* **51**, 717–729.
- Siler E.R., Wallace J.B. & Eggert S.L. (2001) Long-term effects of resource limitation on stream invertebrate drift. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **58**, 1624–1637.
- Vasudev D., Fletcher R.J., Goswami V.R. & Krishnadas M. (2015) From dispersal constraints to landscape connectivity: lessons from species distribution modeling. *Ecography* **38**, 967–978.
- Waters T.F. (1972) The drift of stream insects. *Annual Review of Entomology* **17**, 253–272.
- Wellnitz T. (2014) Can current velocity mediate trophic cascades in a mountain stream? *Freshwater Biology* **59**, 2245–2255.
- Wilcox A.C., Peckarsky B.L., Taylor B.W. & Encalada A.C. (2008) Hydraulic and geomorphic effects on mayfly drift in high-gradient streams at moderate discharges. *Ecohydrology* **1**, 176–186.

Author Manuscript

501 **Tables**

502 Table 1. Summary of drift dispersal results for the 8 study stream insects. *t*-tests comparing the mean source/sink index (SS) for each invertebrate
503 taxa to zero. *P* values are significant at 0.05 (1-tailed test). Least squares regression relationships between SS and pool morphology are also
504 summarised. Mean depth and mean width were tested as linear responses and length as a negative exponential response. Relationships $0.05 < P <$
505 0.10 are shown in italics and relationships $P < 0.05$ are indicated in bold.

Taxon	t-tests				Regression analysis									
					length				mean depth			mean width		
	Mean SS	df	t-value	P	df	F	P	R ²	F	P	R ²	F	P	R ²
Ephemeroptera														
<i>Offadens hickmani</i> (Baetidae)	-0.60	22	-10.1	<0.01	21	1.9	0.22	0.07	8.1	<0.01	0.28	1.6	0.22	0.07
<i>Coloburiscoides munionga</i> (Coloburiscidae)	-0.30	20	-2.2	0.04	19	2.6	0.12	0.12	4.2	0.05	0.18	0.1	0.80	0.01
<i>Austrophlebioides</i> spp. (Leptophlebiidae)	-0.13	23	-1.1	0.27	22	0.8	0.37	0.04	11.0	<0.01	0.33	0.7	0.41	0.03
Plecoptera														
<i>Dinotoperla</i> spp. (Gripopterygidae)	-0.43	24	-4.0	<0.01	23	0.4	0.51	0.02	1.8	0.20	0.07	0.2	0.66	0.01
Trichoptera														
<i>Asmicridea edwardsii</i> (Hydropsychidae)	-0.38	24	-3.3	<0.01	23	1.9	0.18	0.07	3.1	0.09	0.12	<0.1	0.86	0.00

<i>Cheumatopsyche</i> sp. AV4 (Hydropsychidae)	-0.38	19	-2.6	0.02	18	0.3	0.57	0.02	0.2	0.67	0.01	<0.1	0.99	0.00
Coleoptera														
<i>Simsonia</i> spp. (adult) (Elmidae)	-0.41	24	-3.8	<0.01	23	0.7	0.42		<0.1	0.95	0.00	1.8	0.20	0.07
Diptera														
<i>Austrosimulium</i> spp. (Simuliidae)	-0.29	24	-3.6	<0.01	23	0.1	0.83		5.1	0.03	0.18	8.7	<0.01	0.27

506

507

508 **Figure legends**

509 Figure 1. Location of the 13 sampling sites within the Mowamba and Thredbo Rivers.

510 Figure 2. Mean source/sink index (SS) for study taxa. Error bars are standard errors. * indicates
511 mean SS is significantly < 0 (t - tests). Grey line shows $SS=0$.

512 Figure 3. Regression relationships between source/sink index (SS) and measures of pool
513 morphology. Significant relationships between SS and mean pool depth (a – c) and mean pool
514 width (d). Example of non-significant relationship between SS and pool length for *Cheumatopsyche*
515 AV4 (e). Note that SS – length relationships were tested as negative exponential functions.

516

517 Figure S1. Mean daily discharge in the Thredbo River (gauge no. 222451) and Mowamba River
518 (gauge no. 222546) for the period of this study. Flow data was missing for the period between July
519 and September. The horizontal grey line indicates the Q_{50} (median) discharge. Arrows indicate
520 sampling occasions.

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Brooks, AJ;Wolfenden, B;Downes, BJ;Lancaster, J

Title:

Do pools impede drift dispersal by stream insects?

Date:

2017-09-01

Citation:

Brooks, A. J., Wolfenden, B., Downes, B. J. & Lancaster, J. (2017). Do pools impede drift dispersal by stream insects?. FRESHWATER BIOLOGY, 62 (9), pp.1578-1586. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12969>.

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/293107>