One of These Things is Not Like the Other. Evaluation of Wetland Nutrient Stoichiometry and Homeostasis in a Subtropical Treatment Wetland
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Wetlands are complex and critical ecosystems that regulate global biogeochemical cycles (Johnson et al. 2010). Wetlands are biologically active biogeochemical hotspots. (Reddy and DeLaune 2008)
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Everglades Stormwater Treatment Areas

- 1994 ENR (now STA 1W)
- Now 5-STAs plus support infrastructure.
- Total treatment area: 230 km²
- Constructed to remove TP
- Removed $2.3 \times 10^6$ kg of TP (circa April 2017)
Ecological Stoichiometry

- Relates environments nutrient to biota
- “Redfield Ratio”
  - Open Ocean
  - Homogenous reservoir of inorganic nutrients
  - C:N:P $\rightarrow$ 105:15:1 (water column)
  - C:N:P $\rightarrow$ 106:16:1 (plankton)
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• C:N:P is well constrained in plankton biomass (Redfield 1934 and 1958).
• Is C:N:P well constrained in other ecosystem compartments elsewhere?
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Ecological Stoichiometry Redux

• Redfield and others laid the conceptual framework for Ecological Stoichiometry.

• Organism – Environment nutrient stoichiometry feedback mechanism (i.e. stoichiometric homeostasis)

• Context of ecosystem disturbances
  • Organism/Ecosystem respond to changing conditions
Objectives and Hypotheses

Objectives

- Overall evaluation of nutrient relationships between ecosystem compartments (water, floc, soil and veg.) between systems (EAV and SAV).
- Assess changes in stoichiometry along each flow way.

Hypotheses

- Nutrient stoichiometry will be tightly constrained across ecosystem compartments.
- Shifts in nutrient stoichiometry are likely to occur along a given flow path.
STA-2 (8 cells, 62.7 km²)

- Flow way 1: Emergent Aquatic Vegetation Dominate (7.4 km²)
- Flow way 3: Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Dominate (9.3 km²)
Methods

• Nutrient concentrations log-transformed.
• Standardized major axis (SMA) regression was used to evaluate stoichiometric relationships.

- Residuals are measured vertical for linear regression against a fitted axis
- Best fit line based on predicting Y given X

- Residuals are measured and standardized against the Y axis
- Best fit line relative to two variables

Warton et al., (2006)
Methods

• Evaluate the slope of the Standardized Major Axis regression to be significantly different from 1.

*Significantly different*  
Independent scaling between variables (allometric)  

*Not Significantly different*  
Proportional scaling between variables (isometric)
Nutrient Source:
- EAV mine P from soils
- SAV assimilate P from water column

Nutrient Homeostasis

\[ \frac{1}{H_{N:P}} = \frac{\log(y) - \log(c)}{\log(x)} \]

\[ Y = \text{Organism N:P} \]
\[ X = \text{Resource N:P} \]
\[ C = \text{Intercept} \]

\( \frac{1}{H_{N:P}} < 0.5 \) Homeostatic
\( \frac{1}{H_{N:P}} > 0.5 \) Non-Homeostatic
Log-Log regression results of Standardized Major Axis regression between water column variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Flow way</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>FW 1</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FW 3</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>FW 1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FW 3</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>FW 1</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FW 3</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- All surface water relationships did not proportionally scale (i.e. “allometric” scaling; Slope $\neq 1$).
- Different relationships of DOC-TP between FWs.
- Majority of TN is organic N.
- Organic matter dynamics differ between cells.
• High $K_d$ less light in water column.
• Stimulation of benthic algae influencing P flux and C consumption.
Effects of light on sediment nutrient flux and water column nutrient stoichiometry in a shallow lake

Bryan M. Spears, Laurence Carvalho, Rupert Perkins, David M. Paterson
• Differences in carbon balance, flux and storage.
• Possible higher C flux in FW 3.
Most relationships did not proportionally scale (i.e. allometric scaling; Slope ≠ 1).

TC – TN (FW 1) and TC – TP (FW3) isometrically scaled (Slope = 1; ρ>0.05).

Carbon dynamics differ between cells
OM decomposition mechanisms differ
Depositional environment is differ

Log-Log regression results of Standardized Major Axis regression between soil variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Flow way</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Slope</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>ρ-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>FW 1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>11.35</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FW 3</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>FW 1</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FW 3</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>FW 1</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FW 3</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Differences in OM decomposition
- Variable N and P mineralization rates
- Mechanism differ across FWs potentially linked to microbial communities (bacteria vs fungal; P. Inglett Unpublished Data)
Fig. 1 Potential patterns relating resource to consumer stoichiometry. The stoichiometry of *homeostatic* organisms (solid line) is strictly defined, and changes in resource stoichiometry do not influence organism stoichiometry. The stoichiometry of *non-homeostatic* organisms may match resource stoichiometry in a 1:1 relationship (large dashes) or in a relationship (small dashes) that diverges from the 1:1 line (Adapted from Sterner and Elser 2002)
• Both EAV and SAV are non-homeostatic with respect to ambient environment.

• $1/H_{N:P}$ and fractional distance was not significantly correlated for both FWs ($r=0.71, \rho=0.12$ and $r=-0.21, \rho=0.73$).

• $1/H_{N:P}$ significantly different between FW1 and FW3 ($\chi^2=7.5, \rho<0.05$) suggesting a divergent stoichiometric homeostasis.
  
  • Physiological and biochemical mechanisms associated with nutrient retention and uptake.
• Stoichiometry is highly variable between systems (i.e. FW 1 and FW 3) and within ecosystem compartments (water, floc, soil, veg.).

• N and P mineralization processes differ between EAV and SAV systems.

• EAV and SAV are non-homeostatic to facilitate luxury uptake and nutritional structural investments.
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**Methods**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection</th>
<th>Water Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Surface water sampled weekly (via grab sample) during semi-prescribed flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyzed for TP, TN and DOC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation</td>
<td>• 4 – 8 randomly placed 0.25 m² quadrat adjacent to sampling location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sampled 2015 and 2016 wet season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyzed for TP, TN and TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil</td>
<td>• Push core method sampled 2015 and 2016 wet and dry season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analyzed for TP, TN and TC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Handling & Statistics**

• All concentrations were converted to molar concentrations (mM or mmol kg⁻¹)
• Any value below the MDL was assigned the MDL