



King's Research Portal

[Link to publication record in King's Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Dawson, S. K., Catford, J. A., Berney, P., Kingsford, R. T., & Capon, S. (in press). Land-use alters soil propagule banks of wetlands down the soil depth profile. *MARINE AND FRESHWATER RESEARCH*.

Citing this paper

Please note that where the full-text provided on King's Research Portal is the Author Accepted Manuscript or Post-Print version this may differ from the final Published version. If citing, it is advised that you check and use the publisher's definitive version for pagination, volume/issue, and date of publication details. And where the final published version is provided on the Research Portal, if citing you are again advised to check the publisher's website for any subsequent corrections.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the Research Portal

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact librarypure@kcl.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

1 **Title: Land-use alters soil propagule banks of wetlands down the soil depth**
2 **profile**

3 **Authors:** Samantha K. Dawson^{1,2}, Jane A. Catford³, Peter Berney, Richard T. Kingsford²,
4 Samantha Capon⁵.

5 1. Swedish Species Information Centre, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences,
6 Uppsala, Sweden

7 2. Centre for Ecosystem Science, School of Biology, Earth and Environmental Science,
8 UNSW, Sydney, Australia

9 3. Department of Geography, King's College London, Strand, London WC2R 2LS, UK

10 4. NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service, Narrabri, NSW, 2390, Australia

11 5. Australian Rivers Institute, School of Environment and Science, Griffith University,
12 Nathan, Australia

13 **Nomenclature:** Australian Plant Name Index, National Species List, Council of Heads of
14 Australasian Herbaria (<https://biodiversity.org.au/nsl/services/apni>, searched 26 Sep 2016)

15 **Abstract:**

16 Many studies have investigated the effects of human disturbances on floodplain propagule
17 banks, but few examine how these propagule banks change down the soil depth profile.

18 Changes in soil propagule banks with depth can indicate the state of past vegetation and
19 potentially demonstrate the effects of different land-uses on the soil profile. Here, we

20 examined changes in soil propagule banks down the soil depth profile in an Australian

21 floodplain wetland with five different land-use histories ranging from a relatively minor

22 disturbance (clearing) through to more major disturbance (continuous cultivation). Land-use

23 had a larger influence than floodplain geomorphology on the propagule distribution of

24 wetland plant group numbers. An observed decrease in individuals over the depth profile also

25 altered terrestrial plant groups in fields with longer land-use histories. Overall, soil propagule

26 profiles for terrestrial plants were not as affected by land-use as those of wetland plants. The

27 geomorphological position on the floodplain also altered the soil propagule bank, with areas

28 subject to the most flooding having the highest number of wetland species and retaining more

29 of these species with greater depths. In conclusion, land-use impacts alter soil propagule

30 banks down the profile, despite most studies focussing on the top few centimetres.

31 **Keywords:** restoration, seed, agriculture, flood frequency, floodplain wetland, propagule
32 bank

33 **Introduction:**

34 By directly altering standing vegetation, agricultural land-use, including cultivation and
35 grazing, can indirectly alter the composition and structure of soil propagule banks in
36 floodplain wetlands at the surface or to a few centimetres depth (~ 5 cm), with significant
37 implications for patterns of vegetation regeneration (Wienhold and van der Valk, 1989;
38 Hölzel and Otte, 2001; Middleton, 2003; O'Donnell, Fryirs & Leishman, 2014; Dawson, *et*
39 *al.*, 2017a). Little research, however, has examined how different disturbances affect plant
40 propagule banks with increasing soil depth. While the abundance and richness of propagules
41 in soil propagule banks typically decline with depth, the rate of decline can depend on various
42 factors including (but not limited to) vegetation type, the length of time over which a wetland
43 has been drained, and the condition of standing wetland vegetation (van der Valk and Davis,
44 1979; Wienhold and van der Valk, 1989; Godefroid, Phartyal and Koedam, 2006). Soil
45 propagule banks in wetlands are usually deeper than those in terrestrial ecosystems
46 (Nicholson and Keddy, 1983; O'Donnell, Fryirs and Leishman, 2014), with viable propagules
47 germinating from sediment samples taken as deep as 35 cm (van der Valk and Davis, 1979).
48 Deeply buried seeds tend to be older and include species that form persistent propagule banks
49 or propagule banks that are more resistant to disturbance (Godefroid, Phartyal and Koedam,
50 2006). Further, changes in the soil seed or propagule bank can indicate characteristics of past
51 vegetation or the level of past disturbances (van der Valk and Davis, 1979; Godefroid,
52 Phartyal and Koedam, 2006). Although most germination from floodplain soil propagule
53 banks is likely to occur from propagules in the top of the soil profile, deeper seeds may
54 potentially be moved to the surface via flooding or other disturbances, meaning that the deep
55 propagule bank could act as a propagule source for regenerating wetlands. Furthermore,
56 examining the depth profile of plant propagule banks can demonstrate the extent of soil
57 degradation or what changes may have occurred over time as soil layers accumulate, and may
58 reveal levels of resilience of propagules to anthropogenic disturbances.

59 Assisted natural restoration is common in degraded wetlands, where degrading processes are
60 halted and “natural” water regimes (either managed or unmanaged) are reinstated, with the
61 assumption that wetland revegetation will occur from the soil propagule bank and colonising
62 species (Wienhold and van der Valk, 1989; Donath, Holzelt and Otte, 2003; Middleton, 2003).
63 However, restoration often follows an alternative trajectory where other types of vegetation

64 (e.g. terrestrial shrubs) rapidly colonise instead of wetland species (Suding, Gross and
65 Houseman, 2004; Moreno-Mateos *et al.*, 2015). In general, degradation of floodplain
66 wetlands in Australia leads to the soil propagule bank in the top 5 cm holding fewer wetland
67 plant species, more exotics and more terrestrial species than non-degraded floodplain
68 wetlands (Robertson and James, 2006; Dawson, *et al.*, 2017a). In a previous study focused on
69 the top 5 cm of soil from the same area (Dawson, *et al.*, 2017a), we showed that soil
70 propagule banks in fields with histories of longer cultivation had compromised restoration
71 capability. However, fields with few years of cultivation, or fields that were only cleared,
72 showed less signs of disturbance. We concluded that with time and flooding, these soil
73 propagule banks had the potential to restore wetland vegetation composition (Dawson, *et al.*,
74 2017a). While this, and other studies focusing on the top 5 cm of soil, have led to an
75 understanding of the effects of degradation on close-to-surface floodplain wetland propagule
76 banks, we are not aware of any studies based in Australia that have examined past land-use
77 effects on the propagule bank down the sampled soil depth profile.

78 In this study, we examined changes in the soil propagule bank down the soil depth profile in a
79 wetland on retired agricultural land in the Macquarie Marshes, Australia. We investigated this
80 in five fields with a range of disturbance histories that spanned a single clearing event with a
81 bulldozer 14 years before sampling, through to being cultivated continuously for 23 years and
82 then left to restore for five years before sampling was conducted. We sought to examine how
83 past disturbances changed the propagule bank down the soil depth profile and to determine
84 which wetland plant groups were most affected. Further, we also explored whether the
85 amount of flooding a site received before sampling changed the soil propagule bank down the
86 soil depth profile, using the proxy of geomorphological floodplain position. Specifically, the
87 two questions we address are: 1) Does the soil propagule bank depth profile change with past
88 land-use and which wetland plant groups are most affected? and 2) How does past
89 disturbance (land-use history) and floodplain position affect the soil propagule bank with
90 increasing depth?

91 We hypothesised that the more intensive past land-uses (i.e. continuous cultivation) would
92 show effects deeper into the soil profile of the propagule bank and that wetland plant groups
93 and native species would be the most affected – as indicated by lower numbers of individuals
94 from the wetland plant groups. This is because we assumed that the effects of repeated years
95 of cultivation would eventually degrade the soil propagule bank deeper than where land use
96 had only comprised clearing or fewer cultivation events. As part of this hypothesis, we

97 thought that fields that had been cultivated rather than only cleared would show a greater
98 effect, as would those fields that had been disturbed more recently. Further, we anticipated
99 that sites geomorphologically prone to flooding would have higher numbers of wetland plant
100 groups and native species, as flood regimes that are less modified or more similar to historical
101 regimes favour native species (Catford *et al.*, 2014; Dawson, *et al.*, 2017a). Consequently, we
102 expected such sites to show greater abundances of wetland seeds in the upper layers of the
103 soil profile reflecting the restoration of propagule banks after flooding.

104

105 **Methods:**

106 **Study site:** This study was conducted in a revegetating floodplain wetland, part of the
107 Macquarie Marshes, south-eastern Australia (Fig. S1; 147.55°E 30.8°S). The Macquarie
108 Marshes consists of a range of a flood-dependent vegetation communities that reflect the
109 local inundation regime. This inundation regime is driven by upstream rainfall events, as
110 local conditions are dry (<500 mm rainfall per annum) and relatively warm (daily
111 temperatures range between 4-16°C in winter and 20-36°C in summer). The most regularly
112 flooded vegetation communities are *Typha domingensis/orientalis* and *Phragmites australis*
113 reed-beds, with *Paspalum distichum* grasslands, which are inundated annually. Slightly
114 higher elevations that are still frequently inundated support river red gum (*Eucalyptus*
115 *camaldulensis*) forests and lignum (*Duma florulenta*) swamps, both with understories of
116 amphibious wetland (mainly native) species. The highest elevations support black box
117 (*Eucalyptus largiflorens*) open woodland with terrestrial understorey species (e.g. grasses and
118 chenopods; (Bowen and Simpson, 2010; Thomas *et al.*, 2010). While the vegetation varies
119 along an elevation-gradient, the entire area is very flat, with an average rise of less than 1 m
120 every 2.4 km in the study area (Hesse 2009; Yonge & Hesse 2009).

121 The Macquarie Marshes is part of the Murray-Darling Basin, where river regulation and
122 water diversion for irrigation have led to degraded floodplain vegetation communities
123 (Catford *et al.*, 2011, 2014) with the Marshes no exception (Kingsford and Thomas, 1995;
124 Bino *et al.*, 2015). In the late 2000s, several initiatives were undertaken to restore these
125 degraded vegetation communities, including the purchase of 2,436 hectares of land
126 (Pillicawarrina property), along with its 8,658 ML water licence (Department of Environment
127 Climate Change and Water NSW, 2011). Historically, vegetation on this property would have
128 been similar to the rest of the Marshes until it was progressively cleared for grazing and

129 cultivation (Paijmans, 1981; Kidson *et al.*, 2000; Dawson *et al.*, 2016). Different fields had
130 different land-use histories, ranging from continuously cultivated from 1985 until 2008, to
131 cleared once in the late 1980s (L. Johnson, pers. comm., 2014 Pillicawarrina property
132 manager; Waters 2011; Dawson, Kingsford, Berney, Keith, *et al.* 2017). In addition to
133 clearing and cultivation, artificial levee banks ('dikes') were constructed adjacent to the river
134 which held back all but the highest flows, significantly decreasing river/floodplain
135 connectivity (L. Johnson, pers. comm., 2014 Pillicawarrina property manager; Dawson,
136 Kingsford, Berney, Keith, *et al.* 2017).

137 In 2009, when the property was purchased by the government, cultivation ceased and
138 management focussed on revegetation, with the aim of restoring vegetation communities to a
139 similar character as those of undisturbed sites (Waters, 2011; Berney, 2012). Aside from the
140 cessation of agricultural land-use, the only other active management intervention was to
141 breach the levees at strategic points and enlarge culverts in June 2010 to enhance water
142 passage between the river and floodplain (Hesse, 2009; Department of Environment Climate
143 Change and Water NSW, 2011; Dawson, *et al.*, 2017a). The timing of this was fortuitous as a
144 decade-long drought in the Macquarie Marshes was broken by natural floods, supplemented
145 with environmental flows in the 2009/2010, 2010/2011 and 2011/12 flooding seasons.

146

147 **Soil sampling:** In January 2014, we sampled the propagule bank at 45 sites within five fields
148 of differing land-use histories and three floodplain positions (a subsample of sites from
149 Dawson *et al.* (2017; Fig. S1). The fields' land-use histories were:

- 150 i. cleared with bulldozer in 2000 ("Clear. 2000");
- 151 ii. cleared with bulldozer and ripped with bulldozer tines in 2003 ("Clear. 2003");
- 152 iii. cultivated in 2003 ("Cult. 2003");
- 153 iv. cultivated in 2006 ("Cult. 2006"); and
- 154 v. cultivated from 1985-2008 ("Cult. 85-08").

155 Each field had nine sampling sites that were evenly stratified across three geomorphological
156 floodplain positions:

- 157 a. floodplain micro-channels (Channel);
- 158 b. immediately adjacent to these micro-channels (Riparian); and
- 159 c. 50-100 m from the micro-channels (Plain; Dawson, Kingsford, Berney, Keith, *et al.*
160 2017).

161 These floodplain micro-channels (<20 cm deep; Hesse 2009) were identified using a LIDAR-
162 based digital elevation model (DEM; Steinfeld *et al.* 2013).

163 At each site, we collected soil samples at 5 cm increments down to a maximum depth of 30
164 cm with a sampling pipe that had a diameter of 5 cm (area = 19.63 cm², volume = 98.15 cm³).
165 Throughout the rest of the manuscript, numbers are presented for this volume only and we
166 have not scaled the data, unless specifically stated otherwise. Two of the sites (Plain sites in
167 Cult. 2003 and Cult. 2006), however, had such hard and dry clay that it was only possible to
168 take samples down to a depth of 25 cm. Samples were then air-dried and stored in the dark
169 for 5 months. Although we also conducted vegetation surveys at the same time, extremely dry
170 conditions meant that very few annual species were present, so the observations were not
171 representative of the plant communities that typically occur after inundation and therefore not
172 used in analyses.

173

174 **Germination methods:** We germinated propagules in the greenhouse over two months
175 (June-July 2014). The greenhouse was heated to 20-27 °C, similar to spring temperatures in
176 the Macquarie Marshes. Soil samples were spread as thinly as possible in plastic containers
177 filled with steam-sterilised potting soil to a depth of 3 cm. Experimental containers were then
178 laid out randomly on benches and re-randomised every two weeks. Watering occurred twice
179 daily and samples were allowed to drain freely as a previous study found this watering
180 regime produced the greatest number of germinants (Dawson, *et al.*, 2017a). Germinants of
181 angiosperms and pteridophytes were counted, identified and removed every two to three days
182 to avoid competition (Capon, 2007). We refer to all emerging plants as ‘germinants’ for
183 communication ease, although we recognise that some plants may have originated from
184 spores and vegetative propagules rather than seeds. Unidentified germinants were re-potted
185 separately and grown until diagnostic features developed. Where many germinants emerged
186 simultaneously (e.g. rush species or some grass species), only a subset were grown until
187 identification was possible. Species were then categorised into nine wetland plant groups
188 defined by first taking Brock and Casanova’s (1997) six functional groups (no submerged
189 species germinated) and then subdividing into native status according to the Australian
190 National Botanic Gardens (Table 1; following Dawson *et al.* 2017;
191 <http://www.anbg.gov.au/apni/index.html>). The rush species complex was analysed separately
192 from the other amphibious tolerant emergent species as they dominated germination numbers

193 and we wanted to distinguish what was happening in this species complex from the rest of the
194 plant group.

195

196 **Data analyses:** Data were analysed using the Hierarchical Modelling of Species
197 Communities (HMSC) package in R (Ovaskainen *et al.* 2017, Tikhonov *et al.* (in prep)). This
198 package uses joint species distribution modelling framework (Warton *et al.*, 2015), with a
199 Bayesian evaluation to examine community data with species' abundances (Ovaskainen *et*
200 *al.*, 2017). The 'species' in our data were the 9 plant groups and 45 sites (9 sites in five
201 fields), out of which seeds germinated in 237 samples out of a possible 268 samples (6 depth
202 samples per site, minus the two missing deeper plain sites). Three values were omitted from
203 the analysis as they were outliers in each of the plant groups (more than double the next
204 largest value) and affected the ability of the model to converge: 93 amphibious tolerator low-
205 growing germinants in the Clear. 2003 field, 34 terrestrial damp exotic germinants in the
206 Cropped-85-08 field, and 241 terrestrial damp native germinants in the Clear. 2003 field.
207 Samples where seeds did not germinate were still included in the model - but had 0
208 abundance for all plant groups.

209 Our model included three explanatory variables: land-use history, floodplain position and
210 sample depth. Sample depth was entered as a continuous variable and the interaction between
211 sample depth and both land-use history and floodplain position was included in the model
212 terms. The intercept used in the model was the field with the least disturbance, Clear. 2000
213 and plain sites for the geomorphological position. There were also two random variables in
214 the model, one to account for the nested sampling design of floodplain position within each
215 field and another at the site level, to account for depth samples coming from the same site. A
216 lognormal (overdispersed) Poisson distribution was used in the models as the transformed
217 variance was close to the mean (1.8 and 1.4 respectively), but still skewed.

218 HMSC supports variance partitioning, which allowed examination of how much each
219 explanatory variable contributes to the total variance explained for each plant group
220 (Ovaskainen *et al.*, 2017). Further, relationships between plant groups and explanatory
221 (environmental) variables can be examined by extracting relationships that are supported in
222 the majority (90%) of cases from the posterior. For example, a negative relationship indicates
223 that there are fewer individuals of that plant group with that environmental variable. The
224 Markov Chains Monte Carlo (MCMC) chain was run for a total 500 000 iterations and two

225 chains, with a thinning of 1000 to sample the posterior, after discarding 750 000 iterations as
226 burn-in. The convergence of the MCMC chain was assessed visually by examining the
227 convergence of the results between 10, 100 and 250 thinning. Further, to assess model fit, the
228 Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) and Mean Absolute Error (MAE) were calculated between
229 the observed values and the predicted (posterior distribution) values. MAE measures the
230 average error magnitude, while RMSE incorporates the MAE and the variability within the
231 error distribution, as both are related directly to the model inputs, they increase with the
232 number of individuals in the model (Willmott and Matsuura, 2005).

233

234 **Results:**

235 **Floristics:** A total of 8,285 individuals germinated in our study, 5,456 of which were rush
236 species, primarily comprising *Juncus* spp. There were 19 non-grass germinants that we could
237 not grow to identification. Of the 145 grass germinants, only 68 grew to a stage where
238 identification was possible; all other grass and unidentified germinants were removed from
239 the model. Only one individual germinated of *Phyla canescens*, an invasive exotic species of
240 concern in the area. None of the characteristic woody, shrub or clonal species (e.g. river red
241 gum, lignum, black box, river cooba and *Typha* spp.) associated with the floodplain wetlands
242 occurred.

243 Overall, there was an increasing number of germinants with decreasing levels of land-use (i.e.
244 more in cleared fields, fewer in cultivated fields), and, in the cultivated fields, an increasing
245 number of germinants with fewer cultivation years and time since last land-use event (Fig. 1).
246 The number of exotic germinants was low compared to natives, but they were more abundant
247 in the field Cult. 85-08 (Fig. 2). This heavily cultivated field had the lowest number of native
248 germinants (Fig 2.). In most plant groups, the number of germinants declined with soil depth,
249 although this trend did not always occur for amphibious responders (Fig. 1). Numbers of
250 germinants from native species also decreased with depth, a trend less clear with exotics (Fig.
251 2). Germinant numbers across the floodplain positions showed that there were more in
252 channel positions than in other geomorphological locations (Fig. 3). The number of
253 individual germinants categorized as amphibious responders and terrestrial dry germinants
254 were variable (i.e. not declining) with depth, particularly in floodplain channels (Fig. 3).

255 Sample depth alone explained more of the variance in the terrestrial plant groups, while field
256 explained more variance in the amphibious plant groups (with the exception of the

257 amphibious tolerator emergent group; Fig. 4). RMSE and MAE values show that the models
258 performed reasonably well (Table 2), with higher error rates in groups with the highest
259 number of individuals found on a site, as is expected with these statistics. Variance
260 partitioning showed that most of the variance being explained by the model was attributable
261 to land-use history, with fields alone accounting for a mean 16.3% across the plant groups
262 and the field by sample depth interaction accounting for a mean of 18.9%. The total mean
263 variance explained by fields (land-use history) was 35.2% in the model, demonstrating this
264 variable generally had the highest explanatory power. Sample depth alone accounted for the
265 next largest amount of variance explained (mean of 28.6%), followed by the explanatory
266 variables related to floodplain position accounting (mean of 12.6% for the interaction with
267 depth and 11.8% alone, totalling 24.4%; Fig. 4).

268 Although fields and field x sample depth interaction had high explanatory power when
269 grouped, individually there were only a few relationships that had at least 90 % support in the
270 posterior (Fig. 5). Surprisingly, a number of plant groups had strong positive relationships
271 with the Clear. 2003 field in comparison to the Clear. 2000 field. Numbers of individual
272 germinants within all plant groups had a weak negative relationship with sample depth (Fig.
273 5). Furthermore, all native groups, except for amphibious tolerators, were more likely to
274 occur in floodplain channels (Fig. 5). There were numerous weak relationships between the
275 number of individual germinants in both field x sample depth and floodplain position x
276 sample depth interactions. These were all weakly negative, except for the depth x Cult. 2003
277 field for amphibious responder floating natives and the only supported depth x channel
278 interaction, which were weakly positive. These show that, when compared with the intercept,
279 the posterior showed slightly more or slightly fewer germinants with increasing depth.

280

281 **Discussion:**

282 Land-use history negatively affected the soil propagule banks down the sampled soil depth
283 profile, with fewer individual germinants belonging to wetland (amphibious) plant groups
284 and increasing number of exotic individuals found in fields that were cultivated more recently
285 or for longer periods. The strong effect of land-use is consistent with both our first hypothesis
286 - that more intensive land-use results in a larger negative effect - and with previous propagule
287 bank studies that have examined only the top 5 cm of soils (Middleton, 2003; Dawson, *et al.*,
288 2017a). Floodplain positions that were more likely to be inundated had a positive effect on

289 the number of germinants in the soil propagule bank, supporting our second hypothesis - that
290 channel sites would have higher numbers of individuals in the upper layers. We found similar
291 numbers at corresponding depths as the floodplain sites examined by O'Donnell, Fryirs and
292 Leishman (2014), but compared with other wetland types worldwide, there were fewer
293 propagules at corresponding depths (van der Valk and Davis, 1979). However, we found
294 more propagules at similar depths than other habitat types, such as forests (Nicholson and
295 Keddy, 1983; McGraw, 1987; Godefroid, Phartyal and Koedam, 2006). Despite past
296 disturbances in the Macquarie Marshes landscape, amphibious responders and terrestrial dry
297 species did not decrease with depth as expected. This suggests that they form persistent soil
298 propagule banks, providing a temporal storage mechanism effect (Chesson, 2000), which
299 may confer some resilience to disturbances such as drought and low levels of land-use.

300 This is the first study, to our knowledge, that examines the relationships of land-use with the
301 propagule bank depth profile in wetlands, although effects of forestry on soil propagule banks
302 with depth has been investigated in forests (Olano *et al.* 2002). In our study, land-use history
303 and its interaction with depth had the highest level of explanatory power for amphibious plant
304 groups (except amphibious tolerator emergents) and exotic terrestrial dry germinants (Fig. 4).
305 For germinants from other terrestrial groups, explanatory power was more evenly split or
306 dominated by depth (Fig. 4), indicating that land-use history more strongly affected wetland
307 species, even more than soil depth alone. The highest number of exotics, usually undesirable
308 for wetland restoration, were in the field with the longest history of cultivation (Fig. 2).

309 Further, this intensely cultivated field exhibited negative relationships with germinants of
310 amphibious responder native species (Fig. 5) and had less rushes and amphibious responders
311 throughout the soil depth profile (Fig. 1). Clearly, and consistent with our expectations,
312 cultivation had a negative effect on the abundance of native species in soil propagule banks,
313 particularly for amphibious groups, which continued down the soil depth profile.

314 While there is little knowledge of how the propagule bank depth profile changes with land-
315 use, there is a greater understanding of how land-uses discussed here affect propagule banks
316 in the top 5 cm. The findings of this study are consistent with a previous study in the same
317 wetland (Dawson *et al.* 2017a) and another study on the effect of cultivation in floodplain
318 wetlands (Casanova, 2012). All three studies found fewer amphibious species or numbers in
319 cultivated areas, but there were also indications that recovery may be possible, depending on
320 future flooding. It is vital that Australian restoring floodplain wetlands continued to be
321 monitored to evaluate and understand restoration successes and failures (Roberts *et al.*,

2017). While we focused on clearing and cultivation land-use here, other forms of disturbance (e.g. grazing; Nicol *et al.*, 2007) can negatively affect propagule banks as well. Establishing how much different land-uses contribute to propagule bank degradation is important in understanding current restoration attempts and planning future management. Increased inundation may offset some impacts of land-use history, as floodplain positions prone to flooding were more likely to have higher numbers of germinants from wetland plant groups. Areas with increased flows can support increased deposition events that enable many seeds to accumulate down the soil depth profile (O'Donnell, Fryirs and Leishman, 2014), particularly in cracking vertosol soils. The channel position of the floodplain had higher numbers of propagules from all native plant groups – a trend that persisted down the sampled soil depth profile (i.e. only one very weak channel x sample depth interaction was supported; Fig. 5). Additionally, the Clear. 2003 field had greater numbers of propagules in several native and wetland plant groups, when compared with the intercept, the Clear. 2000 field (Fig. 5). This may seem contrary to expectation as the latter field was cleared a longer time ago (had more recovery time) and was only bulldozed, whereas the Clear. 2003 field was both bulldozed and ripped. However, the Clear. 2003 field has a higher background rate of flooding compared to all the other fields; averaging 18.2 times, compared to averages of 8.8 (Clear. 2000), 9.8 (Cult. 2003), 8.4 (Cult. 06) and 7.1 (Cult. 85-08), using the 32 flooding events that occurred in the 25 years prior to sampling, prior to and during the disturbance (i.e. 1988 to 2012; Dawson, *et al.* 2017b). The difference between the Clear. 2003 field and the other fields was significant, however the differences in the rest of the flood data were not significant, even though the Cult. 85-08 field had slightly fewer floods (Fig. S2). Despite these differences all fields were flooded in events that occurred between 2009-2012: i.e. after the levees were breached and prior to soil sampling (Dawson, *et al.*, 2017a). This increased background flooding in the Clear. 2003 field may account for the higher numbers of amphibious floating individuals observed there (Fig. 1).

Although the propagule banks investigated in this study had more propagules at deeper depths than have been observed in forest and lake soil profiles (Nicholson and Keddy, 1983; Godefroid, Phartyal and Koedam, 2006), there were not nearly as many propagules with depth as have been recorded in prairie marshes (tens of thousands individuals per m² at 35 cm depth – if we scale our data using our sampled area to 1 m² we have ~5000 individuals at 30 cm) or sphagnum bogs (more than 60 individuals of one species at 29 cm alone - with a core diameter of 9.5 cm; McGraw 1987). Further, the numbers of germinants found here are either

355 similar to (O'Donnell, Fryirs and Leishman, 2014) or slightly more than (Nielsen *et al.*, 2018)
356 germinant numbers in other Australian floodplain wetlands. Propagule banks in semi-arid
357 Australian floodplain wetlands may therefore effectively be positioned between forests and
358 the more environmentally similar prairie marshes in terms of germinant frequency, possibly
359 due to the strong heterogeneity in these environments, including potentially long periods
360 between floods (Kingsford and Thomas, 1995; Kingsford, 2000). Strangely, van der Valk &
361 Davis (1979) found high abundances of *Typha glauca*, even as deep as 35 cm, whereas we
362 did not have any *Typha* species germinating in either this or the previous study from this
363 wetland (Dawson, *et al.*, 2017a), although this may be due to relatively low abundances of
364 *Typha* in the aboveground vegetation (Dawson, *et al.*, 2017c).

365 Changes in propagule numbers with soil depth highlights how transient (or short-lived) the
366 soil propagule bank is for different plant groups, which can help understanding of plant
367 strategies. Propagule banks in which the numbers do not steadily or dramatically decrease
368 over the depth profile indicate long-lived propagules that can reside in the soil until
369 favourable germination conditions occur (McGraw, 1987; Olano *et al.*, 2002). This strategy
370 of using propagules in the soil to overcome non-favourable periods for the plant is one
371 mechanism of achieving a temporal storage effect, enabling species coexistence and
372 resilience (Chesson, 2000). In this study, we did not observe strong (or any) declines in
373 propagule numbers with depth for either amphibious responders (both floating and plastic in
374 the less disturbed sites) or the terrestrial dry group, showing they likely form persistent
375 propagule banks (Brock, 2011). Species in these plant groups are generally short-lived (i.e. <
376 one year) and the conditions suitable for either group (i.e. inundation or dryness) occur at
377 intermittent, discrete intervals. Therefore, it is likely that species in these groups form
378 substantial persistent soil banks as part of a temporal storage effect, enabling persistence in
379 location over the long-term. Although the rush plant groups did decline in a way associated
380 with transient soil propagule banks, the sheer number of germinants indicated that these
381 species also rely on the temporal storage effect, through a large propagule bank. Others have
382 found similarly large numbers of rushes (particularly *Juncus* spp.) with increasing soil depths
383 in wetlands (van der Valk and Davis, 1979; McGraw, 1987), and even forest habitats (Olano
384 *et al.*, 2002), which was also attributed to a species strategy of awaiting perturbations to
385 germinate.

386 While this study is the first examination of how land-use disturbance affects soil propagule
387 bank depth profiles in Australian wetlands, there were three shortcomings. First, although we

388 chose germination conditions that supported the largest number of germinants in a previous
389 study (Dawson, *et al.*, 2017a), it is unlikely that these conditions suited all species, meaning
390 that we may have failed to detect some species present in the soil propagule bank (e.g. see
391 Nielsen *et al.*, 2018). Second, the deposition rates of both propagules and soil probably
392 change across the floodplain in relation to topographic position, in turn affecting rates of
393 change in the propagule bank over the soil depth profile. Lastly, the soils of this floodplain
394 often form large, deep cracks when completely dried (cracking clays; personal observation).
395 Although we ensured samples were not near any current cracks, seeds may have fallen down
396 previous cracks in the past, altering the depth profile that would occur from gradual
397 accumulation of soil layers. This would be consistent with what has been found in seasonally
398 drying salt-marshes (Espinar, Thompson and Garcia, 2005; Espinar and Clemente, 2007) and
399 may account for some of the higher numbers seen at greater depth for amphibious responder
400 species.

401 Examining how past degradation has changed the propagule depth profile provides insights
402 into the nature of past land-use and disturbances. Past land-use was the most important factor
403 influencing the depth profile of propagule banks and this was most apparent amongst native
404 and amphibious plant groups. However, channel and riparian floodplain positions or
405 increased background rates of inundation were associated with greater propagule abundances
406 of native and amphibious species, both desirable for restoration. Further, amphibious
407 responder species appeared to be persistent in the propagule bank, which is encouraging for
408 projects aiming to use the soil propagule bank to restore degraded but uncultivated areas. As
409 well as amphibious responders, terrestrial dry groups also formed persistent propagule banks,
410 and each of these groups generally consists of species with shorter life cycles and that have
411 longer periods between germination events, indicating that these species rely on the
412 propagule banks as a temporal storage mechanism.

413

414 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to thank the editors of the special issue for inviting us to
415 contribute this paper. We acknowledge and thank Chantel Benbow and Stephanie Creer for
416 assistance in the greenhouse and the field work volunteers: Ellery Johnson, Thao Le,
417 Veronica Grigaltchik, Esthel Verma and Andrea Fullagar. SKD recognises the support of the
418 Peter Cullen Scholarship and the Australian Postgraduate Award.

419

420 **Conflicts of Interest:** The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

421

422 **References:**

423 Berney, P. (2012) Pillicawarrina; Summary of findings from vegetation surveys 2009 – 2012.
424 Office of Environment and Heritage, Sydney.

425 Bino, G., Sisson, S. A., Kingsford, R. T., Thomas, R. F. and Bowen, S. (2015) ‘Developing
426 state and transition models of floodplain vegetation dynamics as a tool for conservation
427 decision-making: a case study of the Macquarie Marshes Ramsar wetland’, *Journal of*
428 *Applied Ecology*, 52(3), pp. 654–664.

429 Bowen, S. and Simpson, S. (2010) Changes in Extent and Condition of the Vegetation
430 Communities of the Macquarie Marshes Floodplain 1991-2008. Final Report to NSW
431 Wetland Recovery Program, Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water,
432 Sydney.

433 Brock, M. A. (2011) ‘Persistence of seed banks in Australian temporary wetlands’,
434 *Freshwater Biology*. 56(7), pp. 1312–1327.

435 Brock, M. A. & Casanova, M. T. (1997) ‘Plant life at the edges of wetlands; ecological
436 responses to wetting and drying patterns’, in Klomp, N. and Lunt, I. D. (eds) *Frontiers in*
437 *Ecology; Building the Links*. pp. 182–192.

438 Capon, S. J. (2007) ‘Effects of flooding on seedling emergence from the soil seed bank of a
439 large desert floodplain’, *Wetlands*, 27(4), pp. 904–914.

440 Casanova, M. T. (2012) ‘Does cereal crop agriculture in dry swamps damage aquatic plant
441 communities?’, *Aquatic Botany*. 103, pp. 54–59.

442 Catford, J. a., Downes, B. J., Gippel, C. J. and Vesk, P. a. (2011) ‘Flow regulation reduces
443 native plant cover and facilitates exotic invasion in riparian wetlands’, *Journal of Applied*
444 *Ecology*, 48(2), pp. 432–442.

445 Catford, J. A., Morris, W. K., Vesk, P. A., Gippel, C. J. and Downes, B. J. (2014) ‘Species
446 and environmental characteristics point to flow regulation and drought as drivers of riparian
447 plant invasion’, *Diversity and Distributions*. 20(9), pp. 1084–1096.

448 Chesson, P. (2000) ‘Mechanisms of maintenance of species diversity’, *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.*
449 31, pp. 343–366.

450 Dawson, S., Fisher, A., Lucas, R., Hutchinson, D., Berney, P., Keith, D., Catford, J. and
451 Kingsford, R. (2016) 'Remote Sensing Measures Restoration Successes, but Canopy Heights
452 Lag in Restoring Floodplain Vegetation', *Remote Sensing*. 8(7), p. 542.

453 Dawson, S. K., Kingsford, R. T., Berney, P., Catford, J. A., Keith, D. A., Stoklosa, J. and
454 Hemmings, F. A. (2017) 'Contrasting influences of inundation and land use on the rate of
455 floodplain restoration', *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*.

456 Dawson, S. K., Kingsford, R. T., Berney, P., Keith, D. A., Hemmings, F. A., Warton, D. I.,
457 Waters, C. and Catford, J. A. (2017) 'Frequent inundation helps counteract land use impacts
458 on wetland propagule banks', *Applied Vegetation Science*. 20, 459-467

459 Dawson, S. K., Warton, D. I., Kingsford, R. T., Berney, P., Keith, D. A. and Catford, J. A.
460 (2017) 'Plant traits of propagule banks and standing vegetation reveal flooding alleviates
461 impacts of agriculture on wetland restoration', *Journal of Applied Ecology*. 54(6), pp. 1907–
462 1918.

463 Department of Environment Climate Change and Water NSW (2011) NSW Rivers
464 Environmental Restoration Program Final Report. Department of Environment Climate
465 Change and Water, Sydney.

466 Donath, T. W., Holzel, N. and Otte, A. (2003) 'The impact of site conditions and seed
467 dispersal on restoration success in alluvial meadows', *Applied Vegetation Science*, 6(1), pp.
468 13–22.

469 Espinar, J. L. and Clemente, L. (2007) 'The impact of vertic soil cracks on submerged
470 macrophyte diaspore bank depth distribution in Mediterranean temporary wetlands', *Aquatic
471 Botany*, 87(4), pp. 325–328.

472 Espinar, J. L., Thompson, K. and Garcia, L. V. (2005) 'Timing of seed dispersal generates a
473 bimodal seed bank depth distribution', *American Journal of Botany*. 92(10), pp. 1759–1763.

474 Godefroid, S., Phartyal, S. S. and Koedam, N. (2006) 'Depth distribution and composition of
475 seed banks under different tree layers in a managed temperate forest ecosystem', *Acta
476 Oecologica*. 29(3), pp. 283–292.

477 Hesse, P. (2009) *Geomorphologic Mapping For Pillicawarrina Environmental Water Management*
478 *Plan*. Macquarie University for the NSW Department of Environment, Climate Change and
479 Water, Sydney.

480 Hölzel, N. and Otte, A. (2001) 'The impact of flooding regime on the soil seed bank of flood-
481 meadows', *Journal of Vegetation Science*, 12(2), pp. 209–218.

482 Kidson, R., Witts, T., Martin, W. and Raisin, G. (2000) Historical vegetation mapping of the
483 Macquarie Marshes 1949 - 1991. NSW Department of Land and Water Conservation, Dubbo.

484 Kingsford, R. T. (2000) 'Ecological impacts of dams, water diversions and river management
485 on floodplain wetlands in Australia', *Austral Ecology*, 25(2), pp. 109–127.

486 Kingsford, R. T. and Thomas, R. F. (1995) 'The Macquarie Marshes in Arid Australia and
487 Their Waterbirds : A 50-Year History of Decline', *Environmental Management*, 19(6), pp.
488 867–878.

489 McGraw, J. B. (1987) 'Seed-bank properties of an Appalachian sphagnum bog and a model
490 of the depth distribution of viable seeds', *Canadian Journal of Botany*, 65(10), pp. 2028–
491 2035.

492 Middleton, B. A. (2003) 'Soil seed banks and the potential restoration of forested wetlands
493 after farming', *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 40(6), pp. 1025–1034.

494 Moreno-Mateos, D., Meli, P., Vara-Rodríguez, M. I. and Aronson, J. (2015) 'Ecosystem
495 response to interventions: lessons from restored and created wetland ecosystems', *Journal of*
496 *Applied Ecology*, 52(6), pp. 1528–1537.

497 Nicholson, A. and Keddy, P. A. (1983) 'The depth profile of a shoreline seed bank in
498 Matchedash Lake', *Canadian Journal of Botany*, 61, pp. 3293–3296.

499 Nicol, J., Muston, S., D'Santos, P., McCarthy, B. and Zukowski, S. (2007) 'Impact of sheep
500 grazing on the soil seed bank of a managed ephemeral wetland: implications for
501 management', *Australian Journal of Botany.*, 55(2), p. 103.

502 Nielsen, D. L., Campbell, C., Rees, G. N., Durant, R., Littler, R. and Petrie, R. (2018) 'Seed
503 bank dynamics in wetland complexes associated with a lowland river', *Aquatic Sciences.*,
504 80(2), p. 23.

505 O'Donnell, J., Fryirs, K. and Leishman, M. R. (2014) 'Digging deep for diversity: riparian
506 seed bank abundance and species richness in relation to burial depth', *Freshwater Biology.*,
507 59(1), pp. 100–113.

508 Olano, J. M., Caballero, I., Laskurain, N. A., Loidi, J. and Escudero, A. (2002) 'Seed bank
509 spatial pattern in a temperate secondary forest', *Journal of Vegetation Science*. 13(6), pp.
510 775–784.

511 Ovaskainen, O., Tikhonov, G., Norberg, A., Guillaume Blanchet, F., Duan, L., Dunson, D.,
512 Roslin, T. and Abrego, N. (2017) 'How to make more out of community data? A conceptual
513 framework and its implementation as models and software', *Ecology Letters*. 20(5), pp. 561–
514 576.

515 Pajmans, K. (1981) *The Macquarie Marshes of inland northern New South Wales*.
516 Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Melbourne.

517 Roberts, J., Casanova, M. T., Morris, K. and Papas, P. (2017) *Vegetation recovery in inland*
518 *wetlands: an Australian perspective*. Arthur Rylah Institute for Environmental Research.
519 Technical Report Series Number 270. Department of Environment, Land, Water and
520 Planning Hedelberg, Victoria. Available at: www.relayservice.com.au.

521 Robertson, H. A. and James, K. R. (2006) 'Plant Establishment from the Seed Bank of a
522 Degraded Floodplain Wetland: A Comparison of Two Alternative Management Scenarios',
523 *Plant Ecology*, 188(2), pp. 145–164.

524 Steinfeld, C. M. M., Kingsford, R. T. and Laffan, S. W. (2013) 'Semi-automated GIS
525 techniques for detecting floodplain earthworks', *Hydrological Processes*, 27(4), pp. 579–591.

526 Suding, K. N., Gross, K. L. and Houseman, G. R. (2004) 'Alternative states and positive
527 feedbacks in restoration ecology.', *Trends in ecology & evolution*, 19(1), pp. 46–53.

528 Thomas, R., Lu, Y., Cox, S. and Hunter, S. (2010) *Inundation Mapping and Monitoring of*
529 *the Macquarie Marshes. Final Report to the NSW Wetland Recovery Program*, NSW
530 Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water, Sydney.

531 van der Valk, A. G. and Davis, C. B. (1979) 'A reconstruction of the recent vegetational
532 history of a prairie marsh, Eagle Lake, Iowa, from its seed bank', *Aquatic Botany*. 6, pp. 29–
533 51.

534 Warton, D. I., Blanchet, F. G., O'Hara, R. B., Ovaskainen, O., Taskinen, S., Walker, S. C.
535 and Hui, F. K. C. (2015) 'So Many Variables: Joint Modeling in Community Ecology',
536 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 30(12), pp. 766–779.

537 Waters, C. (2011) *Vegetation Restoration Plan for the Pillicawarrina Floodplain*. NSW
538 Department of Primary Industries, Trangie, NSW.

539 Wienhold, C. E. and van der Valk, A. G. (1989) 'The impact of duration of drainage on the
540 seed banks of northern prairie wetlands', *Canadian Journal of Botany*. 67(6), pp. 1878–1884.

541 Willmott, C. and Matsuura, K. (2005) 'Advantages of the mean absolute error (MAE) over
542 the root mean square error (RMSE) in assessing average model performance', *Climate
543 Research*, 30(1), pp. 79–82.

544 Yonge, D. and Hesse, P. P. (2009) 'Geomorphic environments, drainage breakdown, and
545 channel and floodplain evolution on the lower Macquarie River, central-western New South
546 Wales', *Australian Journal of Earth Sciences*. 56, pp. S35–S53.

547

549 **Tables and Figures:**

550 **Table 1:** Description of plant groups, based on Brock & Casanova (1997), with functional
 551 groups divided into native and exotic where applicable and the rushes species complex. This
 552 group fits within the amphibious tolerator emergent family, but as this species complex had
 553 very high numbers germinating, we chose to separate it for the purposes of this study.


Full plant group name	Shortened name for figures	Description
Amphibious responder, floating (native species)	AR Float.	Species with floating leaves that can grow in damp to flooded conditions, germinate when flooded and has floating leaves in response to inundation
Amphibious responder, morphologically plastic (native species)	AR Plast.	Species that are morphologically plastic, which can grow in damp to flooded conditions, germinate when flooded and is morphologically plastic in response to inundation
Amphibious tolerator, emergent (native species)	AT Emer.	Emergent species that germinate in damp to flooded conditions, tolerate variation in inundation with basal parts submerged and reproduce above water
Amphibious tolerator, low-growing (native species)	AT. Low.	Low-growing species that germinate in damp to flooded conditions, tolerate variation in inundation and can be completely submerged
Rush species, (<i>Juncus</i> spp.; native species)	Rushes	Germinants that were rush species, predominately composed of <i>Juncus</i> spp.
Terrestrial damp (native species)	Ter. Damp	Native species which complete some or all of their lifecycle on saturated soil
Terrestrial damp (exotic species)	Ter. Damp E.	Exotic species which complete some or all of their lifecycle on saturated soil
Terrestrial dry (native species)	Ter. Dry	Native species that complete their life cycle where there is no surface water
Terrestrial dry (exotic species)	Ter. Dry E.	Exotic species that complete their life cycle where there is no surface water

555

556 **Table 2:** Values for the Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) and Mean Absolute Error (MAE)
557 statistics used for model evaluation for each plant group. These values can be used to assess
558 how well our models are characterising each plant group. Values are calculated from
559 comparing the numbers predicted by the model with the raw data. MAE shows the average
560 error magnitude; i.e. on average how far are predicted values from actual values. RMSE
561 incorporates both MAE and the variability within the error distribution. Both values will
562 increase with increasing numbers of individuals in the plant group (e.g. we had far more rush
563 species in the model than any other group). Full plant group names can be found in Table 1.

Plant Group	RMSE	MAE
AR Float.	9.67	4.11
AR Plast.	1.03	0.42
AT Emer.	1.19	0.52
AT. Low.	5.64	0.43
Rushes	42.66	26.92
Ter. Damp	14.28	4.52
Ter. Damp E.	2.12	0.61
Ter. Dry	1.68	1.02
Ter. Dry E.	1.5	0.49


564



565

566 *Figure 1: Mean number of germinants (with standard error) of each plant group within each*
 567 *field (per 98.15 cm³); note: Y axis changes depending on the maximum number found in each*
 568 *group and groups that are divided into natives and exotics for the analysis are combined here*
 569 *(see Fig. 2 for native versus exotic distribution). Fields are arranged by the level of past*
 570 *land-use: cleared with bulldozer in 2000 (Clear. 2000), cleared with bulldozer and ploughed*
 571 *in 2003 (Clear. 2003), cultivated in 2003 (Cult. 2003), cultivated in 2006 (Cult. 2006) and*
 572 *cultivated from 1985-2008 (Cult. 85-08). Plant groups (also found in Table 1) from top to*
 573 *bottom are: amphibious responder, floating (AR Float.), amphibious responder,*
 574 *morphologically plastic (AR Plast.), amphibious tolerator, emergent (AT Emer.), amphibious*
 575 *tolerator, low growing (AT Low.), rush species, dominated by *Juncus spp.* (Rushes),*
 576 *terrestrial damp (Ter. Damp) and terrestrial dry (Ter. Dry).*


577



578

579 *Figure 2. Mean number of germinants (with standard error) of natives and exotics within*
 580 *each field (per 98.15 cm³). Fields are arranged by the level of past land-use (see Fig. 1).*

581




582

583 *Figure 3: Mean number of germinants (with standard error) of each plant group within each*
 584 *floodplain position (native and exotics that are separated for the analysis are combined here;*
 585 *per 98.15 cm³). Floodplain position is arranged from least to most frequently inundated:*
 586 *plain positions 50-100 m from nearest micro-channel (Plain), sites located immediately*
 587 *adjacent to floodplain micro-channels (Riparian) and within the floodplain micro-channels*
 588 *(Channel). For full plant group names see Fig. 1 caption.*

589


Variance partitioning



590

591 *Figure 4: Variance partitioning plot showing the proportion of each set of explanatory*
 592 *variables contributing to the total variance explained. Note: the total variance explained*
 593 *would be different for each plant group; this figure demonstrates what each part of the model*
 594 *is contributing to the variance that the full model can explain (not equivalent to R^2 , for model*
 595 *evaluation see Table 2). Each set of explanatory variables in the key represents several single*
 596 *explanatory variables (e.g. Fields represent all variance explained by the four fields against*
 597 *the intercept), except for Sample Depth, which is a continuous variable. For full plant group*
 598 *names see Table 1.*

599



600

601

602 *Figure 5: Relationships between explanatory variables and plant groups that had at least*
 603 *90% support in the posterior distribution in relation to number of germinants. The intercept*
 604 *for each group of explanatory variables is Clear. 2000 for the Fields and Plain for the*
 605 *Floodplain Position, meaning the displayed relationships are relative to each of these (i.e.*
 606 *Clear. 2003 had more AR Float. than Clear. 2000 in 90% of posterior sample). Names of*
 607 *plant groups follow Fig. 4 with the fields and floodplain positions following Figs 1 and 3.*
 608 *Red indicates increasing numbers of germinants (values logged) with that variable (i.e. the*
 609 *model predicts more rush germinants in channel sites then plain sites or more amphibious*
 610 *responder floater germinants in Clear. 2003 sites than Clear. 2000 sites). The blue indicates*
 611 *the inverse relationship (i.e. fewer predicted amphibious responder plastic germinants in*
 612 *Cult 85-08 sites than Clear. 2000 sites or fewer predicted terrestrial dry exotic germinants in*
 613 *riparian sites compared with plain sites).*

614