

# Loughborough University Institutional Repository

---

## *The fine sediment conundrum; quantifying, mitigating and managing the issues*

This item was submitted to Loughborough University's Institutional Repository by the/an author.

**Citation:** MATHERS, K.L. ...et al., 2017. The fine sediment conundrum; quantifying, mitigating and managing the issues. *River Research and Applications*, 33(10), pp. 1509-1514.

### **Additional Information:**

- This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: MATHERS, K.L. ...et al., 2017. The fine sediment conundrum; quantifying, mitigating and managing the issues. *River Research and Applications*, 33(10), pp. 1509-1514, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1002/rra.3228>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

**Metadata Record:** <https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/2134/28116>

**Version:** Accepted for publication

**Publisher:** © Wiley

**Rights:** This work is made available according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence. Full details of this licence are available at: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Please cite the published version.

1 **The fine sediment conundrum; quantifying, mitigating and managing the**  
2 **issues**

3 Mathers, K.L.<sup>1</sup>, Collins, A.L.<sup>2</sup>, England, J.<sup>3</sup>, Brierley, B.<sup>4</sup> and Rice, S.P<sup>1</sup>.

4 <sup>1</sup> Department of Geography, Centre for Hydrological and Ecosystem Science,  
5 Loughborough University, Loughborough, UK. LE11 3TU, UK.

6 <sup>2</sup> Sustainable Agriculture Science, Rothamsted Research, North Wyke, Okehampton,  
7 Devon, UK, EX20 2SB, UK.

8 <sup>3</sup> Environment Agency, Red Kite House, Howbery Park, Crowmarsh Gifford,  
9 Wallingford, OX10 8BD, UK.

10 <sup>4</sup> Freshwater Biological Association, The Ferry Landing, Far Sawrey, Ambleside,  
11 Cumbria, LA22 0LP, UK.

12

13 **Abstract**

14 Excess fine sediment is a global cause of lotic ecosystem degradation. Despite  
15 historic interest in identifying sediment sources and quantifying instream dynamics,  
16 tackling fine sediment problems remains a key challenge for river managers and a  
17 continued focus of international research. Accordingly, a national meeting of the  
18 British Hydrological Society brought together those working on fine sediment issues  
19 at the interface of hydrology, geomorphology and ecology. The resulting collection of  
20 papers illustrates the range of research being undertaken in this interdisciplinary  
21 research arena, by academic researchers, environmental regulators, landowners  
22 and consultants. More specifically, the contributions highlight key methodological  
23 advancements in the identification of fine sediment sources, discuss the complexities  
24 surrounding the accurate quantification of riverbed fine sediment content,  
25 demonstrate the potential utility of faunal traits as a biological monitoring tool and  
26 recognize the need for improved mechanistic understanding of the functional  
27 responses of riverine organisms to excess fine sediment. Understanding and  
28 mitigating the effects of fine sediment pressures remains an important and  
29 multifaceted problem which requires inter-disciplinary collaborative research to  
30 deliver novel and robust management tools and sustainable solutions.

31 **Keywords:** sedimentation, ecology, sediment sources, management tools.

32

33 The erosion, transport, and storage of fine sediment in riverine catchments is widely  
34 recognised to be a global cause of habitat and ecological degradation (Collins et al.,  
35 2011; Jones et al. 2012; Wharton et al., 2017). Fine sediments are an essential  
36 component of healthy riverine functioning. However, sediment yields of many rivers  
37 currently exceed background levels due to changing land cover, land use and  
38 management practices (Farnsworth and Milliman, 2003; Owens et al., 2005; Foster  
39 et al., 2011; Collins and Zhang, 2016). In addition, it is anticipated that fine sediment  
40 pressures will increase in the future due to climatically driven changes to rainfall and  
41 runoff regimes (Walling and Collins, 2016; Burt et al., 2016). Developing an improved  
42 understanding of fine sediment dynamics (i.e. key sources, pathways and exports,  
43 deposition and ingress of fines into riverine substrates) and the associated  
44 implications for aquatic habitats and ecology is therefore essential for the  
45 development of effective intervention and management strategies. Such strategies  
46 should seek to combine both slope-based (e.g. on-farm) and morphological  
47 restoration in order to tackle both the sources and consequences of sediment  
48 mobilisation. Slope-based interventions are commonly supported by agricultural  
49 policy including agri-environment schemes, but also by management strategies  
50 funded by water companies in the form of payment for ecosystem services (PES)  
51 schemes. The increasing numbers of river restoration schemes being implemented  
52 as a result of widespread habitat degradation (Palmer et al., 2005; Kail et al., 2015;  
53 Geist and Hawkins, 2016) reflects the need for a twin-track approach to manage the  
54 degradation of aquatic ecosystems. In all instances, management must be  
55 considered in the context of catchment processes (Gurnell et al., 2016a, 2016b), with  
56 some interventions required to be catchment-wide whilst others may be targeted to  
57 the main areas of concern.

58 To explore and discuss ongoing challenges and uncertainties associated with  
59 improving the capacity to address the fine sediment 'conundrum', a national meeting  
60 of the British Hydrological Society was held in 2016 at Loughborough University (UK).  
61 This meeting considered the fine sediment cascade in its broadest sense attracting a  
62 diverse and multi-disciplinary group of attendees including hydrologists,  
63 geomorphologists, ecologists, environmental regulators, landowners and consultants.  
64 This special issue stems from that meeting and the papers herein reflect on three  
65 main themes (notwithstanding some inevitable overlap) associated with managing

66 the fine sediment problem, namely; (i) characterising the primary catchment sources  
67 of fine sediment inputs into riverine systems; (ii) physical and biological approaches  
68 to the assessment of fine sediment pressures on aquatic ecosystems, and; (iii)  
69 evaluating the ecological consequences of excessive fine sediment using empirical  
70 and modelling approaches.

### 71 ***Catchment scale evaluation of sediment sources***

72 To manage increased fine sediment loading effectively requires reliable knowledge  
73 of the sources of such material at a catchment scale. Fine sediment is typically  
74 referred to as particles <2mm in diameter, but it is important to note that predicting  
75 the effect of excess loadings on instream organisms is heavily dependent on a  
76 number of critical factors including, grain size distribution, chemical composition,  
77 duration of exposure and concentration (Bilotta and Brazier, 2008). Available  
78 methods for investigating sediment sources can be divided into indirect and direct  
79 approaches (Collins and Walling, 2004). The most commonly applied direct method  
80 of identifying catchment sediment sources is the fingerprinting approach which  
81 quantifies the relative contributions of individual sediment sources to target sediment  
82 samples, including those collected in gravel beds or from the suspended load  
83 (Owens et al., 2017; Collins et al., 2017). Potential sources of sediment and  
84 associated organic matter are identified and sampled, such as agricultural top soils,  
85 channel banks, damaged road verges, septic tanks, farmyard manures and decaying  
86 instream vegetation. Representative samples of target sediment are also collected,  
87 including channel bed sediments, often via remobilisation (Duerdoth et al., 2015) or  
88 time-integrating methods (Phillips et al., 2000). These samples are analysed in the  
89 laboratory for unique physical or biogeochemical properties known as tracers or  
90 'sediment fingerprints'. By coupling the composition of source materials with channel  
91 sediments, the contribution of each source may be quantified at catchment scale.  
92 This approach is a valuable tool in the identification of priority source types and  
93 geographical areas for sediment management and mitigation programmes.

94 Four papers within this special issue illustrate and reflect on how sediment  
95 fingerprinting can be implemented in the management of sediment and associated  
96 organic matter using diverse case study examples. Zhang et al., (2017) present the  
97 findings of a study conducted in three tributaries of the River Itchen, in southern  
98 England, which successfully identifies the main sources of sediment-associated

99 organic-matter inputs. In all three sub-catchments, the top three sources were found  
100 to be watercress farms, farmyard manures / slurries and decaying instream  
101 vegetation, although the relative contributions and importance varied. These results  
102 highlight that sediment management strategies should be undertaken on a sub-  
103 catchment specific basis to accommodate scale dependency and corresponding  
104 spatial variations in source contributions. Biddulph et al. (2017) reflect on the  
105 perennial problem associated with the identification of diffuse sources of fine  
106 sediment across relevant spatial scales and the implications for on-farm  
107 management of the sediment problem. They highlight the need for sediment sources  
108 to be considered from individual farms through to the landscape scale in order to  
109 effectively partition the relevant contributions of individual sources. They advise  
110 coordinated farm-scale interventions taking due account of sediment source and  
111 corresponding erosion process domains to maximise management impacts at the  
112 landscape scale.

113 Collins et al., (2017) examined the provenance of fine sediment-associated organic  
114 matter and complimented this with sediment oxygen demand (SOD) measurements.  
115 By utilising the two methods simultaneously it was possible to account for the key  
116 sources of sediment-associated organic matter that contributed to oxygen demand  
117 and therefore habitat and ecological degradation. Pulley et al. (2017) discuss the  
118 importance of carefully defining source group classifications when using sediment  
119 fingerprinting. The classification of sources is often the least considered aspect of  
120 the methodology. Their methodology introduces an additional step that complements  
121 conventional decision-tree methods by enabling assessment of the environmental  
122 relevance of different source groupings.

123 In-channel sources of sediment, and in particular the role of tributary inputs, are  
124 considered by Marteau et al., (2017). Much of the research focussing on sediment  
125 delivery by tributaries has typically tended to consider coarse grain fractions in  
126 perennial rivers (Rice et al., 2001; Hooke, 2003; Rice 2017). However, the authors  
127 illustrate that following a restoration project which reconnected an ephemeral river to  
128 the main stem, sediment yields increased by 65%. They highlight that even a small  
129 increase in catchment area, in this instance 1.2% of the catchment size, can result in  
130 significant alterations to fine sediment dynamics, particularly in sediment starved and  
131 regulated rivers. This also clearly highlights the importance of considering alternative

132 sediment sources which may have previously been overlooked in sediment dynamic  
133 models.

134 ***Physical and biological approaches to the appraisal of fine sediment***  
135 ***pressures***

136 Many of the deleterious effects of enhanced fine sediment levels on instream  
137 ecology are associated primarily with the deposited rather than suspended  
138 component since substrate characteristics exert an important control on habitat  
139 availability especially during the critical life stages of many organisms (Culp et al.,  
140 1986; Berry et al., 2003; Jones et al., 2012). Consequently, the ability to quantify  
141 accurately the fine sediment content of a river bed is vital for assessing habitat status,  
142 checking compliance with recommended thresholds and successfully implementing  
143 management strategies. Fine sediment pressures in river substrates can be  
144 measured using two primary means. First, the fine sediment content of riverbeds can  
145 be physically measured or estimated, and second; biological metrics derived from  
146 the sediment tolerance of a community of organisms can be used as a proxy to  
147 monitor deviation from reference conditions. Six papers within this special issue  
148 address the complexities surrounding the accurate quantification of fine sediment  
149 content in stream substrates.

150 One physical method for measuring fine sediment deposition rates involves the  
151 installation of traps that collect fine sediment infiltrating into the river bed over a  
152 known time period. Harper et al., (2017) employed two different designs of such  
153 traps; one which permits vertical exchange and one which permits both vertical and  
154 lateral exchange. Their results corroborate a number of previous studies which  
155 demonstrate the importance of lateral transport for the accumulation and retention of  
156 fine sediment (Petticrew et al., 2007; Mathers and Wood, 2016; Casas-Mulet et al.,  
157 2017). However, the authors also raise questions about the accuracy of traps and  
158 the physical processes that they measure. Physical sampling techniques can  
159 however be labour and time intensive and, as such, many monitoring agencies (and  
160 increasingly researchers) employ rapid assessment methods. One such method is  
161 the visual assessment of substrate composition which involves an individual  
162 estimating the percentage cover of different particle sizes at a given site. Although  
163 such methods can be effective (e.g. Buffington and Montgomery, 1999) they can be  
164 associated with a high degree of operator subjectivity. Turley et al (2017) present a

165 novel, image-based technique that seeks to overcome operator subjectivity thereby  
166 providing non-destructive, rapid and less subjective estimates of surface sediment  
167 cover.

168 Given the widely-documented effects that excess fine sediment deposition has on a  
169 range of aquatic organisms, from fish through to macroinvertebrates and diatoms  
170 (Wood et al., 1997; Kemp et al., 2011; Jones et al., 2014), biomonitoring techniques,  
171 which use biota to track changes in the aquatic environment (Friberg et al., 2011),  
172 are increasingly being used to monitor fine sediment content. Based on quantified  
173 relationships between taxa abundances and benthic substrate composition, the  
174 extent of fine sediment stress on an ecosystem can be determined. A number of  
175 biological indices that relate the structural responses of macroinvertebrates to fine  
176 sedimentation have been proposed (e.g. Relyea et al., 2000; Murphy et al., 2015;  
177 Turley et al., 2016). Extence et al., (under review) evaluate one such biological index,  
178 the proportion of sediment sensitive invertebrates (PSI). They demonstrate its  
179 potential application as a national screening and catchment management tool in the  
180 identification of priority areas for sediment management practices and for post-  
181 management appraisals.

182 There is however, a growing body of biomonitoring research which is focused on the  
183 use of biological traits, including life history, behaviour and morphology  
184 characteristics, in environmental assessments. Trait-based approaches may be  
185 more widely applicable because they overcome the intrinsic problem with  
186 composition-based indices that are limited to the biogeographic region in which they  
187 were developed (Zullig and Schmidt, 2012). Despite the high potential of trait based  
188 indices as a tool for diagnosing fine sediment pressures, further research is required  
189 to improve their robustness. Two papers in this special issue call for an improved  
190 mechanistic understanding of macroinvertebrate functional responses to  
191 sedimentation (Murphy et al., 2017; Wilkes et al., 2017). In the first paper Murphy et  
192 al (2017) test the association of trait responses to fine sediment stress at national  
193 scale across England and Wales. They find limited evidence to support 18  
194 predictions made in previous studies by Descloux et al (2014) and Mondy and  
195 Usseglio-Polatera (2013), but they do identify a number of traits that exhibit  
196 consistent patterns in relation to sediment stress. Wilkes et al., (2017) test the  
197 mechanistic basis of biological indices to species traits. The authors report a poor fit

198 of two fine sediment indices against species traits. When only traits reported to  
199 respond to fine sediment based on available literature were included in the model,  
200 the fit was reduced further. Further refinement of the trait database is therefore  
201 required to enable trait-based approaches to be embedded into statutory monitoring  
202 and research projects.

203 Identifying and quantifying relationships between fine sediment loading and  
204 ecological responses is often confounded because the physical controls of hydrology  
205 and geomorphology vary in time and space (Bond and Downes, 2003; Evans and  
206 Wilcox, 2014; Gurnell et al., 2016a). River regulation and land use changes are two  
207 of the most common catchment disturbances globally and may occur independently  
208 or concurrently, which makes it difficult to isolate which process is responsible for  
209 ecological degradation (Wood and Armitage, 1999; Jones et al., 2015; Wood et al.,  
210 2016). Bradley et al., (2017) present a hydro-ecological model which, when used in  
211 combination with flow indicators and other local environmental information, can  
212 identify target areas where flow and fine sediment pressures need to be managed  
213 independently or in combination. Application of such coupled approaches will  
214 increase the ability of regulatory agencies to make effective management decisions  
215 by avoiding consideration of a single stressor in isolation.

### 216 ***Ecological effects of fine sedimentation***

217 Improved understanding of the negative effects of excess fine sediment on  
218 ecosystem functioning remains an area where fundamental research is still required.  
219 Despite the wealth of literature and historic interest in the ecological consequences  
220 of sedimentation, many of the fundamental processes surrounding the effects remain  
221 unstudied. The implications of fine sediment deposition on salmonid embryos has  
222 been widely studied, partly because of their high economic value (Suttle et al., 2004;  
223 Sear et al., 2016). In this collection, Sear et al., (2017) present a study in which they  
224 model Sediment Intrusion and Dissolved Oxygen (SIDO) and quantify the  
225 implications for dissolved oxygen supply to salmonid redds. They indicate that high  
226 sediment-associated consumption rates reduce dissolved oxygen concentrations  
227 within redds but that the mass of fine sediment was the most important controlling  
228 factor. Higher quantities of fine sediment result in elevated sediment oxygen demand  
229 but also physically block substratum pores causing a more dramatic decline in  
230 dissolved oxygen concentrations. Béjar et al., (2017) conclude the special issue by



231 presenting a study that investigates the role of suspended sediment on  
232 macroinvertebrate drift. The authors found significant increases in suspended  
233 sediment concentrations (SSC) were sufficient to trigger changes in drift behaviour,  
234 with some taxa demonstrating an increase in drift propensity whilst others displayed  
235 a reduction. It is clear that further research is required in this area to understand the  
236 mechanisms underlying these behavioural adaptations.

### 237 ***Future directions***

238 The thirteen papers in this special issue demonstrate the complex suite of issues  
239 that surround the management of excess fine sediment in aquatic habitats and the  
240 diversity of approaches used to inform characterisation and intervention. Ultimately,  
241 effective management of rivers requires a multi-scaled approach in which several  
242 disciplines combine to tackle the overarching problem. From this special issue, it is  
243 clear that research is required to further improve source fingerprinting procedures  
244 and to appraise the potential importance of additional sources of fine sediment that  
245 may become more important in the future, such as ephemeral streams (Acuña,  
246 Hunter and Ruhí, 2017). Despite significant advancements in sediment fingerprinting  
247 methods, there is a clear need to take account of the scale dependency of source  
248 apportionment data and to implement coordinated intervention strategies that target  
249 cumulative source contributions at the landscape scales and not just local problems.  
250 This requirement would be facilitated by developing comprehensive and transparent  
251 assessment methods that enable both landowners and advisors to fully understand  
252 the science of fine sediment dynamics and impacts. This would enable greater  
253 engagement and process understanding and thereby facilitate better implementation  
254 of management practices and subsequent appraisals of their effectiveness.

255 Fundamental problems still exist in the quantification of fine sediment content in river  
256 substrates. Many of the methods employed are subject to operator and  
257 methodological errors and/or are time and labour intensive. As such, further work is  
258 required that subjectively tests current methods to fully resolve their accuracy  
259 relative to resource implications (e.g. Duerdoth et al., 2015). Biological metrics  
260 provide an opportunity to monitor the health of lotic ecosystems effectively, but a  
261 deeper understanding of the mechanisms that link taxon responses to fine sediment  
262 pressure is required. This is particularly evident in the trait literature where results  
263 lack consistency. Experimental research is required that investigates and documents

264 specific responses of organisms to fine sediment (*sensu* Mathers et al., 2014;  
265 Vadher et al., 2015; Beermann et al., 2018) and which is subsequently corroborated  
266 via broad-scale field studies. There is also a growing body of work focused on the  
267 impacts that organisms have on fine sediment dynamics (e.g. Gurnell, 2014; Rice et  
268 al. 2016), recognising the two-way interactions and feedbacks between the biotic  
269 and abiotic components of river systems and the potential importance of these  
270 processes for full management solutions. Finally, and linked to the effective  
271 monitoring of lotic systems, further research is required to improve understanding of  
272 the individual processes and components of fine sediment dynamics that cause  
273 shifts in biota behaviour and survival. Pinpointing the most influential factors such as  
274 organic matter content and associated oxygen demand, sediment size or sediment  
275 quality will enable management practices to be implemented effectively whilst  
276 minimising time and monetary costs.

## 277 **Acknowledgements**

278 The authors acknowledge the British Hydrological Society with support from the  
279 Environment Agency of England and the Freshwater Biological Association for  
280 facilitating the meeting at Loughborough University from which many of these papers  
281 derived. Paul Wood and John-Davy Bowker are thanked for their help in co-  
282 convening the meeting. The authors thank Geoff Petts and Paul Wood for the  
283 opportunity to prepare this special issue in River Research and Applications. Finally,  
284 we would like to thank all the reviewers for their input and comments which helped  
285 improve the quality of the papers.

## 286 **References**

- 287 Acuña, V., Hunter, M., & Ruhí, A. (2017). Managing temporary streams and rivers as  
288 unique rather than second-class ecosystems. *Biological Conservation*. DOI:  
289 10.1016/j.biocon.2016.12.025.  
290  
291 Beermann, A.J., Elbrecht, V., Karnatz, S., Ma, L., Matthaei, C.D., Piggott, J.J., &  
292 Leese, F. (2018). Multiple-stressor effects on stream macroinvertebrate communities:  
293 A mesocosm experiment manipulating salinity, fine sediment and flow velocity.  
294 *Science of The Total Environment*, 610, 961-971.  
295  
296 Béjar, M., Gibbins, C.N., Vericat, D., & Batalla, R.J. (2017). Effects of Suspended  
297 Sediment Transport on Invertebrate Drift. *River Research and Applications*. DOI:  
298 10.1002/rra.3146.  
299

300 Berry, W., Rubinstein, N., Melzian, B., & Hill, B. (2003). The Biological Effects of  
301 Suspended and Bedded Sediment (SABS) in Aquatic Systems: A Review. US  
302 Environment Protection Agency, National Health and Environmental Health Effects  
303 Laboratory, Rhode Island, Internal Report, 58 pp.

304 Biddulph, M., Collins, A.L., Foster, I.D.L., & Holmes, N. (2017). The scale problem in  
305 tackling diffuse water pollution from agriculture: insights from the Avon  
306 Demonstration Test Catchment programme in England. *River Research and  
307 Applications*. DOI: 10.1002/rra.3222.  
308

309 Bilotta, G.S., & Brazier, R.E. (2008). Understanding the influence of suspended  
310 solids on water quality and aquatic biota. *Water Research*, 42, 2849-2861.  
311

312 Bond, N.R. & Downes, B.J. (2003). The independent and interactive effects of fine  
313 sediment and flow on benthic invertebrate communities characteristic of small upland  
314 streams. *Freshwater Biology*, 48, 455-465.

315 Bradley, D.C., Streetly, M.J., Cadman, D., Dunscombe, M., Farren, E., & Banham, A.  
316 (2017). A hydroecological model to assess the relative effects of groundwater  
317 abstraction and fine sediment pressures on riverine macro-invertebrates. *River  
318 Research and Applications*. DOI:10.1002/rra.3191.  
319

320 Buffington, J.M., & Montgomery, D.R. (1999). A procedure for classifying and  
321 mapping textural facies in gravel-bed rivers. *Water Resources Research*, 35, 1903-  
322 1914.  
323

324 Burt, T.P., Boardman, J., Foster, I., & Howden, N. (2016). More rain, less soil: long-  
325 term changes in rainfall intensity with climate change. *Earth Surface Processes and  
326 Landforms*. 41, 563-566.

327 Casas-Mulet, R., Alfredsen, K.T., McCluskey, A.H., & Stewardson, M.J. (2017). Key  
328 hydraulic drivers and patterns of fine sediment accumulation in gravel streambeds: A  
329 conceptual framework illustrated with a case study from the Kiewa River, Australia.  
330 *Geomorphology*. DOI: 10.1016/j.geomorph.2017.08.032.  
331

332 Collins, A.L., & Walling, D.E. (2004). Documenting catchment suspended sediment  
333 sources: problems, approaches and prospects. *Progress in Physical Geography*, 28,  
334 159-196.  
335

336 Collins, A.L., & Zhang, Y. (2016). Exceedance of modern 'background' fine-grained  
337 sediment delivery to rivers due to current agricultural land use and uptake of water  
338 pollution mitigation options across England and Wales. *Environmental Science and  
339 Policy*, 61, 61-73.

340 Collins, A.L. Naden, P.S., Sear, D.A., Jones, J.I., Foster, I.D.L. & Morrow, K. (2011).  
341 Sediment targets for informing river catchment management: international  
342 experience and prospects. *Hydrological Processes*, 25, 2112-2129.

343 Collins, A.L., Foster, I.D.L., Gellis, A., Porto, P., & Horowitz, A.J. (2017). Sediment  
344 source fingerprinting for informing catchment management: methodological  
345 approaches, problems and uncertainty. *Journal of Environmental Management* 194,  
346 1-3.

347 Collins, A.L., Zhang, Y., McMillan, S., Dixon, E.R., Stringfellow, A., Bateman, S., &  
348 Sear, D.A. (2017). Sediment-associated organic matter sources and sediment  
349 oxygen demand in a Special Area of Conservation (SAC): A case study of the River  
350 Axe, UK. *River Research and Applications*. DOI: 10.1002/rra.3175.

351 Culp, J.M., Wrona, F.J., & Davies, R.W.(1986). Response of stream benthos and  
352 drift to fine sediment deposition versus transport. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 64,  
353 1345-1351.

354  
355 Descloux, S., Datry, T., & Usseglio-Polatera, P. (2014). Trait-based structure of  
356 invertebrates along a gradient of sediment colmation: benthos versus hyporheos  
357 responses. *Science of the total environment*, 466, 265-276.

358  
359 Duerdoth, C.P., Arnold, A., Murphy, J.F., Naden, P.S., Scarlett, P., Collins, A.L.,  
360 Sear, D.A., & Jones, J.I. (2015). Assessment of a rapid method for quantitative  
361 reach-scale estimates of deposited fine sediment in rivers. *Geomorphology*, 230, 37-  
362 50.

363  
364 Evans, E., & Wilcox, A.C. (2014). Fine sediment infiltration dynamics in a gravel-bed  
365 river following a sediment pulse. *River research and Applications*, 30, 372-384.

366 Extence, C.A., Chadd, R.P., England, J., & Naura, M. (UNDER REVIEW).  
367 Application of the proportion of sediment-sensitive invertebrates (PSI) biomonitoring  
368 index at local and national scales.

369  
370 Farnsworth, K.L., & Milliman, J.D. (2003). Effects of climatic and anthropogenic  
371 change on small mountainous rivers: the Salinas River example. *Global and  
372 Planetary Change* 39, 53–64.

373  
374 Foster, I.D.L., Collins, A.L., Naden, P.S., Sear, D.A., Jones, J.I., & Zhang, Y. (2011).  
375 The potential for paleolimnology to determine historic sediment delivery to rivers.  
376 *Journal of Palaeolimnology*, 45, 287-306.

377 Friberg N., Bonada N., Bradley D.C., Dunbar M.J., Edwards F.K., Grey J., Hayes,  
378 R.B., Hildrew, A.G., Lamouroux, N., Trimmer, M., & Woodward, G. (2011).  
379 Biomonitoring of human impacts in freshwater ecosystems: the good, the bad and  
380 the ugly. In: Woodward, G. (Ed.) *Advances in Ecological Research*, Elsevier  
381 Academic Press Inc., San Diego, CA. pp. 1–68, Vol. 44.

382

383 Geist, J., & Hawkins, S.J. (2016). Habitat recovery and restoration in aquatic  
384 ecosystems: current progress and future challenges. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine  
385 and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 26, 942-962.  
386

387 Gurnell A.M. (2014). Plants as river ecosystem engineers. *Earth Surface Processes  
388 and Landforms* 39, 4–25. DOI. 10.1002/esp.3397.  
389

390 Gurnell, A.M., Rinaldi, M., Buijse, A.D., Brierley, G. & Piegay, H., (2016a).  
391 Hydromorphological frameworks: emerging trajectories. *Aquatic Sciences*, 78, 135–  
392 138. DOI:10.1007/s00027-015-0436-1.  
393

394 Gurnell, A.M., Rinaldi, M., Belletti, B.S., Bizzi, S., Blamauer, B., Braca, G., Buijse,  
395 A.D., Bussettini, M., Camenen, B., Comiti, F., Demarchi, L., García de Jalón, D.,  
396 González del Tánago, M., Grabowski, R.C., Gunn, I.D.M., Habersack, H., Hendriks,  
397 D., Henshaw, A.J., Klösch, M., Lastoria, B., Latapie, A., Marcinkowski, P., Martínez-  
398 Fernández, V., Mosselman, E., Mountford, J.O., Nardi, L., Okruszko, T., O’Hare,  
399 M.T., Palma, M., Percopo C., Surian, N., van de Bund, W., Weissteiner, C., & Ziliani,  
400 L., (2016b). A multi-scale hierarchical framework for developing understanding of  
401 river behaviour to support river management. *Aquatic Sciences*, 78, 1–16.  
402 DOI:10.1007/s00027-015-0424-5.  
403

404 Harper, S.E Foster, I.D.L., Lawler, D.M., Mathers, K.L., McKenzie, M., & Petts G.E.  
405 (2017). The complexities of measuring fine sediment accumulation within gravel-bed  
406 rivers. *River Research and Applications*. DOI: 10.1002/rra.3198.  
407

408 Hooke, J. (2003). Coarse sediment connectivity in river channel systems: a  
409 conceptual framework and methodology. *Geomorphology*, 56, 79-94.  
410

411 Jones, J.I., Gowns, I., Arnold, A., McCall, S., & Bowes, M. (2015). The effects of  
412 increased flow and fine sediment on hyporheic invertebrates and nutrients in stream  
413 mesocosms. *Freshwater Biology*, 60, 813-826.  
414

415 Jones, J.I., Duerdoth, C.P., Collins, A.L., Naden, P.S., & Sear, D.A. (2014).  
416 Interactions between diatoms and fine sediment. *Hydrological Processes*, 28, 1226-  
417 1237.  
418

419 Jones, J.I., Murphy, J.F., Collins, A.L., Sear, D.A., Naden, P.S., & Armitage, P.D.,  
420 (2012). The impact of fine sediment on macro-invertebrates. *River Research and  
421 Applications*, 28, 1055-1071.  
422

423 Kail, J., Brabec, K., Poppe, M., & Januschke, K. (2015). The effect of river restoration  
424 on fish, macroinvertebrates and aquatic macrophytes: a meta-analysis. *Ecological  
425 Indicators*, 58, 311–321. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecolind.2015.06.011.  
426

427 Kemp, P., Sear, D., Collins, A., Naden, P., & Jones, I. (2011). The impacts of fine  
428 sediment on riverine fish. *Hydrological Processes*, 25, 1800-1821.

429 Marteau, B., Batalla, R.J., Vericat, D., & Gibbins, C. (2017). The importance of a  
430 small ephemeral tributary for fine sediment dynamics in a main-stem river. *River*  
431 *Research and Applications*. DOI: 10.1002/rra.3177.  
432

433 Mathers, K.L., & Wood, P.J. (2016). Fine sediment deposition and interstitial flow  
434 effects on macroinvertebrate community composition within riffle heads and tails.  
435 *Hydrobiologia*, 776, 147-160.  
436

437 Mathers, K.L., Millett, J., Robertson, A.L., Stubbington, R., & Wood, P.J. (2014).  
438 Faunal response to benthic and hyporheic sedimentation varies with direction of  
439 vertical hydrological exchange. *Freshwater Biology*, 59, 2278-2289.  
440

441 Mondy, C.P., & Usseglio-Polatera, P. (2013). Using conditional forest trees and life  
442 history traits to assess 485 specific risks of stream degradation under multiple  
443 pressure scenario. *Science of the Total Environment*, 461-462, 750-760.  
444

445 Murphy, J.F., Jones, J.I., Pretty, J.L., Duerdoth, C.P., Hawczak, A., Arnold, A.,  
446 Blackburn, J.H., Naden, P.S., Old, G., Sear, D.A., & Hornby, D. (2015). Development  
447 of a biotic index using stream macroinvertebrates to assess stress from deposited  
448 fine sediment. *Freshwater Biology*, 60, 2019-2036.  
449

450 Murphy, J.F., Jones, J.I., Arnold, A., Duerdoth, C.P., Pretty, J.L., Naden, P.S., Sear,  
451 D.A., & Collins, A.L. (2017). Can macroinvertebrate biological traits indicate fine-  
452 grained sediment conditions in streams?. *River Research and Applications*. DOI:  
453 10.1002/rra.3194.  
454

455 Owens, P.N., Batalla, R.J., Collins, A.J., Gomez, B., Hicks, D.M., Horowitz, A.J.,  
456 Kondolf, G.M., Marden, M., Page, M.J., Peacock, D.H., & Petticrew, E.L. (2005).  
457 Fine-grained sediment in river systems: environmental significance and management  
458 issues. *River Research and Applications*, 21, 693-717.

459 Owens, P.N., Blake, W.H., Gaspar, L., Gateuille, D., Koiter, A.J., Lobb, D.A.,  
460 Petticrew, E.L., Reiffarth, D.G., Smith, H.G., & Woodward, J.C. (2017). Fingerprinting  
461 and tracing the sources of soils and sediments: earth and ocean science,  
462 geoarchaeological, forensic and human health applications. *Earth-Science*  
463 *Reviews*. 162, 1-23.  
464

465 Palmer, M.A., Bernhardt, E.S., Allan, J.D., Lake, P.S., Alexander, G., Brooks, S.,  
466 Carr, J., Clayton, S., Dahm, C.N., Follstad Shah, J., & Galat, D.L. (2005). Standards  
467 for ecologically successful river restoration. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 42. 208-217.  
468

469 Petticrew, E.L., Krein, A., & Walling, D.E. (2007). Evaluating fine sediment  
470 mobilization and storage in a gravel-bed river using controlled reservoir releases.  
471 *Hydrological Processes*, 21, 198-210.

472 Phillips, J.M., Russell, M.A. & Walling, D.E., (2000). Time-integrated sampling of  
473 fluvial suspended sediment: a simple methodology for small catchments.  
474 *Hydrological Processes*, 14, 2589-2602.

475 Pulley, S., Van der Waal, B., Collins, A.L., Foster, I.D.L. & Rowntree, K. (2017). Are  
476 source groups always appropriate when sediment fingerprinting? The direct  
477 comparison of source and sediment samples as a methodological step. *River*  
478 *Research and Applications*. DOI: 10.1002/rra.3192.

479

480 Relyea, C.D., Minshall, G.W., & Danehy, R.J. (2000). Stream insects as bioindicators  
481 of fine sediment. *Proceedings of the water Environment Federation, 2000*, 663-686.  
482

483 Rice S.P., Johnson M.F., Mathers K., Reeds J., & Extence C. (2016). The  
484 importance of biotic entrainment in base flow fluvial sediment transport, *Journal of*  
485 *Geophysical Research – Earth Surface*, 121, 890–906, doi:10.1002/2015JF003726.  
486

487 Rice, S.P. (2017) Tributary connectivity, confluence aggradation and network  
488 biodiversity, *Geomorphology*, 27, 6-16.

489

490 Rice, S.P., Greenwood, M.T., & Joyce, C.B. (2001). Tributaries, sediment sources,  
491 and the longitudinal organisation of macroinvertebrate fauna along river systems.  
492 *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 58, 824-840.

493

494 Sear, D.A., Jones, J.I., Collins, A.L., Hulin, A., Burke, N., Bateman, S., Pattison, I., &  
495 Naden, P.S. (2016). Does fine sediment source as well as quantity affect salmonid  
496 embryo mortality and development?. *Science of the Total Environment*, 541, pp.957-  
497 968.

498 Sear, D., Pattison, I., Collins, A., Jones, J., Naden, P., & Smallman, D. (2017). The  
499 magnitude and significance of sediment oxygen demand in a gravel spawning beds  
500 for the incubation of salmonid embryos. *River Research and Applications*. DOI:  
501 10.1002/rra.3212.

502 Suttle, K.B., Power, M.E., Levine, J.M., & McNeely, C. (2004). How fine sediment in  
503 riverbeds impairs growth and survival of juvenile salmonids. *Ecological applications*,  
504 14, 969-974.

505

506 Turley, M.D., Bilotta, G.S., Chadd, R.P., Extence, C.A., Brazier, R.E., Burnside, N.G.,  
507 & Pickwell, A.G. (2016). A sediment-specific family-level biomonitoring tool to identify  
508 the impacts of fine sediment in temperate rivers and streams. *Ecological Indicators*,  
509 70, 151-165.

510 Turley, M.D., Bilotta, G.S., Arbocute, G., Chadd, R.P., Extence, C.A., & Brazier, R.E.  
511 (2017). Quantifying submerged deposited fine sediments in rivers and streams using  
512 digital image analysis. *River Research and Applications*. DOI: 10.1002/rra.3073.  
513

514 Vadher, A.N., Stubbington, R., & Wood, P.J. (2015). Fine sediment reduces vertical  
515 migrations of *Gammarus pulex* (Crustacea: Amphipoda) in response to surface water  
516 loss. *Hydrobiologia*, 753, 61-71.  
517

518 Walling, D.E., & Collins, A.L. (2016). Fine sediment transport and management. In  
519 Gilvear, D.J., Greenwood, M.T., Thoms, M.C. and Wood, P.J. (Eds.) *River Science:  
520 Research and Management for the 21st Century*, John Wiley & Sons Ltd: Chichester.

521 Wharton, G., Mohajeri, S.H., & Righetti, M. (2017). The pernicious problem of  
522 streambed colmation: a multi-disciplinary reflection on the mechanisms, causes,  
523 impacts, and management challenges. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water*. 4,  
524 e1231. DOI: 10.1002/wat2.1231.

525 Wilkes, M.A., Mckenzie, M., Murphy, J.F. & Chadd, R.P. (2017). Assessing the  
526 mechanistic basis for fine sediment biomonitoring: Inconsistencies among the  
527 literature, traits and indices. *River Research and Applications*. DOI: 10.1002/rra.3139.  
528

529 Wood, P.J., & Armitage, P.D. (1997). Biological effects of fine sediment in the lotic  
530 environment. *Environmental Management*, 21, 203-217.  
531

532 Wood, P.J., & Armitage, P.D. (1999). Sediment deposition in a small lowland  
533 stream—management implications. *River Research and Applications*, 15,199-210.  
534

535 Wood, P.J., Armitage, P.D., Hill, M.J., Mathers, K.L., & Millett, J. (2016). Faunal  
536 response to fine sediment deposition in urban rivers. In *River Science: Research and  
537 Management for the 21st Century*. John Wiley and Sons Chichester.

538 Zhang, Y., Collins, A.L., McMillan, S., Dixon, E.R., Cancer-Berroya, E., Poiret, C., &  
539 Stringfellow, A. (2017). Fingerprinting source contributions to bed sediment-  
540 associated organic matter in the headwater subcatchments of the River Itchen SAC,  
541 Hampshire, UK. *River Research and Applications*. DOI: 10.1002/rra.3172.  
542

543 Zuellig, R.E., & Schmidt, T.S. (2012). Characterizing invertebrate traits in wadeable  
544 streams of the contiguous US: differences among ecoregions and land uses.  
545 *Freshwater Science*, 31, 1042-1056.  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550