

Revised Manuscript Submission

bg-2017-28

## Reviewer Comments

## ***Interactive comment on “Carbon cycling at the aquatic-terrestrial interface is linked to parafluvial hyporheic zone inundation history” by Amy E. Goldman et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #1**

Received and published: 13 May 2017

Review comments on bg-2017-28-manuscript-version2.pdf Dear Editor, While I found this paper of interest, generally well written with data well presented, I have several main concerns. First of all, the authors should use such unusual setting (anthropogenic driven soil saturation which occur on very limited areas of emerged Earth to allow the better understanding of the relationship between soil water content and soil saturation by water and major biogeochemical cycles. This is not performed and when done, it should greatly enhance the impact of the performed research. In their acknowledgment of the existing literature the authors should present quantitative information, trends from studies having investigated the impact of soil inundation of the cycles of elements and discuss the trends for further identification of gaps. While for instance water satura-

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



tion by water bodies leads in many cases to denitrification in sediments, Grimaldi and Chaplot (Water, Air, and Soil Pollution, 2000) showed that in some cases exchange processes between streamwater, the hyporheic and riparian zones forbid that process. The second issue concerns the interpretation of the results. Not only are the study variables of interest (microbial biomass, . . .) affected by inundation but also by multiple factors such as inerrant soil type, vegetation type and its impact on rooting, organic matter quality, soil temperature, . . . This is a major which by itself nullifies all conclusions. Moreover, how can the authors convince on the observed trends is no temporal evaluation has been performed? The third issue concerns the study objectives. The authors should decide about their objectives. Is it about process understanding or about modeling?. Authors have to choice. I suggest to move all the conceptual results to the discussion part of the paper. Figure 2 is too simplistic. Other comments Figure 1 can not be presented with not true colors or pictures taken under constant light. In figure 2 why having a legend with distance from water? Why colors into the figure? This “distance to water” is not really adequate as the water level always changes.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., doi:10.5194/bg-2017-28, 2017.

BGD

Interactive  
comment

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



## ***Interactive comment on “Carbon cycling at the aquatic-terrestrial interface is linked to parafluvial hyporheic zone inundation history” by Amy E. Goldman et al.***

### **Anonymous Referee #2**

Received and published: 25 May 2017

I find the article generally interesting. It is well written, includes extensive literature documentation, and pays ample attention to describe the practical and general implications of this study which is undertaken in a rather unusual, dam-controlled river environment.

Coming from the geochemistry side of biogeochemistry, my comments focus on the physico/chemical part of the study. There are two topics I have problems with. The first is temperature, or rather the lack of its consideration (only “room temperature” is mentioned twice on page 4). Are the results temperature-independent? If so, the authors should explain it. If the results are temperature dependent, the authors will have to discuss the implications of it, and preferably give some more accurate temperature conditions during the experiments.

[Printer-friendly version](#)

[Discussion paper](#)



The second problem I have with the paper is that on page 5, lines 5-7, the authors describe in detail how measurements of cations and anions are conducted. However, none of those parameters, with the exception of nitrate or nitrite, is ever mentioned in the paper – so, why are the measurements listed? If the chemistry plays no role, it should be mentioned; if the authors discuss it in a companion paper, it should be mentioned; if the data were not used at all, their measurement methods should not be discussed in the methods section.

As far as figures are concerned, I would suggest two changes. In Figure 1 the colors are described to be misleading, so why show them? The photos should be converted to grey scale. Figure 6 could be deleted, it is very simplistic and the importance of changing biology is extensively described, with much more detail, in the text of the publication.

---

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., doi:10.5194/bg-2017-28, 2017.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)

## Author Response to Comments

# ***Interactive comment on “Carbon cycling at the aquatic-terrestrial interface is linked to parafluvial hyporheic zone inundation history” by Amy E. Goldman et al.***

**Amy E. Goldman et al.**

amy.goldman@pnnl.gov

Received and published: 23 June 2017

Please find in the attached supplement a detailed response to each reviewer.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/bg-2017-28/bg-2017-28-AC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-2017-28>, 2017.

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper





bg-2017-28

Author response to reviewer comments on “Carbon cycling at the aquatic-terrestrial interface is linked to parafluvial hyporheic zone inundation history” by A. E. Goldman et al.

Please find in plain text our responses to both reviews. Reviewer comments are in bold.

**RC1 and RC2 (duplicate comment; 13 and 14 May 2017):**

**Dear Editor, While I found this paper of interest, generally well written with data well presented, I have several main concerns.**

**First of all, the authors should use such unusual setting (anthropogenic driven soil saturation which occur on very limited areas of emerged Earth to allow the better understanding of the relationship between soil water content and soil saturation by water and major biogeochemical cycles. This is not performed and when done, it should greatly enhance the impact of the performed research.**

Thank you for your comment. While we agree that further investigating the nuanced relationship between varying soil water content and biogeochemical cycles is merit worthy, this research focuses on the historical influence of river inundation on sediment. Although water saturation is an important driver of the environmental changes we investigate, a detailed analysis of different sediment water contents is outside the scope of this research.

We also note that while anthropogenically driven sediment saturation may initially seem to be an unusual setting, dams are widespread and globally distributed. In the United States, 2653 dams generate hydropower (USACE 2016) and 90% of water discharge is hydrologically altered (Jackson et al., 2001). Hydropower currently accounts for 80% of renewable energy globally (Zarfl et al., 2015; Hermoso, 2017) and is projected to increase as countries begin managing their energy production within the Paris Agreement and other climate accords (Hermoso, 2017; Latrubesse et al., 2017).

**In their acknowledgment of the existing literature the authors should present quantitative information, trends from studies having investigated the impact of soil inundation of the cycles of elements and discuss the trends for further identification of gaps. While for instance water saturation by water bodies leads in many cases to denitrification in sediments, Grimaldi and Chaplot (Water, Air, and Soil Pollution, 2000) showed that in some cases exchange processes between streamwater, the hyporheic and riparian zones forbid that process.**

We agree that it is important to include quantitative results of literature pertinent to the scope of the research. Because the research we present is unique with regard to looking at the historical effects of inundation in the parafluvial zone (page 3, line 5-8), we are unable to put directly comparable results into our literature review. Instead, we utilize the discussion section to link specific qualitative and quantitative results from reviewed literature to specific results that we

present (page 8-11). By using this structure, we aim to minimize reader confusion and to use references in the most impactful way possible.

In order to keep the text up to date, we will add text to the discussion (Section 4.1 Microbial response to inundation), related to a May 2017 publication that indicates soil respiration is determined in part by the historical influence of climate, with historically wetter soil emitting twice as much carbon, on average, than historically drier soils (Hawkes et al., 2017). This conclusion aligns with our result of historically wetter sediment emitting more CO<sub>2</sub> than historically drier sediment.

**The second issue concerns the interpretation of the results. Not only are the study variables of interest (microbial biomass,...) affected by inundation but also by multiple factors such as inerrant soil type, vegetation type and its impact on rooting, organic matter quality, soil temperature,....This is a major which by itself nullifies all conclusions.**

We believe the reviewer is stating that the conclusions we present are weakened due to the many variables influencing the study system. We agree that many factors influence carbon cycling, nitrogen cycling, and microbial communities, but we note that this does not preclude interpretation of the system's response to inundation. The goal of this research was to investigate the influence of hydrologic history on the system response as a whole, which is described on page 2, line 23-24 ("By identifying the processes impacted by the historical contingencies of this variable inundation, it is possible to understand linkages among hydrology, biogeochemistry, and microbial ecology on a systems level"). In our discussion of the microbial respiration response (page 8, line 23-24), we also specifically mention that having a consistent respiration rate (RR) across the upper elevations was unexpected due to the environmental and microbial differences across the upper elevations ("Consistent RR across the upper elevations was unexpected, because they differed significantly in features that influence RR, including microbial composition, surrounding vegetation, and time since most recent river inundation"), and we subsequently present a hypothesis that aligns with our conceptual model ("We suggest that microbial communities in sediments that are inundated permanently or for extended periods are better adapted to full water saturation than those that are infrequently inundated, which led to the binary RR response between 0 m and the upper elevations.")

Over time, hydrologic history drives changes in vegetation, microbial community composition, physical sediment characteristics, and many other variables (Hupp and Osterkamp, 1996; Tockner et al., 2000; Larned et al., 2010). We describe this on page 2 (line 20-23): "Over time, cycles of wetting and drying impact different elevations of the parafluvial zone at different frequencies, which naturally results in a gradient of sediment moisture content, but also has the potential to create biogeochemical and microbial interactions specifically dependent on preceding environmental conditions." By studying the whole system response, we do not attempt to resolve the intermediate mechanisms. Instead, we propose a conceptual model and hypotheses that can help guide future research to resolve the mechanisms at play. Rather than weakening our results, the integration of variables influencing the study system helps us to investigate the complexity of the natural system and creates a foundation for future research. We appreciate the reviewer's comment, and we will add the references listed above to the introduction to indicate

the context for our statements regarding hydrologic history's influence on many environment and microbial variables.

**Moreover, how can the authors convince on the observed trends is no temporal evaluation has been performed?**

Thank you for highlighting that we do not adequately discuss the importance of temporal influence in our text. We recognize that our study utilizes samples from a single point in time, a common limitation in scientific studies. We will specify in our conclusions that seasonal differences are an additional question to investigate and that future work would benefit from studying other dam-influenced systems to investigate if other systems behave as our study site does.

**The third issue concerns the study objectives. The authors should decide about their objectives. Is it about process understanding or about modeling?. Authors have to choice. I suggest to move all the conceptual results to the discussion part of the paper.**

Thank you for your comment. The study objectives are listed in Section 1 (page 3, line 11-15), and accompanying hypotheses are listed with the objectives (page 3, line 18-26). Our objectives are focused on process understanding. We mention modeling at two points in the paper. In the introduction, we briefly mention modeling to identify the context and implications of this work (page 2, line 25). Additionally, Section 4.3 is designated for discussing linkages between this work and modeling (page 10, lines 17-31; page 11 line 1-12), because modeling is an important component of the implications and transferability of this interdisciplinary study. Our conclusions (Section 5, page 11, line 13-32; page 12, line 1-7), however, focus on process understanding via the conceptual model that we outline.


In Section 4.3, we aim to establish context for the current state of predictive models, explain how our results identify modeling research needs, and illustrate the current importance of moving modeling research forward. We will make several changes to more clearly present our aims within the text. We will change the section heading from "Importance of parafluvial hyporheic dynamics to hydrobiogeochemical models," to "Implications of parafluvial hydrobiogeochemical processes for predictive models." We will also revise the text (page 10, line 18-31; page 11, line 1-2) to better integrate our results with the modelling context as indicated below (changes in bold and strikethrough):

"Biogeochemical response lags due to physiological stress of parafluvial microbial communities are of particular importance in creating modeling frameworks that can accurately predict the biogeochemical behavior of terrestrial-aquatic transition zones in managed systems. **Our results indicate that a combination of ecological and physiological mechanisms limited the ability of the microbial communities to rapidly adapt to an inundated state. This resulted in the suppression of RR, which we propose is a transient condition whereby there is also temporal lag in biogeochemical function.** ~~Microbial adaptation to the abrupt change in local~~

environment is not instantaneous in general, but a long time lag is often observed in microbial adaptation to the abrupt change in local environment (Wood et al., 1995). This phenomenon can affect the transport of biodegradable substrates and contaminants, particularly when the timescale of the metabolic lag is comparable to that of transport (Nilsen et al., 2012). Despite such importance, mechanistic approaches for incorporating metabolic lags into subsurface transport modeling are currently lacking. Past modeling work that attempted to account for this lag effect was either based on temporal convolution integral (Wood et al., 1995; Nilsen et al., 2012) or introducing exposure time as an additional dimension (or coordinate) (Ginn, 1999). These efforts do not address fundamental mechanisms responsible for time lags and consequently, their predictions may be limited. Our results indicate that a combination of ecological and physiological mechanisms impeded the ability of the microbial communities to rapidly adapt to an inundated state. This resulted in the suppression of RR, which we propose is a transient condition whereby there is also temporal lag in biogeochemical function. Given that we find time lags to be extremely important to the microbial and biogeochemical behavior of our system, therefore, future modeling efforts need to consider more ecologically and physiologically relevant causes for delays in microbial adaptation and associated biogeochemical function, including the response to changes in timing and magnitude of flow variations.”

**Other comments Figure 1 can not be presented with not true colors or pictures taken under constant light.**

We agree. To address concerns of both reviewers, we will change the figure so that the photographs are presented in greyscale to minimize the differences in lighting/camera quality. We feel it is important to keep the photographs so that readers can visually see differences in sediment moisture and texture across the sampling locations.



**Figure 2 is too simplistic. In figure 2 why having a legend with distance from water? Why colors into the figure? This “distance to water” is not really adequate as the water level always changes.**

Thank you for your comment. We chose to use both different shapes and different colors to differentiate the sampling locations. We kept the color scheme consistent throughout all figures, which allows the colors to aid in visualization across the different figures. Using greyscale colors would make it more difficult to make visual linkages across the different figures presented in the manuscript, and we use different shapes to assist colorblind readers.

“Distance to water” refers to the distance to the water line at the time of sampling and is therefore a stable value. In order to more clearly differentiate among sample locations and to change the focus to the primary research question- the historical influence of inundation- we will change the terminology throughout the text and figures to utilize days since last inundation (0, 13, 127, 398 days) instead of distance to water (0, 2, 4, 6 m). For brevity, we will still include references to “elevation” as a means of differentiating among sample sites. Making this change will impact Table 1, which presents results from linear regressions. Although the exact  $p$  and  $R^2$  values change in the new regressions, using days since last inundation does not alter whether or not the variable has a significant relationship to the sampling location except in one instance. Bacterial biomass does not have a significant relationship to distance from water ( $p=0.09$ ;  $R^2=0.19$ ), but it does have a significant relationship to days since inundation ( $p=0.03$ ;  $R^2=0.32$ ). Subsequently, we will change the text that mentions the result explicitly (page 7, line 4-8). Making this change will not influence any of our conclusions.

### References:

- Hawkes, C. V., Waring, B. G., Rocca, J. D., and Kivlin, S. N.: Historical climate controls soil respiration responses to current soil moisture, *PNAS*, 114, 6322-6327, 10.1073/pnas.1620811114, 2017.
- Hermoso, V.: Freshwater ecosystems could become the biggest losers of the Paris Agreement, *Global Change Biol.*, 10.1111/gcb.13655, 2017.
- Hupp, C. R., and Osterkamp, W. R.: Riparian vegetation and fluvial geomorphic processes, *Geomorphology*, 14, 277-295, 10.1016/0169-555X(95)00042-4, 1996.
- Jackson, R. B., Carpenter, S. R., Dahm, C. N., McKnight, D. M., Naiman, R. J., Postel, S. L., and Running, S. W.: Water in a changing world, *Ecol. Appl.*, 11, 1027-1045, 10.1890/1051-0761(2001)011[1027:WIACW]2.0.CO;2, 2001.
- Larned, S. T., Datry, T., Arscott, D. B., and Tockner, K.: Emerging concepts in temporary-river ecology, *Freshwat. Biol.*, 55, 717-738, 10.1111/j.1365-2427.2009.02322.x, 2010.
- Latrubesse, E. M., Arima, E. Y., Dunne, T., Park, E., Baker, V. R., d’Horta, F. M., Wight, C., Wittmann, F., Zuanon, J., Baker, P. A., Ribas, C. C., Norgaard, R. B., Filizola, N., Ansar, A., Flyvbjerg, B., and Stevaux, J. C.: Damming the rivers of the Amazon basin, *Nature*, 546, 363-369, 10.1038/nature22333, 2017.
- Tockner, K., Malard, F., and Ward, J. V.: An extension of the flood pulse concept, *Hydrobiologia*, 14, 2861-2883, 10.1002/1099-1085(200011/12)14:16/17<2861::AID-HYP124>3.0.CO;2-F, 2000.
- Zarfl, C., Lumsdon, A. E., Berlekamp, J., Tydecks, L., and Tockner, K.: A global boom in hydropower dam construction, *Aquat. Sci.*, 77, 161-170, doi:10.1007/s00027-014-0377-0, 2015.

**RC3 (25 May 2017):**

**I find the article generally interesting. It is well written, includes extensive literature documentation, and pays ample attention to describe the practical and general implications of this study which is undertaken in a rather unusual, dam-controlled river environment. Coming from the geochemistry side of biogeochemistry, my comments focus on the physico/chemical part of the study. There are two topics I have problems with.**

**The first is temperature, or rather the lack of its consideration (only “room temperature” is mentioned twice on page 4). Are the results temperature-independent? If so, the authors should explain it. If the results are temperature dependent, the authors will have to discuss the implications of it, and preferably give some more accurate temperature conditions during the experiments.**

We agree that temperature is an important component that we did not discuss adequately. We will add text to the methods (Section 2.1 Study Site) that characterizes the temperatures of the study site. We will include historical (2014-2016) river water temperature, mean groundwater temperature, and air temperature. We will also include the river water temperature at the start of sample collection and the air temperature from the date of sample collection. Additionally, we will remove the term “room temperature” (page 4, line 23 and 31) and instead state that sample processing and incubations were performed in a laboratory maintained at temperatures between 21 and 22°C, which correspond to maximum river temperatures. We will also clarify in the methods (Section 2.3 Laboratory incubations) that the river water used in incubations was left at ambient laboratory temperature for approximately one hour prior to use.

As the reviewer alludes to, process rates are likely temperature dependent. With this in mind, we discuss our results in a relative, as opposed to absolute, sense throughout the text. We assume that temperature had the same effect across samples, which is supported by the randomized sample processing order, which we will add text to the methods to explain (Section 2.3 Laboratory incubations). We note, however, that the lack of temperature control precludes the comparison of our data to other work in an absolute, rather than relative, sense, and we will add text to the methods that explains this important point.

**The second problem I have with the paper is that on page 5, lines 5-7, the authors describe in detail how measurements of cations and anions are conducted. However, none of those parameters, with the exception of nitrate or nitrite, is ever mentioned in the paper – so, why are the measurements listed? If the chemistry plays no role, it should be mentioned; if the authors discuss it in a companion paper, it should be mentioned; if the data were not used at all, their measurement methods should not be discussed in the methods section.**

We agree that we can improve the clarity with which we discuss anions and cations. We will add additional text throughout the manuscript to more clearly present the anion results. Specifically, we will add text that states that  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$  was significant in the PERMANOVA results and that  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$  is displayed on the NMDS plots (Fig. 3)(Section 3.1.1 Microbial biogeography). We will also add text (Section 3.1.1 Spatial gradients in environmental variables) that states that there were no

significant relationships between the non-nitrogen anions ( $\text{Cl}^-$ ,  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}$ ) and time since last inundation.

Unfortunately, we do not have cation measurements from untreated, control samples, which we apologize for listing in error in the methods section (page 5, line 14) and which we will correct. We mention cations as a component of our motivations for utilizing three different treatment waters (page 3, line 15-26). We will add text (Section 3.2.1 Response to different treatment waters) that lists the differing cation content of the three treatment waters as an additional means of highlighting the lack of treatment effects (page 7, line 30), and we will list the associated values in Table 2. We will also clarify in the text (“The initial (0.5 hour), prolonged (25 hour), or change (25hr–0.5hr) in any measured inundation response did not differ significantly across treatment waters”, page 7, line 28-29) which variables we are referring to, including cations. We will also add a supplemental table (Table S3) that provides the anion, cation, respiration rate, and NPOC data from the incubations, so that readers can easily access the information.

**As far as figures are concerned, I would suggest two changes. In Figure 1 the colors are described to be misleading, so why show them? The photos should be converted to grey scale.**

We agree with the assessment regarding the colors in Figure 1. To address concerns from both reviewers, we will change the photographs to grey scale to minimize the differences in lighting/camera quality. Please see page 12 for the new figure.

**Figure 6 could be deleted, it is very simplistic and the importance of changing biology is extensively described, with much more detail, in the text of the publication.**

We agree that Figure 6 is simplistic. This was an intentional choice to allow easy visualization of the complex concepts described in the text. We believe it is an important addition to the manuscript, as it both summarizes our conceptual model and aids readers less familiar with the concepts discussed. In particular, the figure clearly illustrates the differences between the initial versus prolonged effect of inundation with regard to both microbial community and  $\text{CO}_2$  flux. It also allows for the juxtaposition of the constantly-inundated versus variably-inundated sites and thus stresses the open question of timescales of biogeochemical resilience, which underpins the need for future research. If the figure was removed, it would be difficult for readers to see the whole conceptual framework that the study points towards. Losing that connection will diminish the scientific impact of the paper. Additionally, many readers flip through figures before reading a manuscript. With the conceptual figure, those readers can understand the major outcomes without needing to spend significant time reading the paper, which will make our results more widely accessible.

Revised Text



# Biogeochemical cycling at the aquatic-terrestrial interface is linked to parafluvial hyporheic zone inundation history

Amy E. Goldman<sup>1</sup>, Emily B. Graham<sup>1</sup>, Alex R. Crump<sup>1</sup>, David W. Kennedy<sup>1</sup>, Elvira B. Romero<sup>1</sup>, Carolyn G. Anderson<sup>1</sup>, Karl L. Dana<sup>1</sup>, Charles T. Resch<sup>1</sup>, Jim K. Fredrickson<sup>1</sup>, and James C. Stegen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, 99352, USA

Correspondence to: Amy E. Goldman (amy.goldman@pnnl.gov)

**Abstract.** The parafluvial hyporheic zone combines the heightened biogeochemical and microbial interactions indicative of a hyporheic region with direct atmospheric/terrestrial inputs and the effects of wet/dry cycles. Therefore, understanding biogeochemical cycling and microbial interactions in this ecotone is fundamental to understanding biogeochemical cycling at the aquatic-terrestrial interface and to creating robust hydrobiogeochemical models of dynamic river corridors. We aimed to (i) characterize biogeochemical and microbial differences in the parafluvial hyporheic zone across a small spatial domain (6 lateral meters) that spans a breadth of inundation histories and (ii) examine how parafluvial hyporheic sediments respond to laboratory-simulated reinundation. Surface sediment was collected at four elevations along transects perpendicular to flow of the Columbia River, eastern WA, USA. The sediments were inundated by the river 0 days, 13 days, 127 days, and 398 days prior to sampling. Spatial variation in environmental variables (organic matter, moisture, nitrate, glucose, % C, % N) and microbial communities (16S and ITS rRNA gene sequencing, qPCR) were driven by differences in inundation history. Microbial respiration did not differ significantly across inundation histories prior to forced inundation in laboratory incubations. Forced inundation suppressed microbial respiration across all histories, but the degree of suppression was dramatically different between the sediments saturated and unsaturated at the time of sample collection, indicating a binary threshold response to re-inundation. We present a conceptual model in which irregular hydrologic fluctuations facilitate microbial communities adapted to local conditions and a relatively high flux of CO<sub>2</sub>. Upon re-wetting, microbial communities are initially suppressed metabolically, which results in lower CO<sub>2</sub> flux rates primarily due to suppression of fungal respiration. Following prolonged inundation, the microbial community adapts to saturation by shifting composition, and the CO<sub>2</sub> flux rebounds to prior levels due to the subsequent change in respiration. Our results indicate that the time between inundation events can push the system into alternate states: we suggest that (i) above some threshold of inundation-interval, re-inundation suppresses respiration to a consistent, low rate, and (ii) that below some inundation-interval, re-inundation has a minor effect on respiration. Extending reactive transport models to capture processes that govern such dynamics will provide more robust predictions of river corridor biogeochemical function under altered surface water flow regimes in both managed and natural watersheds.

Deleted: Carbon

Deleted: carbon

Deleted: for assays and forced inundation laboratory incubations (destructively sampled at 0 hours and 25 hours)

Deleted: ampling elevations

Deleted: elevation and thus

Deleted: elevations

Deleted: I

Deleted: relative to uninundated sediment

Deleted: elevations

Deleted: elevations

Deleted: during sampling

Deleted: via a

Deleted: in

## 1 Introduction

The hyporheic zone, the subsurface region where river water and groundwater (GW) mix, is characterized by heightened biogeochemical cycling and microbial interactions (McClain et al., 2003; Boulton et al., 2010; Mulholland and Webster, 2010; Stegen et al., 2016). Hyporheic sediment is exposed to different aquatic chemistries due to variation in hydraulic head that drives flow into and out of the hyporheic zone (Arntzen et al., 2006; Hucks Sawyer et al., 2009). When river elevation rises, river water infiltrates hyporheic sediment. When river elevation falls, outflow from the hyporheic zone consists of both bank storage, which contains river water altered by hyporheic biogeochemical transformation (Wörman et al., 2002), and groundwater flowing out to the river through the hyporheic zone (Boano et al., 2008). Many prior studies have focused on the main channel hyporheic zone that is continuously overlain by a column of water (e.g., Boulton et al., 1998; Tonina and Buffington, 2009; Boulton et al., 2010; Mulholland and Webster, 2010; Trimmer et al., 2012). However, the parafluvial hyporheic zone (Fig. 1), located in the region of the river channel that is dry during low flows, presents an important location to investigate biogeochemical cycling at the aquatic-terrestrial interface because it combines the prominent interactions of a hyporheic region with the addition of direct atmospheric/terrestrial inputs and the effects of wet/dry cycles. Given that the parafluvial zone is present in all river systems, understanding biogeochemical cycling and microbial interactions in this ecotone is fundamental to understanding the coupling between aquatic and terrestrial biogeochemical cycles.

In the United States, 2653 dams generate hydropower (USACE 2016) and 90% of water discharge is hydrologically altered (Jackson et al., 2001). Hydropower currently accounts for 80% of renewable energy globally (Zarfl et al., 2015; Hermoso, 2017) and is projected to increase as countries begin managing their energy production within the Paris Agreement and other climate accords (Hermoso, 2017; Latrubesse et al., 2017). In dam-controlled watersheds, the parafluvial hyporheic zone undergoes rapid cycles of wetting and drying caused by hydropeaking regimes in which flow is intentionally maximized during times of high energy demand and/or fish migration. In the Hanford Reach of the Columbia River, for example, hydropower dam operations cause river water elevation to fluctuate up to 2 meters in a single day (Arntzen et al., 2006). Over time, cycles of wetting and drying impact different elevations of the parafluvial zone at different frequencies, which naturally results in a gradient of sediment moisture content, but also has the potential to create biogeochemical and microbial interactions specifically dependent on preceding environmental conditions (Hupp and Osterkamp, 1996; Larned et al., 2010; Tockner et al., 2000; Hawkes et al., 2017). Given that dam-impacted parafluvial zones are globally ubiquitous and likely to expand with ongoing dam construction efforts, there is a need to identify the processes impacted by the history of variable inundation. Doing so will unlock new possibilities to understand linkages among hydrology, biogeochemistry, and microbial ecology on a systems level and ultimately use that knowledge to develop robust hydrobiogeochemical models for application in dam-impacted systems.

Deleted: carbon

Deleted: By

Deleted: ing

Deleted: ical

Deleted: contingencies

Deleted: this

Deleted: , it is

Deleted: le

Deleted: , which therefore allows the creation of

Previous studies of biogeochemical cycling in the parafluvial zone have sampled gravel bars to investigate hydrologic flow paths (Claret and Boulton, 2008; Deforet et al., 2009; Zarnetske et al., 2011) and have sampled during saturated conditions utilizing well/piezometer transects (Baker et al., 1999; Deforet et al., 2009; Briody et al., 2016; Graham et al., 2016; Stegen et al., 2016). Such studies have indicated that the parafluvial hyporheic zone is an active region of diverse biogeochemical transformations (Zarnetske et al., 2011; Briody et al., 2016) and microbial community dynamics (Baker et al., 1999; Graham et al., 2016; Stegen et al., 2016; Graham et al., 2017), often influenced by residence times (Claret and Boulton, 2008; Deforet et al., 2009; Zarnetske et al., 2011). However, studies that have compared biogeochemical cycling in the parafluvial zone to other floodplain environments (e.g., forest, ponds, islands, wetlands) have found that stream and nearby gravel habitats have had lower respiration, bacterial abundance, enzyme activities, and sediment nitrogen nutrient leaching than adjacent pasture/grassland, vegetated islands, and/or mature forest habitats, but short flood pulses (24 hr) have increased bacterial extracellular enzymes in sediment from both flooded riverbanks and wetlands (Burns and Ryder, 2001; Doering et al., 2011; Ostojic et al., 2013; Bodmer et al., 2016). With regard to wet/dry cycles, many studies have examined their biogeochemical and microbial effects in terrestrial soils (Jarvis et al., 2007 and references therein; Kim et al., 2012 and references therein). Fewer have investigated them in intermittent stream sediments, wherein the entire stream dries for stretches of time (Leigh et al., 2016 and references therein). Zeglin et al. (2011) investigated parafluvial transects of two intermittent streams located in cold (Antarctic) and hot (New Mexico, US) deserts and identified binary microbial community (16S rRNA gene sequencing) differences based on wet vs. dry sediments in both environments.

**Deleted:** relate

**Deleted:** and water residence time to biogeochemistry and microbial activity

**Deleted:** Several s

**Deleted:** have also investigated how

**Deleted:** compares

**Deleted:** (Burns and Ryder, 2001; Doering et al. 2011; Ostojic et al., 2013; Bodmer et al., 2016)

**Deleted:** Additionally, Zeglin et al. (2011) investigated parafluvial transects of two intermittent streams located in cold (Antarctic) and hot (New Mexico, US) deserts and identified binary microbial community (16S rRNA gene sequencing) differences based on wet vs. dry sediments.

Prior work has not examined how inundation history and wet/dry cycles influence biogeochemical cycling and microbial communities within a hydropower-influenced transect of the parafluvial hyporheic zone and has not investigated the degree to which response to rewetting is due to inundation–history–driven microbial community composition or aqueous chemistry. Determining drivers of biogeochemical– microbial interactions in the parafluvial zone will elucidate the implications of climate-watershed interactions on biogeochemical cycling, which will aid understanding of both managed river systems and related ecosystems (e.g., intermittent streams, tidally-influenced littoral zones of the Great Lakes).

**Deleted:** carbon

To fill knowledge gaps in parafluvial biogeochemical cycling dynamics, we aimed to (i) characterize differences in sediment biogeochemistry and microbial communities (bacteria, archaea, and fungi) in the parafluvial hyporheic zone across a spatial domain of 6 lateral meters that integrates a breadth of inundation histories and (ii) examine how the sediments respond to laboratory–simulated re–inundation. In order to determine the re–inundation response under different GW/river water mixing scenarios, we used three different re–inundation waters to capture the influence of cation content (typically higher in GW), NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> concentration (typically higher in GW), and availability of dissolved organic carbon (typically higher in river water). We expected to observe higher amounts of carbon (e.g., organic matter, glucose) at the upper elevations where it could accumulate away from the physical mixing and dilution of inundation and subsequently greatest respiration at the drier upper elevations following re–wetting (e.g., the "Birch Effect"; Birch, 1958). We identified two opposing hypotheses to determine

**Deleted:** this

**Deleted:** cal

**Deleted:** variables

**Deleted:** transect

additional drivers of microbial respiration across an elevational transect of the parafluvial hyporheic zone. First, we hypothesized that recreating the GW-river water mixing that occurs in the hyporheic zone would stimulate respiration regardless of inundation history, because GW-surface water mixing brings complementary electron donors and acceptors together (McClain et al., 2003). Alternately, we hypothesized that inundation history is a more important driver of respiration response, such that local adaptation of the microbial community due to inundation history would overwhelm the influence of shifts in aqueous chemistry.

**Deleted:** CO<sub>2</sub> flux

## 2 Materials and Methods

### 2.1 Study site

Samples were collected on 28 March 2016 from the parafluvial zone of the Columbia River located 80 km downstream of hydroelectric Priest Rapids Dam in the 300 Area of the Hanford Reach in semi-arid eastern WA, USA (Arntzen et al., 2006; Slater et al., 2010). Air temperature at the site ranged from -16 to 44°C in 2014-2016, and on the day of sampling ranged from 1 to 14°C, with a mean of 8°C ((Hanford Meteorological Station, 2016). The site experienced trace amounts of precipitation the week before sampling and cumulative rainfall of 0.64 cm from March 13 to 22 (Hanford Meteorological Station, 2016). River water elevation in the Hanford Reach is controlled by dam operations and fluctuates up to 2 meters daily (Arntzen et al., 2006). A water column pressure sensor (0–15 psig; Campbell Scientific) was used to record water level elevation and temperature near the study site at 15–minute intervals from 2013 to 2017. River water temperature ranged from 3.6 to 22.7°C in 2014-2016 and was 6.9°C at the start of sample collection. Groundwater temperature, which is measured in nearby groundwater wells using the same sensor model and interval, was approximately 16.5°C in 2014-2016. In order to relate shoreline elevation to historical river water elevation, an elevation survey of the study site was performed by combining manual elevation measurements with a point of known elevation for each sampling transect, which allowed for the calculation of time since last inundation by the river for each sampling elevation.

**Deleted:** Precipitation in the two weeks prior to sampling included

### 2.2 Experimental design

Surface sediment (0–10 cm) was collected at four locations along three transects (12 sites total) perpendicular to river flow and encompassing 1 m of elevation change (Fig. 1). The four locations were spaced laterally at 2 m intervals beginning at the water line and going 6 lateral meters upslope. The three transects were within 4 m of each other. Based on recorded river water elevation, the four sampling elevations had been last inundated by the river 0 days (0 m sampling location), 13 days (2 m), 127 days (4 m), and 398 days (6 m) prior to sampling. The four sampling elevations will be referred to by the time since last inundation or, for brevity, as different “histories”. The highest elevations (127 d and 398 d) were marked by grasses and mature trees (*Morus rubra*; Red Mulberry) with large roots extending down through the 127 d elevation. The lower elevations (0 d and 13 d) were marked with sparse grasses and dried algal mats. All elevations had an extensive cobble layer overlying the sediment. Unsieved sediment was collected at each location for grain size analysis and for organic matter

**Moved (insertion) [3]**

**Deleted:** For clarity, the four elevations will be referred to by their distance from the water line: 0 m, 2 m, 4 m, and 6 m.

**Deleted:** 4 m and 6m

**Deleted:** 4 m

**Deleted:** m and 2 m

**Moved up [3]:** Based on recorded river water elevation, the four sampling elevations had been last inundated by the river 0 days (0 m sampling location), 13 days (2 m), 127 days (4 m), and 398 days (6 m) prior to sampling.

(OM) content (loss-on-ignition). For all remaining analyses, sediment was sieved to < 2 mm and subsampled in the field. 15 mL aliquots for laboratory incubations were subsampled into 40 mL borosilicate incubation vials and kept on ice until used for same-day laboratory incubations. Aliquots for microbial analyses were flash frozen in liquid N<sub>2</sub> and kept on dry ice before storage at -80°C. Aliquots for C/N (Elementar vario EL Cube), sieved OM content (loss-on-ignition), and moisture content (gravimetric) were stored on dry ice before storage at -4°C.

Deleted: ; LOI

Deleted: LOI

### 2.3 Laboratory incubations

Pairs of incubation vials were removed from ice in a randomized order to be used for destructive sampling at 0.5 hour and 25 hour time points. Sample processing and incubations were performed in a laboratory maintained at temperatures between 21 and 22°C, which correspond to maximum river temperatures. Vials were left at ambient laboratory temperature for 10 minutes before 15 mL of re-inundation treatment water was added to each vial, leaving a 10 mL headspace of ambient air.

Deleted: I

Deleted:

Deleted: in pairs

Deleted: room

River water used for treatments was collected during sediment sampling, stored on ice, and then left at ambient laboratory temperature for approximately one hour prior to use. Three replicate vials from each sample site were used per time point and were exposed to one of three different treatment waters: river water, 1:1 river water and synthetic GW without nitrate (NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>), or 1:1 river water and synthetic GW with NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>. The lack of additional temperature control precludes comparison of our data to other work in an absolute, rather than relative or conceptual, sense. Both synthetic GW solutions were created from calcium chloride, sodium bicarbonate, magnesium sulfate, sodium sulfate, sodium carbonate, potassium carbonate, and (for NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> containing GW) calcium nitrate. The final content of each GW contained (mmol/L): 1.4 Na<sup>+</sup>, 1.0 Ca<sup>2+</sup>, 0.5 Mg<sup>2+</sup>, 0.2 K<sup>+</sup>, 1.6 CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup>, 0.6 SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>. The NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> containing GW had 0.5 NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> and 1.3 Cl<sup>-</sup>, whereas the non-NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> GW had 1.8 Cl<sup>-</sup>. The final pH values of the three treatments were 7.59 (river water), 7.77 (River + GW), and 7.66 (River + GW + NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>).

Deleted: (collected during sediment sampling; stored on ice)

Vials were inverted multiple times and then stored upright (dark, ambient laboratory temperature) until their end-time sampling point.

Deleted: room

After the incubation period, vials were shaken on a mini-vortex for three minutes to equilibrate dissolved gas with headspace. Vial headspace was subsequently sampled using a 5mL gas-tight syringe and immediately analyzed for CO<sub>2</sub> (EGM-4, PP Systems, Amesbury, MA). CO<sub>2</sub> values (ppm) were used as a proxy for respiration rate (RR; ppm CO<sub>2</sub> min<sup>-1</sup> g dry sediment<sup>-1</sup>) after initial (0.5 hr) and prolonged (25 hr) inundation. After headspace sampling, vials were opened and subsampled. Assays on water-extracted samples included anions (Dionex ICS-2000 anion chromatograph with AS40 auto sampler), cations (nitric acid acidified; Perkin Elmer Optima 2100 DV ICP-OES with an AS93 auto sampler), pH, and dissolved non-purgeable organic carbon (NPOC; Shimadzu combustion carbon analyzer TOC-Vcsh with ASI-V auto sampler). Ammonium (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) was also determined colorimetrically, following KCl extraction (adapted from Weatherburn, 1967) (Shimadzu UV/Vis spectrophotometer).

In addition to incubation vials that had treatment water added, a set of untreated, control incubations (one from each site) was incubated for 0.5 hours without the addition of any water, and vials were subsequently analyzed for organic acids and sugars (Agilent 1100 series HPLC), headspace CO<sub>2</sub>, and anions as described above.

Deleted: cations,

## 5 2.4 Microbial analyses

DNA was extracted from flash-frozen sediment using a MoBio PowerSoil kit (MoBio Laboratories, Inc., Carlsbad, CA) according to manufacturer's instructions with the addition of one-hour incubation with proteinase-K solution (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA) and MoBio C1 solution to facilitate cell lysis. 16S and ITS rRNA amplicon sequencing was used to identify microbial and fungal communities. Assays were performed in triplicate using an Illumina MiSeq at the Environmental Sample Preparation and Sequencing Facility at Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, IL. The recently modified forward barcoded primer set was used for 16S [rRNA gene](#) sequencing (Aprill et al., 2015), and reverse barcoded primers were used for ITS sequencing.

Quantitative PCR (qPCR) was used to quantify 16S and ITS rRNA gene copies. Assays were performed in 384-well plates using a Life Technologies ViiA7 real-time PCR instrument at the DNA Services Facility at the University of Illinois at Chicago, using methods described previously (Nadkarni et al., 2002). Final gene copies per extract were calculated by multiplying elution volume by gene abundance and were then normalized to grams of dry sediment extracted. Absolute concentrations (referred to as "abundance" throughout) of specific OTUs were calculated by multiplying percent abundance from 16S [rRNA gene](#) and ITS sequencing by the sample's total bacterial, archaeal, or fungal concentration (ng ul<sup>-1</sup> g dry sed. <sup>-1</sup>) from qPCR.

## 2.5 Statistical analyses

All statistical analyses were completed using R (version 3.2.4). Linear and quadratic regressions were used to assess the relationship between environmental variables and [log of days since inundated](#). If the variable clearly exhibited a stepped relationship, analysis of variance (ANOVA) and subsequent pairwise t-tests were used to categorically compare the elevations to each other. R<sup>2</sup> values reported are adjusted R<sup>2</sup>. Significance for all analyses was determined based on  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

Deleted: elevation

Operational taxonomic unit (OTU) data were rarefied for both 16S [rRNA gene](#) and ITS sequencing based on the sample with the lowest count of assigned OTUs, because assigned 16S [rRNA gene](#) OTU counts ranged from 44,807 to 345,564. Rarefied data were used for all subsequent analyses, including calculation of absolute concentrations utilizing qPCR results. The *Chloroplast* class was removed from 16S [rRNA gene](#) data analyses, because it is often a sequencing artifact and not indicative of sample composition. Permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) and non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) were used to assess dissimilarities among bacterial/archaeal and fungal communities using Bray-Curtis distances calculated from 16S [rRNA gene](#) and ITS OTUs within the *vegan* R package. Significant

Deleted: Using days since inundation instead of distance from water line did not qualitatively change the results or any conceptual inferences. We used distance because it is a more integrative measure of inundation history

environmental variables were plotted as vectors on NMDS plots using the “envfit” function from *vegan*. Because NPOC was not measured in the untreated samples, NPOC at 0.5 hours was averaged for each sampling site to be used for statistical analyses. Linear discriminant analysis coupled with effect size (LEfSe) was performed following Niederdorfer et al. (2016). LEfSe utilizes Kruskal-Wallis sum rank tests ( $\alpha=0.05$ ), pairwise Wilcoxon rank-sum tests ( $\alpha=0.05$ ), and linear discriminant analysis (threshold= 2.0; strategy=“all-against-all”) to detect differential taxa among the four elevations and estimate effect size. Analyses were completed and figures were produced using the Huttenhower Galaxy server (<http://huttenhower.sph.harvard.edu/galaxy>).

### 3 Results

#### 3.1 Field conditions

##### 3.1.1 Spatial gradients in environmental variables

Moisture content of the sediment decreased with increasing time since last inundation, with mean (sd) percent moisture of 35.5 (6.6), 24.5 (2.2), 21.5 (1.7), and 17.5 (1.8) and mean percent field saturation 100, 69, 61, and 49, from 0 d, 13 d, 127 d, and 398 d, respectively. In addition, many environmental variables (OM (<2mm sieved), glucose, NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, % C, and % N) exhibited significant positive linear relationships with log of days since inundation (Table 1), but some variables had more complex spatial distributions linked to inundation history (Fig. 2). Specifically, OM displayed a distinct stepped relationship in which 0 d sediments had significantly lower OM than the other histories (13 d, 127 d, 398 d) (ANOVA and pairwise t-test;  $P<0.01$  for all), and the 13 d, 127 d, and 398 d sediments did not differ from each other ( $P>0.7$  for all). In addition, glucose and % C also exhibited stepped relationships, but in both cases, 0 d was significantly lower than only 127 d and 398 d (% C:  $P<0.01$  for 127 d and 398 d; glucose:  $P<0.04$  for 127 d and 398 d) (Fig 2). There were no stepped relationships or significant linear relationships between log of days since inundation and Cl<sup>-</sup>, SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>, or NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>;  $p>0.05$ ).

##### 3.1.2 Microbial biogeography

Fungal to bacterial ratio, bacterial abundance, and fungal abundance were significantly positively related to log of days since inundation (Table 1). Additionally, bacterial abundance displayed a distinct stepped relationship in which 0 d sediments had significantly lower abundance than the other histories (ANOVA and pairwise t-test;  $P<0.03$  for all), but the 13 d, 127 d, and 398 d sediments were not significantly different from each other ( $P>0.1$  for all), much like the stepped relationships between log of days since inundation and OM, glucose, and % C (Fig. 2).

From 16S rRNA gene and ITS sequencing, 9893 and 1856 individual OTUs were identified, respectively (Table S1). The same seven fungal phyla were identified from all inundation histories with ITS sequencing. Although the order of abundance

Deleted: elevation

Deleted: m, 2 m, 4 m, and 6 m

Deleted: organic matter

Deleted: elevation

Deleted: elevation

Deleted: organic matter

Deleted: distribution

Deleted: m

Deleted: was

Deleted: upper elevations

Deleted: 2 m, 4 m, and 6 m

Deleted: upper elevations

Deleted: distributions

Deleted: m

Deleted: 4 m and 6 m

Deleted: 4 m and 6 m

Deleted: 4 m and 6 m

Deleted: elevation

Deleted: Conversely

Deleted: lacked a linear relationship with elevation but

Deleted: distribution

Deleted: m

Deleted: was

Deleted: upper elevations (

Deleted: 2 m, 4 m, and 6 m

Deleted: )

Deleted: upper elevations

Deleted: distribution

Deleted: distance

Deleted: organic matter

Deleted: at all elevations

Deleted: from

varied across the individual sites, all four inundation histories had the same top eleven bacterial and archaeal phyla identified from 16S rRNA gene sequencing (Table S2). Despite the similarities on the phylum-level, the bacterial/archaeal and the fungal community compositions were significantly different across inundation history based on OTUs (PERMANOVA, bacteria/archaea:  $P < 0.001$ ; fungi:  $P < 0.01$ ) (Fig. 3). Of 153 bacteria/archaea classes identified by 16S rRNA gene sequencing, 15 were unique to the 0 d sediments, and two were present at all inundation histories but absent at the 0 d sediments. Of the 15 unique classes, the most abundant were Marine Group I and South African Gold Mine Gp 1, which are both in the ammonia oxidizing *Thaumarchaeota* phylum (Francis et al., 2005; Brochier-Armanet et al., 2008). Additionally, LEfSe identified no archaeal, no fungal, and 12 bacterial taxa driving dissimilarity among the inundation histories (Fig. S1). All of the LEfSe-identified taxa were from the 0 d and 398 d sediments.

Bacterial/archaeal and fungal communities clustered in distinct inundation history groups in NMDS plots (stress = 0.01 and 0.04, respectively; Fig. 3a and b). Significant environmental variables plotted as vectors on NMDS plots indicate moisture content was the strongest predictor of both bacterial/archaeal and fungal communities, with the 0 d sediments clustering separately from the other inundation histories and  $R^2$  for moisture of 0.90 and 0.91, respectively (*envfit*). Carbon was a significant explanatory variable in both communities in multiple forms (e.g., % C, OM, glucose, NPOC). Additionally, %N,  $SO_4^{2-}$ , and  $NO_3^-$  were significant for one or both communities and are displayed as vectors (Fig. 3a and b).

## 3.2 Incubations

### 3.2.1 Response to different treatment waters

The initial (0.5 hour), prolonged (25 hour), or change (25hr–0.5hr) in any measured inundation response (respiration rate, NPOC, cations, anions) did not differ significantly across treatment waters (river water; 1:1 river water and synthetic GW without  $NO_3^-$ ; 1:1 river water and synthetic GW with  $NO_3^-$ ) (ANOVA:  $P > 0.05$ ) (Table S3), despite the large differences in  $NO_3^-$  between treatments and source sediment and the differing cation contents of the treatment waters (Table 2). Given the lack of treatment effect, the results from the three treatments were pooled and utilized as replicates for all other incubation-based results.

### 3.2.2 Respiration response to inundation

In control sediment (no water added), respiration rate (RR) across all inundation histories was not significantly different (ANOVA;  $P > 0.2$ ). Although initial and prolonged inundation suppressed RR relative to control sediment across all inundation histories, the degree of suppression was dramatically different between 0 d sediments and the other histories (Fig. 4). Specifically, following experimental inundation, the samples that had been saturated at the time of sediment collection (0 d sediments) had a significantly higher RR than those unsaturated at the time of sediment collection (13 d, 127 d, 398 d) (ANOVA and pairwise  $t$ -test;  $P < 0.001$ ), and the 13 d, 127 d, and 398 d sediments did not have RRs significantly different

Deleted: elevations

Deleted: elevations

Deleted: m

Deleted: elevation

Deleted: elevations

Deleted: m

Deleted: elevations

Deleted: m and 6 m

Deleted: elevations

Deleted: elevation

Deleted: m

Deleted: upper elevations

Deleted: Additionally, c

Deleted: elevations

Deleted: elevations

Deleted: m

Deleted: upper elevations

Deleted: sampling

Deleted: m

Deleted: sampling

Deleted: 2 m, 4 m, 6 m

Deleted: the unsaturated elevations



from each other (pairwise t-test;  $P > 0.07$ ) (Fig. 4b,c). Across the inundation histories, therefore, the RR response to inundation was binary, with greater suppression relative to uninundated rates in the sediments with greater times since last inundation and the highest RR in 0 d sediments.

Deleted: elevations

Deleted: at

Deleted: upper elevations

Deleted: at

Deleted: m

## 4 Discussion

### 5 4.1 Microbial respiration response to inundation

The RR suppression in the 13 d, 127 d, and 398 d sediments relative to the 0 d sediments after both initial and prolonged inundation (Fig. 4a,b,c) indicates that brief increases in moisture content (e.g., recurring splashing or < 1 day periods of hydropeaking) can suppress respiration rates in the parafluvial hyporheic zone. Numerous studies have reported high  $\text{CO}_2$  production when dry soils are wetted (e.g., the "Birch Effect"; Birch, 1958; Fierer and Schimel, 2003) and greater  $\text{CO}_2$  from soils undergoing wet/dry cycles than those maintained at a specific moisture content (Miller et al., 2005). We therefore had hypothesized that high amounts of carbon (% C, glucose, NPOC, OM) and bacterial abundance would fuel respiration in the samples unsaturated during sediment collection (13 d, 127 d, 398 d) immediately following forced inundation, despite the sediments being at 49–69% field saturation; however, we found that prior to forced inundation, RR did not differ significantly across 13 d, 127 d, and 398 d sediments, but after inundation, the sediments had significantly lower RR than 0 d sediments. Consistent RR across 13 d, 127 d, and 398 d sediments was unexpected, because they differed significantly in features that influence RR, including microbial composition, surrounding vegetation, and time since most recent river inundation. We suggest that microbial communities in sediments that are inundated permanently or for extended periods are better adapted to full water saturation than those that are infrequently inundated, which led to the binary RR response between 0 d sediments and the other inundation histories. This finding is similar to that of Hawkes et al. (2017) who reported that historically wetter soil emitted twice as much carbon, on average, than historically drier soils.

Deleted: at

Deleted: upper elevation

Deleted: m

Deleted: at

Deleted: upper elevations

Deleted: 2 m, 4 m, 6 m

Deleted: upper elevations

Deleted: elevations

Deleted: upper elevation

Deleted: m

Deleted: the upper elevations

Deleted: m

Deleted: upper elevations

The RR suppression within the 13 d, 127 d, and 398 d sediments, following re-inundation could be attributed to multiple factors. First, the bacterial communities may have physiologically adapted to prolonged terrestrial conditions, and the sudden return to aquatic conditions may have led to osmotic shock or other stress response that produced a lower RR than that of the already saturated samples (0 d sediments) (Kieft et al., 1987; Fierer et al., 2003; Jarvis et al., 2007; Schimel et al., 2007; Borken and Matzner, 2009; Warren, 2014; Meisner et al., 2015). Second, the microbial community composition may have been less suited to respiring carbon in aquatic conditions or during wet/dry cycles specifically due to the higher proportion of fungi (Lundquist et al., 1999). Fungi have been shown to account for the majority of soil/sediment respiration, with variability across studies yielding estimates of respiration contribution of 78% (Anderson and Domsch, 1973), 74–90% (Blagodatskaya and Anderson, 1998), and 18–40% (Sapronov and Kuzyakov, 2007). As filamentous fungi are poorly adapted to soils/sediments that are water-saturated or inundated for extended periods (Alexander, 1977; Kominkova et al.,

Deleted: upper elevations

Deleted: upper elevation microbial

Deleted: and contributed to a lag in response time

Deleted: as suggested above,

Deleted: upper elevation

2000; Kuehn et al., 2000), it follows that for sediment that experiences less frequent inundation, microbial respiration will be depressed upon re-inundation due to fungal suppression.

Deleted: upper elevation

Deleted: and shorter intervals of

Both scenarios may have contributed to the RR response to inundation, but an osmolytic microbial stress response was unlikely considering the relatively high moisture content of the sediments prior to forced inundation. Given the expected fungal response to inundation and the higher proportion of fungi in the sediments unsaturated at the time of sampling, it is most likely that community composition—in particular the fungal to bacterial ratio—was a key driver to the RR response. The persistence of the RR spatial distribution after prolonged inundation further suggests a significant time lag in the response of the 13 d, 127 d, and 398 d sediments following perturbation, which can be attributed to the need for community shifts in response to inundation.

Deleted: and the rainfall that had occurred in the weeks prior to sampling

Deleted: at the upper elevations

Deleted: distribution

Deleted: of fungi

Deleted: upper elevations

Within the context of the historically contingent responses to re-inundation, the absence of re-inundation response differences among the three treatment waters suggests that inundation history is a stronger driver of short-term biogeochemical dynamics than shifts in aquatic chemistry. Large fluctuations in river water elevation alter hydraulic flow paths at the study site (Arntzen et al., 2006) and subsequently determine whether surface sediments are exposed to river water, bank storage of river water altered by hyporheic biogeochemical transformation (Wörman et al., 2002), or GW flowing out to the river through the hyporheic zone (Boano et al., 2008). The treatment waters were intended to reflect the range of aqueous chemistry conditions resulting from the exposure to these different water sources. The lack of difference among the treatment waters was unexpected, particularly for  $\text{NO}_3^-$ . In the sediments with greater time since last inundation where  $\text{NO}_3^-$  was highest (Table 2), the sediment values likely overwhelmed the influence of the  $\text{NO}_3^-$  treatment, but this should not have been the case for the more recently inundated sediments, where we expected reduction of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and potentially associated production of  $\text{NO}_2^-$  or  $\text{NH}_4^+$ . Locations with longer times since inundation accumulated more biogeochemically reactive water soluble analytes (e.g.,  $\text{NO}_3^-$ , glucose) that would not have suppressed RR upon re-inundation; if anything, we would expect them to stimulate RR. This, combined with lack of response to experimental treatments, strongly suggests that the influence of inundation history is via the microbial community. In this case, non-inundated conditions select for a suite of traits that allow for growth and reproduction under relatively dry to moist conditions, with the apparent tradeoff of metabolic suppression upon re-inundation. As such, we propose that inundation history influences short-term biogeochemical responses to re-inundation by imposed ecological selection for traits that fall along a tradeoff surface that spans fungal and bacterial/archaeal strategies. This is similar to Chambers et al. (2016), who reported greater impacts on microbial community structure and function from inundation history relative to water chemistry (salinity) in mangrove peat soil.

Deleted: elevation-based

Deleted: the upper elevations

Deleted: lower elevation

Deleted: -

Deleted: -

#### 4.2 Microbial communities differ along inundation history gradient

Examining patterns of microbial community structure and relative abundances of fungi and bacteria across the inundation histories provides evidence in support of inundation history influencing biogeochemical responses via selection for locally adapted microbial communities. In the 0 d sediments, the fungal to bacterial ratio and the abundance of fungi were lower than those in the sediments that experienced longer periods of unsaturated conditions. Other studies have identified similar patterns in which the ratio of fungal to bacterial biomass, based upon phospholipid fatty acid (PLFA) biomarkers, was consistently lower in flooded vs. unsaturated soil (Bossio et al., 1998), and the fungal biomarker 18:2 $\omega$ 6,9c was absent in long-term submerged floodplain soil relative to floodplain soils experiencing shorter inundation time (Rinklebe and Langer, 2006). With regard to bacteria, LEfSe only identified bacterial taxa driving dissimilarity from 0 d and 398 d sediments (Fig. S1), which suggests that there was a gradient in bacterial community composition in which the two inundation history end-members paired with community end-members. Therefore, inundation history likely drove the spatial distribution of microbial community composition, which supports the inference that the response to re-inundation was influenced by the specific community make-up (e.g., proportion of fungi; bacterial community differences).

#### 4.3 Implications of parafluvial hydrobiogeochemical processes for predictive models

Biogeochemical response lags due to physiological stress of parafluvial microbial communities are of particular importance in creating modeling frameworks that can accurately predict the biogeochemical behavior of terrestrial-aquatic transition zones in managed systems. Our results indicate that a combination of ecological and physiological mechanisms limited the ability of the microbial communities to rapidly adapt to an inundated state. This resulted in the suppression of RR, which we propose is a transient condition whereby there is also temporal lag in biogeochemical function. A long time lag is often observed in microbial adaptation to the abrupt change in local environment (Wood et al., 1995). This phenomenon can affect the transport of biodegradable substrates and contaminants, particularly when the timescale of the metabolic lag is comparable to that of transport (Nilsen et al., 2012). Despite such importance, mechanistic approaches for incorporating metabolic lags into subsurface transport modeling are currently lacking. Past modeling work that attempted to account for this lag effect was either based on temporal convolution integral (Wood et al., 1995; Nilsen et al., 2012) or introducing exposure time as an additional dimension (or coordinate) (Ginn, 1999). These efforts do not address fundamental mechanisms responsible for time lags and consequently, their predictions may be limited. Given that we find time lags to be extremely important to the microbial and biogeochemical behavior of our system, future modeling efforts need to consider more ecologically and physiologically relevant causes for delays in microbial adaptation and associated biogeochemical function, including the response to changes in timing and magnitude of flow variations.

Deleted: along

Deleted: elevation transects

Deleted: At

Deleted: m

Deleted: at the upper elevations

Deleted: m and 6 m

Deleted: elevations

Deleted: ).

Deleted: Importance of parafluvial hyporheic dynamics to hydrobiogeochemical

Moved (insertion) [2]

Deleted: impeded

Deleted: Microbial adaptation to the abrupt change in local environment is not instantaneous in general but a

Moved up [2]: Our results indicate that a combination of ecological and physiological mechanisms impeded the ability of the microbial communities to rapidly adapt to an inundated state. This resulted in the suppression of RR, which we propose is a transient condition whereby there is a temporal lag in biogeochemical function.

Deleted: Therefore

The need for models that can incorporate the microbial response to changes in flow variation is particularly important in the context of climate-watershed interactions. In years with low snowpack, the degree of short term stage fluctuations (hydropeaking) through the summer is significantly elevated (Fig. 5). Local inundation dynamics (e.g., frequency of inundation) are therefore sensitive to watershed hydrology even in highly managed main-stem river corridor systems, and the influences should be even stronger in lower-order and unmanaged streams that are subject to direct environmental flows regimes without the regulating influence of dams. Therefore, in watersheds that are projected to shift from snowpack to rain dominated hydrology, like those found in the Pacific Northwest, prediction of biogeochemical responses to changes in inundation dynamics is needed. Filling this knowledge gap is urgent, given the global expansion of hydropower, with 3700 large dams planned worldwide as of 2015 (Zarfl et al., 2015), but also because of its widespread applicability to naturally variable systems (e.g., intermittent streams, unregulated rivers, tidally-influenced littoral zones of the Great Lakes).

Moved (insertion) [1]

Deleted: hydropeaking

Deleted: or "return-interval"

## 5 Conclusion

From the synthesis of our results, we have derived the following conceptual model (Fig. 6): Watershed-climate interactions lead to changes in river elevation fluctuations, which alter parafluvial inundation dynamics (e.g., magnitude and time between inundation events). Irregular hydrologic fluctuations create spatial variation in the concentrations of C and N reactants and microbial communities adapted to local conditions (i.e., increasing fungal populations with increasing time since inundation). Under conditions that allow for local adaptation, there is a relatively high flux of CO<sub>2</sub> from microbial respiration (left-hand side of Fig. 6). Upon re-inundation (right-hand side of Fig. 6), substrates become more available for use, but microbial communities are initially suppressed metabolically because they are adapted to unsaturated conditions (e.g., rapid transport and significant penetration of oxygen into sediment due to gas filled pore spaces). The result is lower CO<sub>2</sub> flux rates primarily due, we hypothesize, to suppression of fungal respiration. Following prolonged inundation, the microbial community should adapt via a shift in composition away from fungal dominance. The time scales of such responses are an important knowledge gap and may depend upon the time-since-inundation. Ultimately, local adaptation to an inundated state should lead to recovery of pre-inundation CO<sub>2</sub> flux rates, but the timescale of adaptation is unclear. This conceptual model hypothesizes that biogeochemical function (i.e., CO<sub>2</sub> flux rates) are resilient in the sense that they recover to pre-disturbance conditions. The degree to which this occurs, the associated time scales, and the dependence of 'biogeochemical resilience' on historical and ongoing inundation dynamics are important, open questions.

Moved up [1]: The need for models that can incorporate the microbial response to changes in flow variation is particularly important in the context of climate-watershed interactions. In years with low snowpack, the degree of hydropeaking through the summer is significantly elevated (Fig. 5). Local inundation dynamics (e.g., frequency of inundation or "return-interval") are therefore sensitive to watershed hydrology even in highly managed main-stem river corridor systems, and the influences should be even stronger in lower-order and unmanaged streams. Therefore, in watersheds that are projected to shift from snowpack to rain dominated hydrology, like those found in the Pacific Northwest, prediction of biogeochemical responses to changes in inundation dynamics is needed. Filling this knowledge gap is urgent, given the global expansion of hydropower, with 3700 large dams planned worldwide as of 2015 (Zarfl et al., 2015), but also because of its widespread applicability to naturally variable systems (e.g., intermittent streams, unregulated rivers, tidally-influenced littoral zones of the Great Lakes).¶

Deleted: hydropeaking

Deleted: dynamics

Deleted: elevation and return-interval

Deleted: wetting

Deleted: non-inundated

The Columbia River is one of many high order rivers with an extensive alluvial hyporheic zone (Downing et al., 2012). Our results can therefore be applicable not only to other regions along the Columbia River, but also to other rivers worldwide. We demonstrate that biogeochemical cycling in the parafluvial zone does not follow behavior commonly observed in soils

Deleted: are

Deleted: carbon

and sediments, wherein rewetting produces a pulse of CO<sub>2</sub>, and that inundation history influences the ability of parafluvial hyporheic microbial communities to respond to re-inundation. In addition to causing spatial variation in the concentrations of key reactants within C and N cycles, inundation history along the parafluvial zone affects aquatic-terrestrial biogeochemical cycling by driving variation in microbial community composition that, in turn, governs biogeochemical responses to hydrologic perturbation. The parafluvial hyporheic zone should therefore be considered as an important ecotone for biogeochemical dynamics and may need to be integrated as a distinct environment within hydrobiogeochemical models to predict the watershed biogeochemical function. Future research would benefit from studying other dam-influenced systems as well as seasonal influences to support widespread applicability.

Deleted: carbon

## 6 Data Availability

Data are accessible at <https://sbrsfa.velo.pnnl.gov/datasets/?UUID=3cab0d6a-b8e3-4f16-82e1-6ef5987fd9d3>.

Deleted: 6

## 7 Author contribution

A. E. Goldman, E. B. Graham, A. R. Crump, D. W. Kennedy, and J. C. Stegen contributed to experimental design. A. E. Goldman, E. B. Graham, A. R. Crump, D. W. Kennedy, E. B. Romero, C. G. Anderson, K. L. Dana, C. T. Resch, J. K. Fredrickson contributed to sample collection and analysis. A. E. Goldman, E. B. Graham, A. R. Crump, D. W. Kennedy, J. K. Fredrickson, and J. C. Stegen contributed to data interpretation. A. E. Goldman prepared manuscript with contributions from all authors.

Deleted: 7

## 8 Acknowledgments

Thank you to Mike Perkins for Fig. 6 graphic, Hyun-Seob Song for modeling expertise, Eric Bottos, Taniya Roy Chowdhury, Yukari Maezato, and Tom Wietsma for sample analysis. This research was supported by the US Department of Energy (DOE), Office of Biological and Environmental Research (BER), as part of Subsurface Biogeochemical Research Program's Scientific Focus Area (SFA) at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL). PNNL is operated for DOE by Battelle Memorial Institute under contract DE-AC06-76RLO 1830.

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

## References

Alexander, M.: Introduction to soil microbiology, 2 ed., John Wiley & Sons., 1977.

- Anderson, J. P. E., and Domsch, K. H.: Quantification of bacterial and fungal contributions to soil respiration, *Archiv für Mikrobiologie*, 93, 113-127, doi:10.1007/bf00424942, 1973.
- Apprill, A., McNally, S., Parsons, R., and Webe, L.: Minor revision to V4 region SSU rRNA 806R gene primer greatly increases detection of SAR11 bacterioplankton, *Aquat. Microb. Ecol.*, 75, 129-137, doi:10.3354/ame01753 2015.
- 5 Arntzen, E. V., Geist, D. R., and Dresel, P. E.: Effects of fluctuating river flow on groundwater/surface water mixing in the hyporheic zone of a regulated, large cobble bed river, *RRA*, 22, 937-946, doi:10.1002/trra.947, 2006.
- Baker, M. A., Dahm, C. N., and Valett, H. M.: Acetate retention and metabolism in the hyporheic zone of a mountain stream, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 44, 1530-1539, doi:10.4319/lo.1999.44.6.1530, 1999.
- 10 Birch, H.: The effect of soil drying on humus decomposition and nitrogen availability, *Plant Soil*, 10, 9-31, doi:10.1007/BF01343734, 1958.
- Blagodatskaya, E. V., and Anderson, T.-H.: Interactive effects of pH and substrate quality on the fungal-to-bacterial ratio and qCO<sub>2</sub> of microbial communities in forest soils, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 30, 1269-1274, doi:10.1016/S0038-0717(98)00050-9, 1998.
- Boano, F., Revelli, R., and Ridolfi, L.: Reduction of the hyporheic zone volume due to the stream-aquifer interaction, *GeoRL*, 35, doi:10.1029/2008GL033554, 2008.
- 15 Bodmer, P., Freimann, R., von Fumetti, S., Robinson, C. T., and Doering, M.: Spatio-temporal relationships between habitat types and microbial function of an upland floodplain, *Aquat. Sci.*, 78, 241-254, doi:10.1007/s00027-015-0420-9, 2016.
- Borken, W., and Matzner, E.: Reappraisal of drying and wetting effects on C and N mineralization and fluxes in soils, *Global Change Biol.*, 15, 808-824, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2486.2008.01681.x, 2009.
- 20 Bossio, D. A., Scow, K. M., Gunapala, N., and Graham, K.: Determinants of soil microbial communities: effects of agricultural management, season, and soil type on phospholipid fatty acid profiles, *MicEc*, 36, 1-12, doi:10.1007/s002489900087, 1998.
- Boulton, A. J., Findlay, S., Marmonier, P., Stanley, E. H., and Valett, H. M.: The Functional Significance of the Hyporheic Zone in Streams and Rivers, *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.*, 29, 59-81, doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.29.1.59 1998.
- 25 Boulton, A. J., Datry, T., Kasahara, T., Mutz, M., and Stanford, J. A.: Ecology and management of the hyporheic zone: stream-groundwater interactions of running waters and their floodplains, *J. N. Am. Benthol. Soc.*, 29, 26-40, doi:10.1899/08-017.1 2010.
- Briody, A. C., Cardenas, M. B., Shuai, P., Knappett, P. S. K., and Bennett, P. C.: Groundwater flow, nutrient, and stable isotope dynamics in the parafluvial-hyporheic zone of the regulated Lower Colorado River (Texas, USA) over the course of a small flood, *HydJ*, 24, 923-935, doi:10.1007/s10040-016-1365-3, 2016.
- 30 Brochier-Armanet, C., Boussau, B., Gribaldo, S., and Forterre, P.: Mesophilic crenarchaeota: proposal for a third archaeal phylum, the Thaumarchaeota, *Nat Rev Micro*, 6, 245-252, doi:10.1038/nrmicro1852, 2008.
- Burns, A., and Ryder, D. S.: Response of bacterial extracellular enzymes to inundation of floodplain sediments, *Freshwat. Biol.*, 46, 1299-1307, doi:10.1046/j.1365-2427.2001.00750.x, 2001.
- 35 Chambers, L. G., Guevara, R., Boyer, J. N., Troxler, T. G., and Davis, S. E.: Effects of Salinity and Inundation on Microbial Community Structure and Function in a Mangrove Peat Soil, *Wetlands*, 36, 361-371, doi:10.1007/s13157-016-0745-8, 2016.
- Claret, C., and Boulton, A. J.: Integrating hydraulic conductivity with biogeochemical gradients and microbial activity along river-groundwater exchange zones in a subtropical stream, *HydJ*, 17, 151, doi:10.1007/s10040-008-0373-3, 2008.
- 40 Deforet, T., Marmonier, P., Rieffel, D., Crini, N., Giraudoux, P., and Gilbert, D.: Do parafluvial zones have an impact in regulating river pollution? Spatial and temporal dynamics of nutrients, carbon, and bacteria in a large gravel bar of the Doubs River (France), *Hydrobiologia*, 623, 235-250, doi:10.1007/s10750-008-9661-0, 2009.
- Doering, M., Uehlinger, U. R. S., Ackermann, T., Woodtli, M., and Tockner, K.: Spatiotemporal heterogeneity of soil and sediment respiration in a river-floodplain mosaic (Tagliamento, NE Italy), *Freshwat. Biol.*, 56, 1297-1311, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2427.2011.02569.x, 2011.
- 45 Downing, J. A., Cole, J. J., Duarte, C. A., Middelburg, J. J., Melack, J. M., Prairie, Y. T., Kortelainen, P., Striegl, R. G., McDowell, W. H., and Tranvik, L. J.: Global abundance and size distribution of streams and rivers, *Inland waters*, 2, 229-236, doi:10.5268/IW-2.4.502, 2012.
- Fierer, N., and Schimel, J. P.: A proposed mechanism for the pulse in carbon dioxide production commonly observed following the rapid rewetting of a dry soil, *SSSAJ*, 67, 798-805, doi:10.2136/sssaj2003.7980, 2003.

- Fierer, N., Schimel, J. P., and Holden, P. A.: Influence of Drying–Rewetting Frequency on Soil Bacterial Community Structure, *MicEc*, 45, 63-71, doi:10.1007/s00248-002-1007-2, 2003.
- Francis, C. A., Roberts, K. J., Beman, J. M., Santoro, A. E., and Oakley, B. B.: Ubiquity and diversity of ammonia-oxidizing archaea in water columns and sediments of the ocean, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 102, 14683-14688, doi:10.1073/pnas.0506625102 2005.
- 5 Ginn, T. R.: On the distribution of multicomponent mixtures over generalized exposure time in subsurface flow and reactive transport: Foundations, and formulations for groundwater age, chemical heterogeneity, and biodegradation, *Water Resour. Res.*, 35, 1395-1407, doi:10.1029/1999WR900013, 1999.
- Graham, E. B., Crump, A. R., Resch, C. T., Fansler, S., Arntzen, E., Kennedy, D. W., Fredrickson, J. K., and Stegen, J. C.:  
 10 Coupling Spatiotemporal Community Assembly Processes to Changes in Microbial Metabolism, *Frontiers in Microbiology*, 7, doi:10.3389/fmicb.2016.01949, 2016.
- Graham, E. B., Crump, A. R., Resch, C. T., Fansler, S., Arntzen, E., Kennedy, D. W., Fredrickson, J. K., and Stegen, J. C.:  
 Deterministic influences exceed dispersal effects on hydrologically-connected microbiomes, *Environ. Microbiol.*, 19, 1552-1567, 10.1111/1462-2920.13720, 2017.
- 15 Hanford Meteorological Station, March 2016 Historical Weather Chart: <http://www.hanford.gov/files.cfm/Mar2016.pdf>, access: 20 Nov. 2016, 2016.
- Hawkes, C. V., Waring, B. G., Rocca, J. D., and Kivlin, S. N.: Historical climate controls soil respiration responses to current soil moisture, *PNAS*, 114, 6322-6327, 10.1073/pnas.1620811114, 2017.
- Hermoso, V.: Freshwater ecosystems could become the biggest losers of the Paris Agreement, *Global Change Biol.*,  
 20 10.1111/gcb.13655, 2017.
- Hucks Sawyer, A., Bayani Cardenas, M., Bomar, A., and Mackey, M.: Impact of dam operations on hyporheic exchange in the riparian zone of a regulated river, *HyPr*, 23, 2129-2137, doi:10.1002/hyp.7324, 2009.
- Hupp, C. R., and Osterkamp, W. R.: Riparian vegetation and fluvial geomorphic processes, *Geomorphology*, 14, 277-295, 10.1016/0169-555X(95)00042-4, 1996.
- 25 Jackson, R. B., Carpenter, S. R., Dahm, C. N., McKnight, D. M., Naiman, R. J., Postel, S. L., and Running, S. W.: Water in a changing world, *Ecol. Appl.*, 11, 1027-1045, 10.1890/1051-0761(2001)011[1027:WIACW]2.0.CO;2, 2001.
- Jarvis, P., Rey, A., Petsikos, C., Wingate, L., Rayment, M., Pereira, J., Banza, J., David, J., Miglietta, F., Borghetti, M., Manca, G., and Valentini, R.: Drying and wetting of Mediterranean soils stimulates decomposition and carbon dioxide emission: The "Birch effect", *Tree Physiology*, 27, 929-940, 2007.
- 30 Kieft, T. L., Soroker, E., and Firestone, M. K.: Microbial biomass response to a rapid increase in water potential when dry soil is wetted, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 19, 119-126, doi:10.1016/0038-0717(87)90070-8, 1987.
- Kim, D. G., Vargas, R., Bond-Lamberty, B., and Turetsky, M. R.: Effects of soil rewetting and thawing on soil gas fluxes: A review of current literature and suggestions for future research, *Biogeosciences*, 9, 2459-2483, doi:10.5194/bg-9-2459-2012, 2012.
- 35 Kominkova, D., Kuehn, K. A., Busing, N., Steiner, D., and Gessner, M. O.: Microbial biomass, growth, and respiration associated with submerged litter of *Phragmites australis* decomposing in a littoral reed stand of a large lake, *Aquat. Microb. Ecol.*, 22, 271-282, doi:10.3354/ame022271 2000.
- Kuehn, K. A., Lemke, M. J., Suberkropp, K., and Wetzel, R. G.: Microbial biomass and production associated with decaying leaf litter of the emergent macrophyte *Juncus effusus*, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 45, 862-870, doi:10.4319/lo.2000.45.4.0862,  
 40 2000.
- Larned, S. T., Datry, T., Arscott, D. B., and Tockner, K.: Emerging concepts in temporary-river ecology, *Freshwat. Biol.*, 55, 717-738, 10.1111/j.1365-2427.2009.02322.x, 2010.
- Latrubesse, E. M., Arima, E. Y., Dunne, T., Park, E., Baker, V. R., d'Horta, F. M., Wight, C., Wittmann, F., Zuanon, J., Baker, P. A., Ribas, C. C., Norgaard, R. B., Filizola, N., Ansar, A., Flyvbjerg, B., and Stevaux, J. C.: Damming the rivers of  
 45 the Amazon basin, *Nature*, 546, 363-369, 10.1038/nature22333, 2017.
- Leigh, C., Boulton, A. J., Courtwright, J. L., Fritz, K., May, C. L., Walker, R. H., and Datry, T.: Ecological research and management of intermittent rivers: an historical review and future directions, *Freshwat. Biol.*, 61, 1181-1199, doi:10.1111/fwb.12646, 2016.

- Lundquist, E. J., Scow, K. M., Jackson, L. E., Uesugi, S. L., and Johnson, C. R.: Rapid response of soil microbial communities from conventional, low input, and organic farming systems to a wet/dry cycle, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 31, 1661-1675, doi:10.1016/S0038-0717(99)00080-2, 1999.
- 5 McClain, M. E., Boyer, E. W., Dent, C. L., Gergel, S. E., Grimm, N. B., Groffman, P. M., Hart, S. C., Harvey, J. W., Johnston, C. A., and Mayorga, E.: Biogeochemical hot spots and hot moments at the interface of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, *Ecosystems*, 6, 301-312, doi:10.1007/s10021-003-0161-9, 2003.
- Meisner, A., Rousk, J., and Bååth, E.: Prolonged drought changes the bacterial growth response to rewetting, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 88, 314-322, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2015.06.002, 2015.
- 10 Miller, A. E., Schimel, J. P., Meixner, T., Sickman, J. O., and Melack, J. M.: Episodic rewetting enhances carbon and nitrogen release from chaparral soils, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 37, 2195-2204, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2005.03.021, 2005.
- Mulholland, P. J., and Webster, J. R.: Nutrient dynamics in streams and the role of J-NABS, *J. N. Am. Benthol. Soc.*, 29, 100-117, doi:10.1899/08-035.1, 2010.
- Nadkarni, M. A., Martin, F. E., Jacques, N. A., and Hunter, N.: Determination of bacterial load by real-time PCR using a broad-range (universal) probe and primers set, *Microbiology*, 148, doi:10.1099/00221287-148-1-257 2002.
- 15 Niederdorfer, R., Peter, H., and Battin, T. J.: Attached biofilms and suspended aggregates are distinct microbial lifestyles emanating from differing hydraulics, *Nature Microbiology*, 1, doi:10.1038/nmicrobiol.2016.178, 2016.
- Nilsen, V., Wyller, J., and Heistad, A.: Efficient incorporation of microbial metabolic lag in subsurface transport modeling, *Water Resour. Res.*, 48, doi:10.1029/2011WR011588, 2012.
- 20 Ostojčić, A., Rosado, J., Miliša, M., Morais, M., and Tockner, K.: Release of Nutrients and Organic Matter from River Floodplain Habitats: Simulating Seasonal Inundation Dynamics, *Wetlands*, 33, 847-859, doi:10.1007/s13157-013-0442-9, 2013.
- Rinklebe, J., and Langer, U.: Microbial diversity in three floodplain soils at the Elbe River (Germany), *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 38, 2144-2151, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2006.01.018, 2006.
- Sapronov, D. V., and Kuzyakov, Y. V.: Separation of root and microbial respiration: Comparison of three methods, *Eurasian Soil Science*, 40, 775-784, doi:10.1134/s1064229307070101, 2007.
- 25 Schimel, J., Balsler, T. C., and Wallenstein, M.: Microbial stress-response physiology and its implications for ecosystem function, *Ecology*, 88, 1386-1394, doi:10.1890/06-0219, 2007.
- Slater, L. D., Ntarlagiannis, D., Day-Lewis, F. D., Mwakanyamale, K., Versteeg, R. J., Ward, A., Strickland, C., Johnson, C. D., and Lane, J. W.: Use of electrical imaging and distributed temperature sensing methods to characterize surface water-groundwater exchange regulating uranium transport at the Hanford 300 Area, Washington, *Water Resour. Res.*, 46, doi:10.1029/2010WR009110, 2010.
- 30 Stegen, J. C., Fredrickson, J. K., Wilkins, M. J., Konopka, A. E., Nelson, W. C., Arntzen, E. V., Chrisler, W. B., Chu, R. K., Danczak, R. E., Fansler, S. J., Kennedy, D. W., Resch, C. T., and Tfaily, M.: Groundwater-surface water mixing shifts ecological assembly processes and stimulates organic carbon turnover, *Nature Communications*, 7, doi:10.1038/Ncomms11237, 2016.
- 35 Tockner, K., Malard, F., and Ward, J. V.: An extension of the flood pulse concept, *HyPr*, 14, 2861-2883, 10.1002/1099-1085(200011/12)14:16/17<2861::AID-HYP124>3.0.CO;2-F, 2000.
- Tonina, D., and Buffington, J. M.: Hyporheic Exchange in Mountain Rivers I: Mechanics and Environmental Effects, *Geography Compass*, 3, 1063-1086, doi:10.1111/j.1749-8198.2009.00226.x, 2009.
- 40 Trimmer, M., Grey, J., Heppell, C. M., Hildrew, A. G., Lansdown, K., Stahl, H., and Yvon-Durocher, G.: River bed carbon and nitrogen cycling: state of play and some new directions, *ScTEen*, 434, 143-158, doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2011.10.074, 2012.
- Warren, C. R.: Response of osmolytes in soil to drying and rewetting, *Soil Biol. Biochem.*, 70, 22-32, doi:10.1016/j.soilbio.2013.12.008, 2014.
- 45 Weatherburn, M.: Phenol-hypochlorite reaction for determination of ammonia, *AnaCh*, 39, 971-974, doi:10.1021/ac60252a045, 1967.
- Wood, B. D., Ginn, T. R., and Dawson, C. N.: Effects of microbial metabolic lag in contaminant transport and biodegradation modeling, *Water Resour. Res.*, 31, 553-563, doi:10.1029/94WR02533, 1995.
- Wörman, A., Packman, A. I., Johansson, H., and Jonsson, K.: Effect of flow-induced exchange in hyporheic zones on longitudinal transport of solutes in streams and rivers, *Water Resour. Res.*, 38, doi:10.1029/2001WR000769, 2002.
- 50




Zarfl, C., Lumsdon, A. E., Berlekamp, J., Tydecks, L., and Tockner, K.: A global boom in hydropower dam construction, *Aquat. Sci.*, 77, 161-170, doi:10.1007/s00027-014-0377-0, 2015.

Zarnetske, J. P., Haggerty, R., Wondzell, S. M., and Baker, M. A.: Dynamics of nitrate production and removal as a function of residence time in the hyporheic zone, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Biogeosciences*, 116, doi:10.1029/2010JG001356, 2011.

Zeglin, L. H., Dahm, C. N., Barrett, J. E., Gooseff, M. N., Fitzpatrick, S. K., and Takacs-Vesbach, C. D.: Bacterial Community Structure Along Moisture Gradients in the Parafluvial Sediments of Two Ephemeral Desert Streams, *MicEc*, 61, 543-556, doi:10.1007/s00248-010-9782-7, 2011.


5

10



15

Figure 1: Diagram of parafluvial hyporheic zone and of sampling design with photographs of sieved sediment sampled. The four locations were spaced laterally at 2-m intervals beginning at the water line and encompassed 1 m of elevation change. Note changes in sediment moisture and texture with changes in inundation history.



Deleted: elevation

Deleted: Color differences are due to camera quality and light availability and do not reflect sediment characteristics.





Figure 2: Environmental/microbial variables with a stepped relationship to **days since inundation**. All have significant categorical differences (ANOVA;  $P < 0.05$  for all). **Note that the x-axis is plotted as a log scale.**



Deleted:

Deleted: distance from water line





Figure 3: Non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) plots of bacteria/archaea (a) and fungi (b) community composition (n=12). Colors indicate groupings by **days since inundation**, which are significantly different (PERMANOVA, bacteria/archaea:  $P < 0.001$ ; fungi:  $P < 0.01$ ). Vectors indicate significant environmental variables with corresponding  $R^2$  values.



Deleted:

Deleted: elevations




Figure 4: RR of untreated, control samples and 0.5 hour inundated samples with black 1:1 line (a), 0.5 hour inundated RR and days since inundation (b), and 25 hour RR and days since inundation (c). Note that in panel (a), 0 days since inundation RR (gray) plots along 1:1 line, but upper elevation inundated RR does not co-vary with uninundated RR. Note that in (b) and (c) the x-axis is plotted as a log scale.





Figure 5: River water elevation near the study site 2014 through 2015. Note that melting snowpack caused an increase in water elevation during the spring of 2014. In 2015, the lack of spring water elevation rise was due to very little snowpack in the winter, which then led to increased hydropeaking in the summer of 2015 that is not seen in 2014 and is typically only seen in late fall.




Deleted:

Deleted: distance from water line

Deleted: distance from water line

Deleted: the first plot

Deleted: m elevation



Deleted:

Deleted: the

Deleted: level

Deleted: , caused by melting snowpack and the subsequent spring freshet

Deleted: freshet

Deleted: early winter




Figure 6: Fungi (branching organisms) perform well (green) and increase in non-inundated conditions, but are metabolically suppressed (orange) upon re-inundation (blue shading), leading to lower CO<sub>2</sub> flux (thin arrow). We propose that prolonged inundation shifts the community towards bacterial (rod-shapes) dominance. The influence of inundation history on the timescale of the transient, metabolically suppressed, state is unknown.

Table 1. Mean, standard deviation (sd), significance (P), and R<sup>2</sup> values (n.s. if not significant) from linear regressions of environmental variables and the log of days since inundation from untreated sediment (n=12). Organic matter (<2mm) also had a significant quadratic fit (P<0.01 (x); P=0.03 (X<sup>2</sup>); R<sup>2</sup>=0.57), which is not included below. All units are per gram dry sediment.

Deleted: distance from water line

10

	Mean	SD	P	R <sup>2</sup>
% moisture	24.73	7.49	<0.01	0.77
Organic matter (<2 mm) (mg)	42.97	8.56	0.02	0.41
Organic matter (unsieved) (mg)	32.82	6.38	0.12	n.s.
Glucose (μmol)	0.32	0.11	<0.01	0.53
Acetate (μmol)	0.88	1.12	0.22	n.s.
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> (mg)	0.082	0.122	0.02	0.38
NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> (mg)	0.010	0.0030	0.93	n.s.
% C	1.42	0.38	<0.01	0.54
% N	0.14	0.038	<0.01	0.55

C/N	9.89	0.47	0.87	n.s.
Fungal to bacterial ratio	0.058	0.041	0.01	0.43
Fungal biomass (ng $\mu\text{L}^{-1}$ )	0.015	0.0035	0.01	0.42
Bacterial biomass (ng $\mu\text{L}^{-1}$ )	$9.4 \times 10^{-4}$	$7.70 \times 10^{-4}$	0.03	0.32
Archaeal biomass (ng $\mu\text{L}^{-1}$ )	$1.1 \times 10^{-4}$	$6.9 \times 10^{-5}$	0.85	n.s.

Table 2. Nitrate concentrations from untreated sediment (mean and standard deviation; uncorrected for grams of dry sediment) and nitrate and anion concentrations from treatment water.

	$\text{NO}_3^-$ (mg/L)	$\text{Na}^+$ (mg/L)	$\text{Ca}^{2+}$ (mg/L)	$\text{Mg}^{2+}$ (mg/L)	$\text{K}^+$ (mg/L)
River water treatment	1.75	<u>4.16</u>	<u>19.85</u>	<u>5.07</u>	<u>1.05</u>
Groundwater without $\text{NO}_3^-$ treatment	0.70	<u>18.35</u>	<u>29.80</u>	<u>8.70</u>	<u>3.83</u>
Groundwater with $\text{NO}_3^-$ treatment	14.49	<u>18.14</u>	<u>30.91</u>	<u>8.54</u>	<u>4.28</u>
	<u><math>\text{NO}_3^-</math></u> (mg/L)	<u>SD</u>			
<u>0 d</u> sediment	1.17	0.69			
<u>13 d</u> sediment	3.43	3.67			
<u>127 d</u> sediment	18.49	6.61			
<u>398 d</u> sediment	64.81	48.30			

Deleted: SD

Deleted: m

Deleted: 2 m

Deleted: 4 m

Deleted: 6 m

## Supplement of

# **Biogeochemical cycling at the aquatic-terrestrial interface is linked to parafluvial hyporheic zone inundation history**

Deleted: Carbon

Amy E. Goldman<sup>1</sup>, Emily B. Graham<sup>1</sup>, Alex R. Crump<sup>1</sup>, David W. Kennedy<sup>1</sup>, Elvira B. Romero<sup>1</sup>,  
5 Carolyn G. Anderson<sup>1</sup>, Karl L. Dana<sup>1</sup>, Charles T. Resch<sup>1</sup>, Jim K. Fredrickson<sup>1</sup>, and James C. Stegen<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, 99352, USA

*Correspondence to:* Amy E. Goldman (amy.goldman@pnnl.gov)

### Supplementary material

10 **Table S1. OTUs identified from 16S and ITS sequencing.**

	# OTUs
Total 16S sequencing	9893
Bacteria	9470
Archaea	2313
Unidentified kingdom	305
Total ITS sequencing	1856
Fungi	1818
Unidentified kingdom	722

**Table S2. Bacteria, archaea, and fungi classes with 1% abundance or greater.**

	0 d		13 d		127 d		398 d	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
<b>Bacteria</b>								
Unidentified class	3.10	0.83	1.72	0.11	1.32	0.02	1.78	0.78
<i>Proteobacteria</i>								
Betaproteobacteria	10.24	1.54	9.40	1.24	10.69	0.85	8.66	1.64
Alphaproteobacteria	9.91	0.83	11.18	1.56	12.63	1.93	17.95	3.29
Gammaproteobacteria	8.64	1.11	5.80	1.08	7.37	2.79	6.76	1.89
Deltaproteobacteria	8.66	1.46	6.68	0.44	5.50	1.12	4.83	0.83
TA18	0.54	0.11	0.25	0.06	0.16	0.03	0.10	0.03
<i>Bacteroidetes</i>								
Sphingobacteriia	10.90	1.77	12.73	3.23	16.55	4.29	14.66	2.40
Flavobacteriia	2.38	0.71	1.92	0.82	2.81	2.39	1.79	1.36
Cytophagia	2.32	0.43	2.66	1.22	2.83	1.22	3.17	0.34
<i>Acidobacteria</i>								
Acidobacteria	8.13	1.18	9.46	1.02	9.62	2.70	9.03	0.87
Subgroup 22	1.22	0.33	0.40	0.10	0.24	0.16	0.09	0.03
Holophagae	0.62	0.17	0.62	0.03	0.66	0.28	0.78	0.11
<i>Verrucomicrobia</i>								
Spartobacteria	2.82	1.10	9.09	2.05	6.90	0.75	5.44	2.11
Verrucomicrobiae	1.82	0.41	1.50	0.65	1.11	0.36	1.04	0.58
OPB35 soil group	1.76	0.32	1.28	0.20	1.36	0.50	0.74	0.37
<i>Actinobacteria</i>								
Actinobacteria	1.59	0.34	2.39	0.32	3.12	0.90	5.46	1.17
Thermoleophilia	1.22	0.37	2.60	1.15	2.27	0.95	4.85	2.91
Acidimicrobiia	0.48	0.02	0.60	0.11	0.46	0.16	0.63	0.16
<i>Planctomycetes</i>								
Planctomycetacia	6.20	0.34	5.04	0.94	4.34	1.03	3.73	1.30
Phycisphaerae	0.78	0.18	0.52	0.10	0.46	0.14	0.50	0.09
<i>Nitrospirae</i>								
Nitrospira	3.12	0.63	1.62	0.31	0.95	0.30	0.75	0.25
<i>Chloroflexi</i>								

Deleted: m

Deleted: 2 m

Deleted: 4 m

Deleted: 6 m

Anaerolineae	1.43	0.58	0.52	0.11	0.26	0.12	0.23	0.01
<i>Firmicutes</i>								
Bacilli	2.98	3.89	0.72	0.69	0.48	0.05	0.78	0.19
<i>Gemmatimonadetes</i>								
Gemmatimonadetes	1.18	0.48	0.78	0.06	0.87	0.56	1.90	0.49
<i>Chlorobi</i>								
Chlorobia	0.61	0.11	0.56	0.07	0.34	0.10	0.13	0.03
<b>Archaea</b>								
<i>Thaumarchaeota</i>								
Soil Crenarchaeotic Group (SCG)	1.92	1.99	6.61	3.47	4.08	1.31	1.77	1.22
<b>Fungi</b>								
Unidentified class	22.14	5.30	14.48	5.25	11.89	3.51	28.29	6.66
<i>Ascomycota</i>								
Dothideomycetes	16.48	9.29	19.68	5.40	28.25	5.02	26.59	7.80
Eurotiomycetes	1.46	0.65	2.94	1.12	2.55	1.22	2.60	0.83
Leotiomycetes	8.60	2.55	30.86	18.63	22.72	17.76	11.34	6.54
Pezizomycetes	3.38	5.72	0.24	0.14	2.64	3.46	1.74	2.68
Sordariomycetes	25.04	14.51	17.82	7.79	13.23	6.71	18.34	3.08
<i>Basidiomycota</i>								
Agaricomycetes	14.88	15.30	4.46	2.04	4.37	1.17	1.52	1.87
Microbotryomycetes	0.49	0.10	0.51	0.42	0.34	0.10	0.30	0.19
Tremellomycetes	1.72	0.49	3.19	1.26	3.91	1.12	4.86	1.48
<i>Zygomycota</i>								
Mortierellomycotina_cls_Incertae_sedis	4.20	2.50	4.80	1.68	9.56	11.92	3.58	2.81
Mucoromycotina_cls_Incertae_sedis	0.09	0.07	0.20	0.23	0.08	0.07	0.40	0.56
<i>Glomeromycota</i>								
Glomeromycetes	0.66	0.18	0.07	0.04	0.10	0.07	0.19	0.15






Figure S1. Linear discriminant analysis coupled with effect size (LEfSe) cladogram of bacterial taxa driving dissimilarity among **inundation histories**. Symbol diameter is proportional to relative abundance. Colors indicate **inundation history**, and brown symbols indicate non-significant taxa. **0\_d and 398\_d** elevations contribute 100% of taxa driving dissimilarity.

5




Table S3. Mean and standard deviation of NPOC, Cl<sup>-</sup>, SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2-</sup>, NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>, Na<sup>+</sup>, Ca<sup>2+</sup>, Mg<sup>2+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup>, and respiration rate from 0.5hr and 25hr incubations. Treatments are indicated by RW (river water), GW (groundwater without NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>), and GWN (groundwater with NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>). All units are per g dry sediment. N=3 for all treatments except 0 days/25hr/river water (n=2).

Time since inundated	Incubation	Treatment	NPOC (mg)		Cl <sup>-</sup> (mg)		SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup> (mg)		NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> (mg)		NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> (mg)		Na <sup>+</sup> (mg)		Ca <sup>2+</sup> (mg)		Mg <sup>2+</sup> (mg)		K <sup>+</sup> (mg)		Respiration rate (ppm CO <sub>2</sub> /min)			
			Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
0 days	0.5hr	RW	5.85E-03	6.66E-04	7.96E-03	2.05E-03	2.28E-02	6.66E-03	2.21E-02	2.67E-02	1.63E-02	7.93E-03	8.51E-03	1.26E-03	6.76E-03	1.95E-03	1.52E-03	4.68E-04	2.02E-03	2.94E-04	23.06	6.31		
		GW	4.53E-03	9.06E-04	1.27E-02	5.38E-03	2.66E-02	7.32E-03	2.73E-02	4.00E-02	1.52E-02	4.82E-03	8.65E-03	2.57E-03	6.86E-03	3.01E-03	1.54E-03	6.07E-04	3.26E-03	1.02E-03	0.75	0.16		
		GWN	4.26E-03	1.17E-03	3.03E-02	1.97E-02	4.60E-02	2.55E-02	5.52E-02	8.68E-02	1.21E-02	4.34E-03	3.53E-03	1.02E-02	3.53E-03	6.50E-03	2.43E-03	1.45E-03	4.87E-04	2.40E-03	1.64E-03	26.92	8.73	
	25hr	RW	5.04E-03	1.43E-03	3.23E-02	8.26E-03	4.19E-02	7.17E-03	3.86E-02	9.68E-02	1.63E-02	6.16E-03	1.19E-02	4.19E-03	8.65E-03	3.01E-03	1.95E-03	6.62E-04	4.02E-03	1.29E-03	0.88	0.27		
		GW	3.88E-03	1.07E-03	1.65E-02	5.38E-03	3.10E-02	7.93E-03	3.58E-02	4.69E-02	1.40E-02	5.11E-03	8.98E-03	3.23E-04	4.92E-04	1.38E-03	5.24E-05	1.69E-03	2.25E-04	22.84	6.35			
		GWN	7.25E-03	2.26E-03	2.72E-02	8.98E-03	4.35E-02	8.25E-03	4.64E-02	7.04E-02	1.68E-02	4.31E-03	1.42E-02	2.07E-02	8.50E-03	2.74E-03	1.86E-03	7.53E-04	4.46E-03	1.72E-03	0.80	0.22		
13 days	0.5hr	RW	5.40E-03	1.33E-03	5.60E-03	2.65E-03	1.48E-02	3.81E-03	2.12E-02	2.06E-02	1.61E-02	2.54E-03	8.42E-03	3.41E-03	1.19E-02	1.21E-02	1.18E-03	1.92E-04	1.95E-03	4.13E-04	9.53	1.88		
		GW	8.88E-03	2.96E-03	7.76E-03	6.11E-04	1.49E-02	1.20E-03	2.26E-02	2.83E-02	2.26E-02	6.49E-03	5.86E-03	2.16E-03	1.34E-04	1.92E-03	8.62E-05	3.00E-03	4.79E-04	0.48	0.04			
		GWN	5.51E-03	1.83E-03	1.96E-02	1.11E-03	2.59E-02	1.80E-03	3.86E-02	5.28E-02	1.63E-02	3.21E-03	6.59E-03	9.84E-04	7.12E-03	3.56E-03	1.65E-03	8.91E-04	2.41E-03	1.14E-03	10.61	1.10		
	25hr	RW	7.95E-03	3.74E-03	2.30E-02	1.78E-03	3.00E-02	1.92E-03	4.43E-02	7.20E-02	2.06E-02	4.31E-03	6.32E-03	3.48E-04	1.10E-02	4.62E-03	1.96E-03	3.08E-04	2.67E-03	7.83E-04	0.48	0.09		
		GW	5.53E-03	1.70E-03	1.26E-02	9.23E-03	2.14E-02	1.57E-02	7.73E-03	5.58E-03	9.99E-03	7.27E-03	6.82E-04	5.60E-04	1.12E-02	5.02E-03	2.80E-03	1.27E-03	4.03E-03	1.01E-03	10.61	0.21		
		GWN	1.09E-02	5.84E-03	2.08E-02	4.69E-03	2.93E-02	1.79E-03	2.90E-03	1.39E-03	2.36E-02	4.75E-03	6.17E-03	5.46E-04	1.12E-02	5.02E-03	2.80E-03	1.27E-03	4.03E-03	1.01E-03	0.59	0.04		
127 days	0.5hr	RW	9.49E-03	5.93E-03	7.50E-03	4.15E-04	2.04E-02	3.02E-03	5.55E-02	2.65E-02	1.88E-02	1.17E-02	6.81E-03	1.91E-03	8.90E-03	3.65E-03	2.17E-03	1.10E-03	1.02E-02	5.04E-03	8.57	2.12		
		GW	1.05E-02	6.46E-03	8.16E-03	7.47E-04	1.67E-02	4.95E-04	1.05E-02	3.20E-03	1.05E-02	2.47E-02	6.09E-03	7.93E-03	2.49E-03	1.06E-02	3.77E-03	2.78E-03	1.24E-03	4.00E-03	0.43	0.21		
		GWN	9.04E-03	5.16E-03	3.20E-02	5.86E-03	4.00E-02	6.78E-03	4.87E-02	2.38E-02	2.38E-02	1.34E-02	1.25E-02	4.77E-03	9.86E-03	3.79E-03	2.51E-03	1.08E-03	9.87E-03	3.89E-03	9.31	2.17		
	25hr	RW	1.02E-02	6.68E-03	2.72E-02	7.82E-03	3.20E-02	9.57E-03	9.71E-03	6.29E-04	2.83E-02	1.33E-02	8.37E-03	1.35E-03	1.09E-02	4.04E-03	2.88E-03	1.25E-03	1.15E-03	5.17E-03	0.48	0.23		
		GW	8.83E-03	5.54E-03	2.71E-02	5.03E-03	4.27E-02	8.26E-03	6.03E-02	1.42E-02	1.92E-02	1.57E-02	1.15E-02	2.97E-03	1.09E-02	4.25E-03	2.72E-03	1.14E-03	1.06E-02	4.88E-03	7.46	2.23		
		GWN	1.27E-02	1.07E-02	2.33E-02	3.16E-03	3.40E-02	6.20E-03	1.31E-02	2.14E-03	2.52E-02	7.59E-03	1.25E-02	3.88E-03	1.19E-02	5.03E-03	2.95E-03	1.22E-03	1.23E-02	6.43E-03	0.41	0.18		
398 days	0.5hr	RW	1.17E-02	5.60E-03	7.19E-03	3.68E-03	1.53E-02	1.03E-02	8.15E-02	4.87E-02	1.02E-02	5.98E-03	9.52E-03	3.91E-03	8.69E-03	3.71E-03	3.24E-03	3.09E-03	2.55E-02	1.57E-02	11.27	7.87		
		GW	1.24E-02	5.93E-03	7.53E-03	1.07E-03	1.31E-02	3.99E-03	4.73E-02	4.14E-02	1.53E-02	8.77E-03	7.79E-03	1.93E-03	7.87E-03	2.15E-03	1.99E-03	5.41E-04	2.62E-02	1.21E-02	0.31	0.08		
		GWN	9.63E-03	3.36E-03	3.73E-02	1.26E-02	4.49E-02	1.70E-02	1.36E-01	1.04E-01	7.78E-03	2.99E-03	1.04E-02	1.99E-03	8.98E-03	2.52E-03	2.97E-03	1.49E-03	2.74E-02	1.35E-02	7.66	1.96		
	25hr	RW	1.25E-02	4.81E-03	3.35E-02	8.60E-03	3.78E-02	1.20E-02	4.70E-02	4.93E-02	1.40E-02	4.61E-03	1.22E-02	3.19E-03	1.20E-02	2.19E-03	3.98E-03	1.62E-03	3.02E-02	9.84E-03	0.37	0.12		
		GW	1.04E-02	3.28E-03	3.18E-02	1.13E-02	4.81E-02	1.94E-02	1.59E-01	1.04E-01	5.94E-03	2.25E-03	1.05E-02	2.66E-03	2.07E-02	1.99E-02	2.34E-03	5.94E-04	2.60E-02	1.15E-02	8.65	0.87		
		GWN	1.06E-02	4.46E-03	2.66E-02	9.63E-03	3.48E-02	1.74E-02	7.45E-02	8.50E-02	1.32E-02	7.21E-03	9.20E-03	8.08E-04	9.51E-03	1.64E-03	4.33E-03	2.36E-03	2.52E-02	1.05E-02	0.46	0.16		