ORIGINAL PAPER

A latent threat to biodiversity: consequences of small-scale heterogeneity loss

Judi Hewitt • Simon Thrush • Andrew Lohrer • Michael Townsend

Received: 7 May 2009 / Accepted: 5 December 2009 / Published online: 22 December 2009 Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2009

Abstract The threat of homogenisation to biodiversity is generally considered to occur at broad scales or in response to high-intensity impacts. Therefore, most biodiversity studies estimate local average or total species richness rather than local heterogeneity. Here we consider the potential for relative shifts between these different aspects of biodiversity at small spatial scales to be an early warning signal for biodiversity loss. In response to chronic, very low-level pollution, we observed a disjunctive response with gamma diversity (total species richness) and beta diversity (heterogeneity) decreasing while alpha diversity (average species richness) was still increasing. Homogenisation may, therefore, affect biodiversity through thresholds that alter the relationship between the average species richness and its heterogeneity, leading to the potential for regime shifts. Our stressor also had a strong negative effect on rare species, meaning that the purported importance of rare species as ''insurance'' in the face of environmental change may be overstated.

Keywords Alpha Beta Biodiversity Contaminants Estuary Gamma \cdot Heterogeneity · Macrofauna · Predictions · Species-accumulation

Introduction

In response to the growing threat of biodiversity loss in nearly every ecological system (Pimm et al. [1995](#page-7-0)) many ecologists are seeking better understanding of, and improved ability to predict, the consequences of anthropogenic disturbances (Loreau et al. [2001;](#page-7-0) Naeem [2002\)](#page-7-0). As biodiversity is inextricably linked to habitat diversity (Huston [1994;](#page-7-0) Guégan et al. [1998;](#page-6-0) Ricklefs and Lovette [1999](#page-7-0); Hewitt et al. [2005;](#page-7-0) Thrush et al. [2006](#page-7-0)), habitat homogenisation is expected to be a major threat to biodiversity. Habitat homogenisation particularly endangers the rare, often habitat-specific, species that represent a large

National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research, P.O. Box 11-115, Hillcrest, Hamilton, New Zealand

J. Hewitt $(\boxtimes) \cdot$ S. Thrush \cdot A. Lohrer \cdot M. Townsend

e-mail: j.hewitt@niwa.cri.nz

proportion of species richness (Gaston [1994](#page-6-0)). Homogenisation is generally considered to occur as a result of broad-scale, high-intensity impacts that remove habitats (e.g., conversion of forests to pasture) or alter them (e.g., sedimentation in estuaries resulting in extended mud flats). Therefore, most biodiversity studies do not focus on estimating local heterogeneity in diversity, instead only estimating average or total diversity.

Biodiversity is a multidimensional concept (Purvis and Hector [2000](#page-7-0)) and encompasses many scales of variation in biological organisation (from genes-to ecosystems). Despite the broad nature of this term, species diversity is one of the more commonly used attributes. Even the simplest of its measures, species richness, has three aspects, generally referred to as γ (total number of species), α (average number of species) and β (variability, heterogeneity or species turnover (Loreau 2000)). Although γ -diversity usually refers to a region and α -diversity to the scale of the sampling unit in any particular study, there is no explicit spatial scale for any of these variables. Different ecological theories also frequently emphasise different aspects of biodiversity at different scales, e.g., eutrophication and habitat homogenisation affecting γ -diversity (Velland et al. [2007\)](#page-7-0), biodiversity-ecological functioning experiments focussing on α -diversity (Tilman et al. [1996;](#page-7-0) Emmerson et al. [2001;](#page-6-0) Solan et al. [2004;](#page-7-0) Hooper et al. [2005](#page-7-0)).

The relationship between stress (whether driven by physical disturbance or contaminants) and ecological responses are not necessarily monotonic, especially when stress is imposed unevenly across landscapes. At low levels of stress, asynchronous dynamics of individual patches should produce heterogeneity, with mosaics of patches of differing successional ages emerging, increasing overall species richness (Connell [1978](#page-6-0); Huston [1979\)](#page-7-0). This leads to the potential for relative shifts in average, total and heterogeneity of the number of species found at small spatial scales to be an early warning signal for biodiversity loss as a result of low levels of anthropogenic stress.

Here we investigate the relationships between α -, β - and γ -diversity along a relatively weak gradient of heavy metal contamination (copper, lead and zinc), where even the most contaminated site was well below levels assumed to have no effects (see methods). Macrofaunal communities found below the mean tide mark in intertidal sandflats were used as they are generally species rich and contain multiple trophic levels.

Methods

Intertidal sandy sites were selected along a known contamination gradient (concentration of heavy metals produced by urbanisation) within a large harbour (Waitemata, New Zealand). Previous studies at 95 sampling stations along this same contaminant gradient established strong community and single species responses to contaminants (Thrush et al. [2008b](#page-7-0); Hewitt et al. [2009](#page-7-0)). The four sites selected for the current study occupied the lower half of this gradient (low contamination), and represented a single substrate type (fine sand). Positioning of the sites was carefully chosen to prevent correlation with other possible gradients (e.g., inundation times, wave exposure and distance to channels). The four sites varied from domination by a patchy mix of suspension- and deposit-feeding bivalves and large tube-dwelling polychaetes (the least contaminated), through domination by two bivalve species with patches of varying densities of these and shell hash, to domination by a mix of species, mainly deposit feeders and often small.

At each site, 48 macrofaunal cores (13 cm diam. \times 15 cm deep) were collected along two parallel transects (80 m length, approximately 20 m apart). Core positions were randomly allocated every 3–4 m within a 1 m strip either side of the transect lines. Between

transects, smaller cores of surface sediment (2.5 cm diam. \times 2 cm deep) were collected approximately every 15 m for contaminant analysis and to confirm that sediment grain size at the sites was similar.

Macrofaunal cores were sieved across a 0.5 mm mesh screen prior to identification and enumeration to as low a taxonomic resolution as possible (predominantly species level). Species accumulation curves were derived for each site using the jacknife technique available in Estimate S (Colwell [2006\)](#page-6-0). γ -diversity for each site was determined as that predicted to be achieved by the species accumulation curve at 100 samples. Note that 100 samples was chosen as the degree of separation between the curves had largely stabilised by this point. β diversity was defined as the difference between gamma diversity and average species richness (within-site heterogeneity Lande [1996;](#page-7-0) Crist et al. [2003;](#page-6-0) Gering et al. [2003;](#page-6-0) Klimek et al. [2008\)](#page-7-0). This definition, rather than γ/α (Whittaker [1960;](#page-8-0) Legendre et al. [2005](#page-7-0); Ricotta [2008\)](#page-7-0), was used as the latter more accurately represents species turnover rather than within-site heterogeneity. Species evenness, Shannon–Weiner and Simpson's Index were calculated using Primer E (Clarke and Gorley [2006\)](#page-6-0). Rare species (those occurring in only 1 or 2 of the 40 replicates at a site) were identified at each site. Those species that were rare at the least contaminated site were examined at each of the other sites to determine whether they continued to be rare, disappeared, or became more common.

Contaminants in the harbour were mainly those associated with storm-water inputs, which are indicated by heavy metal concentrations (i.e., copper, lead and zinc). Other contaminants (e.g., arsenic, mercury) have previously been measured at the four locations, but concentrations found to be low with minimal variation. Concentrations of total recoverable copper, lead and zinc were determined at each site using strong acid digestion of the $\langle 0.5 \rangle$ mm sediment fraction in aqua regia (HCl/HNO₃) at 100–110^oC. As within-site variance was low, averages were then calculated for each site to be used in future analyses. Maxima of 7.1, 18.0 and 56 mg kg^{-1} for copper, lead and zinc respectively were obtained for the sites (Table 1), values well below sediment quality guideline values considered to be rarely associated with biological affects (18.7, 30.2 and 124 mg kg^{-1} for total copper, lead and zinc respectively (MacDonald et al. [1996](#page-7-0))). As the effects of these three metals had previously been demonstrated to be multiplicative for some species in this harbour (Thrush et al. [2008b](#page-7-0)), a combined contamination index (CI) was derived using the equation for the first PCA axis derived from average copper, lead and zinc concentrations across 84 sites in Waitemata Harbour, as given in Hewitt et al. [\(2009](#page-7-0)). That is

$$
CI = 0.619(ln(x_{Cu}) - 2.426) + 0.536(ln(x_{Zn}) - 4.383) + 0.574(ln(x_{Pb}) - 2.897
$$

where x_{Cu} , x_{Zn} , x_{Pb} are concentrations of copper, zinc and lead, respectively, at the site. This PCA axis explained 94% of the variability.

Table 1 Total contamination index at each site together with measured sediment concentrations of copper, lead and zinc $(mg kg^{-1})$

Contamination index	Copper $(mg kg^{-1})$	Lead (mg kg^{-1})	Zinc (mg kg^{-1})
1.5	3.2	4.1	14
2.6	4.1	9.9	34
3.8	4.8	15	52
4.0	7.1		56

Results

Obvious differences in species accumulation curves were observed between sites, with the least contaminated site exhibiting a log–log relationship, and the other three sites exhibiting linear–log relationships (Fig. 1). As a result, predicted γ -diversity for each site showed a clear negative relationship with the contaminant gradient (Fig. [2](#page-4-0)a, Pearson's $R = -0.97, P < 0.0001$.

Interestingly, while there was a clear negative relationship for γ -diversity with stress, no such relationships were observed for the more typically used expressions of biodiversity in impact assessments e.g., average species richness (a-diversity), evenness, Shannon–Weiner H' or Simpson's diversity indices (Fig. [2](#page-4-0)). α -diversity exhibited a unimodal curve; initially increasing with increasing contamination then decreasing as contamination continued to increase (Fig. [2](#page-4-0)b). These different relationships with stress between γ - and α -diversity resulted in high β -diversity at less contaminated sites and a strong negative linear rela-tionship with the contaminant gradient (Fig. [2a](#page-4-0), Pearson's $R = -0.99$, $P \lt 0.0001$). No relationships were obvious for evenness, Shannon–Weiner H' or Simpson's diversity indices (Fig. [2c](#page-4-0)).

The percentage of rare species at sites declined with increasing contamination from 42% to a low of 18% at the most contaminated site (Fig. [2d](#page-4-0), Pearson's $R = -0.98$, $P < 0.0001$). However, declining percentages of rare species could be caused by either species disappearing or becoming more common due to turnover along the gradient. Investigation of the identity of which species were rare at each site revealed that only 9 of the 22 rare species found at the least contaminated site became more common at the next site along the contaminant gradient, most (11) disappeared and three continued to be rare (Table [2](#page-4-0)). The species disappearing included large, tube building or suspension-feeding polychaetes (7) as well as three small crustaceans and a small grazing gastropod. A similar percentage of species that were rare at the second most contaminated site were not found at the third most contaminated site (2 species of crabs, 3 of the larger isopods, 1 nemertean and a small deposit feeding polychaete), but fewer became common (29% cf. 41%). The

Fig. 1 Species accumulation curves calculated for the four sites

Fig. 2 Response of different aspects of biodiversity to the contaminant gradient. a y-diversity, b α -diversity, c average evenness, Shannon–Weiner H' and Simpson's diversity indices and d number of rare species

Contamination index	Rare species	Not found at next site	Common at next site	Rare at next site
1.5	22			
2.6	14			
3.8				
4.0				

Table 2 Effect of the contaminant gradient on rare species

For each site, the number of rare species found is given together with whether they were not found, were common or were rare at the next most contaminated site

majority of the species that were rare at the third most contaminated site were not found at the most contaminated site (72%). Thus, the decline in rare species actually signalled a loss of most of those species, with very few displaying robustness to the contamination gradient.

Discussion

Studies on the response of biodiversity to stress/disturbance generally focus on species richness following a unimodal response to increasing stress (e.g., Connell [1978;](#page-6-0) Hacker and Gaines [1997\)](#page-6-0), and do not incorporate effects on β -diversity. However, patch theory suggests that massive stress events should override patch dynamics by re-setting all patches to the same (early) successional state (Connell and Slatyer [1977](#page-6-0); Pearson and Rosenberg [1978;](#page-7-0) Denslow [1980\)](#page-6-0), while at lower levels of stress, asynchronous dynamics of individual patches should produce heterogeneity (Connell [1978](#page-6-0); Huston [1979](#page-7-0)). While we observed indications of a unimodal response of average species richness, we did not observe an initial increase in β - and y-diversity, both of which were decreasing while α -diversity was still increasing. α -diversity did not begin to decrease until the ratio of γ to β was greater than 1.46.

The implications of habitat heterogeneity and habitat selectivity to biodiversity preservation are accepted (Olson et al. [2001](#page-7-0); Hoekstra et al. [2005\)](#page-7-0) and the protection of habitats and connectivity between them is a focus of many conservation networks. How-ever, Dornelas et al. [\(2006](#page-6-0)) recently demonstrated that similar habitats adjacent to each other can have markedly different communities, thereby decreasing the scale at which we should consider heterogeneity to be important to biodiversity. Similarly, our results suggest that, even within a soft-sediment habitat apparently homogeneous at the 100 m scale, enough heterogeneity in species distributions can exist such that homogenisation of these can still pose a threat to gamma diversity.

Such changes to within-site β -diversity have important implications for assessing the potential for a regime shift. It has recently been suggested that regime shifts are indicated by increasing temporal variation (Carpenter and Brock [2006](#page-6-0)). Our results suggest that ecological shifts and functional impairment associated with anthropogenic stressors may be signalled at an early stage by decreasing spatial heterogeneity in biodiversity as numbers of rare species and habitat formers decrease and more of the community is represented by less vulnerable, more robust species, resulting from a strong link between spatial and temporal community dynamics (Thrush et al. [2008a\)](#page-7-0). These less vulnerable species become more common, increasing α -diversity at the same time that the overall γ -diversity and heterogeneity declines (Fig. 3). Finally a threshold is reached at which α -diversity also reduces and a depauperate, homogeneous community of small, robust species begins to develop.

Fig. 3 Conceptual diagram of the effect of anthropogenic stressors on community heterogeneity and biodiversity

The interplay observed between α -, β - and γ -diversity has a major implication for resilience. Rare species have been implicated as providing insurance and functional resilience against change (Walker [1992](#page-7-0); Lawton and Brown [1993](#page-7-0); Naeem and Li [1997;](#page-7-0) Yachi and Loreau [1999](#page-8-0)). The percentage of rare species (those found in only one or two samples) we observed at our least contaminated site (42%) was similar to other figures reported for marine systems (Schlacher et al. [1998](#page-7-0); Shin and Ellingsen [2004](#page-7-0); Ellingsen et al. 2007). Moreover, our rare species appeared more sensitive to our stressor than many of the more common species as the percentage of rare species dropped to 18% at the most contaminated site, similar to findings by Hewitt et al. [\(2009](#page-7-0)), and most of the rare species found at the least contaminated site did not become more common over the contaminant gradient. This suggests that communities with a high proportion of rare species may prove less resilient, as indicated by early studies of species abundance distributions under stress (e.g., Whittaker [1975](#page-8-0); Gray and Mirza 1979). In this case the stressor is likely to have an increasing effect, rapidly approaching a threshold, over which a regime shift occurs. As many rare species are large and often functionally important (Loreau et al. [2001;](#page-7-0) Thrush and Dayton [2002](#page-7-0)), their response to stressors is crucial for functional resilience. Our empirical results therefore give new impetus to the need to include the response of γ - and β -diversity and rare species into theoretical models predicting resilience and regime shifts and to empirical studies trying to understand the role of rare species in different systems.

Acknowledgments The authors thank the New Zealand Foundation for Science and Technology (C01X0504) for provided funding for this work. Thanks also to David Hawksworth, who as editor encouraged us to revise the paper, and to 2 anonymous reviewers, whose suggestions improved the paper.

References

- Carpenter SR, Brock WA (2006) Rising variance: a leading indicator of ecological transition. Ecol Lett 9:308–315
- Clarke RT, Gorley RN (2006) Primer v6. PrimerE, Plymouth
- Colwell RK (2006) EstimateS: biodiversity estimation. 8.0 ed. <http://viceroy.eeb.uconn.edu/EstimateS>
- Connell JH (1978) Diversity in tropical rainforests and coral reefs. Science 199:1302
- Connell JH, Slatyer RO (1977) Mechanisms of succession in natural communities and their role in community stability and organisation. Am Nat 111:1119–1144
- Crist TO, Veech JA, Gering JC, Summerville KS (2003) Partitioning species diversity across landscapes and regions: a hierarchical analysis of α , β , and γ diversity. Am Nat 162:734–743
- Denslow JS (1980) Pattern of plant species diversity during succession under different disturbance regimes. Oecologia 46:18–21
- Dornelas M, Connolly SR, Hughes TP (2006) Coral reef diversity refutes the neutral theory of biodiversity. Nature 400:80–82
- Ellingsen KE, Hewitt JE, Thrush SF (2007) Rare species, habitat diversity and functional redundancy in marine benthos. J Sea Res 58:291–301
- Emmerson MC, Solan M, Emes C et al (2001) Consistent patterns and the idiosyncratic effects of biodiversity in marine ecosystems. Nature 411:73–77
- Gaston KJ (1994) Rarity. Chapman and Hall, London
- Gering JC, Crist TO, Veech JA (2003) Additive partitioning of species diversity across multiple spatial scales: implications for regional conservation of biodiversity. Conserv Biol 17:488–499
- Gray JS, Mirza FB (1979) A possible method for the detection of pollution-induced disturbances on marine benthic communities. Mar Pollut Bull 10:142–146
- Guégan J-F, Lek S, Oberdorff T (1998) Energy availability and habitat heterogeneity predict global riverine fish diversity. Nature 391:382–384
- Hacker SD, Gaines SD (1997) Some implications of direct positive interactions for community species diversity. Ecology 78:1990–2003
- Hewitt JE, Thrush SF, Halliday J, Duffy C (2005) The importance of small-scale biogenic habitat structure for maintaining beta diversity. Ecology 86:1618–1626
- Hewitt JE, Anderson MJ, Hickey C, Kelly S et al. (2009) Enhancing the ecological significance of contamination guidelines through integration with community analysis. Environ Sci Technol 43:2118– 2123
- Hoekstra JM, Boucher TM, Ricketts TH, Roberts C (2005) Confronting a biome crisis: global disparities of habitat loss and protection. Ecol Lett 8:23–39
- Hooper DU, Chapin FS III, Ewel JJ et al (2005) Effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning: a consensus of current knowledge. Ecol Monogr 75:3–35
- Huston M (1979) A general hypothesis of species diversity. Am Nat 113:81–101
- Huston MA (1994) Biological diversity: the coexistence of species on changing landscapes. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge
- Klimek S, Marini L, Hofman M, Isselstein J (2008) Additive partitioning of plant diversity with respect to grassland management regime, fertilisation and abiotic factors. Basic Appl Ecol 9:626–634
- Lande R (1996) Statistics and partitioning of species diversity, and similarity among multiple communities. Oikos 76:5–13
- Lawton JH, Brown VK (1993) Redundancy in ecosystems. In: Schulze ED, Mooney HA (eds) Biodiversity and ecosystem function. Springer-Verlag, New York
- Legendre P, Borcard D, Peres-Neto PR (2005) Analyzing beta diversity: partitioning the spatial variation of community composition data. Ecol Monogr 75:435–450
- Loreau M (2000) Are communities saturated? On the relationship between α , β and γ diversity. Ecol Lett 3:73–76
- Loreau M, Naeem S, Inchausti P et al (2001) Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: current knowledge and future challenges. Science 294:804–808
- MacDonald DD, Carr RS, Calder FD et al (1996) Development and evaluation of sediment quality guidelines for Florida coastal waters. Ecotoxicology 5:253–278
- Naeem S (2002) Ecosystem consequences of biodiversity loss: the evolution of a paradigm. Ecology 83:1537–1552
- Naeem S, Li S (1997) Biodiversity enhances ecosystem reliability. Nature 390:507–509
- Olson DM, Dinerstein E, Wikramanayake ED et al (2001) Terrestrial ecoregions of the world: a new map of life on earth. Bioscience 51:933–938
- Pearson TH, Rosenberg R (1978) Macrobenthic succession in relation to organic enrichment and pollution of the marine environment. Oceanogr Mar Biol Annu Rev 16:229–311
- Pimm SL, Russell GJ, Gittleman JL, Brooks TM (1995) The future of biodiversity. Science 269:347–350 Purvis A, Hector A (2000) Getting the measure of biodiversity. Nature 405:212–219
- Ricklefs RE, Lovette IJ (1999) The roles of island area per se and habitat diversity in the species-area relationships of four Lesser Antillean faunal groups. J Anim Ecol 68:1142–1160
- Ricotta C (2008) Computing additive diversity from presence-absence scores: a critique and alternative parameters. Theor Popul Biol 73:244–249
- Schlacher TA, Newell P, Clavier J, Schlacher-Hoenlinger MA et al (1998) Soft-sediment benthic community structure in a coral reef lagoon—the prominence of spatial heterogeneity and ''spot endemism''. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 174:159–174
- Shin PKS, Ellingsen KE (2004) Spatial patterns of soft-sediment benthic diversity in subtropical Hong Kong waters. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 276:25–35
- Solan M, Cardinale BJ, Downing A, Engelhardt KAM et al (2004) Extinction and ecosystem function in the marine benthos. Science 306:1177–1180
- Thrush SF, Dayton PK (2002) Disturbance to marine benthic habitats by trawling and dredging—implications for marine biodiversity. ARES 33:449–473
- Thrush SF, Gray JS, Hewitt JE, Ugland KI (2006) Predicting the effects of habitat homogenization on marine biodiversity. Ecol Appl 16:1636–1642
- Thrush SF, Coco G, Hewitt JE (2008a) Complex positive connections between functional groups are revealed by neural network analysis of ecological time-series. Am Nat 171:669–677
- Thrush SF, Hewitt JE, Hickey CW, Kelly S (2008b) Multiple stressor effects identified from species abundance distributions: interactions between urban contaminants and species habitat relationships. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 366:160–168
- Tilman D, Wedin D, Knops J (1996) Productivity and sustainability influenced by biodiversity in grassland ecosystems. Nature 379:718–720
- Velland M, Verheyen K, Flinn KM et al (2007) Homogenization of forest plant communities and weakening of species-environment relationships via agricultural land use. J Ecol 95:565–573
- Walker BH (1992) Biodiversity and ecological redundancy. Conserv Biol 6:18–23

Whittaker RH (1960) Vegetation of the Siskiyou Mountains, Oregon and California. Ecol Monogr 30: 279–338

Whittaker RH (1975) Communities and ecosystems, 2nd edn. Macmillan, New York

Yachi S, Loreau M (1999) Biodiversity and ecosystem productivity in a fluctuating environment: the insurance hypothesis. Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 96:1463