# Stream water quality impacted by different plantations in south subtropics

Pan Lijun<sup>1</sup> · Huang Yuhui<sup>2</sup> · Zhang Weiqiang<sup>2</sup> · Tang Honghui<sup>2</sup> · Su Murong<sup>2</sup> · Gan Xianhua<sup>2</sup>

Abstract Four types of plantations in Yunyong forest farm in Foshan, including needle-broad leaf mixed plantations (MP), evergreen broadleaf plantations (EBP), Eucalyptus plantations (EP) and Cunninghamia lanceolata plantation (CLP), were studied to characterize local stream water quality. The results indicated that the stream water in all plantations was slightly acid with pH of 5.93-6.34. Total nitrogen concentrations of stream water in MP and EBP were significantly lower than that in EP. The total nitrogen concentration in water was above 2.0 mg $\cdot$ L<sup>-1</sup> in EP and CLP, exceeding the level V of environmental quality limit of surface water standard (EQSSW), while total phosphorus concentration reached the level ∏ or ∭ of EOSSW. For stream water in all plantations at different stand age, total water hardness and the concentrations of Cd, Hg met the standards of drinking water standard, while fluoride, Pb, Cu, Zn and Cr<sup>6+</sup> and As achieved level I of EQSSW. Grey cor-

**Project funding** Guangdong forestry science and technology innovation projects (2015KJCX027, 2015KJCX029).

- 1 Maintenance Center for Yunyong Ecological Forest of Foshan, Foshan, Guangdong 528518, China;
- 2 Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Silviculture, Protection and Utilization / Guangdong Academy of Forestry, Guangzhou, Guangdong 510520, China

relation analysis and principal component analysis result shows that stream water quality was the highest in the CLP, followed by EP, MP and EBP.

**Keywords** Stream water quality · Stand age · Plantation · South subtropics

### Introduction

The stream water is formed from rain, runoff, soil flow and groundwater collection after the precipitation through the woodland (Shi et al. 2008). Vegetation and soils play an important role in the regulation of chemical substances in water during the process that the precipitation is converted into runoff in the forest ecosystem (Liu et al. 2013). Vegetation is very sensitive to the change in water environment chemistry while it can directly or indirectly influences water quality. Therefore, it is of great significance to analyze the effect of forest vegetation on water environment, to explore the mechanism of water purification of forest ecosystem, and to understand the response of regional geochemical conditions to water environment process (Bu et al. 2010). The relationship between forest and water quality has become a hot topic of forest hydrology research (Zhao et al. 2008). Recent research relating stream water quality to forest effect is mainly focused on the effects of forest surface

Zhang Weiqiang happyzwq@sina.com

on stream water quality (Luo et al. 2013; Xiang et al. 2012; Wang et al. 2007; Zhang et al. 2012; Qiu et al. 2013), forest space key layer of water quality (Jin et al. 2013; Liu et al. 2011; Li et al. 2004; Li et al. 2013; Zhang & Li, 2007; Li et al. 2010; Brun et al. 2008) and the relationship between watershed landscape pattern and surface water conditions (Ou et al. 2012; Zhao et al. 2012). However, studies on the effects of planting native hardwood species and Eucalyptus sp. on water quality in the Cunninghamia lanceolata forest are rarely reported (Xiang et al. 2012). In this study, we examined the impacts of several plantations including the coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest, evergreen broad-leaved forest, eucalyptus forest and C. lanceolata forest at different forest ages in Yunyong forest farm, Foshan city on stream water quality using the gray correlation degree and the principal component analysis method. The findings from this study will provide valuable information for functional evaluation and sustainable management of plantation ecosystem.

### Materials and methods

#### Study area

Research site is in Gaoming district Yunyong forest farm (112°40′E, 22°43′N) in Foshan city, Guangdong province. Being in the south subtropical humid monsoon climate zone, the site has annual mean temperature, maximum temperature, and minimum temperature of 22.0, 34.5 and 3.5 °C, respectively. The average annual precipitation is 2 000 mm, concentrated in April- August. The study area was characterized by acid red deep

Table 1 Sampling site description

soils developed from granite on hilly terrain.

From 2002 to 2011, *C. lanceolata* forest was deforested. Reforestation species were selected from native broadleaf species and eucalyptus while the germination of *C. lanceolata* was also preserved on a single plant. In this study, four forest types were selected: *C. lanceolata*, coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest, evergreen broad-leaved forest, and eucalyptus forest (Table 1). The main reforestation broadleaf species is *Rhodoleia championii*, *Spathodea campanulat*, *Michelia macclurei*, *Mytilaria laosensis*, *Cinnamomum burmannii*, *Elaeocarpus sylvestris*, *Liquidambar formosana*, *Cinnamomum camphora*, *Erythrophleum fordii*, *Schima superba*, *Castanopsis fissa*, *Evodia glabrifolia*, *Sterculia lanceolata*, *Toona sinensis*, *Cinnamomum porrectum*, *Manglietia glauca*.

#### Method

Some small streams within typical plantation (evergreen broadleaf forest, coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest, *Eucalyptus* forest and *C. lanceolata* forest) were selected for the research. Three sampling locations were established for each forest type at 9-11 years old and 5-7 years old (Table 1) with a total of 21 sampling sites. Sampling points are located at the outlet of each small watershed. The distance between sampling points was greater than 500 m. Water samples were collected once per day for 3 days on sunny days in May, August, and October 2014. Each water sample was collected into a clean plastic bottle at volume of 550 mL for analysis.

All indicators of the measurement methods are reference to Chinese national standards (Xie & Wang, 1998) (Table 2).

Stand age (a)	Forest type	DHB (cm)	Height (m)	Canopy closure
9-11	Coniferous and broad - leaved mixed forest	9.0	8.1	0.9
	Evergreen broad - leaved forest	10.2	8.8	0.7
	Eucalyptus forest	11.1	10.4	0.7
5-7	Coniferous and broad - leaved mixed forest	5.7	4.8	0.6
	Evergreen broad - leaved forest	5.7	4.7	0.5
	Eucalyptus forest	12.7	11.5	0.6
12	C. lanceolata forest	11.6	11.5	0.7

Indicator	Abbreviation	Measurement method
pH value	pН	Ysi-6600eds environmental monitoring system
Dissolved oxygen		Ysi-6600eds environmental monitoring system
Chemical oxygen demand	COD	Potassium dichromate method
Permanganate index		Acid method
Biochemical oxygen demand	BOD <sub>5</sub>	Dilution inoculation method
Ammonium nitrogen	$NH_4^+ - N$	Nessler's reagent spectrophotometry
Nitrate nitrogen	NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> -N	Phenols disulfonic acid photometric method
Total phosphorus		Potassium persulfate oxidation - molybdenum antimony spectrophotometric method
Total nitrogen		Potassium persulfate oxidation - ultraviolet spectrophotometry
Cu content	Cu	Flame atomic absorption spectrophotometry
Zn content	Zn	Flame atomic absorption spectrophotometry
As content	As	Flame atomic absorption spectrophotometry
Hg content	Hg	Cold atomic absorption method
Fluoride		Ion selective electrode method
Cd cotent	Cd	Graphite, atomic absorption spectrophotometry
Pb content	Pb	Graphite, atomic absorption spectrophotometry
Cr <sup>6+</sup> content	Cr <sup>6+</sup>	Diphenylcarbazide spectrophotometry

Table 2 Indicators of the measurement method

#### Data analysis

Microsoft excel 2010 and SPSS 16.0 were used for required data analysis. Based on the surface water quality standard, the representative water quality index of the stream is selected as the reference sequence, and the water quality evaluation standard is the comparative sequence. The level of the reference sequence corresponding to the maximum degree of correlation is based on the level of the stream (Zhang et al. 2004; Huang et al. 2014; Wang et al. 2012; Lv & Dong, 2011).

#### Results

# Water quality analysis of artificial forest stream in different age group

Water samples collected from stream within plantation forests has a pH varying between 5.93–6.34, slighly acid (Table 3). Acid rain and soil surface acidification may be the main reason for the low pH in the streams. The dissolved oxygen concentration sampled from stream within *C. lanceolata* was the highest. The dissolved oxygen of sample from stream under 9-11 years old and 5-7 years old forest of plantation was between 7.97-8.40 mg/L and 6.98-8.63 mg/L, respectively. Dissolved oxygen of stream water was higher under coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest and Eucalyptus forest than under evergreen broad - leaved forest. The TDS of water samples from stream under 9-11 years old and 5-7 years old forest stands were between 0.037-0.053 g/L and 0.046-0.054 g/L, respectively. TDS was generally low in the stream under C. lanceolata (0.038 g·L<sup>-1</sup>). The total chlorophyll content of Eucalyptus forest was lower than that of coniferous and broad - leaved mixed forest and evergreen broad - leaved forest. The total chlorophyll content (17.09 g·L<sup>-1</sup>) of C. lanceolata forest was close to that of 5-7 years old evergreen broad-leaved forest.

The content of COD in the water flowing through plantation forest ranged from 5.33 to 16.56 mg  $\cdot$  L<sup>-1</sup>. The water COD from stream under 5–7 years old evergreen broad-leaved forest and 12-year-old *C. lanceolata* forest met the surface water I Standard ( $\leq$  15 mg·L<sup>-1</sup>). However, the COD of stream water under *Eucalyptus* forest was significantly lower than that under coniferous and broad - leaved mixed forest and evergreen broad -

1	1 5			0 1	
Stand age (a)	Forest type	pН	Dissolved oxygen (mg $\cdot$ L <sup>-1</sup> )	Solid content $(g \cdot L^{-1})$	Chlorophyll content (mg $\cdot$ L <sup>-1</sup> )
	Coniferous and broad - leaved mixed forest ( ])	6.25±0.25	8.25±0.09	0.037±0.002	19.68±6.47
9–11	Evergreen broad - leaved forest ( $II$ )	6.05±0.29	7.97±0.28	0.041±0.003	18.39±6.33
	<i>Eucalyptus</i> forest ( III )	$6.34 \pm 0.09$	8.40±0.09	$0.053 {\pm} 0.003$	13.00±6.34
5-7	Coniferous and broad - leaved mixed forest ( IV )	5.95±0.20	8.63±0.10	0.046±0.004	12.66±5.35
	Evergreen broad - leaved forest (V)	6.28±0.27	6.98±0.41	0.054±0.008	17.50±6.35
	Eucalyptus forest (VI)	$5.93 \pm 0.25$	8.55±0.07	$0.054{\pm}0.005$	6.95±1.69
12	C. lanceolata forest ( Ⅶ )	6.21±0.35	10.56±0.19	0.038±0.001	17.09±7.75
	20 <b>г</b> <sup>а</sup> а <sup>А</sup>			A	

Table 3 Comparison of water quality indexes of artificial forest streams in different ages of south subtropics



Note: I, II, III for 9-11 years old coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest, evergreen broad-leaved forest, *Eucalyptus* forest, IV, V, VI for 5-7 years old coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest, evergreen broad-leaved forest, *Eucalyptus* forest, and VII for 12 years old fir forest. Different lowercase letters indicate that the water quality index under 9-11 years old forest is significantly different at  $\alpha = 0.05$ , and different uppercase letters indicate that the water quality index under 5-7 years old forest is significantly different at  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

Figure 1 COD, BOD<sub>5</sub>, permanganate, total nitrogen, NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>-N and NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>-N of water under different types of plantations in Yunyong forest farm

leaved forest (P < 0.05). The range of BOD<sub>5</sub> was 2.43– 4.63 mg·L<sup>-1</sup>, and there was no significant difference among the artificial forest in the same age group. The BOD<sub>5</sub> level of stream water under 5-7 years old evergreen broadleaved forest and 5-7 years old *Eucalyptus* forest also met the standard of surface water I ( $\leq 3$  mg·L<sup>-1</sup>). The permafrost index ranged from 2.94 to 4.45 mg·L<sup>-1</sup>, showing no dependence on the artificial forest in the same age group. Except for the water under 9-11 years old evergreen broad-leaved forest, water under other plantations reached surface water Class II standard (2–4 mg·L<sup>-1</sup>). The changes of total nitrogen,  $NO_3^--N$  and  $NH_4^+-N$  contents were consistent, displaying some dependence on forests with *Eucalyptus* forest> *C. lanceolata*> evergreen broad - leaved forest> coniferous and broad - leaved mixed forest. Nitrogen is mainly present in the form of  $NO_3^--N$  in streams. The contents of total nitrogen and  $NO_3^--N$  of stream water in *Eucalyptus* forest were significantly higher than those in coniferous and broad - leaved forest (P < 0.05). There was significant difference between 5-7 years old *Eucalyptus* forest, coniferous and broad - leaved mixed forest (P < 0.05). The total nitro-

gen content of the stream in *Eucalyptus*, *C. lanceolata* and 5-7 years old evergreen broad - leaved forest exceeded the standard of surface water  $V (> 2.0 \text{ mg} \cdot \text{L}^{-1})$ .

There was no significant difference in Pb,  $Cr^{6+}$ , Zn and As of stream water within coniferous and broad leaved mixed forest, evergreen broad - leaved forest and *Eucalyptus* forest. The content of Cu of stream water varied with forest with coniferous and broad - leaved mixed forest, higher than that in evergreen broad leaved forest and *Eucalyptus* forest (P<0.05). The Cd content of stream in 9-11a evergreen broad-leaved forest was significantly lower than that in the coniferous and broad-leaved forest and *Eucalyptus* forest (P < 0.05), and the content of Hg was significantly higher than that of the latter two (P < 0.05). The content of Cd of stream water in the plantation was lower than 1 mg·L<sup>-1</sup> and the content of Hg was 0.03–0.24 mg·L<sup>-1</sup>, which was lower than that of national drinking water (Cd: 5 mg·L<sup>-1</sup>; Hg: 0.001 mg·L<sup>-1</sup>). Pb and Cu contents were lower than 0.01 mg·L<sup>-1</sup>, Cr<sup>6+</sup> content is between 3.22–4.72 mg·L<sup>-1</sup>, Zn and As contents were between 1.3–5.0 mg·L<sup>-1</sup> and 4.6– 7.7 mg·L<sup>-1</sup>, respectively, which reached the standard of



Note: I, II, III for 9-11 years old coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest, evergreen broad-leaved forest, *Eucalyptus* forest, IV, V, VI for 5-7 years old coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest, evergreen broad-leaved forest, *Eucalyptus* forest, and VII for 12 years old fir forest. Different lowercase letters indicate that the water quality index in 9-11 years old forest is significantly different at  $\alpha = 0.05$ , and different uppercase letters indicate that the water quality index in 5-7 years old forest is significantly different at  $\alpha = 0.05$ .





Note: I, II, III for 9-11 years old coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest, evergreen broad-leaved forest, *Eucalyptus* forest, IV, V, VI for 5-7 years old coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest, evergreen broad-leaved forest, *Eucalyptus* forest, and VII for 12 years old fir forest. Different lowercase letters indicate that the water quality index of stream in 9-11 years old forest is significantly different  $\alpha = 0.05$ , and different uppercase letters indicate that the water quality index of stream in 5-7 years old forest is significantly different at  $\alpha = 0.05$ .

Figure 3 Fluoride, total phosphorus, Mn, Al, total hardness, Ca, Mg, and Fe for different plantations type in Yunyong forest farm

surface water 1(Fig. 2).

The contents of fluoride, total phosphorus, Mn, and Al in plant water were between  $0.150-0.247 \text{ mg} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ ,  $0.059-0.124 \text{ mg} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ ,  $0.005-0.015 \text{ mg} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$  and 0.037- $0.064 \text{ mg} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ , respectively. Among them, the fluoride content reached the surface water class I standard. Total phosphorus content met the surface water class  $\Pi$  or III standard. Mn, Al content was lower than the national drinking water health standards ( $\leq 0.1 \text{ mg} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ ). The total phosphorus content of stream water in 5-7 years old coniferous and broad - leaved mixed forest was significantly higher than that of *Eucalyptus* forest (P < 0.05), and the content of Mn was opposite. The difference between the other indexes was not significant. The total hardness of water in different plantations ranged from 3.94 to 16.77 mg $\cdot$ L<sup>-1</sup>, which was much lower than the limit of hygienic standard of domestic drinking water ( $\leq$ 450 mg $\cdot$ L<sup>-1</sup>). The total hardness, Ca, and Mg concentration of stream water at varied with forest type at same forest stage with *Eucalyptus*> evergreen broad - leaved forest and coniferous and broad - leaved mixed forest, indicating that the soil eruption of Eucalyptus forest was stronger. This may be due to the relatively low terrain of the Eucalyptus forest. Long-term soil water increases the solubility of CO<sub>2</sub> in soil water caused by plant root respiration. Soil insoluble CaCO<sub>3</sub> is converted to water soluble Ca  $(HCO_3)_2$  (Man et al. 2006). The calcium content in the water in the Eucalyptus forest increased. Fe content was between 0.240 and 0.859 mg $\cdot$ L<sup>-1</sup>. The Fe content of stream water in 5-7 years old eucalyptus forest and 12 years old C. lanceolata forest was lower than the limit of national drinking water health standard ( $\leq$  $0.3 \text{ mg} \cdot \text{L}^{-1}$ ).

# Water quality evaluation of stream water based on gray correlative degree analysis

The main pollution indicators that represent the environmental quality were used to carry out the environmental quality assessment. pH, dissolved oxygen, COD, permanganate index,  $BOD_5$ ,  $NH_4^+$ -N,  $NO_3^-$ -N, total phosphorus, total nitrogen, Cu, Zn, As, Hg, fluoride, Cd, Pb and Cr<sup>6+</sup> are used as evaluation factors. The gray correlation model was used to evaluate the water quali-

ty of four forest types. As the water quality monitoring data and evaluation criteria in the parameters of the standard is not the same. To eliminate the inconsistency of the dimension, it is necessary to carry out dimensionless processing on the parameters of the observed data and the evaluation criteria (Li et al. 2014). This paper selects three standards of water quality evaluation as a reference value. The measured values of water quality and the standard values were divided by the reference values of the corresponding parameters to obtain dimensionless values of the parameters (Table 4-5). The correlation coefficient and correlation degree are deried by gray correlation degree calculation, and the correlation degree between water quality and water quality level of different forest stands was obtained (Table 6). If the stream water quality and a certain water quality level has the greatest degree of correlation, then that stream water quality belongs to the water quality level (Li et al. 2014). The forest water of different forest age coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest, evergreen broadleaved forest, Eucalyptus forest and C. lanceolata forest reached the standard of surface water I (Table 6).

## Evaluation of stream water quality based on principal component analysis

According to the principle of eigenvalue  $\geq 1$ , five principal components are extracted (Table 7). The cumulative contribution rate of the first five principal components is 96.340%, which can reflect the water quality of the stream. The indexes of the first principal component factor load are COD and total nitrogen. The indicators of the second main component factor load are fluoride and Zn. The index of the third principal component factor load is NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>-N and pH value. The indexes of the fourth principal component factor load are Hg and dissolved oxygen. The indexes of the fifth principal component factor load are dissolved oxygen and Cd.

The main components are the original 17 indicators (pH, dissolved oxygen, COD, permanganate index, BOD<sub>5</sub>, NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>-N, NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>-N, total phosphorus, total nitrogen, Cu, Zn, As, Hg, Cd, Pb and Cr<sup>6+</sup>, hereinafter referred to as  $X_1$ ,  $X_2$ ,  $X_3$ ,  $X_4$ ,  $X_5$ ,  $X_6$ ,  $X_7$ ,  $X_8$ ,  $X_9$ ,  $X_{10}$ ,  $X_{11}$ ,  $X_{12}$ ,  $X_{13}$ ,  $X_{14}$ ,  $X_{15}$ ,  $X_{16}$  and  $X_{17}$ , respectively), and

Index	Ι	Π	Ш	IV	V
pH	0.800	0.933	1.000	1.067	1.200
Dissolved oxygen	1.500	1.200	1.000	0.600	0.400
COD	0.750	0.750	1.000	1.500	2.000
Permanganate index	0.333	0.667	1.000	1.667	2.500
$BOD_5$	0.750	0.750	1.000	1.500	2.500
$NH_4^+$ -N	0.150	0.500	1.000	1.500	2.000
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> N	0.400	0.500	1.000	1.000	1.250
Total phosphorus	0.100	0.500	1.000	1.500	2.000
Total nitrogen	0.200	0.500	1.000	1.500	2.000
Cu	0.010	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Zn	0.050	1.000	1.000	2.000	2.000
As	1.000	1.000	1.000	2.000	2.000
Hg	0.500	0.500	1.000	10.000	10.000
Fluoride	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.500	1.500
Cd	0.200	1.000	1.000	1.000	2.000
Pb	0.200	0.200	1.000	1.000	2.000
Cr <sup>6+</sup>	0.200	1.000	1.000	1.000	2.000

Table 4 Non-dimensionality of water quality assessment criteria (reference series)

**Table 5** Non-dimensional analysis of water quality observation indicators for different types of plantations in Yunyong forest farm (comparative series)

	9-11 years old forest			5-7 yea			
Index	Coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest	Evergreen broad-leaved forest	Eucalyp- tus forest	Coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest	Evergreen broad-leaved forest	Eucalyp- tus forest	<i>C. lanceola-</i> <i>ta</i> forest
pН	0.8340	0.8070	0.8450	0.7930	0.8370	0.7910	0.8280
Dissolved oxygen	1.6500	1.5930	1.6790	1.7250	1.3950	1.7090	2.1120
COD	0.8280	0.8010	0.4820	0.8090	0.5730	0.2660	0.5090
Permanganate index	0.5630	0.7420	0.5170	0.6230	0.4990	0.4890	0.5340
$BOD_5$	1.1580	0.9810	1.0330	0.8930	0.6310	0.6080	0.8710
$NH_4^+$ -N	0.4140	0.4190	0.4650	0.3620	0.2990	0.5240	0.3630
NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> -N	0.0290	0.0560	0.1210	0.0100	0.0450	0.1830	0.0810
Total phosphorus	0.4060	0.5230	0.3390	0.6200	0.4670	0.2930	0.3680
Total nitrogen	1.4820	1.9260	3.4240	0.9870	2.0070	5.2360	2.7760
Cu	0.0007	0.0001	0.0001	0.0012	0.0000	0.0001	0.0001
Zn	0.0013	0.0022	0.0032	0.0050	0.0017	0.0032	0.0027
As	0.0927	0.0927	0.1527	0.1367	0.1533	0.1480	0.1533
Hg	1.3500	2.3633	0.6800	1.0167	0.6800	1.8567	0.3467
Fluoride	0.1532	0.1653	0.2228	3.7400	2.9933	2.9367	0.1503
Cd	0.1130	0.0158	0.1054	0.1436	0.0409	0.0459	0.0507
Pb	0.0119	0.0204	0.0239	0.0242	0.0362	0.0165	0.0101
Cr <sup>6+</sup>	0.0901	0.0943	0.0687	0.0686	0.0858	0.0643	0.0729

	9-11 y	9-11 years old forest			5-7 years old forest			
Class	Coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest	Evergreen broad-leaved forest	<i>Eucalyptus</i> forest	Coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest	Evergreen broad-leaved forest	Eucalyp- tus forest	C. anceola- ta forest	
Ι	0.889	0.874	0.889	0.885	0.891	0.853	0.887	
П	0.833	0.824	0.829	0.833	0.834	0.789	0.826	
Ш	0.779	0.766	0.756	0.785	0.752	0.713	0.743	
$\mathbf{IV}$	0.813	0.810	0.792	0.799	0.799	0.777	0.789	
V	0.762	0.770	0.751	0.750	0.762	0.736	0.750	

Table 6 The correlation of water quality in different types of plantation in Yunyong forest farm

the number is the feature vector rij. It can represent the importance of individual indicators for the principal component and determine the practical significance of the principal component. According to the principal component formula, we can get the linear combination of the five principal components and the original 17 indexes (Formula (1) -(5)).

 $Z_{1} = 0.002X_{1} - 0.044X_{2} + 0.163X_{3} + 0.117X_{4} + 0.094X_{5}$ - 0.087X<sub>6</sub> - 0.152X<sub>7</sub> + 0.135X<sub>8</sub> - 0.155X<sub>9</sub> + 0.098X<sub>10</sub> - 0.016X<sub>11</sub> - 0.115X<sub>12</sub> + 0.028X<sub>13</sub> - 0.018X<sub>14</sub> + 0.049X<sub>15</sub> + 0.018X<sub>16</sub> + 0.111X<sub>17</sub> ...... (1)

 $Z_2 = -0.098X_1 - 0.003X_2 - 0.009X_3 - 0.059X_4 - 0.111X_5$ - 0.089X\_6 - 0.055X\_7 + 0.123X\_8 - 0.048X\_9 + 0.160X\_{10} + 0.213X\_{11} + 0.152X\_{12} - 0.112X\_{13} + 0.229X\_{14} + 0.145X\_{15} + 0.122X\_{16} - 0.163X\_{17} \cdots (2)

 $Z_{3} = -0.250X_{1} + 0.147X_{2} + 0.026X_{3} + 0.141X_{4} + 0.097X_{5} + 0.231X_{6} + 0.078X_{7} + 0.011X_{8} + 0.065X_{9} + 0.136X_{10} + 0.182X_{11} - 0.123X_{12} + 0.191X_{13} - 0.012X_{14} + 0.090X_{15} - 0.223X_{16} - 0.114X_{17} \dots$ (3)

 $Z_{4} = -0.207X_{1} - 0.239X_{2} - 0.024X_{3} + 0.117X_{4} - 0.215X_{5} + 0.033X_{6} + 0.054X_{7} + 0.095X_{8} + 0.058X_{9} - 0.081X_{10} - 0.019X_{11} - 0.064X_{12} + 0.266X_{13} + 0.179X_{14} - 0.217X_{15} + 0.178X_{16} + 0.098X_{17} \cdots (4)$ 

The standardized data were substituted into the formulas (1) – (5), and the scores of the five principal components were obtained. According to  $F = b_1Z_1 +$   $b_2Z_2 + b_3Z_3 + b_4Z_4 + ... b_kZ_k$ , the comprehensive score *F* is obtained. The larger the F value, the worse the quality of the water sample (Li et al. 2010). *C. lanceolata* forest water quality is the best. Among same age plantations, the water quality of stream is better for the *Eucalyptus* forest. While coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest and evergreen broad-leaved forest are poor in water quality (Table 8).

#### Discussion

The results showed that stream water was weakly acidic regardless of plantation type and the pH value was lower than that of Qinling forest (Lv et al. 2011; Man et al. 2006). The forest runoff, acid rain and soil surface acidification in Xiaoxing'anling of Heilongjiang might be the main reason for the low pH value of the plantation water (Chen et al. 2004; Yao & Liang, 2012). During 2006–2010, the acid rain frequency was 79%, the mean pH value of atmospheric precipitation was 4.57, and the acid rain pollution was more serious in Foshan city (Yao & Liang, 2012). The effect of different forest types on the pH of rainwater is very different. The rainwater pH through Pinus radiata after is reduced, but the pH is increased through the forest of Fagus orientalis and Quercus petraea (Alfredsson et al. 1998; Eisalou et al. 2013). The reason is that the litter of coniferous forest is more acidic than that of broadleaf forest. Qinling forest can make neutral (pH=6.65) of atmospheric precipitation into weak alkaline (pH=8.05) (Zhang & Li, 2007). The change of pH of surface water is not only related to the physical and chemical properties of precipitation

Index         First principal component         Second principal component         Third principal component         Fourth principal component         Fifth principal component           pH         0.002         -0.098         -0.250         -0.207         0.190           Dissolved oxygen         -0.044         -0.003         0.147         -0.239         -0.517           COD         0.163         -0.009         0.026         -0.024         0.017           Permanganate index         0.117         -0.059         0.141         0.117         -0.227           BOD <sub>5</sub> 0.094         -0.111         0.097         -0.215         0.221           NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> -N         -0.087         -0.089         0.231         0.033         0.348           NO <sub>5</sub> <sup>-</sup> N         -0.152         -0.055         0.078         0.058         0.076           Total phosphorus         0.135         0.123         0.011         0.095         -0.158           Cu         0.098         0.160         0.136         -0.081         0.180           Zn         -0.016         0.213         0.182         -0.019         -0.078           As         -0.115         0.152         -0.123         -0.064         -0.135	1 5	51	1 5	8		
pH0.002-0.098-0.250-0.2070.190Dissolved oxygen-0.044-0.0030.147-0.239-0.517COD0.163-0.0090.026-0.0240.017Permanganate index0.117-0.0590.1410.117-0.227BOD <sub>5</sub> 0.094-0.1110.097-0.2150.221NH <sub>4</sub> <sup>+</sup> -N-0.087-0.0890.2310.0330.348NO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> N-0.152-0.0550.0780.0540.098Total phosphorus0.1350.1230.0110.095-0.158Total nitrogen-0.155-0.0480.0650.0580.076Cu0.0980.1600.136-0.0810.180Zn-0.0160.2130.182-0.019-0.078As-0.1150.152-0.123-0.064-0.135Hg0.028-0.1120.1910.2660.120Fluoride-0.0180.229-0.0120.1790.077Cd0.0490.1450.090-0.2170.428Pb0.0180.122-0.2230.1780.215Cr6*0.111-0.163-0.1140.098-0.025Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97921.40316.70015.5086.749	Index	First principal component	Second principal component	Third principal component	Fourth principal component	Fifth principal component
Dissolved oxygen-0.044-0.0030.147-0.239-0.517COD0.163-0.0090.026-0.0240.017Permanganate index0.117-0.0590.1410.117-0.227BODs0.094-0.1110.097-0.2150.221NH4'-N-0.087-0.0890.2310.0330.348NO3'-N-0.152-0.0550.0780.0540.098Total hosphorus0.1350.1230.0110.095-0.158Total nitrogen-0.155-0.0480.0650.0580.076Cu0.0980.1600.136-0.0810.180Zn-0.0160.2130.182-0.019-0.078As-0.1150.152-0.123-0.064-0.135Hg0.028-0.1120.1910.2660.120Fluoride-0.0180.229-0.0120.1790.077Cd0.0490.1450.090-0.2170.428Pb0.0180.122-0.2230.1780.215Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111-0.163-0.1140.098-0.025Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97927.38274.08389.59196.340	pH	0.002	-0.098	-0.250	-0.207	0.190
COD0.163-0.0090.026-0.0240.017Permanganate index0.117-0.0590.1410.117-0.227BODs0.094-0.1110.097-0.2150.221NH4*N-0.087-0.0890.2310.0330.348NO3*N-0.152-0.0550.0780.0540.098Total phosphorus0.1350.1230.0110.095-0.158Total nitrogen-0.155-0.0480.0650.0580.076Cu0.0980.1600.136-0.0810.180Zn-0.0160.2130.182-0.019-0.078As-0.1150.152-0.123-0.064-0.135Hg0.028-0.1120.1910.2660.120Fluoride-0.0180.229-0.0120.1790.077Cd0.0490.1450.090-0.2170.428Pb0.0180.122-0.2230.1780.215Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111-0.163-0.1140.098-0.025Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97921.40316.70015.5086.749Cumulative contribution rate (%)35.97957.38274.08389.59196.340	Dissolved oxygen	-0.044	-0.003	0.147	-0.239	-0.517
Permanganate index0.117-0.0590.1410.117-0.227BOD50.094-0.1110.097-0.2150.221NH4*-N-0.087-0.0890.2310.0330.348NO3*N-0.152-0.0550.0780.0540.098Total phosphorus0.1350.1230.0110.095-0.158Total nitrogen-0.155-0.0480.0650.0580.076Cu0.0980.1600.136-0.0810.180Zn-0.0160.2130.182-0.019-0.078As-0.1150.152-0.123-0.064-0.135Hg0.028-0.1120.1910.2660.120Fluoride-0.0180.229-0.0120.1790.077Cd0.0490.1450.090-0.2170.428Pb0.0180.122-0.2230.1780.215Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111-0.163-0.1140.098-0.025Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97957.38274.08389.59196.340	COD	0.163	-0.009	0.026	-0.024	0.017
BODs0.094-0.1110.097-0.2150.221NH4*-N-0.087-0.0890.2310.0330.348NO3*N-0.152-0.0550.0780.0540.098Total phosphorus0.1350.1230.0110.095-0.158Total nitrogen-0.155-0.0480.0650.0580.076Cu0.0980.1600.136-0.0810.180Zn-0.0160.2130.182-0.019-0.078As-0.1150.152-0.123-0.064-0.135Hg0.028-0.1120.1910.2660.120Fluoride-0.0180.229-0.0120.1790.077Cd0.0490.1450.090-0.2170.428Pb0.0180.122-0.2230.1780.215Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111-0.163-0.1140.098-0.025Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97957.38274.08389.59196.340	Permanganate index	0.117	-0.059	0.141	0.117	-0.227
NH4+-N         -0.087         -0.089         0.231         0.033         0.348           NO3-N         -0.152         -0.055         0.078         0.054         0.098           Total phosphorus         0.135         0.123         0.011         0.095         -0.158           Total nitrogen         -0.155         -0.048         0.065         0.058         0.076           Cu         0.098         0.160         0.136         -0.081         0.180           Zn         -0.016         0.213         0.182         -0.019         -0.078           As         -0.115         0.152         -0.123         -0.064         -0.135           Hg         0.028         -0.112         0.191         0.266         0.120           Fluoride         -0.018         0.229         -0.012         0.179         0.077           Cd         0.049         0.145         0.090         -0.217         0.428           Pb         0.018         0.122         -0.223         0.178         0.215           Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111         -0.163         -0.114         0.098         -0.025           Eigenvalues         6.116         3.639         2.839         2.636	$BOD_5$	0.094	-0.111	0.097	-0.215	0.221
NO3 <sup>-</sup> N         -0.152         -0.055         0.078         0.054         0.098           Total phosphorus         0.135         0.123         0.011         0.095         -0.158           Total nitrogen         -0.155         -0.048         0.065         0.058         0.076           Cu         0.098         0.160         0.136         -0.081         0.180           Zn         -0.016         0.213         0.182         -0.019         -0.078           As         -0.115         0.152         -0.123         -0.064         -0.135           Hg         0.028         -0.112         0.191         0.266         0.120           Fluoride         -0.018         0.229         -0.012         0.179         0.077           Cd         0.049         0.145         0.090         -0.217         0.428           Pb         0.018         0.122         -0.223         0.178         0.215           Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111         -0.163         -0.114         0.098         -0.025           Eigenvalues         6.116         3.639         2.839         2.636         1.147           Contribution rate (%)         35.979         57.382         74.083	$\mathbf{NH_4^+}$ -N	-0.087	-0.089	0.231	0.033	0.348
Total phosphorus0.1350.1230.0110.095-0.158Total nitrogen-0.155-0.0480.0650.0580.076Cu0.0980.1600.136-0.0810.180Zn-0.0160.2130.182-0.019-0.078As-0.1150.152-0.123-0.064-0.135Hg0.028-0.1120.1910.2660.120Fluoride-0.0180.229-0.0120.1790.077Cd0.0490.1450.090-0.2170.428Pb0.0180.122-0.2230.1780.215Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111-0.163-0.1140.098-0.025Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97957.38274.08389.59196.340	NO <sub>3</sub> -N	-0.152	-0.055	0.078	0.054	0.098
Total nitrogen-0.155-0.0480.0650.0580.076Cu0.0980.1600.136-0.0810.180Zn-0.0160.2130.182-0.019-0.078As-0.1150.152-0.123-0.064-0.135Hg0.028-0.1120.1910.2660.120Fluoride-0.0180.229-0.0120.1790.077Cd0.0490.1450.090-0.2170.428Pb0.0180.122-0.2230.1780.215Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111-0.163-0.1140.098-0.025Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97921.40316.70015.5086.749	Total phosphorus	0.135	0.123	0.011	0.095	-0.158
Cu0.0980.1600.136-0.0810.180Zn-0.0160.2130.182-0.019-0.078As-0.1150.152-0.123-0.064-0.135Hg0.028-0.1120.1910.2660.120Fluoride-0.0180.229-0.0120.1790.077Cd0.0490.1450.090-0.2170.428Pb0.0180.122-0.2230.1780.215Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111-0.163-0.1140.098-0.025Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97921.40316.70015.5086.749	Total nitrogen	-0.155	-0.048	0.065	0.058	0.076
Zn-0.0160.2130.182-0.019-0.078As-0.1150.152-0.123-0.064-0.135Hg0.028-0.1120.1910.2660.120Fluoride-0.0180.229-0.0120.1790.077Cd0.0490.1450.090-0.2170.428Pb0.0180.122-0.2230.1780.215Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111-0.163-0.1140.098-0.025Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97921.40316.70015.5086.749Cumulative contribution rate (%)35.97957.38274.08389.59196.340	Cu	0.098	0.160	0.136	-0.081	0.180
As-0.1150.152-0.123-0.064-0.135Hg0.028-0.1120.1910.2660.120Fluoride-0.0180.229-0.0120.1790.077Cd0.0490.1450.090-0.2170.428Pb0.0180.122-0.2230.1780.215Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111-0.163-0.1140.098-0.025Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97921.40316.70015.5086.749Cumulative contribution rate (%)35.97957.38274.08389.59196.340	Zn	-0.016	0.213	0.182	-0.019	-0.078
Hg0.028-0.1120.1910.2660.120Fluoride-0.0180.229-0.0120.1790.077Cd0.0490.1450.090-0.2170.428Pb0.0180.122-0.2230.1780.215Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111-0.163-0.1140.098-0.025Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97921.40316.70015.5086.749Cumulative contribution rate (%)35.97957.38274.08389.59196.340	As	-0.115	0.152	-0.123	-0.064	-0.135
Fluoride-0.0180.229-0.0120.1790.077Cd0.0490.1450.090-0.2170.428Pb0.0180.122-0.2230.1780.215Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111-0.163-0.1140.098-0.025Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97921.40316.70015.5086.749Cumulative contribution rate (%)35.97957.38274.08389.59196.340	Hg	0.028	-0.112	0.191	0.266	0.120
Cd0.0490.1450.090-0.2170.428Pb0.0180.122-0.2230.1780.215Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111-0.163-0.1140.098-0.025Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97921.40316.70015.5086.749Cumulative contribution rate (%)35.97957.38274.08389.59196.340	Fluoride	-0.018	0.229	-0.012	0.179	0.077
Pb0.0180.122-0.2230.1780.215Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111-0.163-0.1140.098-0.025Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97921.40316.70015.5086.749Cumulative contribution rate (%)35.97957.38274.08389.59196.340	Cd	0.049	0.145	0.090	-0.217	0.428
Cr <sup>6+</sup> 0.111-0.163-0.1140.098-0.025Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97921.40316.70015.5086.749Cumulative contribution rate (%)35.97957.38274.08389.59196.340	Pb	0.018	0.122	-0.223	0.178	0.215
Eigenvalues6.1163.6392.8392.6361.147Contribution rate (%)35.97921.40316.70015.5086.749Cumulative contribution rate (%)35.97957.38274.08389.59196.340	$Cr^{6+}$	0.111	-0.163	-0.114	0.098	-0.025
Contribution rate (%)         35.979         21.403         16.700         15.508         6.749           Cumulative contribution rate (%)         35.979         57.382         74.083         89.591         96.340	Eigenvalues	6.116	3.639	2.839	2.636	1.147
Cumulative contribution rate (%)         35.979         57.382         74.083         89.591         96.340	Contribution rate (%)	35.979	21.403	16.700	15.508	6.749
	Cumulative contribution rate (%)	35.979	57.382	74.083	89.591	96.340

Table 7 Factor load of water quality in different types of plantation in Yunyong forest farm

Table 8 The main component score and comprehensive score table in different types of plantation in Yunyong forest farm

Age (a)	Forest type	$F_1$	$F_2$	$F_3$	$F_4$	$F_5$	F	Sequence
9–11	Coniferous and broad – leaved mixed forest	0.330	-0.190	0.027	-0.126	0.069	0.110	5
	Evergreen broad – leaved forest	0.330	-0.249	0.079	0.193	-0.042	0.311	6
	Eucalyptus forest	-0.241	-0.028	-0.037	-0.138	0.074	-0.369	2
5-7	Coniferous and broad – leaved mixed forest	0.339	0.405	0.132	-0.008	-0.003	0.865	7
	Evergreen broad – leaved forest	0.015	0.098	-0.343	0.126	0.003	-0.102	4
	Eucalyptus forest	-0.590	0.015	0.149	0.136	0.021	-0.269	3
12	C. lanceolata forest	-0.187	-0.050	-0.023	-0.184	-0.123	-0.567	1

and water body, but also to the ability of soil subsidence in subsurface waters, the rate of bedrock mineralization and vegetation type (Kernan et al. 1998). Chen et al (2004) found that the secondary forest in the Pearl River Delta and the secondary mixed forest could increase the pH of the rainwater entering the forest. The mechanism was mainly the neutralization effect of the cation in the weathered and hydrolyzed granite.

The content of total nitrogen in the water flowing through coniferous and broad-leaved mixed forest and evergreen broad-leaved forest was significantly lower than that of *Eucalyptus* forest, while the total phosphorus content was significantly higher than that of Eucalyptus forest. The total nitrogen content of water through eucalyptus and *C. lanceolata* was greater than 2.0 mg $\cdot$ L<sup>-1</sup>, exceeding the standard value of the surface class V, for the eutrophic type. In addition to the effects of soil physical and chemical properties, the nutrient use strategies of different species are also one of the factors that affect the N and P contents of the streams. As the age increases, the change of nitrogen leaching in the Picea asperata forest is very small, While the oak forest nitrogen leaching amount is declining, which will inevitably affect the forest stream water N content (Van der Salm et al. 2006). Eucalyptus herbaceous fertilization may influence the increase in the N content of the stream. The concentration of  $NO_3^-$ -N was higher than that of  $NH_4^+$ -N in the stream.  $NO_3^{-}N$  is not easily adsorbed by the soil, but it is easy to fall with the precipitation and runoff, which leads to the high concentration of NO<sub>3</sub>-N in the stream (Foster et al. 1989; Simmons et al. 1992). In addition, the Pearl River Delta region of nitrogen deposition is serious, it is bound to enter through the precipitation more  $NO_3$  – N (Ren et al. 2000; Zhou & Yan, 2001). *Eucalyptus* forest water total phosphorus content is low. Eucalyptus forest is relatively low terrain. The soil is easy to accumulate water, while the water particles or soil adsorption of P will increase. Soluble inorganic phosphorus is easy to precipitate or adsorb with Al<sup>3+</sup>,  $Fe^{3+}$ ,  $Ca^{2+}$  in soil, which leads to the decrease of P content in stream water (Liang & Wu, 2000).

The water quality of *C. lanceolata* is the best, followed by *Eucalyptus* forest, while coniferous and broadleaved mixed forest and evergreen broad-leaved forest are poor in water quality, but the water quality of these forest types is the standard class I of surface water. The forest stands are middle and young plantations in our study. Forest structure and function are not mature. The interference of human activities is also greater. Therefore, the influence of multiple factors such as age, species physiological characteristics, soil physical and chemical properties, human disturbance and so on cannot be separated. It is still necessary to study the water quality of plantations of different forest types.

### Reference

- Alfredsson H, Condron L M, Clarholm M, et al (1998) Changes in soil acidity and organic matter following the establishment of conifers on former grassland in New Zealand [J]. Forest Ecology and Management 112(3): 245-252
- Brun CB, Astrom ME, Peltola P, et. Al (2008) Trends in major and trace elements in decomposing needle litters during a long-term experiment in Swedish forests. Plant Soil 306:199-210
- Bu HM, Dang HS, Zhang QF (2010) Impacts of forest vegetation on water environment of the Jinshui River Basin in the Upper Han River. Acta Ecologica Sinica 30(5): 1341-1348
- Chen BF, Chen Y, Yin GT, et al (2004) Study on the Water Quality of Urban Forest Ecosystem in the Pearl River Delta. Forest Research 17(4): 453-460
- Eisalou HK, Şengönül K, Gökbulak F, et al (2013) Effects of forest canopy cover and floor on chemical quality of water in broad leaved and coniferous forests of Istanbul, Turkey. Forest Ecology and Management 289: 371-377
- Foster NW, Nicolson JA, Hazlett PW (1989) Temporal variation in nitrate and nutrient cations in drainage waters from a deciduous forest. Journal of Environmental Quality 18(2): 238-244
- Huang D, Xiong W, Liu K, et al (2014) Temporal-spatial variations of water quality in a reclaimed-water-supplied constructed wetland purification system: A case study in Olympic Forest Park of Beijing. Acta Scientiae Circumstantiae 34(7): 1738-1750
- Jin JX, Zhang SL, Lu B, et al (2013) Spatial Variation Characteristics of the Forest Ecosystem on Water Quality in the Water Source Area of Xi'an, China. Journal of Northeast Forestry University 41(3): 46-50
- Kernan MR, Allott THE, Battarbee RW (1998) Predicting freshwater critical loads of acidification at the catchment scale: an empirical model. Water, Air, & Soil Pollution 105(1/2): 31-41
- Li HJ, Zhang YT, Zhang XP, et al (2010) The water quality changes during rainfall in natural *Picea schrenkiana* var. tianschanica forest ecosystem in the Middle Tianshan mountains. Acta Ecologica Sinica 30(18): 4828-4838
- Li LL, Gu XF, Zhao WJ, et al (2014) Analysis of water environmental monitoring and grey correlation degree in lakes of Beijing park. Journal of Water Resources and Water Engineering 25(1): 33-37
- Li L, Liu LQ, Zhou GY, Et al (2014) Effects of Canopy Damage on Hydrochemistry of Throughfall and Stemflow in Evergreen Broadleaved Forest of Nanling Mountains. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 28(2): 45-50
- Li WY, Yu XX, Ma QY, et al (2004) Analysis to Influence of Water Conservation Forest in Miyun Reservoir on Water Quality, Science of Soil and Water Conservation. Science of Soil

and Water Conservation 2(2): 80-83

- Liang W, Wu ZB (2000) Research Progress on Removal Mechanism of Nitrogen and Phosphorus in Sewage by Constructed Wetland. Environmental Science Trends (3): 32-37
- Liu N, Wang YJ, Wang YQ, et al (2013) Hydrochemical Effects of Typical Forest Stands at Different Spatial Levels in Jinyun Mountain, Subtropical Region. Journal of Basic Science and Engineering 21(2): 236-248
- Liu Y, Yang XB, Chen B, et al (2011) Study on Precipitation Hydro-chemical Characteristic of Mixed Forest of Poplar and Birch of North Mountain of Hebei Province [J]. Ecology and Environmental Sciences 20(11): 1665-1669
- Luo WH, Man XL, Tian YH, et al (2013) Hydrochemical Characteristics of Streams of Forest Watershed in Cold-temperate Zone of Greater Xing'an Mountains, China. Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 27(5): 119-124
- Lv HL, Dong XB (2011) Evaluation of Clear-Cutting Improvement Methods of Low-Quality Forests in Xiaoxing'an Mountains Based on Principal Component Analysis. Scientia Silvae Sinicae 47(12): 172-178
- Man XL, Fan JF, Tan XJ, et al (2006) Effects of forest and swamp on hydrochemical characteristics of streams. Chinese Journal of Applied Ecology 17(6): 992-996
- Ou Y, Wang XY, Geng RZ (2012) The influences of different landscape characteristics on water quality in the upper watershed of Miyun Reservoir. Acta Scientiae Circumstantiae 32(5): 1219-1226
- Qiu QY, Chen XM, Liang GH, et al (2013) Effect of simulated acid deposition on chemistry of surface runoff in monsoon evergreen broad-leaved forest in Dinghushan. Acta Ecologica Sinica 33(13): 4021-4030
- Ren R, Mi FJ, Bai NB (2000) A Chemometrics Analysis on the Data of Precipitation Chemistry of China. Journal of Beijing Polytechnic University 26(2): 90-95
- Shi FC, Li FY, Cai TJI, et al (2008) Seasonal dynamics of hydrochemical characteristics of streams under different forest types. Chinese Journal of Applied Ecology 19(4): 717-722
- Simmons RC, Gold AJ, Groffman PM (1992) Nitrate dynamics in riparian forests: groundwater studies. Journal of Environmental Quality 21(4): 659-665
- van der Salm C, van der Gon H D, Wieggers R, et al (2006) The effect of afforestation on water recharge and nitrogen leach-

ing in The Netherlands. Forest ecology and management 221(1): 170-182

- Wang JC, Wu YQ, Dang BL, et al (2012) Spatial and Temporal Distribution of Surface Water Quality Using Multivariate Statistical Analysis in Jinghe River of Shaanxi Province, China. Journal of Natural Resources 27(4): 674-685
- Wang QC, Yao Q, Mou PP, et al (2007) Habitat assessment and water quality analysis of low order streams in different landscapes in Liangshui and Maoershan, Heilongjiang, China. Acta Ecologica Sinica 27(12): 5176-5183
- Xiang YZ, Xu DP, Yang ZJ, et al (2012) Evaluation of Surface Water Quality in Forest Catchment Based on Euclidean Distance Model with Varying Weights. Forest Research 25(3): 400-406
- Xie XQ, Wang LJ (1998) Observation and Analysis of Water Environment Factors. Beijing: China Standards Press
- Yao Z, Liang LH (2012) Analysis of Rainfall Components and Acid Rain Pollution in Foshan City. Journal of Green Science and Technology (7): 158-160
- Zhang L, Wang GX, Luo MR (2004) Application of an Improved Grey Association Analysis Method in Water Environmental Quality Assessment. Acta Scientiarum Naturalium Universitatis Sunyatseni 43(S1): 234-236
- Zhang SL, Li GL (2007) The effects of different components of the forest ecosystem on water quality in the Huoditang forest region, Qinling Mountain Range. Acta Ecologica Sinica 27(5): 1838-1844
- Zhang SL, Liang CP, Jin JX, et al (2012) Response of Stream Water Chemistry to Rainwater Acidification in the Natural Forest Region of the Qinling Mountains. Scientia Silvae Sinicae 48(4): 1-7
- Zhao P, Xia BC, Qin JQ, et al (2012) Multivariate correlation analysis between landscape pattern and water quality. Acta Ecologica Sinica 32(8): 2331-2341
- Zhao YS, Xin Y, Zeng FS (2008) Influence of the Water Conservation Forest in the Headstream of Ashi River on Water Quality. Scientia Silvae Sinicae 44(6): 5-9
- Zhou GY, Yan JH (2001) The influences of regional atmospheric precipitation characteristics and its element inputs on the existence and development of Dinghushan forest ecosystems. Acta Ecologica Sinica 21(12): 2002-2012