

Regional scale modelling of the lower River Murray wetlands

**A model for the assessment of nutrient retention of floodplain
wetlands pre- and post-management**

Dipl. Ökol. Kjartan Tumi Björnsson B.Sc.

Thesis Submitted for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

June 2007



School of Earth and Environmental Sciences

Regional Scale Modelling of the lower River Murray wetlands

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	I
List of Figures and Tables	V
Figures	V
Tables.....	IX
Declaration.....	XI
Acknowledgements	XII
Abstract.....	XIV
1 Background	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.1.1 Wetland processes	5
1.1.2 Spatial relationships of wetlands to transport processes	10
1.2 Degradation of floodplain wetlands.....	12
1.2.1 Eutrophication of aquatic environments.....	14
1.2.2 Alternate stable states and permanent inundation impacts on wetlands 17	
1.2.3 Irrigation drainage and constructed wetlands	19
1.3 Restoration of degraded floodplain wetlands	21
1.3.1 Management strategies for restoration	21
1.4 Predictive modelling of wetland processes and services; current state and potential alteration due to management	23
1.4.1 Complexity and feasibility of modelling.....	25
1.4.2 Qualitative and quantitative assessment of model accuracy and generic applicability.....	27
1.4.3 Validation	30
1.4.4 Modelling role in environmental decision-making.....	31

Regional Scale Modelling of the lower River Murray wetlands

2	Aims and objectives.....	39
3	Materials and Methods.....	41
3.1	Model Description	41
3.1.1	Design Considerations.....	41
3.1.2	WETMOD 1	45
3.1.3	WETMOD 2	54
3.2	Data: Model Driving Variables	63
3.2.1	“Exemplar” Wetland Sites	65
3.2.2	Wetland Data	71
3.2.3	River Data.....	80
3.3	Data Handling.....	85
3.3.1	Model Calibration	88
3.3.2	Validation Procedure.....	88
3.4	Wetland Management	89
3.4.1	Options	89
3.4.2	Management scenarios for cumulative assessment.....	92
4	Validation of the model WETMOD 2 and Discussion.....	97
4.1	Fitting and Validation based on calibrated (“exemplar”) wetlands.....	97
4.1.1	Implication for irrigation affected wetland representation	118
4.1.2	Implication for wetland representation.....	120
4.2	Validation based on non-calibrated wetland data.....	125
4.3	Evaluating model performance.....	136
4.3.1	Generic nature and structural restrictions of model	136
4.3.2	Relevance of project objectives	137
4.4	Chapter summary and Implication for the first hypothesis	139
5	Simulation results of potential management scenarios and Discussion	140

Regional Scale Modelling of the lower River Murray wetlands

5.1.1	Implications for Management	157
5.2	Chapter summary and Implications for the second hypothesis	161
6	Results of the cumulative assessment of management scenarios, visualisation and discussion.....	163
6.1	Cumulative assessment: category 3 wetlands.....	164
6.2	Cumulative assessment: category 4 wetlands.....	185
6.3	Implications of cumulative impact of multiple wetland management.....	192
6.4	Chapter summary and Implications for the third hypothesis	198
7	Summary, Context and Discussion.....	200
7.1	Assessment methodology.....	201
7.2	Current capabilities	202
8	Conclusion & Future Work.....	209
9	References	216
	Glossary	232
	Appendix A: WETMOD differential equations.....	234
	\$Macrophytes	235
	\$Phytoplankton	237
	\$Nutrients.....	242
	\$NutrientExchange.....	246
	\$Wetland&RiverFlowExchange	251
	\$SpatialRelevantTimeSeries	252
	\$RiverNutrients	252
	\$WetlandsTimeseriesUpdateMeasuredValues.....	252
	\$WetlandTimeseriesUpdate	252
	\$RiverTimeseries4WetlandUpdateTimeseries.....	252
	\$PotentialContributionToRiver	252

Regional Scale Modelling of the lower River Murray wetlands

Appendix B: Driving Variables	253
Appendix C: Key to wetland numbers	263
Appendix D: Cumulative Management Scenarios.....	266
Appendix E: WETMOD 2 Code.....	291

List of Figures and Tables

Figures

Figure 1: Wetland exchange modelling.....	3
Figure 2: Cumulative assessment of wetland processes.....	3
Figure 3: Study Area	5
Figure 4: Driving Variables, State Variables and Major Interactions in WETMOD	146
Figure 5: Macrophyte Module	49
Figure 6: Plankton Module	51
Figure 7: Nutrient Module.....	53
Figure 8: WETMOD 2 Structure and Data Flow.....	56
Figure 9: Volume Exchange Module	58
Figure 10: External Nutrient Module.....	60
Figure 11: Outflow Module.....	61
Figure 12: “ <i>Exemplar</i> ” Wetlands & River Monitoring Sites.....	65
Figure 13: Paiwalla & Sunnyside wetlands	68
Figure 14: Lock 6 and Pilby Creek wetlands.....	69
Figure 15: Reedy Creek wetland.....	70
Figure 16: Wetlands (Categories 1 to 5) Driving Variables Turbidity, Water Temperature & Solar Radiation (see also in Appendix B)	73
Figure 17: Sunnyside Irrigation Drainage PO ₄ -P, NO ₃ -N, Phytoplankton and Estimated Flow Volume (see also in Appendix B)	79
Figure 18: River Murray Nutrient & Phytoplankton Time Series as well as River Flow Volume (see also in Appendix B)	84
Figure 19: Wetlands (Categories 1 to 5) Monitored Nutrients and Phytoplankton	87
Figure 20: Wetland exchange modelling.....	92
Figure 21: Cumulative assessment of wetland processes.....	96
Figure 22: Percentage Deviation based estimate of flow exchange: Reedy Creek wetland.....	98
Figure 23: Validation of simulation results for Paiwalla wetland of PO ₄ -P, and NO ₃ -N for both conditions with and without water exchange.....	101

Regional Scale Modelling of the lower River Murray wetlands

Figure 24: Validation of simulation results for Paiwalla wetland of Macrophyte Biomass, Zooplankton and Phytoplankton for both conditions with and without water exchange	102
Figure 25: Validation of simulation results for Sunnyside wetland of PO ₄ -P, and NO ₃ -N for both conditions with and without water exchange	105
Figure 26: Validation of simulation results for Sunnyside wetland of Macrophyte Biomass, Zooplankton and Phytoplankton for both conditions with and without water exchange	106
Figure 27: Validation of simulation results for Lock 6 wetland of PO ₄ -P, and NO ₃ -N for both conditions with and without water exchange	108
Figure 28: Validation of simulation results for Lock 6 wetland of Macrophyte Biomass, Zooplankton and Phytoplankton for both conditions with and without water exchange	109
Figure 29: Validation of simulation results for Reedy Creek wetland of PO ₄ -P, and NO ₃ -N for both conditions with and without water exchange	112
Figure 30: Validation of simulation results for Reedy Creek wetland of Macrophyte Biomass, Zooplankton and Phytoplankton for both conditions with and without water exchange	113
Figure 31: Validation of simulation results for Pilby Creek wetland of PO ₄ -P, and NO ₃ -N for both conditions with and without water exchange	116
Figure 32: Validation of simulation results for Pilby Creek wetland of Macrophyte Biomass, Zooplankton and Phytoplankton for both conditions with and without water exchange	117
Figure 33: Sunnyside monitoring area	119
Figure 34: Validation of simulation results for Lock 6 wetland PO ₄ -P and NO ₃ -N, using non-calibrated wetland data	128
Figure 35: Validation of simulation results for Lock 6 wetland Macrophyte Biomass, Zooplankton and Phytoplankton biomass, using non-calibrated wetland data ..	129
Figure 36: Validation of simulation results for Reedy Creek wetland PO ₄ -P and NO ₃ -N, using non-calibrated wetland data	131
Figure 37: Validation of simulation results for Reedy Creek wetland Macrophyte Biomass, Zooplankton and Phytoplankton biomass, using non-calibrated wetland data.....	132

Regional Scale Modelling of the lower River Murray wetlands

Figure 38: Validation of simulation results for Pilby Creek wetland PO ₄ -P and NO ₃ -N, using non-calibrated wetland data	134
Figure 39: Validation of simulation results for Pilby Creek wetland Macrophyte Biomass, Zooplankton and Phytoplankton biomass, using non-calibrated wetland data.....	135
Figure 40: Lock 6 impacts on Nutrient concentration due to Turbidity reduction	143
Figure 41: Lock 6 impacts on Macrophyte, Zooplankton & Phytoplankton due to Turbidity reduction	144
Figure 42: Reedy Creek wetland impacts on Nutrient concentration due to irrigation drainage reduction	147
Figure 43: Reedy Creek wetland impacts on Macrophyte, Zooplankton & Phytoplankton due to irrigation drainage reduction	148
Figure 44: Reedy Creek wetland impacts on Nutrient concentration due to irrigation drainage reduction and 75% turbidity reduction	152
Figure 45: Reedy Creek wetland impacts on Macrophyte, Zooplankton & Phytoplankton due to irrigation drainage reduction and 75% turbidity reduction	153
Figure 46: Reedy Creek wetland impacts on Nutrient concentration due to 95 % irrigation drainage reduction at 25, 50 and 75% turbidity reduction	154
Figure 47: Reedy Creek wetland impacts on Macrophyte, Zooplankton & Phytoplankton due to 95% irrigation drainage reduction at 25, 50 and 75% turbidity reduction	155
Figure 48: Reedy Creek wetland PO ₄ -P % reduction in outflow	156
Figure 49: Reedy Creek wetland NO ₃ -N % reduction in outflow.....	156
Figure 50: Reedy Creek wetland Phytoplankton % reduction in outflow	157
Figure 51: Cumulative retention- category 3 wetlands	165
Figure 52: PO ₄ -P Concentration Trends	168
Figure 53: Macrophyte Biomass Growth Trends.....	169
Figure 54: Phytoplankton Biomass Growth Trends.....	170
Figure 55: Zooplankton Biomass Growth Trends.....	171
Figure 56: NO ₃ -N Concentration Trends.....	172
Figure 57: Macrophyte Biomass (size of sphere, kg/m ³) plotted against Wetland Volume and Wetland Depth.....	175
Figure 58: Macrophyte Biomass vs. Wetland Depth	175

Regional Scale Modelling of the lower River Murray wetlands

Figure 59: Average Macrophyte Biomass (size of sphere, kg/m ³) plotted against Average Wetland Volume and Wetland Depth.....	176
Figure 60: Macrophyte Biomass vs. Wetland Volume	176
Figure 61: Average Macrophyte Biomass (size of sphere) Plotted against Average Wetland Volume and Wetland Depth range 1 – 2 m.....	178
Figure 62: Average PO ₄ -P (size of sphere) Plotted against Average Wetland Volume and Wetland Depth range 1 – 2 m.....	178
Figure 63: Average PO ₄ -P vs. Macrophyte Biomass at Wetland Depth range 1 – 2 m	179
Figure 64: Average NO ₃ -N (size of sphere) Plotted against Average Wetland Volume and Wetland Depth range 1 – 2 m.....	179
Figure 65: Average NO ₃ -N vs. Macrophyte Biomass at Wetland Depth range 1 – 2 m	180
Figure 66: Comparison of Macrophyte, Phytoplankton and Zooplankton Biomass for each category 3 wetland (Key to wetland numbers adapted from (Jensen <i>et al.</i> 1996), see list in Table 18 in Appendix C)	181
Figure 67: Nutrient uptake for full year wet vs. uptake for summer wet/winter dry .	184
Figure 68: Cumulative loading to category 4 wetlands.....	186
Figure 69: Macrophyte Growth Trends.....	187
Figure 70: Phytoplankton Growth Trends	188
Figure 71: Zooplankton Growth Trends.....	189
Figure 72: PO ₄ -P Trends.....	190
Figure 73: NO ₃ -N Trends	191
Figure 74: Data - Model Driving Variables; From Figure 9 in section 2.3	254
Figure 75: Data - Model Driving Variables; From Figure 9 in section 2.3	255
Figure 76: Data - Model Driving Variables; From Figure 9 in section 2.3	256
Figure 77: Time Series Irrigation Drainage ; From Figure 10 section 2.3.1	257
Figure 78: Time Series Irrigation Drainage; From Figure 10 section 2.3.1	258
Figure 79: Time Series Irrigation Drainage ; From Figure 10 in section 2.3.1	259
Figure 80: River Data; From Figure 11 in section 2.3.2	260
Figure 81: River Data; From Figure 11 in section 2.3.2	261
Figure 82: River Data; From Figure 11 in section 2.3.2	262

Tables

Table 1: Data Sources, Type & Monitoring Frequency	64
Table 2: Wetland Morphology	76
Table 3: Calibration of inflow data for the 5-wetland categories	99
Table 4: Non calibrated validation of inflow data for 3 wetland categories	126
Table 5: Assessment summary of wetlands realistic simulation	139
Table 6: Lock 6 wetland Percentage Outflow Reduction.....	142
Table 7: Reedy Creek wetland Percentage Inflow reduction vs. Percentage Outflow Reduction	149
Table 8: Assessment summary of wetlands management scenarios	162
Table 9: Impact, of category 3 wetland’s management, on river load per annum.....	192
Table 10: Impact, of category 3 wetland’s (depth range shallow <1m) management, on river load per annum	194
Table 11: Impact, of category 3 wetland’s (depth range medium 1-2m) management, on river load per annum	194
Table 12: Impact, of category 3 wetland’s (depth range deep >2m) management, on river load per annum.....	194
Table 13: Impact, of Lock 6 wetland management, on river load per annum	195
Table 14: Impact, of Lock 6 wetland management, summer wet winter dry, on river load per annum	195
Table 15: Impact, of category 4 wetland’s management, on river load per annum...	196
Table 16: Impact, of Reedy Creek wetland management, on river load per annum..	197
Table 17: Initial values	234
Table 18: Wetlands simulated as category 3 wetlands.....	263
Table 19: Wetlands simulated as category 4 wetlands.....	265
Table 20: Change in PO ₄ -P wetland loading and percentage outflow due to management; category 3 wetland scenarios.....	267
Table 21: Change in NO ₃ -N wetland loading and percentage outflow due to management; category 3 wetland scenarios.....	273
Table 22: Change in Phytoplankton wetland loading and percentage outflow due to management; category 3 wetland scenarios.....	279
Table 23: PO ₄ -P comparison between Full year wet versus Summer wet Winter dry for three selected wetlands; category 3 wetland scenarios	285

Regional Scale Modelling of the lower River Murray wetlands

Table 24: NO ₃ -N comparison between Full year wet versus Summer wet Winter dry for three selected wetlands; category 3 wetland scenarios	286
Table 25: Phytoplankton comparison between Full year wet versus Summer wet Winter dry for three selected wetlands; category 3 wetland scenarios.....	287
Table 26: Change in PO ₄ -P wetland loading and percentage in and outflow due to management; category 4 wetland scenarios.....	288
Table 27: Change in NO ₃ -N wetland loading and percentage in and outflow due to management; category 4 wetland scenarios.....	289
Table 28: Change in Phytoplankton wetland loading and percentage in and outflow due to management; category 4 wetland scenarios	290

Declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own work and to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material used for the award of another degree, or published or written by another person(s), except where appropriately referenced in the text. To the best of my knowledge and belief, this thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text.

I consent to a copy of my thesis, when deposited in the university Library, being made available for loan or photocopying.

Kjartan Tumi Bjornsson

Date 2007

Acknowledgements

This project used monitoring data from several sources. River flow data, which is collected at all locks, was obtained from the Murray Darling Basin Commission (MDBC). This flow data, which was included in the model, was collected at Locks 1 through to 8 (Figure 12 on page 65). The River Murray nutrient data was provided by the Department of Environment and Heritage of South Australia (DEH). This nutrient data was a collection of data originally sourced from the South Australian Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), the MDBC, and the South Australian Department of Water (SA Water). The river nutrient data monitoring points are at Lock 5, Mannum, and Murray Bridge. For simplicity in this report, all river data is referred to consistently as MDB river data. However, the contributions by the MDBC, DEH, EPA and SA water are gratefully acknowledged, as without their support this project would not have been possible.

Planning SA provided GIS data covering the wetlands (the South Australian Wetlands Atlas (Jensen *et al.* 1996)), Locks, and the River Murray. Wetland Care Australia provided the Wetlands Management Study report 1998 ((Nichols 1998)), which was used in obtaining wetland depth information. Solar radiation was obtained from the Bureau of Meteorology (BOM). Bartsch (1997) Marsh (1997) Wen (2002a) Wielen (nd) have collected a substantial quantity of water quality data for some wetlands of the lower River Murray, as well as irrigation drainage into affected wetlands and some river data at a site close to the wetlands for the same monitoring dates. Table 1 on page 64 describes the source and frequency of data collection. I thank them for their contribution of data.

To my supervisors, starting with my principal supervisor Friedrich Recknagel, I first thank for the initiative to develop this project. I would also like to thank him for his role in the supervision of the project and especially input in the thesis structure and making sure I finished. Bertram Ostendorf I thank for taking on a larger role in this project than anticipated, the input was invaluable. Megan Lewis I thank for the support and input particularly during the early stage of the project when I needed the assistance the most.

Regional Scale Modelling of the lower River Murray wetlands

Lydia Cetin I thank for the input through the Honours work. The effort invested in the WETMOD contributed greatly to my work.

Mardi van der Wielen I thank for the many discussions and ‘lessons’ on the lower River Murray wetland particulars.

I would particularly like to thank Leslie Jackowski for his reviewing of my thesis. You outperformed your role as a good friend. I thank you for helping me through a very difficult writing stage and for giving me the encouragement I needed.

I would also like to thank Bjorn Björnsson, Magnus Björnsson and Jason Bobbin for their role in reviewing sections of the thesis.

I would also like to thank the research group at the University of Maryland. Particularly Thomas Maxwell and Roelof Boumans for their assistance with the SME (Spatial Modeling Environment) during the early part of my project, although the project diverted from this course I thoroughly enjoyed the learning experience.

Without the finance provided by the SPIRT grant and the River Murray Catchment Water Management Board this project would never have existed. I am grateful for this financial assistance.

Last and by far not least I would like to thank Georgina Tate, for showing me what true patience and support is. The importance you have played can never be measured nor expressed adequately. It is now my turn to give you the same during your speciality training.

Abstract

Most of the lower River Murray and its floodplain wetlands are impacted upon by degradation caused by river regulation. Increasingly the restoration of these ecosystems and the river water quality has become a high priority for federal and state governments and associated departments and agencies. Public concern is adding to the pressures on these departments and agencies to restore these ecosystems and to sustainably maintain the river water quality.

The long term monitoring of floodplain wetlands has been limited, compounding the difficulties faced by managers and decision makers on assessing the potential outcome of restoration options. The role of this project in the broad scheme of restoration/rehabilitation is to contribute to the construction of a model capable of increasing managers and decision makers understanding, and build consensus of potential outcomes of management option. This model was to use available data.

The developed model, based on WETMOD developed by Cetin (2001), simulates wetland internal nutrient processes, phytoplankton, zooplankton and macrophyte biomass as well as the interaction (nutrient and phytoplankton exchange) between wetlands and the river. The model further simulates the potential impact management options have on the wetlands, and their nutrient retention capacity, and therefore their impact on the river nutrient load.

Due to the limitation of data, wetlands were considered in categories for which data was available. Of these two had sufficient data to develop, calibrate and validate the model. Management scenarios for these two wetlands were developed. These scenarios included, the impact of returning a degraded wetland in a turbid state to a rehabilitated clear state, and the impact the removal of nutrient from irrigation drainage inflows has on wetland nutrient retention, and consequent input to the river.

Scenarios of the cumulative impact of the management of multiple wetlands were developed based on using these two wetlands, for which adequate data was available, as “exemplar” wetlands, i.e. data from these wetlands were substituted for other similar wetlands (those identified as belonging to the same category). The model scenarios of these multiple wetlands provide some insight into the potential response

Regional Scale Modelling of the lower River Murray wetlands

management may have on individual wetlands, the cumulative impact on river nutrient load and how wetland morphology may relate to management considerations.

The model is restricted by data availability and consequently the outputs. Further, some limitations identified during the development of the model need to be addressed before it can be applied for management purposes. However, the model and methods provide a guide by which monitoring efforts can assist in developing future modelling assessments and gain a greater insight not only at the monitoring site but also on a landscape scale.