

HYDROLOGY OF THE UPPER HUNTER CATCHMENT

by

Falguni Biswas

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in
The Fenner School of Environment and Society
of the Australian National University

October 2010



CANDIDATE'S DECLARATION

This thesis contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in any university. To the best of the author's knowledge, it contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference is made in the text.

Falguni Biswas

Date:20/10/2010

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my heartiest gratitude to my supervisor Professor Ian White and co-supervisors Dr Ben Macdonald and Dr Sara Beavis at the Fenner School of Environment and Society (FESS, formerly Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies, CRES), Australian National University. Thanks Ian for all of your kind efforts, support, continual guidance and encouragement throughout my PhD. Big thanks to Dr Ben Macdonald (CSIRO and formerly the Fenner School) for his guidance, discussion, advice from beginning to end of my PhD.

I would like to acknowledge Australian Research Council (ARC) for the linkage Grant LP0560743 and NSW Department of Environment and Climate Change, Department of Environment & Water and Energy and the Hunter Central River Catchment Management Authority for further fund and valuable data.

I would also like to thank to the other academic staffs of FESS specially Professor Michael Hutchinson, Lachlan Newham, John Stein, Janet Stein, Sue Holzkecht, Jenny Kesteven for their valuable advices and support. Thanks also go to Barry Croke and Ross Brodie of Bureau of Rural Science for the support of IHACRES model and hydrographic separation technique respectively. Big thanks to Damian Jellett for his coding of water balance model.

Thanks to David Hoey, John Paul Williams and Anthony Belcher of Department of Natural Resources at Newcastle who provided valuable support and supplied groundwater level data.

Thanks go to my friends and my fellow PhD students at FESS for their invaluable support.

I am indebted to my parents for their moral support, my husband for vital ongoing support and my sons for making me pleasant at all time.

ABSTRACT

One of the ten objectives of the 2004 Australian National Water Initiative is to manage surface and groundwater as a single resource. In order to do that it is necessary to understand the interactions between surface and groundwater, as well as the impacts of water abstraction, land use change and climate variability. In Australia, not just the quantity of water, but also its quality and particularly its salinity are critically important. Some of the difficulties facing agencies in managing surface and groundwater as a single resource are the extreme variability of climate in Australia, the lack of long-term streamflow and groundwater level data sets and the very limited temporal records on water quality.

This thesis presents a study of surface and groundwater interaction and salinity in a selected catchment in the Hunter Valley in mid New South Wales, eastern Australia, where data records are limited and incomplete. The hypotheses tested in this work are that (1) salinity discharge in the Hunter is largely determined by mineral weathering and deep groundwater inflows and (2) a simple parameter-efficient coupled surface and groundwater model can accurately predict groundwater and streamflow behaviour over monthly time scale and is useful in determining surface –groundwater interactions.

In the Hunter, water is a fundamentally important for power generation, coal mining, horticulture, irrigation, stock production and community water supplies. The Hunter however has significant salinity issues, particularly in groundwater. Because of this it is the location of the world's first salinity trading scheme. The site chosen here for detailed study is Wybong Creek, a left bank tributary on the Goulburn River which is a right bank tributary of the Hunter River. As a component of the water reform process in Australia, NSW has been developing water sharing plans designed to return a better share of water to the environment. These plans in general have been based on limited information about surface and groundwater interaction and have largely ignored water quality altogether.

To facilitate better management, this thesis aims to fill in the data sets, investigate impacts of land use change and climate variability, determine water and salt balance, solute sources and identify the interactions between surface and groundwater within the catchments using an improved, parameter efficient monthly, conceptual model. The long-term changes in rainfall and runoff are analysed for identifying whether the long-

term declines in yield are due to 50 year drought-dominated cycles or to changes in land use. Stream discharge and electrical conductivity data are analysed for identifying salinity distribution and discharge. The annual salt load is estimated and the salt balance is also investigated by using an Output/Input (O/I) ratio. The specific salt yield of the catchment for the period 1993 to 2008 was estimated to be 17 tonnes km⁻² year⁻¹ and the annual salt O/I ratio was 5.5 showing that the catchment is not in equilibrium.

Hydrogeochemistry and water isotopes data are employed to identify the solute sources in the catchment. It was found that mineral weathering originated from basalt and sandstone in the upper catchment, with weathering fractions relative to cyclic salt being as high as 80%. Cyclic salt is not an end member of the mixing curve in the catchment but marine origin water is. In the lower catchment, marine-origin groundwater and possibly halite dissolution from the Permian coal seams dominates the stream and groundwater salinity.

The Q-lag method was used to examine stream and groundwater interaction. Comparisons between streamflow percentiles (Q90 percentile flow) and relevant rainfall percentile (7dayR10 rainfall percentile) curve gave reasonable correlations ($r_m > 0.7$) between the shifted flow percentile curves and the reference rainfall percentile curve. These demonstrate that Wybong streamflow is predominantly a stream interacting with the deep groundwater system with a 206 days lag between rainfall and flow. Baseflow separation analysis was used to examine the base flow system in the catchment. Baseflow indices ranged from 0.22 in 2007 to 0.83 in 1982 with the average baseflow index from 1972 to 2000 of 0.53.

The conceptual Xiong and Guo (XG) model was examined for its ability to predict streamflow and groundwater levels. The model performed well, under calibration. R-squared values of calibration are more than 80% for spatially interpolated monthly rainfall and pan evaporation data which is a good fit between observed and predicted values. From 1990 to 2000, up to 42% of the discharge flowing from the catchments each month is groundwater flow. However, the model parameter values needed to fit the data were physically unrealistic and it was concluded that the model has limited applicability in situations with very low stream flows. Modification of the model to include a physically more realistic evaporation component did not improve the model fit or the parameter values. Ungauged water extraction from the catchment during the 2000 to 2008 could have contributed to the poor performance of the model.

As with most catchments, there are significant problems in attempting to test the hypotheses of this thesis due to the limited and incomplete data on stream flow and stream salinity. In the case of stream salinity, despite the fact that salinity was recognised as a major issue in the Hunter more than six decades ago, there is an extremely short continuous salinity record. This limitation was compounded by the severe drought years that extended for much of the salinity record. It has been shown here that catchments in eastern Australia are subject to approximately 50 year cycles of flood- and drought-dominated regimes. The relevance of a less than two decade salinity record to such long cycles is problematic. In the upper catchment, the hydro and geochemistry results here unequivocally show that weathering products make up the major portion of the stream salt load. So the results here have verified the first hypothesis above but the difficulties with fitting the simple conceptual modelled to the rejection of the second hypothesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Candidate's Declaration.....	2
Acknowledgements	3
Abstract	4
Table of Contents.....	7
List of Figures.....	14
List of Tables.....	24
Chapter 1 Introduction	27
1.1 Background.....	27
1.2 Hypothesis.....	29
1.3 Aim and Objectives.....	30
1.4 Thesis Structure.....	30
Chapter 2 Study Site Description.....	33
2.1 Hunter Valley	33
2.2 Salinity Problem in Hunter Region.....	34
2.3 Hunter Salinity Trading Scheme.....	36
2.4. Location of the Study Area.....	36
2.5. Geology of the Catchment.....	38
2.6 Soils of the Catchment.....	40
2.7. Climate.....	43
2.8. Vegetation.....	44
2.9. Land use.....	45
2.10 Surface Water System.....	45
2.10.1 Flow Characteristics.....	46
2.10.2 Stream Water Quality.....	47
2.11 Groundwater system.....	48
2.11.1 Alluvial aquifers.....	48
2.11.2 Hard rock aquifers.....	48
2.11.3 Weathered zone or regolith.....	49

2.12 Water Sharing Plan for Wybong Catchment.....	50
2.13 Wollombi Brook Study Area overview	52
2.13.1 Climate.....	54
2.13.2 Stream Characteristics.....	56
2.13.3 Groundwater System.....	56
2.14 Goulburn River Catchment Description.....	56
2.14.1 Climate.....	57
2.15 Concluding Remarks	58
Chapter 3 Climate Characteristics and Water Yield.....	60
3.1 Introduction.....	60
3.2 Methods.....	61
3.2.1 Spatial Data.....	61
3.2.2. Climate Data.....	61
3.2.2.1 Rainfall.....	61
3.2.2.2 Pan Evaporation.....	61
3.2.2.3 Spatial Thin-Plate Smoothing Spline Interpolation of Data.....	62
3.2.2.4 Extracted Climate Data within the Catchment Boundary	63
3.2.3 Interpolated Rainfall and Evaporation.....	69
3.2.4. Drought Analysis.....	71
3.2.5 Stream Flow.....	73
3.2.5.1 Filling Missing Stream Flow.....	73
3.2.5.2 Annual Catchment Runoff and Runoff Coefficient.....	76
3.2.5.3 Cumulative Specific yield and Rainfall.....	76
3.2.5.4 Percentile Ranking of Runoff	77
3.2.5.5 Catchment Yield	77
3.2.5.6 Water Abstraction from the Catchment	77
3.2.5.7 Southern Oscillation Index (SOI).....	78
3.3. Results and Discussion.....	79
3.3. 1 Climate of the Study Area.....	79

3.3.1.1 Rainfall.....	79
3.3.1.2 Evaporation.....	81
3.3.1.3 Temperature.....	83
3.3.2 Long term Changes in Rainfall	84
3.3.3 Analysis of Droughts.....	86
3.3.4 Southern Oscillation Index (SOI) and Rainfall in Wybong.....	89
3.3.5 Seasonality of Rainfall.....	91
3.3.6. Impact on Catchment Yield	95
3.3.7 Comparison of Percentile Rankings of Runoff and Rainfall.....	99
3.4 Conclusion.....	100
Chapter 4 Salinity Discharge and Salt Balance in Wybong Catchment	103
4.1. Background on Salinity Output/Input Ratios.....	103
4.2. Methods.....	105
4.2.1 Stream Salt Load.....	105
4.2.2 Stream Flow and Specific Discharge.....	105
4.2.3 Filling Missing Flow data.....	105
4.2.4 Measured Stream EC.....	106
4.2.5 Estimation of Total Dissolved Salt Concentration from EC.....	106
4.2.6 Filling Missing Salt Load Data.....	107
4.2.7 Rainfall and Salt Inputs to the Catchment	107
4.2.7.1 Estimating the salt deposition rate in the Wybong Catchment.....	108
4.2.7.2 Salt deposited in rainfall.....	108
4.2.7.3 Dry deposition of salt.....	109
4.2.7.4 Total annual salt deposited in the catchment.....	110
4.2.8 Catchment Discharge of Water and salt.....	110
4.2.9 Annual Catchment Runoff Coefficient and Salt Output/Inputs Ratios.....	111
4.2.10 Flow and EC probability.....	111
4.2.11 Major Ions in Surface Water	111
4.2.12 Baseload Salt Flux.....	112

4.3. Results and Discussion.....	113
4.3.1 Fitting Flow Data to Fill Missing Values.....	113
4.3.2 Relationship between TDS and EC.....	115
4.3.3 Fitting Salt Load Data to Fill Missing EC Values.....	116
4.3.4 Relationship between Stream flow and EC	117
4.3.5 Cumulative Flow and Salt Load in the Wybong Catchment.....	119
4.3.6. Comparison of Streamflow and EC Exceedance.....	120
4.3.7 Catchment Salt Balances.....	122
4.3.8 Baseload salt flux to the stream.....	125
4.5 Conclusion.....	127
Chapter 5 Sources of Salinity in the Wybong Catchment.....	128
5.1 Introduction.....	128
5.2 Methods.....	129
5.2.1 Groundwater and surface water sampling and analysis.....	129
5.2.2 Ion Ratios as Indicators of Catchment Weathering Processes.....	134
5.2.3 Reactions Associated with the Weathering Processes.....	134
5.2.4.1 Estimating the Fraction of Stream Salt load due to Mineral Weathering (White <i>et al.</i> , 2009)	135
5.2.4.2 Estimating Weathering Fraction in Areas with Cyclic Salt.....	136
5.2.4.3 Estimating Weathering Fraction in Areas with Marine Origin Waters ..	137
5.3 Results and Discussion.....	137
5.3.1. EC and pH in surface and ground water.....	137
5.3.2. Major ion chemistry in surface and ground water.....	140
5.3.3. Ion ratios of stream and groundwater	146
5.3.4 Sources of Ca ²⁺ , Mg ²⁺ in Stream and Groundwater.....	155
5.3.5 Sources of Na ⁺ , Ca ²⁺ , HCO ₃ ⁻ and SiO ₂ in Stream and Groundwater.....	158
5.3.6 Calcium and Strontium in Stream and Groundwater.....	161
5.3.7 Na/Cl ratios of stream and Groundwater.....	169
5.3.8 Cl/Br ratios of stream and groundwater.....	171

5.3.9 Stable isotope composition of groundwater and surface water.....	173
5.3.10 Weathering Fractions in Surface and Groundwater	175
5.4 Conclusion.....	182
Chapter 6 Surface and Groundwater Interactions.....	185
6.1 Overview.....	185
6.2 Methods and Data Sources.....	186
6.2.1 Baseflow Separation Methods.....	188
6.2.2 Streamflow Hydrograph Analysis.....	190
6.2.3 Frequency Analysis method.....	192
6.3 Results and Discussion.....	193
6.3.1 Stream Height and Water Table Elevation.....	193
6.3.2 Streamflow Hydrograph Separations.....	196
6.3.3 Frequency Analysis	198
6.3.3.1 Frequency Analysis for Wybong.....	198
6.3.3.2 Land Use Impacts	205
6.3.3.3 Gaining stream – Wollombi Brook at Workworth.....	208
6.3.3.4 Gaining stream – Goulburn River at Coggan.....	212
6.4 Conclusion.....	218
Chapter 7 Model for Groundwater Dynamics.....	221
7.1 Overview.....	221
7.2 Water Balance Model.....	223
7.3 Methods.....	224
7.3.1 Groundwater Level.....	225
7.3.1.1 Data Preparation.....	229
7.3.2 Stream flow.....	230
7.3.3 Rainfall and Pan Evaporation.....	234
7.3.4 Spatial Thin-Plate Smoothing Spline interpolation.....	235
7.4 The XG Model for Predicting Streamflow and Groundwater Level	236
7.4.1 XG Model.....	237

7.4.2 Extensions to the XG Model.....	238
7.4.3 Improvements of the XG Monthly Streamflow Model.....	239
7.4.4 Stream Flow Prediction.....	242
7.5 Summary of the Modified XG Model.....	242
Chapter 8 Model Testing for Streamflow and Groundwater Level.....	243
8.1 Parameter Estimation.....	243
8.2 Goodness-of-fit.....	243
8.3 Automatic Calibration Procedure.....	245
8.4 Model Testing Methods.....	246
8.5 Computer Program and Model Testing.....	248
8.6.1 Model Calibration.....	249
8.6.2 Determination of Initial Values and Parameter Starting Values.....	249
8.6.3 Bounds on Parameter Estimates.....	250
8.6.4 Values of the Cross-Validation Root mean Square Error	250
8.7 Model Testing Results.....	250
8.7.1 Groundwater Level Prediction.....	250
8.7.1.2 Statistical Test for Groundwater Residual.....	253
8.7.1.3 Interpretation of parameter values	256
8.7.2 Model Application.....	260
8.7.2.1 Temporal and Spatial Scale.....	258
8.7.2.2 Prediction of Historic Groundwater Level.....	261
8.7.2.3 Stream Flow Prediction.....	262
8.7.2.3.1 Statistical Test of Streamflow Residual.....	267
8.7.2.4 Stream Flow and Groundwater Level Prediction.....	270
8.7.2.5 Model Testing Results for Wollombi Brook.....	271
8.7.3 Outcomes of the Improved XG Model.....	275
8.8 Summary of Findings.....	278
Chapter 9 Conclusion.....	280
9.1 Introduction.....	280

9.2 Climate Variability and Water Yield.....280

9.3 Salinity Dynamic and Salt Balances.....282

9.4 Sources and Trends in Salinity.....283

9.5 Surface and Groundwater Connectivity.....286

9.6 Predicting Stream Flow and Groundwater Dynamics287

9.7 Conclusions.....289

9.8 Recommendations for Future Research.....291

References292

Appendices317

FIGURES

Figure 2.1	Location of the Wybong catchment and Wollombi Brook in Hunter Valley.....	34
Figure 2.2	Satellite Image of the Hunter Valley with Wybong catchment and Wollombi. Source: Google Earth.....	35
Figure 2.3	Satellite Image of the Wybong Catchment. Source: Google Earth.....	37
Figure 2.4	Geological map in the Wybong catchment Source: DNR 2006.....	39
Figure 2.5	Soil map in the Wybong catchment.....	41
Figure 2.6	Elevation Profile along Wybong Creek showing the different geomorphic categories in relation to the elevation.....	46
Figure 2.7	Map of the Wollombi Brook Catchment (Source: Pritchard, 2005).....	53
Figure 2.8	Satellite Image of the Wollombi Brook Catchment. Source: Google Earth.....	54
Figure 2.9	Relationship between (a) mean monthly rainfalls (1973 to 2004) and evaporation (1972 to 2002) (b) mean monthly rainfalls (1889 to 2002) and potential evaporation (1972 to 2002) at Wollombi Brook taken from Pritchard (2005).....	55
Figure 2.10	Regional map showing the location of the Goulburn River.....	57
Figure 3.1	Location of Bunnan, Denman and Scone rain gauge in Hunter region...	62
Figure 3.2a	Monthly rainfall surface for Eastern NSW for January 2000.....	64
Figure 3.2b	Monthly rainfall surface for January 2000 for the Hunter.....	65
Figure 3.2c	Monthly rainfall surface for July 2000 for the Hunter region.....	66
Figure 3.3a	Monthly evaporation surface for Eastern NSW for January 2000	67
Figure 3.3b	Monthly evaporation surface for January 2000 for Hunter region.....	68
Figure 3.3c	Monthly evaporation surface for July 2000 for Hunter region.....	69
Figure 3.4	Relationship between monthly catchment-weighted rainfall and monthly Bunnan (station #61089) rainfall.....	70
Figure 3.5	Relationship between monthly aerial averaged catchment pan evaporation and Scone (station #61089) pan evaporation.....	70
Figure 3.6	DEM location of Wybong stream gauge (station #210040) Bunnan rain gauge (station #61007).....	74

Figure 3.7	Relationship between Wybong (#210040) runoff and Coggan (#210006) runoff for the July.....	76
Figure 3.8	Annual rainfall at (a) Bunnan (Station # 61007), (b) Denman (Station # 61016) and (c) Scone (Station # 61089) from 1900 to 2008.....	80
Figure 3.9	Double mass curve for Bunnan and Denman rainfall data from 1903 to 2008.....	81
Figure 3.10	Relationship between mean monthly rainfalls at Bunnan (Station # 61007) and mean monthly evapotranspiration at Scone (Station # 61089) from 1972 to 2008.....	83
Figure 3.11	Mean monthly maximum and minimum temperature at Scone (Station # 61089) data from 1955 to 2008.....	84
Figure 3.12	Annual and 5 year running mean rainfall from 1903 to 2008.....	85
Figure 3.13	Cumulative residual spatially interpolated rainfalls from 1903 to 2008.....	85
Figure 3.14	Percentile rankings of rainfall for Wybong catchment Rankings below 10% corresponds to major droughts (a) for 1903 to 2008 (b) for 1955 to 2008.....	87
Figure 3.15	Mean annual SOI from 1900 to 2007 (data from National Climate Centre of the Australian BOM)	90
Figure 3.16	Relationship between Mean annual SOI and annual rainfall from 1903 to 2008.....	91
Figure 3.17	Mean monthly rainfall from 1903 to 2008.....	92
Figure 3.18	Mean seasonal rainfall from 1903 to 2008.....	93
Figure 3.19a	5-year mean seasonal rainfall trends and cumulative residual from 1903 to 2008 (a) summer (b) autumn.....	94
Figure 3.19	5-year mean seasonal rainfall trends cumulative residual from 1903 to 2008 (c) winter (d) spring.....	95
Figure 3.20	Annual runoff coefficient from 1955 to 2008.....	96
Figure 3.21	Relationship between cumulative rainfall and cumulative runoff from 1955 to 2008.....	97

Figure 3.22	Relation between annual runoff and annual rainfall from 1955 to 2008, Black line all data, red line the 7 Significant 12 month meteorological droughts from Table 3.5b, termed dry years (<10% percentile ranked).	98
Figure 3.23	Relation between the percentile rankings of annual runoff and annual rainfall from 1955 to 2008.....	99
Figure 3.24	Ratio of annual percentile rankings of runoff to rainfall as a function of the year of ranking data from 1955 to 2008.....	100
Figure 4.1	Surface (round) and groundwater (triangular) sampling sites in Wybong catchment.....	112
Figure 4.2	Relationship between model and measured streamflow during 2002-2003.....	114
Figure 4.3	Cumulative measured and modelled streamflow during January 2002 to December 2003.....	114
Figure 4.4	Relationship between TDS and EC for the Wybong catchment	115
Figure 4.5	Relationship between daily salt load and daily stream flow, at Wybong catchment	117
Figure 4.6	Mean daily stream EC and streamflow, Q from 1993 to 2008.....	118
Figure 4.7	Relationship between mean daily stream EC and streamflow, Q, in the Wybong catchment from 1993 to 2008.....	118
Figure 4.8	Relationship between cumulative flow and salt load for Wybong for the period 1993-2008.....	120
Figure 4.9	Relationship between streamflow and exceedence	121
Figure 4.10	Relationship between EC and exceedence.....	122
Figure 4.11	Relationship between Output input ratio and runoff coefficient.....	125
Figure 5.1	Surface (round) and groundwater (triangular) sampling sites in Wybong catchment.....	130
Figure 5.2	The relationship between EC and distance downstream from the head of the river (a) during 2006 sampling periods and (b) during 2008 sampling periods.....	139

- Figure 5.3** Piper diagrams for stream chemistry in the Wybong catchment data during (a) July 2006-June 2007 (b) July 2007-July 2008 sampling periods.....141
- Figure 5.4** Piper diagrams for ground water chemistry in the Wybong catchment data during (a) July 2006-June 2007 and (b) July 2008 sampling periods.....142
- Figure 5.5** The relationship between GPS elevation, geological unit and surface and ground water EC during 2006 sampling periods.....143
- Figure 5.6** Relation between ion ratios versus the reciprocal chloride concentration for surface water data during (a) July 2006 (b) July 2007-July 2008 sampling periods.....148
- Figure 5.7** Relation between ion ratios versus the reciprocal chloride concentration for surface water data during (a) July 2006 (b) July 2008 sampling periods.....149
- Figure 5.8a** Profiles of ion ratios of mineral weathering products downstream from the head of the river for the July 2006 sampling period.....150
- Figure 5.8b** Profiles of ion ratios of mineral weathering products downstream from the head of the river for the July 2007-July 2008 sampling period.....151
- Figure 5.9** The relationship between (a) $\text{Na}/(\text{Ca}+\text{Na})$ vs TDS (b) $\text{Na}/(\text{Mg}+\text{Na})$ vs TDS and (c) $\text{Cl}/(\text{Cl}+\text{HCO}_3)$ vs TDS for groundwater during July 2006 sampling.....153
- Figure 5.10** Major ion (a) sodium versus bicarbonate (b) Calcium versus bicarbonate (c) magnesium versus bicarbonate.....154
- Figure 5.11** Relationship between $\text{Ca} + \text{Mg}$ concentrations as a function of $[\text{HCO}_3]$ of the surface water data during (a) July 2006,(b) June 2007 and (c) July 2008 sampling periods.....156
- Figure 5.11** Relationship between $\text{Ca} + \text{Mg}$ as a function of HCO_3 , of the groundwater data during (d) July 2006 and (e) June 2007 and (f) July 2008 sampling periods.....157
- Figure 5.12** Relationship between Na/Ca vs $\text{HCO}_3/\text{SiO}_2$, of surface water in Wybong Creek during (a) July 2006, (b) June 2007 and (c) July 2008 sampling periods. Values for mountain streams are from Jacobsen (2002)..... 159

- Figure 5.12** Relationship between Na/Ca vs $\text{HCO}_3/\text{SiO}_2$, of the groundwater samples during (d) July 2006, (e) June 2007 and (f) July 2008 sampling periods. Values for mountain streams are from Jacobsen (2002).....160
- Figure 5.13** Relationship between Ca/Sr vs Distance downstream for stream water during (a) 2006, (b) 2007 and (c) 2008 sampling periods.....162
- Figure 5.14** Relationship between [Ca/Sr] and 1/[Cl] for stream water during (a) 2006, (b) 2007 and (c) 2008 sampling periods. Seawater values are from Hem (1992).....163
- Figure 5.14** Relationship between Ca/Sr vs 1/Cl for groundwater during (d) 2006, (e) 2007 and (f) 2008 sampling periods. Seawater values are from Hem (1992).....164
- Figure 5.15** Relationship between EC(mS/cm) vs Groundwater depth for (a) 2006, (b) 2007 and (c) 2008 sampling periods.....166
- Figure 5.16** Relationship between Ca/Sr vs Groundwater depth during (a) 2006, (b) 2007 and (c) 2008 sampling periods.....167
- Figure 5.17** Relationship between Ca/Sr vs 1/Cl of surface and groundwater Samples during July (a) 2006, (b) 2007 and (c) 2008 sampling periods.....168
- Figure 5.18** Relationship between Cl and Na of the surface and ground waters data during (a) July 2006 and (b) July 2007-July 2008 sampling periods...170
- Figure 5.19** Relationship between Na/Cl and Cl, and of the surface and ground waters data during (a) July 2006 and (b) July 2007-July 2008 sampling periods.....171
- Figure 5.20** Relationship between Cl/Br and Cl, of the surface and groundwater data during (a) June 2007 and (b) July 2007-July 2008 sampling periods...172
- Figure 5.21** Relationship between Na/Cl and Cl/Br of the surface and groundwater data during June 2007sampling periods.....173
- Figure 5.22** Stable isotope relations for rainwater, stream water and alluvial and deeper groundwater in the Wybong Creek catchment data during 2005 sampling periods.....174
- Figure 6.1** Location of Wybong, Warkworth and Coggan streamflow gauge in the Hunter catchment.....187
- Figure 6.2** Stream flow records for the Wybong catchment (station#210040) from 1972 to 2000.....190

- Figure 6.3** Relationship between groundwater level and stream height for the bore
(a) #080434(standard deviation=0.21m)(b) #080946 (standard deviation=0.34m) (c) #080948 (standard deviation=0.173m).....194
- Figure 6.3** Relationship between groundwater level and stream height for the bore
(d) GW080945 (e) GW080947 (f) GW080944195
- Figure 6.4** Baseflow separation of Wybong for 2002 calendar year using recursive filter.....196
- Figure 6.5** Daily rainfall percentile for Bunnan (station #61007) data from 1972-2000.....198
- Figure 6.6** Daily discharges for various percentiles for the Wybong stream (station #210040) compared with 7dayR10 percentile rainfall for Bunnan (station #61007) (a) low flow Q50-Q95 (b) high flow Q5-Q50.....199
- Figure 6.7** Comparison of various daily stream flow percentiles for Wybong stream gauge (station #210040) with moving 7-day average of daily rainfall percentile (R10) for Bunnan rainfall (station #61007).....201
- Figure 6.7** Comparison of various daily stream flow percentiles for Wybong stream gauge (station #210040) with moving 7-day average of daily rainfall percentile (R5) for Bunnan rainfall (station #61007).....202
- Figure 6.8** Derivation of time lag between Wybong stream flow Q90 and Bunnan rainfall 7dayR10 using cross-correlation r_m . The calculated time lag is the day shift that gives the maximum cross correlation r_m , in the case of 206 days during 1972-2000203
- Figure 6.9** Relation between lag and flow percentiles for Wybong stream flow percentiles (Q_x) and Bunnan rainfall 7R10 percentile (a) during 1972-2000 (b) during 1955-2008.....203
- Figure 6.10** Relationship between maximum cross correlation r_m and flow percentiles for Wybong stream flow percentiles (Q_x) and Bunnan rainfall 7R10 percentile (a) during 1972-2000 (b) during 1955-2008204
- Figure 6.11** Stream flow percentile ratios for Wybong stream gauge compared with Bunnan 7R10 data from 1972-2000.....204
- Figure 6.12** Daily percentile analysis showing relationship between lag and streamflow percentiles for Wybong using (a) pre-drought and minor

- water uses period of 1972–2000 and a post-drought and major water uses period of 1979– 2007 and **(b)** dry and wet periods.....206
- Figure 6.13** Comparison of pre and post **(a)** Q90 flow percentiles and 7 day R10 rainfall percentiles **(b)** Q90/Q10 flow percentiles and 7 day R10 rainfall percentiles for Wybong.....207
- Figure 6.14** Stream flow percentile ratios for Wybong stream gauge compared with Bunnan 7R10 data from 1979-2007.....208
- Figure 6.15** Comparison of various daily stream flow percentiles for Workworth stream gauge (station #210004) with moving 7-day average of daily rainfall percentile for Cessnock rainfall (station #61242)209
- Figure 6.16** Determination of time lag with the maximum cross-correlation between Workworth stream Q90 and Cessnock rainfall 7R10 during 1958 to 2007210
- Figure 6.17** Relation between lag and flow percentiles for the Workworth stream flow percentiles Q_x and Cessnock rainfall 7R10 percentile during 1958 to 2007..... 211
- Figure 6.18** Relationship between maximum cross correlation r_m and flow percentiles for Workworth stream flow percentiles Q_x and Cessnock rainfall 7R10 percentile.....211
- Figure 6.19** Stream flow percentile ratios for Workworth stream gauge compared with Cessnock rainfall 7R10 during 1958 to 2007.....211
- Figure 6.20** Comparison of various daily stream flow percentiles for Coggan stream gauge (station #210006) with moving 7-day average of daily rainfall percentile for Denman rainfall (station #61007) during 1913 to 2007..213
- Figure 6.21** Relation between lag and flow percentiles (Coggan stream flow percentiles Q_x and Denman rainfall 7R10 percentile) during 1913 to 2007.....214
- Figure 6.22** Relationship between maximum cross correlation r_m and flow percentiles (Coggan stream flow percentiles Q_x and Denman rainfall 7R10 percentile)214
- Figure 6.23** Stream flow percentile ratios Q90/Q50 for Coggan stream gauge compared with Denman rainfall 7R10 during 1913 to 2007214

- Figure 6.24** (a) Comparison of various daily stream flow percentiles (b) Lag days and (c) r_m for Coggan stream gauge (station #210006) with moving 7-day average of daily rainfall percentile for Denman rainfall (station #61007) during the drier period 1913 to 1947.....215
- Figure 6.25** (a) Comparison of various daily stream flow percentiles (b) Lag days and (c) r_m for Coggan stream gauge (station #210006) with moving 7-day average of daily rainfall percentile for Denman rainfall (station #61007) during wetter period 1948 to 1999.....216
- Figure 6.26** (a) Comparison of various daily stream flow percentiles (b) Lag days and (c) r_m for Coggan stream gauge (station #210006) with moving 7-day average of daily rainfall percentile for Denman rainfall (station #61007) during 1973 to 2007.....217
- Figure 6.27** Cross-correlation analysis stream flow percentiles (Q_x) and rainfall 7R10 percentile during 1972 to 2000 for Wybong, Coggan and Wollombi (a) relationship between lag and flow percentiles (b) relationship between maximum cross correlation (r_m) and flow percentiles.....218
- Figure 7.1** The portioning of precipitation, P , at the ground surface into runoff, Q , evapotranspiration, E and change in the soil moisture store, ΔS (Jellett, 2005).....224
- Figure 7.2** Shows the pressure transducer groundwater level gauge in a bore. Source: Department of Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources 225
- Figure 7.3a** Elevation map of the Wybong catchment with bore locations marked.....227
- Figure 7.3b** Elevation map of the Wollombi Brook with stream gauge and bore locations marked.....228
- Figure 7.4** Monthly values of a. Groundwater level for the Wybong Road bore (#080434), b. spatially averaged catchment monthly rainfall and c. spatially averaged catchment pan evaporation data231
- Figure 7.5** Location of the Wybong stream gauge (station #210040) and Pressure sensors that measure stream height.....232

Figure 7.6	Monthly values of a. Streamflow for Wybong stream gauge (#210040), b. spatially averaged catchment monthly rainfall and c. spatially averaged catchment monthly pan evaporation data233
Figure 7.7	The correlation between monthly spatially averaged rainfall from Bunnan gauge station #61007 and pan evaporation from Scone gauge station #61089 from 1972 to 2008.....235
Figure 7.8	Conceptual model used in the modify XG model, P=Precipitation, E=Evapotranspiration, Q = Runoff, ΔS = Unsaturated Soil layer, ΔS_s = Saturated Soil layer and G =Groundwater level (Jellett, 2005).....236
Figure 8.1	Split-sample validation configurations of calibration and validation periods for dependent data.....247
Figure 8.2	<i>hv</i> -block cross-validation configurations of calibration, buffer and validation periods for dependent data.....247
Figure 8.3	Measured and predicted groundwater level data from 2003-2008 for bore Wybong Road bore (#0809434) with <i>hv</i> -blocks cross-validation, R^2 (Cal) =0.83252
Figure 8.4	Histogram of the residuals of the XGR model for the Wybong Road bore (#080434).....254
Figure 8.5	Normal QQ-plot of the residuals of the XG model for the Wybong Road bore (#080434).....254
Figure 8.6	Partial autocorrelation of the residual of the XGR model for the Wybong Road bore.....255
Figure 8.7	Plot of the residual versus predicted groundwater levels using the XGR model for the Wybong Road bore (#080434).....256
Figure 8.8	a. Modelled actual evapotranspiration using the XGR model for bore #80434, b. measured rainfall and c. measured pan evaporation.....259
Figure 8.9	Measured groundwater level and estimated change in soil moisture storage using the XGR model for bore # 80434.....260
Figure 8.10	Historic groundwater level predicted for Wybong Road bore (#080434) using the XGR model.....262

- Figure 8.11** Measured and predicted stream flow data from 1990-2000 for gauge #210040 using the hv-blocks cross-validation of R^2 (Cal) = 0.75263
- Figure 8.12** The cumulative measured streamflow volume versus the cumulative predicted streamflow volume of data from 1990-2000265
- Figure 8.13** The cumulative groundwater flow out of the catchment versus time data from 1990-2000.....265
- Figure 8.14** Measured and calculated stream flow data from 2000-2008266
- Figure 8.15** Histogram of the residuals of the XG model for the Wybong streamflow (#210040).....268
- Figure 8.16** Normal QQ-plot of the residuals of the XG model for the Wybong streamflow.....268
- Figure 8.17** Partial autocorrelation of the residual of the XG model for the Wybong streamflow (#210040).....269
- Figure 8.18** Plot of the residual versus predicted streamflow using the XG model for the Wybong streamflow (#210040).....269
- Figure 8.19** Measured and predicted groundwater level for Bore 79056 in Wollombi Brook, Calibration R^2 is 0.79 using the hv-blocks cross-validation ...273
- Figure 8.20** Measured and predicted streamflow at Bulga gauge, calibration R^2 is 0.77 using the hv-blocks cross-validation for the period 1972-2008....274
- Figure 8.21** Cumulative predicted streamflow volume versus measured streamflow volume at Bulga gauge from 1972-2008.....274
- Figure 8.22** Measured and predicted stream flow data for the period 1973-2000 of R^2 (Cal) = 0.55 for the Wybong stream gauge (#210040)..... 276
- Figure 8.23** Performance of the modified XG model in predicting specific yield of the (a) Wybong catchment following the 1981-1983 drought. Here $\beta_e = 0.72$, $\beta_Q = 1869$ and $S_{t=0} = 57$ with a correlation coefficient of 0.43 for the fit in the period 1973 to 2008 (calibration period of 1973-2005) and (b) Cotter River at Gingera following the 1981-1983 drought. Here $\beta_e = 0.7409$, $\beta_Q = 1847$ and $S_{t=0} = 213$ with a correlation coefficient of 0.894 for the fit in the period 1963 to 2005.....277

TABLE

Table 2.1	Stratigraphic units in the Catchment (Kellet <i>et al.</i> 1989).....	40
Table 2.2	Soil landscape and associated soil units (Kovac and Lawrie, 1991).....	43
Table 3.1	Coefficients and R^2 for filling missing streamflow data ($Y=AX$).....	75
Table 3.2	Total daily extraction limits (ML/day).....	78
Table 3.3a	Annual rainfall and pan evaporation statistics goes near the Wybong...	82
Table 3.3b	Rainfall statistics for monthly data, for January 1903 to December 2008 for Bunnan and Denman.....	82
Table 3.4	Rainfall statistics for Wybong for different wet and dry periods identified in Figure 3.13.....	86
Table 3.5a	Significant meteorological droughts for 12 months rainfall (1903 to 2008).....	88
Table 3.5b	Significant meteorological droughts (<10% percentile ranked monthly rainfall) for 12 months rainfall at Wybong for the periods of 1955 to 2008.....	89
Table 3.6	Seasonal rainfall statistics for Wybong from 1903-2008.....	91
Table 4.1	IHACRES model parameters.....	113
Table 4.2	Surface water chemistry for the Wybong catchment in July 2006.....	116
Table 4.3	Coefficient and R^2 for the lower and upper catchment.....	116
Table 4.4	Estimated annual salt output/input ratios, based on TDS inputs and outputs (C is the Runoff coefficient and the mean dry deposition rate is 590 tonnes year ⁻¹)	123
Table 4.5	Groundwater chemistry for the Wybong catchment in 2007.....	125
Table 4.6	Estimated baseload groundwater salt input using the TDS (mg/L) of three sampled bores (Table 4.5).....	126
Table 5.1	Surface water sampling location.....	129
Table 5.2	Bore names, locations, water level, depth, water bearing zone and lithology of groundwater sample.....	131
Table 5.3	Fassifern Coal seam data (Mackie Environmental Research, 2006)...	132
Table 5.4	Surface and groundwater sampling data during July 2006.....	138

Table 5.5	Surface and groundwater sampling data July 2008.....	140
Table 5.6	Surface water sampling data during July 2006 and June 2007	144
Table 5.7	Groundwater sampling data during July 2006 and June 2007.....	145
Table 5.8	Surface water sampling data during July 2007 and July 2008.....	146
Table 5.9	Groundwater sampling data in July 2008.....	147
Table 5.10a	^Salt loads and weathering fraction in Wybong Creek due to cyclic salt estimated by assuming chloride as a conservative tracer sourced from rainwater (rainwater ion ratios are from Murray darling Basin).....	176
Table 5.10b	Salt loads and weathering fraction in Wybong Creek due to cyclic salt estimated by assuming chloride as a conservative tracer sourced from rainwater (rainwater ion ratios are from Bunnan).....	177
Table 5.11	Salt loads and weathering fraction in Wybong Creek due to marine-origin salt estimated by assuming chloride as a conservative tracer sourced from marine-origin waters.....	178
Table 5.12a	Salt loads and weathering fraction in groundwater due to cyclic salt estimated by assuming chloride as a conservative tracer sourced from rainwater (rainwater ion ratios are from Murray darling Basin).....	179
Table 5.12b	Salt loads and weathering fraction in groundwater due to cyclic salt estimated by assuming chloride as a conservative tracer sourced from rainwater (rainwater ion ratios are from Bunnan).....	180
Table 5.13	Salt loads and weathering fraction in groundwater due to marine-origin salt estimated by assuming chloride as a conservative tracer sourced from marine-origin waters.....	181
Table 6.1	Recursive digital filters used in base flow analysis (Grayson <i>et al</i> , 1996; Chapman, 1999; Furey and Gupta, 2001)	189
Table 6.2	Hydrological parameters of Wybong catchment, Wollombi Brook and Goulburn River over a period of 1972–2000, 1958-2007 and 1913-2007 respectively.....	191
Table 6.3	Maximum baseflow indexes for Wet and drought periods (Dry and wet years are marked as black and blue colours respectively).....	197

Table 7.1a	Monitoring bore names, locations relative to the Global Positioning System (GPS) and elevations relative to the Australian Height Datum (AHD) in Wybong	226
Table 7.1b	Monitoring bore names, locations relative to the Global Positioning System (GPS) and elevations relative to the Australian Height Datum (AHD) in Wollombi Brook.....	226
Table 7.2a	Bore monitoring periods and bore charecteristics in Wybong catchment.....	229
Table 7.2b	Bore monitoring periods and bore charecteristics in Wollombi Brook	230
Table 7.3	Stream gauge names, locations relative to the Global Positioning System (GPS), elevations relative to the Australian Height Datum (AHD).....	234
Table 8.1	Calibration and validation results for the XGR model for predicting groundwater level.....	251
Table 8.2	Estimated mean monthly actual evapotranspiration values and estimated mean change in soil moisture storage for bore #80434 calculated by the XGR1.....	258
Table 8.3	Shows the parameter values and statistics for the XGR1 model.....	261
Table 8.4	Results of XGR1 model for predicting streamflow for Wybong.....	264
Table 8.5	Parameters estimate and statistics of the XGR1 model calibrated using different calibration configurations for the Wybong Road bore (#080434) and stream gauge (#210040) from 2003 to 2008.....	271
Table 8.6	Parameters estimate and statistics of the XGR1 model calibrated using different calibration configurations for the Rockhall bore (#080947) and stream gauge (#210040) from 2006 to 2008.....	271
Table 8.7	Results for Predicting Groundwater Level and Streamflow for Wollombi Brook.....	272
Table 8.8	Parameters estimate the XGR1 model calibrated using different calibration configurations for the bore #79056 and Bulga stream gauge #210028 from 2001 to 2005.....	275