

Ellen Brook Catchment

Water Quality Monitoring

July – October 2011



Plate 1: Lennard Brook at Cockram Rd (EBICG, 2011).

Prepared by the Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group: March 2012.



CARING
FOR
OUR
COUNTRY



This project is co-funded by the Australian and Western Australian Government's investment in Caring for our Country administered by the Perth Region NRM.

1. Acknowledgements

This report was prepared for the Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group (EBICG) by Natural Resource Management Officer, Bonny Dunlop-Heague. Water samples were collected with the help of Megan O'grady, Sue Pedrick, Sue Metcalf, and a work experience student from Edith Cowen University Sharon Briggs. Samples were analysed by the National Measurement Institute (NMI), an accredited laboratory of the National Association of Testing Authorities (NATA).

For further information contact:

Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group
Chittering Landcare Centre

PO Box 62
Muccha WA 6501
Phone: (08) 9571 0400
Fax: (08) 9571 4350
Email: chitteringlandcare@iinet.net.au

2. Executive Summary

The assessment of water quality within the Ellen Brook catchment was undertaken between July and October 2011 in compliance with the sampling and analysis plan (Appendix G). The objective of the 2011 snapshot is to provide baseline information on the water quality within the Ellen Brook catchment, and to identify high contaminant contributing sub-catchments, emergent and ongoing trends. Recommendations are then made for areas with nutrient and metal concentration levels outside the Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council water quality guidelines for aquatic ecosystems (2000) to improve or maintain water quality in the catchment, and mitigate detrimental environmental effects in the Swan–Canning estuary system. Intensive clearing, grazing and fertiliser use combined with poor sandy soils in the Ellen Brook catchment has historically contributed a large amount of nutrients entering the Swan-Canning system. The high nutrient levels contribute to algal blooms in the upper reaches of the Swan River.

It must be noted that this assessment was based on once-off grab sampling of water quality in July, August, September and October from 27 selected sites within the Ellen Brook catchment (Figure 2). Consequently, the results represent the condition of the water in the catchment at the time of sampling only. Twenty six of the sites were tested for physical parameters (pH, salinity, temperature and total suspended solids) and nutrients, including total nitrogen (TN), total oxidised nitrogen (TON), and filterable organic nitrogen (FON), total phosphorous (TP), total filterable phosphorous and soluble reactive phosphorous (SRP). Total metals and total water hardness were sampled from seven strategically identified sites.

Comparison to previous nutrient data collected by the Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group indicates that nutrient concentrations have remained relatively static at most sampling sites since 2005; however they have increased slightly since 1996. Acidity has also remained relatively static at most of the sampling sites since 2005. However the increase in acidity since 1996 at a number of sampling sites (identified in Figure 8) is of great concern to the ecological health and function of the Ellen Brook and agricultural production. If left unmanaged this could become a major issue for landholders in terms of agricultural production with metal toxicity affecting livestock and soil condition. Continued monitoring will help identify potential trends and patterns as more data is collected over a greater period of time. All data is entered into the Department of Water's Water Information Network (WIN) database and available to the public.

3. Key Findings

- Total Nitrogen and Total Phosphorous were found in relatively high concentrations, above the guideline trigger values, across the catchment.
- The sub-catchments to the west of the Ellen Brook were the primary sources of total nitrogen in the catchment. Nitrogen was mostly in soluble form at sites with high TN concentrations.
- The sub-catchments to the west of the Ellen Brook were the primary sources of phosphorous. The phosphorous was mostly in soluble form at sites with high TP concentrations when compared to the ANZECC Guidelines.
- All western sub-catchment sampling sites had high total nitrogen, total phosphorous and filterable reactive phosphorous concentrations which were above the ANZECC trigger values. Muchea North (EBN11) was identified as the highest contributor of these nutrients to the Ellen Brook.
- All western sub-catchment sampling sites had total oxidised nitrogen(TON) concentrations above the trigger value.
- Lennard Brook (EBN1), Yal Yal Brook (EBN5) – sub catchments to the east of the Ellen Brook, and Egerton (EBN26) and Roxburgh Ave (EBN29) – sub catchments to the west of Ellen brook were identified as the greatest contributors of TON to the Ellen Brook.
- Wandena North (EBN7) and Muchea East (EBN10) had low pH levels, which were outside the guidelines, and were identified as contributors of heavy metals to the Ellen Brook.
- Results from Table 1 show that the majority of sites exceeded the lowland trigger value for conductivity on most sampling occasions. This is more evidence to show that salinisation of waterways is an issue in the Ellen Brook catchment. Marginal to brackish conductivity levels were recorded predominantly in the main channel of the Ellen Brook and the subcatchments to the east of Ellen Brook including Wandena North (EBN7) and Muchea East (EBN10), (Table 7).
- Acidity of surface water, potentially due to the effects of exposure of soils containing iron sulphide and acid groundwater seepage, in the Ellen Brook catchment is becoming an issue. These identified sites should continue to be investigated and include Wandena North (EBN7), Muchea East (EBN10) and Upper Yal Yal (EBN28).
- Aluminium and Iron concentrations were above the ANZECC guidelines at all heavy metal sampling sites, on every sampling occasion.

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011

Table 1: Number of sites (out of a total of 27) equal to or exceeding the ANZECC Water Quality Guidelines and trigger values.

*Note, metals out of a total of seven sampling sites. Cadmium, Chromium, Copper, Lead, Nickel and Zinc ANZECC water quality trigger values have been modified according to Water Hardness (Appendix) and must be equal to or exceed the Hardness-modified Trigger Value to be over the guideline.

Parameter	Number of Sampling Sites	D.O.W Interim Guideline	ANZECC Trigger Value	Water Quality Trigger Value- lowland rivers				Total Suspended Solids- DOE Interim Guideline			
				21 st July	30 th Aug	21 st Sept	24 th Oct	21 st July	30 th Aug	21 st Sept	24 th Oct
<i>Physical</i>											
pH	27		6.5-8	6	3	3	3				
Conductivity	27		0.12-0.3 mg/L	20	26	26	26				
Total Nitrogen	27		1.2 mg/L	14	20	21	20				
Total Oxidised Nitrogen	27		0.15 mg/L	5	10	6	4				
Nitrogen as Ammonia	27		0.08mg/L	12	8	3	9				
Total Phosphorous	27		0.065 mg/L	13	18	19	17				
Soluble Reactive Phosphorous	27		0.04 mg/L	12	17	18	17				
Total Suspended Solids	27	6mg/L						4	7	11	8

<i>Metal</i>	Number of Sampling Sites	Hardness Modified Trigger Value (400)	ANZECC Trigger Value (mg/L)	21 st July	17 th Aug	15 th Sept	20 th Oct
Aluminium	7		0.055	7	7	7	7
Arsenic	7		0.024	0	0	0	0
Cadmium	7	0.002mg/L	0.0002	0	0	0	0
Chromium	7	0.0049/0.008 4mg/L	0.001	0	0	0	0
Copper	7	0.00728/ 0.0126mg/L	0.0014	1	1	1	1
Iron	7		0.3	7	7	7	7
Lead	7	0.04/0.09mg/ L	0.0034	0	0	0	0
Mercury	7		0.0006	0	0	0	0
Nickel	7	0.099/0.057mg/L	0.011	0	0	0	0
Zinc	7	0.072mg/L	0.008	0	0	0	0

4. Table of Contents

1.	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	2
2.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
3.	KEY FINDINGS.....	4
	<i>Table 1: Number of sites (out of a total of 28) equal to or exceeding the ANZECC Water Quality Guidelines and trigger values.</i>	5
4.	TABLE OF CONTENTS	6
4.1	LIST OF FIGURES	8
5.	BACKGROUND.....	10
5.1	ELLEN BROOK CATCHMENT	12
	5.1.1 CLIMATE	15
	5.1.2 GEOLOGY AND GEOMORPHOLOGY.....	15
	5.1.3 SOIL TYPES.....	16
	5.1.4 VEGETATION.....	17
	5.1.5 LAND USE.....	18
	<i>Table 2: Land Use and Management Issues: Factors affecting Conservation or Protection of Natural Resources (Land Assessment Pty Ltd, 1999).</i>	21
6.	METHODOLOGY	22
	<i>Table 3: Site information including site number, site name, waterway section/component, location, northings and eastings.....</i>	22
6.1	WATER SAMPLING	24
6.2	WATER ANALYSIS	24
	<i>Table 4: Summary of chemical analysis techniques.....</i>	25
7.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	26
7.1	WATER QUALITY	27
	7.1.1 Flow and Rainfall.....	27
	7.2 Physical Properties	31
	7.2.1 pH.....	31
	<i>Table 5: pH levels of Wandena North (EBN7), Wandena South (EBN8), Muchea East (EBN10) between July and October 2009. NB: 'ns' represents 'no sample'</i>	33
	7.2.2 Electrical Conductivity.....	34
	7.2.3 Total Suspended Solids.....	37
7.3	NUTRIENT CONCENTRATIONS IN WATER	39
	7.3.1 Total Nitrogen	39
	7.3.2 Total Oxidised Nitrogen	42
	7.3.3. Ammonia as NH ₃ N.....	44
	7.3.4. Filterable Organic Nitrogen	46
	7.3.3 Total Phosphorous	48
	7.3.4 Filterable Reactive Phosphorous	51
	7.3.5. Total Filterable Phosphorous	53
7.4	HEAVY METALS IN SURFACE WATER	59
	7.4.1 Heavy Metals at Upper Yal Yal (EBN28).....	61
	7.4.2. Surface Water Hardness.....	62
	7.4.2 Aluminium.....	64
	7.4.3 Arsenic	66
	7.4.4 Cadmium	67
	7.4.5 Chromium.....	68
	7.4.6 Copper.....	69
	7.4.7 Iron.....	70

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011

7.4.8 Lead.....	71
7.4.9 Nickel	72
7.4.10 Zinc.....	73
8. COMPARISON WITH PREVIOUS RESULTS.....	74
8.1 pH.....	75
8.2 Conductivity	77
8.3 Total Nitrogen	79
8.4 Total Phosphorous	80
9. RECOMMENDATIONS	81
10. REFERENCES.....	82
APPENDIX A – WATER QUALITY RESULTS (RAW).....	85
PHYSICAL PARAMETERS	85
NUTRIENTS	89
TOTAL HEAVY METAL CONCENTRATIONS IN SURFACE WATER WITHIN THE ELLEN BROOK CATCHMENT 2007.	94
APPENDIX B – FRESHWATER TRIGGER VALUES AND GUIDELINES	96
TRIGGER VALUES AND GUIDELINES FOR NUTRIENT CONCENTRATIONS AND PHYSICAL PROPERTIES IN LOWLAND RIVERS AND FRESHWATER	96
TRIGGER VALUES AND GUIDELINES FOR TOXICANTS (METALS) IN FRESHWATER.....	97
TRIGGER VALUES AND GUIDELINES FOR TOXICANTS (METALS) IN FRESHWATER	98
APPENDIX C – PHOTOGRAPHS OF SAMPLE SITES.....	99
APPENDIX D – SALINITY MEASUREMENTS & TOLERANCE LIMITS	104
APPENDIX E – HARDNESS-MODIFIED TRIGGER VALUE CALCULATIONS BASED ON VARYING WATER HARDNESS (TABLE 3.4.4. ANZECC & ARMCANZ, 2000).	105
APPENDIX F – DAILY, MONTHLY AND ANNUAL RAINFALL (MM) RECORDED AT PEARCE RAAF BASE....	106
APPENDIX G – SAMPLING AND ANALYSIS PLAN.....	107
APPENDIX H - SAFETY PLAN	135

4.1 List of Figures

Figure 1: Ellen Brook Catchment Regional Location.	14
Figure 2: Major Landforms of the Ellen Brook Catchment.	16
Figure 3: Major landform and soil-landscape of the Ellen Brook Catchment (LandSmart™, 2006)	17
Figure 4: Ellen Brook catchment Land Use map (SRT, 2009).	20
Figure 5: Ellen Brook water quality sampling site locations.	23
Figure 6: Total monthly rainfall for 2011, 2010 and 2009 within the Ellen Brook Catchment at 009053 – Pearce RAAF Base.....	28
Figure 7: Temperature of surface waters sampled between July and October within the Ellen Brook catchment in 2011.	30
Figure 8: pH of surface water sampled within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *Note: blanks represent no sample	33
Figure 9: Electrical Conductivity of surface water within the Ellen Brook Catchment between July and October 2011.*Note blanks represent no sample	36
Figure 10: Total Suspended Solid concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook Catchment between July and October 2010. *Note blanks represent not sampled	38
Figure 11: Total Nitrogen concentration in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment sampled between July and October 2010.....	41
Figure 12: Total Oxidised Nitrogen (TON) sampled within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *Note blanks represent no sample.....	43
Figure 13: Ammonia as Nitrogen (NH ₃ N) sampled within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *Note blanks represent no sample.....	45
Figure 14: Dissolved Organic Nitrogen (DON) sampled within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *Note blanks represent no sample	47
Figure 15: Total Phosphorous concentration sampled within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011.	50
Figure 16: Soluble Reactive Phosphorous concentrations sampled within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011.....	52
Figure 18: Composition of Total Filterable phosphorous in percentages of Soluble Organic P and SRP in July Sampling run 2011. *note that blanks represent no sample or TFP below LOR	55
Figure 22: Water hardness of surface water within the Ellen Brook Catchment at sites sampled for metal contamination, between July and October 2011.*Blanks represent no sample	63
Figure 23: Aluminium concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *please note blanks represent no sample	65
Figure 24: Arsenic concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *please note blanks represent no sample	66
Figure 25: Cadmium concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *please note that blanks represent no sample	67
Figure 26: Chromium concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2010. *Note blanks represent no sample.	68
Figure 27: Copper concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011.*note that blanks represent no sample.	69

Figure 28: Iron concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook Catchment between July and October 2011. *please note blanks represent no sample	70
Figure 29: Lead concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *Note blanks represent no sample	71
Figure 30: Nickel concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *Note blanks represent no sample	72
Figure 31: Zinc concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2010. *Note that blanks represent no sample	73
Figure 32: Average pH levels in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between 2005 and 2011.....	76

5. Background

The Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group (EBICG) was formed in 1996 as part of the Swan Avon Regional Initiative. EBICG focuses on coordinating activities, improving communication between stakeholders, encouraging natural resource management (NRM) in the catchment, which varies from revegetation to improved agricultural practices and property planning to educate landholders on how to best manage their land no matter the size (Horwood & Worley, 1996). EBICG has developed a catchment management plan for the Ellen Brook catchment and works with the Shires of Chittering and Gingin, as well as the City of Swan to improve the health of the Ellen Brook Catchment (SRT, 2009).

With support from Tiwest and the Department of Water (DoW), the Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group commenced an annual sampling program focusing on nutrients, physical parameters and total suspended solids at 20 sites within the Ellen Brook catchment, in 2005 and 2006. Water samples collected from seven strategically selected sampling sites in 2005, and six sites in 2006 were also analysed for heavy metals. In 2007 the number of sampling sites were increased to 27 and 'Muehea South' (EBN12) was removed. In 2008 sampling occurred once every three weeks over a three month period commencing with the first consistent winter flows in July. From 2009 to 2011 sampling occurred monthly over four months. The program was funded through the Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group and the Swan River Trust's Drainage Nutrient Intervention Program (DNIP). Support was also received from the City of Swan and the Shire of Chittering for the analysis of sites in their areas.

An assessment of the water quality within the Ellen Brook Catchment was undertaken on four occasions, between July and October 2011. The objectives of this snapshot are to provide annual data on the water quality within the catchment, to assess and monitor the outcomes of on ground works carried out to reduce nutrient transport, to monitor areas of high nutrient transport identified in the previous year's sampling, to determine other potential areas of high nutrient transport arising in the catchment as a result of altered land use, and to build on previous results to determine emerging trends in the subcatchments of the Ellen Brook catchment.

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011

EBICG has been sampling the physical water quality parameters since 1999 as part of a large range of activities in monitoring and environmental repair, concentrated on reducing nutrient export from the region. 2011 water quality has been entered on to the Department of Water's (DoW) Water Information Network (WIN) database.

5.1 Ellen Brook Catchment

The Ellen Brook Catchment is located to the north-east of the Perth metropolitan region and has a gauged area of 71, 500 hectares (Figure 1). The Ellen Brook headwaters start just south of Gingin and run for approximately 60km south through the townships of Muchea and Bullsbrook to its confluence with the Swan River near All Saints Church in Henley Brook. The catchment is situated in three local government authorities, including the Shire of Chittering, Shire of Gingin and the City of Swan (SRT, 2009).

The Ellen Brook and its tributaries (134 subcatchments) form a catchment area shown in Figure 1 as the western portion of the North-East sub region of the Perth Region NRM. These subcatchments include: eastwards flowing groundwater fed streams rising from the Gnangara Mound; westward flowing streams from catchments extending onto the Darling and Dandaragan Plateau; smaller streams and drains flowing into the Ellen Brook from the east and west, rising in the agricultural land on the Swan Coastal Plain (Russell, 2001).

The Ellen Brook, which is an ephemeral stream, discharges into the upper Swan River contributing an average of 8.3% of the total volume each year to this system. The catchment represents the largest coastal subcatchment of the Swan-Canning estuary system, (SRT, 2009).

Despite this relatively small portion of run-off compared to its geographical size, the Ellen Brook catchment is the single largest contributor of nutrients entering the Swan River estuary, on the Swan Coastal Plain (Micenko, 2005). The excessive input of nutrients, predominantly nitrogen and phosphorous, have been partially responsible for regular and potentially toxic algal blooms in the upper reaches of the estuary (DEBCMP, 2000). These algal blooms have caused major ecological disturbances including unsightly scums, foul odours and occasional fish deaths.

According to the Draft Ellen Brook Catchment Management Plan (PPK Environment and Infrastructure, 2000), landuses such as livestock grazing and clearing of vegetation has caused significant land degradation, including soil salinity, wind erosion, water erosion, waterlogging and

flooding. These processes lead to phosphorous and nitrogen export. If these processes are left unmanaged it will continue to compromise the catchment's economic, environmental and social value.




Figure 1: Ellen Brook Catchment Regional Location.

5.1.1 Climate

The Ellen Brook catchment experiences a Mediterranean climate of distinctly dry (and hot) summers and cool wet winters. Mean maximum temperatures range from 17.8°C in winter and 33.5°C in summer and mean minimum temperatures range from 8.1°C in winter to 18°C in summer. Average Annual rainfall for Pearce is 684.1mm. The break of season has changed from April or May to June or July, and 90% of the rainfall occurs between May and October. The growing season lasts several months. Total pan evaporation is 1934mm/yr, with an average daily evaporation of 10.8mm in January to 1.8mm in June (BOM, 2012).

5.1.2 Geology and Geomorphology

The Ellen Brook catchment can be divided into three major geomorphic regions (Figure 2); the Darling Plateau to the east; the Dandaragan Plateau which covers the north eastern part of the catchment and the Swan Coastal Plain which covers the western portion of the catchment (King & Wells, 1990). The geological setting of the Ellen Brook is strongly linked to nutrient transport, with a noticeable difference in nutrient levels in the east and west of the catchment.

The Darling Plateau is part of the Yilgarn Block in the eastern section of the catchment. The Yilgarn Block is an extensive area of Archaean crust typified by old granite rock outcrops with younger doleritic intrusions. It has been dissected by the Avon River system and includes the following geomorphic characteristics; lateritic uplands, dissected valleys, spurs and valleys below the scarp surface, minor valleys and drainage depressions. It is separated from the Dandaragan Plateau by the Darling Fault (DEBCMP, 2001).

The Dandaragan Plateau, in the north east part of the catchment, is less dissected than the neighbouring Darling Plateau and is covered by sands and laterite overlaying older sedimentary formations. It includes a gentle scarp, sandy (lateritic) uplands and relatively shallow incised valleys. The sand plain features dominate, and the western margin of the Dandaragan Plateau is formed by the Gingin Scarp, a moderately sloping topographical feature formed by shoreline erosion and rising approximately 90 metres above the Swan Coastal Plain (WRC 2002).




Figure 2: Major Landforms of the Ellen Brook Catchment.

5.1.3 Soil types

Soil types are grouped according to their geomorphic setting. Aeolian deposits on the Swan Coastal Plain are characterised by the Bassendean dune system (Figure 3). These are well drained porous soils with very poor phosphorous retention capacity. The alluvial deposits in the centre of the catchment are part of the Pinjarra Plain landform, and contain soils made up of coalescing alluvial fans with varying sand and clay content subject to water logging in low-lying areas. Soils of this landform often contain a duplex of impermeable clay layers overlain by deep sandy soils (Russell, 2001).

The Darling Plateau and Dandaragan landforms contain lateritic uplands characterised by gravely yellow earths and yellow duplex soils. Minor valleys and drainage depressions often contain soils in

which the surface layer of the soil profile is often separated from lower finer textured materials by a layer of gravels or stone (Russell, 2001).




Figure 3: Major landform and soil-landscape of the Ellen Brook Catchment (LandSmart™, 2006)

5.1.4 Vegetation

Weeds in the Ellen Brook catchment are usually soft leaved, decaying quickly and releasing high levels of organic nutrients and carbon. Organic matter accumulated in the soil is released following clearing. Native vegetation contains and releases high levels of tannins and oils into the Ellen Brook catchment (DEBCMP, 2001).

A significant area of the catchment has been cleared. The majority of clearing has occurred in the western margin of the Darling Plateau, parts of the Dandaragan Plateau to the north, and much of the Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group

southern section of the Swan Coastal Plain. Remnant vegetation is found in state forests, in the sloping lands of the western edge of the Darling Scarp, in local streamlines and wetlands and in local areas of nature reserves and national parks, and in some isolated areas of privately owned land (DEBCMP, 2001).

5.1.5 Land Use

The majority of the Ellen Brook Catchment has been cleared for either urban use or agriculture. The main categories of agriculture are grazing, horticulture and fodder production. Specific land uses include vineyards and other intensive horticulture, cattle grazing, piggeries, abattoir, chicken farms, gravel extraction, mining, golf courses and residential developments (SRT, 2009).

Pasture and grazing are the largest land-uses in the region, covering over 31,000ha and representing over 85% of all recorded land uses (KBR, 2003). Land use generally changes from cattle grazing and horticulture in the northern parts of the catchment to more urban settlements and small scale light industry in the southern parts (SRT, 2009).

Cattle grazing contributes large amounts of nutrients to the Ellen Brook as the cattle tend to congregate in or around unprotected waterways causing soil compaction and erosion, and directly excreting nutrients into the waterway. The pasture needed to support the cattle is fertilised resulting in an application of over 20kg/ha/yr of phosphate (DEBCMP 2001). Although the pasture does fix a small amount of phosphorous, most of the nutrients associated with this land use are transported through the soil and into the waterways. The soil has a very poor ability to retain nutrients, which is exacerbated by over stocking and erosion. In comparison, although on a smaller scale with regards to area, horticulture has an even higher concentrated nutrient run off potential. For example, orchards in the north of the catchment are supplied with 65kg/ha/yr of phosphorus, although more established vineyards over ten years old were supplied with half of this amount (Gerritse 1996).

Urban expansion is an issue in the catchment, particularly in the southern part of the region where many large farms have been subdivided into small “lifestyle” sized blocks. It is difficult to predict whether this change in land use will be beneficial or detrimental to water quality in the Ellen Brook (Table 2). If managed appropriately during the planning phase, it may allow for conditions to be in

place that will improve or at least maintain water quality. If not managed correctly, issues such as over stocking, increased fertiliser application and herbicide use, increased water use, erosion and more weeds would certainly be detrimental to the water quality in the catchment (CSIRO 1994).

The excessive nutrient load in the Ellen Brook is diffuse because of the nature of the erosion prone, sandy, draining soils with underlying clay layers and high water table which is ideal for the transport of nutrients. All land uses contribute to the nutrient run-off to the Ellen Brook, particularly phosphorus which does not bind in the soil as effectively as nitrogen (Horwood 1997). This nutrient load does not have as much effect on the local environment as it does to the Swan-Canning system.




Figure 4: Ellen Brook catchment Land Use map (SRT, 2009).

Table 2: Land Use and Management Issues: Factors affecting Conservation or Protection of Natural Resources (Land Assessment Pty Ltd, 1999).

Water	Deteriorating Water Quality due to; Nutrient loss to drainage (eutrophication) Salinity Other pollutants
Soils	Loss of soil due to; Water erosion Wind erosion
Vegetation	Decrease in amount and quality of vegetation due to; Clearing Weed infestation
Agricultural Productivity	Soil salinity Waterlogging Soil acidity Soil structure decline Water repellence
Land Development	Flooding Waterlogging Ease of excavation/slope instability
Socio economic aspects of land use change	Loss of agricultural land Land use conflict Diversification Fire risk

6. Methodology

Water samples were taken from twenty seven sites within the Ellen Brook catchment (Figure 5). These sites were selected to be representative of a particular part of the catchment, to determine their relative nutrient and metal contribution to the Ellen Brook, and whether they were situated upstream or downstream of potentially high impact land uses or of likely contaminant sources. Table 3 lists the sampled sites by site number, site name and relative waterway component. Site location is also provided using street names, northings and eastings.

Table 3: Site information including site number, site name, waterway section/component, location, northings and eastings.

Site no.	Site Name	Waterway section/ Component	Location	Northing	Easting
EBN1	Lennard Brook	Lennard Brook	Lennard Brook Road	6527771	0396613
EBN2	Airfield Road	North Chandala/Ellen Brook (Bambun Lakes)	Airfield Road	6519428	0397101
EBN3	Chandala West	Chandala Brook West	Brand Hwy west loc # 853	6511801	0400463
EBN4	Chandala South	Chandala Brook South	Brand Hwy east / TIWest	6510846	0401302
EBN5	Yal Yal Brook	Yal Yal Brook	Reserve Road	6514458	0404923
EBN6	Rocky Gully Creek	Rocky Gully Creek	Old Gingin Rd	6509047	0403714
EBN7	Wandena North	Waterway to Ellen Brook	Wandena North - Great Northern Highway	6507384	0404384
EBN8	Wandena South	Waterway to Ellen Brook	Wandena South - Great Northern Highway	6506686	0404561
EBN9	Brand Hwy Bridge	Ellen Brook - Muchea Central	Bridge on Brand Hwy south	6505838	0404093
EBN10	Muchea East	Waterway to Ellen Brook Muchea East	Great Northern/Brand Highways	6505833	0404780
EBN11	Muchea North	Waterway to Ellen Brook -	Muchea south /Railway Rd 491 chit/swan sign	6500336	0404611
EBN13	Rutland Road	Ellen Brook (upper)	Rutland Road bridge	6498117	0406044
EBN14	Nutrient Inflow	Waterway – Nutrient stripping inflow	Bingham Road/ Department of Defence	6496871	0405690
EBN15	Nutrient Outflow	Waterway - Nutrient stripping Pond outflow	Bingham Road/ Department of Defence	6496885	0405757
EBN16	Bulls Brook	Bullsbrook	Sth past Strachan on Railway Rd	6495684	0405054
EBN17	Warren Road	Mid Ellen Brook	Warren Road	6493379	0406685
EBN18	Gauging Station	Ellen Brook - Almeria Gauging Station	Almeria Parade/Apple Street	6486743	0407638
EBN19	Belhus Reserve	Lower Ellen Brook	Belhus Reserve Millhouse Rd Bridge	6483685	0406519
EBN21	Lower Yal Yal	Yal Yal Brook South	Old Gingin Road	6509922	0403110
EBN22	Ki-it Brook	Ki-it Brook	Warren Road	6493382	0406959
EBN23	Peters Road	Waterway to Ellen Brook – Muchea town site	Peters Road	6505232	0403580
EBN24	Stock Road	Waterway to Ellen Brook West	Railway Parade	6492415	0405221
EBN25	Sawpit Gully	Waterway to Ellen Brook – The Vines north	Lot 4/285 Railway Parade, Upper Swan	6486777	0407430
EBN26	Egerton	Waterway from Egerton Estate to Ellen Brook	Corona Way	6483859	0405129
EBN27	Wandena Road	Waterway to Ellen Brook	Corner of Great Northern Hwy and Wandena Road	6502590	0406553
EBN28	Upper Yal Yal	Yal Yal Brook North	Great Northern Hwy	6516783	0409421
EBN29	Roxburgh Avenue	Drain leading to Ellen Brook from The Vines east	Roxburgh Avenue	6486603	0406975




Figure 5: Ellen Brook water quality sampling site locations.

6.1 Water Sampling

Western Australia experienced its wettest year on record for 2011, with the south west of Western Australia reaching near average rainfall. with the total annual rainfall for Perth recorded as 860.8 in 2011. The average total annual rainfall for Perth is 732mm, and 684mm for Pearce RAAF Base (BOM, 2012). In 2007 the Pearce RAAF received a total of 626.2mm In 2008 Pearce received a total of 610.8mm. In 2009 Pearce received a total of 554.9mm. In 2010 Pearce received at total of 347.2mm which is approximately 55% of the average annual rainfall. In 2011 Pearce received 638.6mm which is 93% of the average rainfall. This is a vast contrast to the 2010 rainfall, Due to this all of the sites flowed on at least one sampling occasion, some of which have not flowed at all for several years. (Appendix F).

Sampling occurred on 21-22nd July, 30-31st August, 21-22nd September, and 24-25th October. The collection of the samples followed strict protocols to prevent contamination and ensure consistency in results. An outline of the sample collection technique is included in the Ellen Brook sampling and analysis plan 2011 (Appendix G). Field observation forms were filled out for each water sample. All samples were transported under ‘chain of custody’ to NMI and were analysed in accordance with the laboratory methods. All samples collected from the Ellen Brook catchment were analysed by NMI laboratory, which has been accredited by the National Association of Testing Authorities (NATA).

6.2 Water Analysis

Water at each of the sites was measured *in situ* for physical properties (pH, conductivity and temperature), using WTW pH and EC probes. Samples were also collected and analysed for a range of contaminants likely to be present in semi-rural, industrial and urban catchments. They were then sent to NMI laboratory to be analysed for nutrients including total nitrogen (TN), total phosphorus (TP), total filterable phosphorous (TFP), total oxidised nitrogen (TON), soluble reactive phosphorus (SRP), dissolved organic nitrogen (DOrgN), nitrogen as ammonia (NH₄-N), and total suspended solids on each sampling occasion.

Samples from Chandala West (EBN3), Wandena North (EBN7), Wandena South (EBN8), Muchea East (EBN10), Warren Road (EBN17), Belhus (EBN19) and Upper Yal Yal (EBN28) were also

collected and sent to NMI laboratory for analysis of metals on each sampling occasion. NMI analysed the samples for the following metals; cadmium (Cd), mercury (Hg), arsenic (As), copper (Cu), lead (Pb), zinc (Zn), aluminium (Al), chromium (Cr), iron (Fe) and nickel (Ni). Table 4 summarizes analysis techniques used for physical parameters, nutrients and heavy metals by NMI.

Table 4: Summary of chemical analysis techniques.

Parameters	Limit of Reporting (LOR)	Variable Unit	Analysis Technique
Cond (Comp25°C)	1	uS/cm	direct read
pH	0.05		direct read
TSS	1	mg/L	grav
PO ₄ -P	0.003	mg/L	DA
NO _x -N	0.005	mg/L	DA
TP	0.01	mg/L	DA
TN	0.05	mg/L	DA

Parameter	Limit Of Reporting (LOR)	Variable Unit	Analysis Technique
Inorganics			
Aluminium	0.005	mg/L	NT2.47
Arsenic	0.001	mg/L	NT2.47/2.51
Cadmium	0.0001	mg/L	NT2.47
Chromium	0.001	mg/L	NT2.47
Copper	0.001	mg/L	NT2.47
Iron	0.005	mg/L	NT2.47
Lead	0.001	mg/L	NT2.47
Mercury	0.0001	mg/L	NT2.47/2.44
Nickel	0.001	mg/L	NT2.47
Zinc	0.001	mg/L	NT2.47

7. Results and Discussion

The National Water Quality Management Strategy provides guidance on both ecosystem and human health protection. Water quality guidelines are provided for a range of environmental values including aquatic ecosystems, primary industries, recreation and aesthetics, drinking water, industrial water, cultural issues, and monitoring and assessment (ANZECC & ARMCANZ, 2000). This report will compare sample concentration results with aquatic ecosystem trigger values for lowland river systems and, when necessary, livestock drinking water trigger values. This is in accordance with the trigger values suggested in the Draft Ellen Brook Management Plan.

The guidelines recognise three levels of protection for aquatic ecosystems; those with high conservation value, slightly to moderately disturbed ecosystems and highly disturbed ecosystems. To assess the level of toxicant contamination in aquatic ecosystems, trigger values were developed from data using toxicity testing on a range of test species. The trigger values (99%, 95%, 90% and 80%) approximately correspond to the levels of protection described above. This report will use the 95% protection level for aquatic ecosystems due to the high conservation value of the receiving environment of the Swan River.

Six metals (cadmium, copper, chromium, lead, nickel, mercury and zinc) are known to have varying toxicity in different water hardness and so were compared to the ANZECC hardness-modified trigger values (HMTV). Refer to Appendix E for details on calculations.

It is important to note that exceedence of the trigger value does not indicate that “standards” are not being met, but is rather an indication that further consideration should be given to the situation. An exceedence of the trigger value indicates that there is the potential for an impact to occur and should therefore trigger a management response such as further investigation or adaptation of the guidelines according to local conditions (ANZECC & ARMCANZ 2000). No ecosystem is pristine, so when using guidelines the realistic and achievable water quality of the Ellen Brook should be considered.

7.1 Water Quality

7.1.1 Flow and Rainfall

According to the DEBCMP (2000) runoff from the Ellen Brook catchment consists of approximately 60% surface and near-surface runoff, with 40% shallow groundwater flow. Additionally, it has been suggested that surface runoff from agricultural paddocks during the winter months is the primary cause of nutrient (nitrogen and phosphorous) discharge to streams within the catchment. The existing townships including Pearce, Bullsbrook and Muchea also contribute small amounts to the total load. Muchea and West Bullsbrook are unsewered townships.

Muchea and Bambun are situated on Palusplains which are seasonally waterlogged plains or flats. Groundwater levels vary seasonally and in relation to rates of recharge from rainfall, evapotranspiration, changes in vegetation and land use, and groundwater extraction. The shallow depth to groundwater for the low lying portion of the Ellen Brook catchment and the risk of seasonal inundation places constraints on urban and industrial development, and facilitates the transport of readily soluble nutrients into the waterways.

Flow from the Ellen Brook into the Swan River occurs as a result of winter rainfall and groundwater seepage, and ceases over the summer months. The Lennard Brook and Yal Yal Brook are perennial streams which depend on groundwater discharge during the hotter months.

Figure 6 shows the total rainfall for Station 009053 – Pearce RAAF Base. In 2009, July had the highest monthly rainfall of 149mm, however, 2009 had extended winter rains. As a result weeds in the catchment were difficult to control due to their extended growing season of warmer weather and extended rainfall. In 2010, July had the highest monthly rainfall of 109.2mm. Overall the season was very dry which severely impacted on revegetation efforts in the catchment, particularly in the more sandy sites where water retention is at its lowest. In 2011 July had the highest monthly rainfall, however the season broke earlier with the 2nd highest monthly rainfall in June. There was however a continuous rainfall season which was beneficial for revegetation projects, but also caused significant growth of summer weeds.




Figure 6: Total monthly rainfall for 2011, 2010 and 2009 within the Ellen Brook Catchment at 009053 – Pearce RAAF Base.

All samples taken were from sites with flowing water at a depth ranging from 10-20cm below the surface and not in contact with the sediment at any time. Water temperatures ranged from 8.2°C to 24.9°C (Figure 7). Temperatures recorded during the 21st July sampling run ranged between 11.8°C and 19.2°C. Temperatures recorded during the 30th August sampling run ranged between 13.7°C and 22.9°C. Temperatures recorded during the 21st September sampling run ranged between 8.2°C and 20.2°C. Temperatures recorded during the 24th October sampling run ranged between 16.8°C and 24.9°C.

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011




Figure 7: Temperature of surface waters sampled between July and October within the Ellen Brook catchment in 2011.

* Note, blanks represent no sample.

7.2 Physical Properties

7.2.1 pH

pH is a measure of acidity and alkalinity. It is measured on a logarithmic scale with a pH of 7.0 being neutral, a pH of less than 7 being acidic and a pH of greater than 7 being alkaline or basic. The importance of pH lies mainly in its effect on other water quality parameters, chemical reactions and aquatic organisms. For example, pH can affect the solubility and toxicity of a wide range of metal contaminants (IEA 2003). No pH data was collected at Upper Yal Yal (EBN28) as it is known to have extremely acidic pH values and would have possibly damaged the monitoring equipment.

The majority of pH levels recorded within the Ellen Brook catchment were within the ANZECC water quality guidelines of 6.5-8 for lowland rivers (Figure 8). There was little variation in pH among most sites or between most sampling occasions.

Wandena South (EBN8), Wandena North (EBN7) and Muchea East (EBN10) recorded pH levels below the ANZECC Guidelines on each sampling occasion (Figure 8). These three sites have consistently recorded pH levels lower than the ANZECC guideline since the 2005 water quality sampling program. There has been a significant drop in pH at Muchea East (EBN10) since the 2005 water quality monitoring program. In 2005 pH ranged between 6.3 and 6.95. In 2011 pH ranged between 3.4 and 6.2 This is potentially due to clay extraction pits located upstream of the tributary. Clay pits located higher up in the catchment may have contributed to pulses of increased acidity being released from those sites. An acidic dam, with a recorded pH as low as 2.8 is on a neighbouring property. Therefore, sites situated downstream of existing clay pits require regular monitoring. Interactions with groundwater could also impact the level of pH, and warrants further investigation.

According to Parsons Brinckerhoff et al. (2006), the overlying gravely sands found at the Wandena and Muchea East subcatchments are slightly acidic with pH values ranging between 5 and 6. pH was found to decrease with increasing depth to the clay horizon. At a depth of 2m pH values were recorded around 5. At a depth of 10m pH was recorded as low as 3.63. The likely source of actual acidity identified by Parsons Brinckerhoff included;

- Historic precipitation of iron sulphides under anoxic marine conditions and subsequent oxidation of sulphides forming sulphuric acid as sea levels declined.

- Some of the acidity would have been leached by rainfall infiltration.
- Some of the acidity may have been lost by displacement of cations (e.g. Al^{3+} , Mg^{2+}) on cation exchange sites of clay minerals.
- Potential acidity was only encountered beneath the watertable at a 15m depth as expected because of the relatively permanent anoxic condition.

Therefore, these soils are naturally acidic, however disturbance and excavation works carried out at these sites has altered the groundwater table and the relationship between anoxic and aerobic conditions. This has resulted in sulphides in the soil forming sulphuric acid that mobilises metals in the soil profile. Refer to Table 5 for pH value of Wandena North (EBN7), Wandena South (EBN8) and Muchea East (EBN10).

Sawpit Gully (EBN25) and Warren Rd (EBN17) recorded pH values below the ANZECC Guideline on 1 out of 4 sampling occasions. This was during the first sampling occasion at both sites. All other sampling occasions recorded pH values within the guidelines, these results at this stage will be considered an anomaly however these sites will be closely monitored in 2012 to ensure that they do not measure outside the ANZECC Guideline.

Lennard Brook (EBN1) and Yal Yal Brook (EBN5) have been identified in previous Ellen Brook Snapshot Reports as a potential cause for concern due to low pH values being recorded, below the ANZECC guidelines, in November 2006. Their respective values were 4.36 and 5.65. Since 2007 pH levels have remained within the guidelines on nearly all sampling occasions. In 2011 both Lennard Brook and Yal Yal Brook remained within the ANZECC guidelines on each sampling occasion.

Peters Rd (EBN 23) recorded pH levels above the ANZECC guidelines on one out of three sampling occasions (Figure 8) This site has been sampled since 2007 and has never previously exceeded ANZECC guidelines. Increased pH can be caused by a combination of factors including reduced flow and an increase in temperature resulting in algal growth. Increased algal growth can result in an increase in pH. This is likely due to the reduced flow that was experienced at this site in the October sampling run. This site will be closely monitored in the 2012 sampling run to ensure these results are an anomaly rather than a decline in water quality.

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011




Figure 8: pH of surface water sampled within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *Note: blanks represent no sample

Table 5: pH levels of Wandena North (EBN7), Wandena South (EBN8), Muchea East (EBN10) between July and October 2011.

Date	EBN 7	EBN 8	EBN 10
21/07/11	3.41	4.78	3.46
17/08/11	3.65	5.91	3.85
15/09/11	3.75	5.98	3.9
20/10/11	3.4	6.2	3.4

7.2.2 Electrical Conductivity

Electrical conductivity (EC) measures the total concentration of inorganic ions (particularly sodium, chlorides, carbonates, magnesium, calcium, potassium and sulfates). Conductivity is often used as a measure of salinity. The conductivity level can directly affect the use of the water. For example, different types of plants have varying tolerance levels to salinity, as does livestock.

Electrical conductivity ranged from 0.193mS/cm at Ki-It Brook to 8.62mS/cm at Muchea East. All but two sites exceeded ANZECC guidelines for freshwater lowland rivers of 0.12mS/cm to 0.3mS/cm (Figure 9). Ki-it Brook and Egerton was the only sites below the ANZECC guideline on the July Sampling occasion. All sites exceeded the guideline on the August, September and October sampling occasions.. Although the sites exceeded the guidelines for ecosystem value, the majority of them were within the marginal zone (marginal water is between 0.9mS/cm to 2.7mS/cm), anything above 2.7mS/cm is considered brackish and would be detrimental for irrigation of stone fruit and citrus orchards (Appendix D). Therefore, the conductivity is acceptable for current land uses (grazing) but consideration for long term effects on ecological value should also be considered and continued monitoring is essential. The exceptions to this included Wandena North (EBN7), Wandena South (EBN 8), Muchea East (EBN10) and Rocky Gully (EBN6) which exceeded the Marginal Zone on all four sampling occasions. Wandena Rd (EBN 27) exceeded on two sampling occasions, Brand Hwy (EBN9) and Lower Yal Yal exceeded on one sampling occasion. Conductivity at these seven sites was brackish on at least one of the sampling occasions, and ranged between 3.05mS/cm (EBN9) and 8.62mS/cm (EBN10). High conductivity readings were concentrated to the central-east of the Ellen Brook catchment, at the Muchea East and Wandena sub-catchments (Appendix A).

The results showed that nine out of twenty sites were brackish in 2006. In 2007, five out of twenty-seven sites were brackish. In 2008, eight of the twenty eight sites were brackish. In 2009, ten of the twenty seven sites were brackish. In 2010 seven of the 27 sites were brackish. In 2011, seven out of the 27 sites were brackish. The Ellen Brook itself had relatively marginal conductivity readings. Only one site on one sampling occasion of the Ellen brook recorded a brackish conductivity reading. This was the Brand Hwy Bridge (EBN9) on the 24th October with a conductivity reading of 3.05mS/cm.

Some individual samples taken from Muchea East, Wandena North and Wandena South were unacceptable for milk cows, poultry, irrigation of olives and figs, grapes, tomatoes and lettuce

Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group

(Appendix D). This is unlikely to effect surrounding landholders as the cattle are for beef production which has a much higher tolerance level, and the nearby chicken farm uses bore water. New urban developments have occurred throughout the catchment in the past few years and particularly in these areas of concern, However the land is generally used for small hobby farms, with most landholders using bore water and rain water tanks.

It is of great concern for environmental value that most sites consistently exceeded ANZECC water quality guidelines for lowland river systems and certainly warrants further monitoring. Over the four sampling occasions the conductivity reading for the southern most sampling site of the catchment, (Belhus Reserve, EBN19), averaged 1.52mS/cm. This shows that the higher concentrations of salts in the major tributaries are diluted as they flow into the Ellen Brook and through the catchment. However, this concentration is above the guideline, deemed to be marginal and unacceptable for stone fruit, citrus, peas, carrot, onion and hot water systems (Appendix D). The most brackish sites were in the mid-eastern part of the catchment (Horwood, 1997). This trend has been noted in previous water quality programs.




Figure 9: Electrical Conductivity of surface water within the Ellen Brook Catchment between July and October 2011. *Note blanks represent no sample

7.2.3 Total Suspended Solids

Total Suspended Solids (TSS) refers to naturally occurring suspended particles including; silt, phytoplankton and organic matter within a water body. Natural sources of TSS include water turbulence from storms, phytoplankton blooms and wind/wave action. However, TSS may also indicate detrimental environmental conditions such as erosion. This makes levels higher than normal in the water body and can result in increased deposition of material to the substrate that may smother faunal communities (McTaggart, 2002).

There are large variations in TSS throughout water bodies and guidelines should be determined by including information on natural levels in the area. As no ANZECC guideline currently exists for TSS, this report will use the interim guideline of 6mg/L adopted by the Department of Water and originally developed by the Waters and Rivers commission for the Wilson Inlet report to community (October 2000).

TSS in the Ellen Brook catchment ranged between less than 1 and 42mg/L at Sawpit Gully (EBN25), (Figure 10). There was great variation in the TSS recorded at most of the sites. No specific sampling occasion recorded consistently high TSS concentrations across the sampling sites. However Fourteen sites exceeded the interim guideline on at least one of the sampling occasions, these included Belhus (EBN19), Sawpit Gully (EBN25), Ki-it Brook (EBN22), Warren Rd (EBN17), Rutland Rd (EBN13), Muchea East (EBN10), Wandena North (EBN7), Lower Yal Yal (EBN21), Wandena South (EBN8), Bulls Brook (EBN16), Muchea North(EBN11), Chandala South (EBN4), Chandala West(EBN3) and Lennard Brook (EBN1), (Figure 10). Concentrations at these sites ranged between 7 and 42mg/L. The outliers in these results is Sawpit Gully(EBN25) and Lower Yalyal(EBN21), this result is likely due to a combination of stock on the water way increased development and Rainfall Events. The other less extreme events were experienced at most subcatchments on various sampling occasions. They do not appear to be localized, but are probably due to a combination of influencing factors including peak rainfall events, earthworks and development, stocking rates and stock access to waterways, clearing of vegetation and increased erosion.

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011




Figure 10: Total Suspended Solid concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook Catchment between July and October 2010. *Note blanks represent not sampled

7.3 Nutrient concentrations in water

Most nutrients present in the catchment are stored in the soils and are transported to the Ellen Brook via surface water (tributaries, drains and general run-off). The original sources of nutrients include; weathering, leaching from soils particularly in eroded areas, fertiliser run-off, detergents, sewerage, fixation by some plants, and decomposition of plant matter, animal wastes and other organic wastes (IEA 2003). Nitrogen and phosphorus are the two major essential elements to plants. Excessive amounts of nutrients in waterways can result in eutrophication with plant and algae growth, increases in nuisance insect numbers and unbalanced aquatic ecosystems. Nutrients include nitrogen in the form of ammonia, nitrate and nitrite, and phosphorus in the form of phosphate either dissolved (soluble reactive phosphate) or particulate (suspended).

7.3.1 Total Nitrogen

Total nitrogen (TN) refers to all forms of nitrogen present including organic (e.g. plant decay matter) and inorganic in the forms of ammonia, nitrate and nitrite (McTaggart 2002). Sources of nitrogen include fertilisers, industrial cleaning operations, feed lots, animal droppings, combustion of fossil fuels and plant debris.

Most sites except Sawpit Gully(EBN25), Roxbourgh Ave (EBN29), Wandena North (EBN7), Muchea East (EBN10), Wandena South (EBN8), Ki-it Brook (EBN22), Rocky Creek (EBN6) and Wandena Road (EBN27) were consistently above the ANZECC water quality guideline values of 1.2mg/L for lowland river systems and ecosystem health on most sampling occasions (Figure 11). These results were consistent with those from 2010, however EBN25, 29, 8 and 6 showed levels lower than in 2010.. Generally, TN concentrations at all sites were lowest during the October sampling occasion.

Muchea North (EBN11) consistently recorded high TN values between 5.6 and 7.1mg/L. However the Highest TN Value was recorded at Warren Rd (EBN17) with a value of 7.8mg/L on the October sampling occasion. This value was more the double the values recorded on the other sampling occasions. This result could be an outlier so further testing completed in 2012 will be looked at to determine whether it was an outlier or a decline in water quality. Belhus (EBN19), Gauging Station (EBN18) Lower Yal Yal (EBN21), Stock Road (EBN24), Bulls Brook (EBN16), NSP Out (EBN15)

and NSP In (EBN14), Chandala South (EBN4) Chandala West (EBN3) and Lennard Brook (EBN 1) all recorded relatively high TN concentrations and should continue to be monitored. Belhus and the Gauging station receive runoff from agricultural land uses to the north of The Vines development. Stock Road (EBN24), Bulls Brook (EBN 16), NSP In (EBN14) and NSP Out (EBN 15) are located downstream of agricultural and horticultural land located on sandy soils which accounts for increased nutrients from runoff. Lower Yal Yal (EBN21), Chandala West (EBN3), Chandala South (EBN4) and Lennard Brook (EBN1) are also located down stream of agricultural areas where runoff of nutrients is common due to poor soils. Most of these sites are situated on the western half of the catchment and contribute a significant amount of TN to the Ellen Brook.

As shown in previous Snapshot Reports for the Ellen Brook catchment, there appears to be a general trend in the data showing that western parts of the catchment have higher levels of nutrients in the run off than eastern sites, most likely due to a change in soil type. Duplex soils of sand over clay with higher nutrient retention capabilities and lateritic uplands dominate on the Darling and Dandaragan Plateaus to the east of the Ellen Brook. These soils are able to retain nutrients in the soil for a longer period of time than the well drained, porous, sandy soils of the Bassendean sands complex located to the west (DEBCMP, 2001).




Figure 11: Total Nitrogen concentration in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment sampled between July and October 2010.

* Note, blanks represent no sample.

7.3.2 Total Oxidised Nitrogen

Total oxidised nitrogen (TON/NO_x) is the sum of the oxidised forms of nitrogen, which includes nitrite (NO₂) and nitrate (NO₃), and is often referred to as NO_x. Nitrite can be converted to nitrogen gas by denitrifying bacteria and ammonium (NH₄) in the form of nitrate; hence plants can easily absorb this form of nitrogen in a continuous cycle as it is readily soluble in water and is rapidly transported through the catchment via surface run-off, sub-surface and groundwater flows (Horwood, 1997).

The majority of sites were within the ANZECC water quality guidelines for TON (0.15mg/L) for lowland river systems and ecosystem health on most sampling occasions, (Figure 12).

Lennard Brook (EBN1), Yal Yal Brook (EBN5) and Egerton (EBN26) recorded TON concentrations above the guideline on every sampling occasion. This is consistent with results from 2010. Lennard Brook TON concentrations ranged between 2.3mg/L and 2.9mg/L. Yal Yal Brook TON concentrations ranged between 0.81mg/L and 1.3mg/L. Egerton TON concentrations ranged between 0.63mg/L and 1.0mg/L. Muchea North (EBN11) recorded TON concentrations above guidelines on 1 out of 3 occasions sampled and ranged between 0.077mg/L and 0.3Mg/L. Belhus (EBN19) and Gauging Station (EBN18) recorded TON concentrations above the guideline on one out of 4 sampling Occasisions with a range of 0.051mg/L and 0.16mg/L which is only slightly above the guideline. Some of these results are high in comparison to other sampling sites within the Ellen Brook catchment as TON is directly available to plants and therefore has a direct correlation with algal blooms. These exceedences are potentially a result of the surrounding intensive land uses (golf course and urban development and agriculture), (Horwood, 1997).

Lennard Brook (EBN1) recorded TON concentrations over thirteen times greater than the guideline value, and Yal Yal Brook (EBN5) recorded concentrations over eight times greater then the guideline. These sites are perennial tributaries in the northern half of the catchment (Figure 5). Lennard Brook is a proclaimed waterway, an important source of water for nearby horticulture, so monitoring of this site should continue. Potential sources of the elevated TON concentrations are linked to land use including an abattoir on Lennard Brook, and intensive horticulture further upstream on both waterways which use high levels of fertiliser.

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011




Figure 12: Total Oxidised Nitrogen (TON) sampled within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *Note blanks represent no sample.

7.3.3. Ammonia as NH₃N

Most sites exceeded the ANZECC guideline of 0.08mg/L on at least 1 sampling occasion(Figure 13). Warren Road (EBN17), Wandena North (EBN7), Muchea East (EBN10) and Chandala South (EBN4) exceeded the guidelines on three occasions. Belhus (EBN19), Lower Yalyal (EBN21), Muchea North (EBN11) and Peters Rd (EBN23) exceeded the guidelines on two occasions. Roxbourghe Ave (EBN29), Gauging Station (EBN18), Rutland Rd (EBN13), Wandena South (EBN8), Bulls Brook (EBN16), Brand Highway (EBN9), and Chandala West (EBN3) exceeded the guideline on one sampling occasion. Sources of this Ammonia could include agricultural fertilisers, and the decomposition of organic wastes. Most of these sites are situated adjacent to or near to agricultural land-uses such as cattle grazing, cropping, fertiliser storage, stock yards and horticulture.




Figure 13: Ammonia as Nitrogen (NH₃N) sampled within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *Note blanks represent no sample

7.3.4. Dissolved Organic Nitrogen

Dissolved Organic Nitrogen (Dissolved Organic Nitrogen) is comprised of the organic forms of nitrogen including amino acids, proteins, urea and humic acid. All sampling sites exceeded the ANZECC guideline of 0.04mg/L on all sampling occasions. The DON results show a direct correlation with the Total Nitrogen (TN). Additionally, DON concentrations when compared with total nitrogen, ammonia and total oxidised nitrogen concentrations showed that nitrogen exists primarily in its soluble form in the Ellen Brook catchment.




Figure 14: Dissolved Organic Nitrogen (DON) sampled within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *Note blanks represent no sample

7.3.3 Total Phosphorous

Total phosphorus (TP) is a measure of all phosphorus in the water including the available and unavailable (or potentially available) forms of phosphorus including orthophosphates (fertilisers), organic phosphate (plants & animals) and condensed phosphates (inorganic cleaning agents). Sources of phosphorus include fertilisers, plant debris, detergents, industrial wastes and lubricants (McTaggart 2002). Phosphorus is naturally occurring in the environment and is usually the limiting factor for plant growth. The concentration of phosphorous is generally lower than nitrogen in most waterways. However, an increase in the total P level in freshwater bodies stimulates the production of *Chlorophyll a* in phytoplankton and results in an algal bloom (Russell, 2001).

As plants and animals excrete waste or die then decay, the organic phosphate sinks to the bottom where bacteria convert it back to inorganic phosphate. Inorganic phosphate returns to the water column when sediments are disturbed, making it available again for uptake by the plants and the cycle continues. Inorganic phosphate is not as mobile as soluble forms of nutrients and tends to be adsorbed by most soils and particulate material. This results in a steady accumulation of phosphorus that slowly moves through the soil profile. Holding time of phosphorus in the catchment depends on the recharge rate to groundwater, rate of adsorption to soil particles and the extent of soil saturation (Gerritse, 1996).

There was no relationship between the time of sampling and the level of TP as concentrations varied at each sampling site, each month (Figure 15). The majority of sites were consistently higher than the guideline value of 0.065mg/L on all four sampling occasions, except for Roxburgh Avenue (EBN27), Kit-it Brook (EBN22), Wandena Road (ENB27), Muchea East (EBN10), Rocky Gully (EBN6), Yal Yal Brook (EBN5) and Wandena North (EBN7). Which were below the guideline on all sampling occasions. Wandena South (EBN8) only exceeded the guideline on the september sampling occasion. Muchea North (EBN11) however recorded TP concentrations of approximately seventy times higher than the guideline value of 0.065mg/L. This is consistent with the levels recorded in 2010 and significantly less than what was recorded in 2009.

These results are certainly cause for further investigation. Similar to total nitrogen, there appears to be a general trend in the data showing that sub catchments to the west of the Ellen Brook have higher levels of nutrients in the runoff than those to the east. This is due to changes in soil type (Figure 3). Duplex soils of sand over clay with high phosphorous retention capabilities dominate on the Darling and Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group

Dandaragan Plateaus to the east of the Ellen Brook. These soils have a higher nutrient trapping capability and are able to retain nutrients in the soil for a longer period of time than the well drained, porous, sandy soils of the Bassendean sands complex located to the west (DEBCMP, 2001).

Muchea North (EBN11) was identified as the highest contributor of TP to the Ellen Brook. This emerging trend has been identified in every Snapshot report since 2005. As a result of monitoring by the Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group, Muchea North was identified in the Swan River Trust's Drainage Nutrient Intervention Program (DNIP) as a site requiring nutrient removal/intervention in the Lower Ellen Brook catchment. On-ground works formed a treatment train approach to nutrient removal and was implemented during 2009 and 2010. The treatment train involved the installation of a drain diversion to slow the flow before passing through a nutrient filter and into the Ellen Brook. Continued monitoring is required to determine the effectiveness of this treatment train approach in this catchment however our initial snapshot results look positive.

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011




Figure 15: Total Phosphorous concentration sampled within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011.

NB: Roxburgh Ave, Ki-it Brook, Wandena Road, Muchea East, Wandena North, Rocky Gully and Yal Yal recorded very low concentrations of TP.

*Note blanks represent no sample

7.3.4 Soluble Reactive Phosphorous

Soluble reactive phosphorus (SRP) measures only the dissolved phosphorus in water and provides a measure of the immediately available phosphate in the system at the time of sampling; it is also referred to as PO_4 . As this form of phosphorus is readily available it is more likely to stimulate algal blooms. This can lead to more decaying vegetation which alters river characteristics including elevated temperature, reduced oxygen and fish kills. This nutrient enrichment process is known as eutrophication (McTaggart, 2002).

Most of the sites were significantly above the lowland river system guideline value of 0.04mg/L on one or more occasions, with the exception of Yal Yal Brook (EBN5), Rocky Gully (EBN6), Wandena north (EBN7), Wandena South (EBN8), Muchea East (EBN10), Ki-it Brook (EBN22), Wandena Road (EBN27), and Roxburgh Ave (EBN29), (Figure 16).

Muchea North (EBN11) recorded the highest concentrations of FRP with values over one hundred and two times greater than the guideline. FRP concentrations have been recorded up to one hundred and thirty two times greater than the ANZECC guideline in 2009 sampling program and one hundred and seven times greater in 2010. Even considering that the guideline value may be unrealistic for the Ellen Brook, the magnitude of the concentration at this site compared to others is alarming and requires further monitoring.

The source of the spikes in FRP at Muchea North was most likely diffuse; the land uses at this site involve high stocking rates of cattle grazing on flat, deep draining, sandy soils. This area is prone to being seasonally waterlogged (palusplain), transporting significant amounts of dissolved nutrients to the Ellen Brook. Again, most of the sites on the western side of the catchment have higher concentrations than those to the east.




Figure 16: Soluble Reactive Phosphorous concentrations sampled within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011

*Note blanks represent no sample

7.3.5. Total Filterable Phosphorous

Total Filterable Phosphorous (Figure 17) was analysed to allow the Swan River Trust to determine the Filterable Unreactive Phosphorous, also known as Soluble Organic Phosphorous. Total Filterable Phosphorous minus Soluble Reactive Phosphorous equals Soluble Organic Phosphorous. TFP compared to Soluble Reactive Phosphorous (Figure 16) shows that TFP is comprised primarily of filterable reactive phosphorous. Figures 18, 19, 20 & 21 shows each sampling occasion and highlights the percentage of Soluble Reactive Phosphorous and soluble Organic Phosphorous as part of the Total Filterable Phosphorous.




Figure 17: Total Filterable Phosphorous (TFP) concentrations sampled within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2010.

*Note blanks represent no sample or very low values




Figure 18: Composition of Total Filterable phosphorous in percentages of Soluble Organic P and SRP in July Sampling run 2011. *note that blanks represent no sample or TFP below LOR




Figure 19: Composition of Total Filterable phosphorous in percentages of Soluble Organic P and SRP in August Sampling run 2011. *note that blanks represent no sample




Figure 20: Composition of Total Filterable phosphorous in percentages of Soluble Organic P and SRP in September Sampling run 2010. *note that blanks represent no sample or TFP below LOR




Figure 21: Composition of Total Filterable phosphorous in percentages of Soluble Organic P and SRP in October Sampling run 2011. *note that blanks represent no sample or TFP below LOR

7.4 Metals in surface water

Metals are found naturally in aquatic ecosystems. However, in excessive amounts they are toxic and associated with pollution. They are derived from a variety of sources such as industrial waste, refuse leachate, and corrosion of pipes and roofs (McTaggart, 2002). The most common sources of metal contaminants in the Ellen Brook are pesticides and fertiliser application. Copper, zinc and cadmium are often found in fertilisers. In the Ellen Brook most metals would enter via stormwater run-off or groundwater contamination. Other metals such as aluminium and iron can also reach toxic levels when mobilised from the soil by acidic groundwater.

Aquatic organisms have varying tolerance levels to different metals. Metals that are essential for growth can become toxic to aquatic organisms at levels beyond their tolerance which may only be slightly higher than normal concentrations. Metals may also accumulate in fatty tissues of animals and in the human body, so repeated exposure to metals can cause toxic levels to build up, this is known as “bioaccumulation” (IEA 2003).

Metals accumulate through the food chain in a process called “biomagnification” which can result in animals at the top end of the food chain receiving a high concentration of metals even if the organisms consumed at lower levels of the food chain have acceptable levels of metals. Tolerance levels of aquatic organisms to metals and their ability to absorb those metals can be influenced by many factors including their interaction with other metals, the chemical form of the metal, dissolved oxygen levels, salinity levels, temperature and hardness of the water.

Samples were taken at seven strategically identified sites and analysed for metals. The sites included Upper Yal Yal (EBN28) – an acidic dam, Warren Road (EBN17 – Ellen Brook main stem), Muchea East (EBN10), Wandena South (EBN8), Wandena North (EBN7) Chandala South (EBN3) and Belhus Reserve (EBN19) on all four sampling occasions.

Metal concentrations in the waters of the Ellen Brook catchment were generally high based on the ANZECC water quality trigger values for freshwater ecosystems. However, concentrations for cadmium, nickel, and zinc were below the hardness-modified trigger values (HMTV) (Table 6), Chromium and Copper was above the HMTV value at one or more sites (Figure 26). Lead was above the limit of reporting but below the relative HMTV value at one or more sites (Figure 29). Arsenic was above the limit of reporting but below the relative ANZECC trigger value at one or more sites (Figure 24). Aluminium (Figure 23) and Iron (Figure 28) were well above the ANZECC trigger values for freshwater ecosystems at one or more sites.

7.4.1 Metals at Upper Yal Yal (EBN28)

Upper Yal Yal (EBN28) is an unregistered contaminated site in the Ellen Brook catchment (Figure 5). This site was included in the Ellen Brook Water Quality Monitoring Program to provide some baseline data for remediation works undertaken by the Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture and Food (Albany Office) and the ARWA Centre for Eco-hydrology UWA.

This site has not been sampled for pH since 2009 due to the possibility of damaging equipment. However, it has been tested in the past and recorded pH levels of less than 3. Furthermore, total water hardness at this site was recorded as extremely hard (Figure 18). Increased mobilisation of metals as a result of low pH levels could be the cause of elevated concentrations recorded. Results show that metals at this site exceeded the ANZECC water quality trigger values on more than one sampling occasion. The ANZECC water quality trigger values for cadmium, chromium, copper, lead, nickel and zinc were modified to take into account the effect of water hardness on metal toxicity (Figure 22). As a result copper exceeded the hardness-modified trigger values (HMTV) on more than one sampling occasion.

EBN28 is a dam which is located on private property and fenced off from stock. There are major acid-saline scalds situated in the adjacent paddock. The sampling point is situated down slope from a clay extraction operation and surrounded by agricultural enterprises. Natural occurrences, farming practices, major earthworks and altered hydrology could be the cause of elevated heavy metal concentrations recorded at this site. The water table was cut at a point above the dam allowing groundwater to flow into the retention dam. This groundwater flows through ancient marine deposits resulting in increased acidity. Furthermore, cadmium, copper and zinc are often found in fertilizer which would have been applied to the paddocks higher in the sub catchment.

Results show cause for concern to the immediate landholder and those who have access to this water source in this sub catchment. It is also of concern that this water could potentially contaminate the Yal Yal Brook (EBN5) which is one of two remaining freshwater perennial streams in the Ellen Brook catchment. To date monitoring of the Yalyal has not produced any evidence that the Upper Yalyal site is having any effect on the catchment however ground water movent is extremely slow so there is still risk of contamination in the future.

7.4.2. Surface Water Hardness

Water described as ‘hard’ is high in dissolved minerals. Hard water is not a health risk, but a nuisance because of mineral build up on plumbing fixtures, and causes poor soap and detergent performance (DOW, 2006). Total hardness, expressed as calcium carbonate (CaCO_3), is the combined concentration of earth-alkali metals, predominantly magnesium (Mg^{2+}) and calcium (Ca^{2+}), and some strontium (Sr^{2+}). The source of this hardness is limestone dissolved by water that is rich in carbon dioxide. Hardness levels range from <60mg/L (soft) to >400 mg/L (extremely hard).

Water hardness can have an effect on the acceptable trigger values for particular heavy metal concentrations (cadmium, copper, zinc, lead, nickel and chromium). Water samples with higher water hardness need to have the trigger values for these metals adjusted by hardness-dependent algorithm or the approximate factors applied to soft water trigger values of varying water hardness provided in ANZECC and ARMCANZ (2000), (Appendix E).

Four sites sampled recorded ‘Extremely High’ water hardness concentrations on each sampling occasion which ranged between 570mg/L at Wandena South (EBN8) and 1300mg/L at Upper Yal Yal (EBN28) over the four month sampling period (Figure 22). Two sites sampled Very Hard which ranged between 120mg/L at Chandala South (EBN4) and 360mg/L at Belhus (EBN19).

Water hardness at six sites remained relatively the same as those recorded in 2010 in regard to the hardness category, except for Chandala West which recorded hardness values 240mg/L less the 2010. Hardness Values were highly variable in 2011 when compared to the 2010 data which remained relatively constant over the four sampling occasions. Refer to Table 6 for the calculated hardness-modified trigger values (HMTV) for cadmium, copper, chromium, lead, nickel and zinc.




Figure 22: Water hardness of surface water within the Ellen Brook Catchment at sites sampled for metal contamination, between July and October 2011. *Blanks represent no sample

Table 6: Hardness-Modified Trigger Values (HMTV) for Cadmium, Copper, Chromium, Lead, Nickel and Zinc based on Figure 22 and Appendix E calculations.

Metal	ANZECC Trigger Value	HMTV for extremely hard water (250 - >400mg/L)	HMTV for very hard water (180 – 240).
Cadmium	0.0002	0.002	0.0011
Copper	0.0014	0.0126	0.0072
Chromium	0.001	0.0084	0.005
Nickel	0.011	0.099	0.057
Lead	0.0034	0.09	0.04
Zinc	0.008	0.07	0.04

7.4.2 Aluminium

All sites tested consistently exceeded the 0.055mg/L ANZECC water quality guideline for freshwater ecosystems (Figure 23). Upper Yal Yal (EBN21) and Wandena North (EBN7) recorded the highest aluminium concentrations. It is interesting to note that pH levels at Muchea East (EBN10) were very similar to those at Wandena North (EBN7) yet the aluminium concentrations at Wandena North were significantly higher (Figure 8). Wandena North (EBN7), Wandena South (EBN8) and Muchea East (EBN10) are situated below old clay pits and consistently record low pH levels between 3 and 7. This is potentially due to run off from old clay extraction pits up stream of the tributary where altered hydrology has resulted in ferrolysis (acid sulphate soil created by the alternating oxidation and reduction of iron/clays), which has subsequently increased the mobility of aluminium in the soil and enabled it to be transported downstream. The other contributing factor could be that these streams are partly groundwater fed. This groundwater flows through ancient marine deposits resulting in increased acidity which mobilizes the metals within the soil.

Belhus (EBN19) recorded relatively high aluminium concentrations during the sampling program. Concentrations reached as high as 0.33mg/L on the August sampling occasion at Belhus (EBN19), and 0.7mg/L at Warren Road (EBN17) in September. Wandena South and Chandala West did record concentrations Higher than 2010 however this could be related to the reduced flow throughout the catchment in 2010. The Warren Road site is on the main stem of the Ellen Brook which runs parallel and then directly south of Pearce RAAF Base. Belhus is the main stem sampling site located just upstream of the confluence of the Ellen Brook with the Swan River. It is of concern that these sites recorded such high aluminium concentrations as it identifies the Ellen Brook as a contributor of aluminium to the Swan River (Figure 5).




Figure 23: Aluminium concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *please note blanks represent no sample

7.4.3 Arsenic

All tested sites were recorded with concentration levels of arsenic below the ANZECC water quality trigger value for freshwater ecosystems of 0.024mg/L (Figure 24). Chandala South (EBN4), Wandena South (EBN8) Warren Road (EBN17) and Belhus (EBN19) were the only sites to record arsenic concentrations above the limit of reporting.

Arsenic is found in pesticides, insecticides, herbicides, fertilisers and various alloys, and occurs naturally in the environment. The recorded concentrations could be a result of excess fertilisers and chemicals transported to the waterways via surface water run-off and subsurface flow.




Figure 24: Arsenic concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *please note blanks represent no sample

7.4.4 Cadmium

All sites recorded cadmium levels below the Hardness Modified Trigger Values (HMTV) of 0.002mg/L in very hard water, 0.0011 in extremely hard water.(Figure 21) Belhus (EBN19) and Warren Rd (EBN17) were well below there HMTV for very hard water (180-240mg/L) and the remaining sites were well below their HMTV for extremely hard water (>400mg/L). Upper Yal Yal (EBN28) Muchea East (EBN10) and Wandena North (EBN7) were the only sites with cadmium levels above the limit of reporting. All other sites are below the limit of reporting on all occasions.




Figure 25: Cadmium concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *please note that blanks represent no sample

7.4.5 Chromium

All tested sites were well below the hardness-modified trigger values. Belhus Reserve (EBN19) and Warren Road (EBN17) were listed as very hard (Figure 17) and were below their HMTV of 0.005mg/L. Chandala South (EBN4), Wandena North (EBN7), Wandena South (EBN8), Muchea East (EBN10) and Upper Yal Yal (EBN28) were listed as extremely hard (Figure 17) and were well below their HMTV of 0.0084mg/L, (Figure 26).

Chromium is used in dyes and paints, and is also a naturally occurring and essential trace element in soil (Wikipedia, 2007).




Figure 26: Chromium concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2010. *Note blanks represent no sample.

7.4.6 Copper

Most sites were well below the hardness-modified trigger value (HMTV) of 0.0126mg/L for extremely hard water and 0.0072mg/L for very hard water. The Upper Yal Yal (EBN28) was the only site to exceed its HMTV on all four sampling occasions (Figure 27).

Four of the sites were above the recommended ANZECC trigger value of 0.0014mg/L. Belhus (EBN19), Warren Rd (EBN17), Upper Yal Yal (EBN28) and Chandala South (EBN4) exceeded the ANZECC trigger value on one or more sampling occasions. The sites are well below the ANZECC values for livestock watering, being 0.5 mg/L for sheep, 5 mg/L for pigs and poultry and 1mg/L for cattle. (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000)

Copper is used in building material, electrical and heat conductors, and in household products. It is also an essential trace element; however in sufficient amounts it can be toxic. The proximity of these sites to the tip site, old clay extraction pits, Pearce RAAF Base, and urban development, accompanied by low pH levels and extremely/very hard water could have increased the mobilisation of the metal through the soil and resulted in increased concentrations in the waterways.




Figure 27: Copper concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *note that blanks represent no sample.

7.4.7 Iron

All sites consistently exceeded the ANZECC guideline trigger value of 0.3mg/L (Figure 28). There is limited data on the effects of high iron levels for stock drinking purposes; however these sites were above the agricultural watering guideline of 1mg/L on all occasions (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000).

Iron concentrations have been well above the guideline of 0.3mg/L on all sampling occasions since 2005. Since 2005, iron concentrations appear to have increased at each of the sites. Potential causes of high iron concentrations in surface waters at Chandala South (EBN4), Wandena North (EBN7), Wandena South (EBN8), Muchea East (EBN10) and Warren Rd (EBN17) include the geology and soil type, the time of sampling and rainfall experienced on the day of sampling, and high acidity enabling the mobilisation of metal ions into solution. These metal ions are generally trapped in the sediments. The sites with higher concentrations than the guideline would more likely have a slight odour and cause an iron stain after irrigating.




Figure 28: Iron concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook Catchment between July and October 2011. *please note blanks represent no sample

7.4.8 Lead

Samples were well below the hardness-modified trigger values of 0.04mg/L at Belhus Reserve (EBN19) and Warren Road (EBN17), and 0.09mg/L at Chandala West (EBN3), Wandena North (EBN7), Wandena South (EBN8), Muchea East (EBN10) and Upper Yal Yal (EBN28) (Figure 29). Lead was found to be at or below the limit of reporting at all sites except for Wandena North (EBN7), Upper Yal Yal (EBN28), Wandena South (EBN8) and Muchea East on one or more sampling occasions. However, lead concentrations remained below the HMTV and are therefore not of concern at this time.

Lead is used in building construction, lead-acid batteries, and bullets. It is also a neurotoxin that accumulates in soft tissues and bone over time. Lead is a soil contaminant, present in natural deposits and may enter the soil through petrol leaks or from grindings from particular industrial operations (DOW, NA).




Figure 29: Lead concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *Note blanks represent no sample

7.4.9 Nickel

All tested sites were well below the hardness-modified trigger values of 0.057mg/L at Belhus Reserve (EBN19) and Warren Road (EBN17), and 0.099mg/L at Chandala West (EBN3), Wandena North (EBN7), Wandena South (EBN8), Muchea East (EBN10) and Upper Yal Yal (EBN28) (Figure 30). All sites were also well below the trigger value of 1mg/L for metals in livestock drinking water.

Nickel is used in many industrial and consumer products, plating and glass tinting.




Figure 30: Nickel concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2011. *Note blanks represent no sample

7.4.10 Zinc

No tested site exceeded the hardness-modified trigger values (HMTV) of 0.04mg/L at Belhus Reserve (EBN19) and Warren Road (EBN17). However Wandena North (EBN7) did exceed the extremely hard HMTV of 0.07mg/L on one sampling occasion. The remaining sites were below the HMTV (Figure 31). It is important to note that total zinc concentrations of less than 20mg/L in livestock drinking water is highly unlikely to be a threat to the health of livestock (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000).

Concentrations of Zinc rarely exceed 0.01mg/L in natural water. Higher concentrations can be associated with pollution from industrial wastes or corrosion of zinc coated plumbing or galvanized water tanks, particularly in areas of low pH (ANZECC and ARMCANZ, 2000).




Figure 31: Zinc concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between July and October 2010. *Note that blanks represent no sample

8. Comparison with previous results

The Ellen Brook catchment water quality monitoring program has been undertaken on an annual basis for seven years, with four or five sampling runs conducted each year, commencing in 2005. Enough data has been collated across the catchment to provide some indication of water quality and emerging trends. It is imperative that this monitoring program be continued to add to the data collected to date and identify emerging trends more clearly.

The sampling results are dependent upon the ‘flushing’ of the system and therefore, the amount of rainfall during that season. Nutrient concentrations in the Ellen Brook originate from sediments on the river bed and tributaries that result from erosion and surface runoff from the eastern part of the catchment, and nutrients carried in suspension through surface runoff and sub-surface flow from the western sub catchments. Therefore, nutrient concentrations represent the amount transported into the Ellen Brook via sedimentation and surface water runoff.

Nutrient concentrations entering the Ellen Brook will vary each sampling year. Additionally, a consequence of snapshot sampling is that it only produces data for four to five individual sampling occasions within the three to four month sampling period, over the seven years (2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 2010 & 2011). It does not take into account daily fluxes or extremes. Therefore, it is imperative that annual monitoring continues in order to determine the significance of change in concentrations and emerging trends.

8.1 pH

Throughout the duration of the 2005-2011 sampling program, pH generally remained within the ANZECC water quality guidelines for freshwater ecosystems between 6.5 and 8 at the majority of sites (Appendix I). However, there are some exceptions.

Subcatchments to the east of the Ellen Brook have been identified as contributors of metals with low pH values. Wandena North, Wandena South and Muchea East sampling sites are located downstream of old, current and proposed clay extraction pits which we infer to have resulted in the exposure of acid clay soils. Parsons Brinckerhoff (2006) found that the overlying gravely sands are slightly acidic with pH values ranging between 5 and 6. pH was found to decrease with increasing depth to the clay horizon. At a depth of 2m pH values were recorded around 5. At a depth of 10m pH was recorded as low as 3.63, therefore, these soils are naturally acidic. Disturbance and excavation works carried out at these sites has altered the groundwater table and potentially the severity of the acid soils contribution to acidic water (refer to 7.2 for more details).

Wandena North has recorded pH values between 3.17 and 8.24. Wandena South recorded pH values between 3.85 and 7.16. Muchea East recorded pH values between 3.15 and 6.95. It is interesting to note that in 2005 at Muchea East pH values were all above 6.3; however 2006 to 2011 averages being considerable lower. In 2011 the average pH was 3.65 which is relatively consistent with the years since 2005. There has definitely been a drastic fall in pH at Muchea East. The following graph has been included to illustrate the average pH trends from 2005 through to 2011 for each site (Figure 32). It is evident that the majority of sites have remained within the guideline. The few sites that have acidity issues are quite different from the other sites.




Figure 32: Average pH levels in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment between 2005 and 2011.

8.2 Conductivity

Throughout the duration of the 2005-2011 sampling program, conductivity (EC) remained above the ANZECC water quality guidelines for freshwater ecosystems of 0.12-0.3mS/cm at all sites (Appendix I). Table 8 depicts the subcatchments sampled in the Ellen Brook catchment as fresh, marginal, brackish or saline based on the seven years of monitoring data.

Table 7: Sub catchment salinity measure based on the average of years of consistent data (2005-2011).
Please note that italicised salinity measurements represent 2-5years of sampling data ONLY.

Sampling Site	Salinity Measurement
EBN1 Lennard Brook	Fresh to marginal
EBN2 Airfield Road	Fresh
EBN3 Chandala West	Marginal
EBN4 Chandala South	Marginal
EBN5 Yal Yal Brook	Fresh to Marginal
EBN6 Rocky Creek	Marginal to Brackish
EBN7 Wandena North	Brackish
EBN8 Wandena South	Brackish
EBN9 Brand Highway	Marginal to Brackish
EBN10 Muchea East	Brackish
EBN11 Muchea North	Fresh to Marginal
EBN12 Muchea South	<i>Fresh to Marginal</i>
EBN13 Rutland Road	Marginal
EBN14 Nutrient Inflow (Bingham)	Fresh
EBN15a Nutrient Outflow (Bingham)	Fresh
EBN16 Bulls Brook	Fresh
EBN17 Warren Road	Marginal
EBN18 Gauging Station	Marginal
EBN19 Belhus Reserve	Marginal
EBN20 All Saints	<i>Marginal</i>
EBN21 Lower Yal Yal	<i>Marginal</i>
EBN22 Ki-it Brook	<i>Marginal to Fresh</i>
EBN23 Peters Road	<i>Marginal</i>
EBN24 Stock Road	<i>Fresh</i>
EBN25 Sawpit Gully	<i>Fresh to Marginal</i>
EBN26 Egerton	<i>Fresh</i>
EBN27 Wandena Road	<i>Marginal to Brackish</i>
EBN28 Upper Yal Yal	NA
EBN29 Roxburgh Ave	<i>Marginal</i>

8.3 Total Nitrogen

Throughout the duration of the 2005-2011 sampling program, total nitrogen (TN) remained above the ANZECC water quality guidelines for freshwater ecosystems of 1.2mg/L at the majority of sites (Appendix I). Most sites across the catchment contribute a relatively significant amount of total nitrogen to the Ellen Brook; however Chandala West (EBN3), Muchea North (EBN11), Lower Yal Yal (EBN21), Bulls Brook (EBN16) Warren Rd (EBN17) and Lennard Brook (EBN1) were identified as high contributors with TN concentrations reaching as high as 7.8mg/L at Warren Rd.

A number of sites recorded TN concentrations below the ANZECC guideline for the majority of sampling occasions over the seven years of sampling and included Muchea East (EBN10), Ki-it Brook (EBN21), and Wandena Road (EBN27). It is also worth mentioning that Wandena North (EBN7) has recorded TN Concentrations below the ANZECC Guideline on five of the seven sampling years, of which includes the 2011 samples.

8.4 Total Phosphorous

Throughout the duration of the 2005-2011 sampling program, total phosphorous (TP) remained above the ANZECC water quality guidelines for freshwater ecosystems of 0.065mg/L at the majority of sites (Appendix I). Muchea North (EBN11) and Muchea South (EBN12) (no longer sampled) were identified as relatively significant contributors of total phosphorous to the Ellen Brook with concentrations ranging between 1.2 and 7.1mg/L, which is over one hundred times greater than the guideline value.

A number of sites recorded TP concentrations below the ANZECC guideline for the majority of sampling occasions over the six years of sampling and included Yal Yal Brook (EBN5), Rocky Gully (EBN6), Wandena North (EBN7), Wandena South (EBN8), Muchea East (EBN10), Ki-it Brook (EBN21), Wandena Road (EBN27) and Roxburgh Ave (EBN29).

TP in the Ellen Brook catchment is composed primarily of the soluble forms of phosphorous which are bioavailable. This ‘dissolved’ fraction (SRP) measures the immediately available phosphate in the system at the time of sampling. It is the dissolved (soluble) forms of phosphorous which are readily available for biological uptake, which is more likely to stimulate algal blooms.

9. Recommendations

- Continue the sampling and analysis monitoring program within the Ellen Brook catchment.
- Nutrient reduction strategies need to be continued in the catchment. Management actions for nutrient reduction may include the following;
 - Construction of nutrient stripping wetlands
 - Construction of nutrient intervention structures
 - Promotion of the use of fertiliser alternatives
 - Best management practice for fertiliser application through soil and leaf testing
 - Best Management practices for deep rooted pasture establishment
 - Revegetation and the fencing off of riparian zones along the Ellen Brook and major tributaries to prevent stock access
 - Revegetation and rehabilitation of remnant vegetation
- Continue to evaluate the effectiveness of the Bingham road subcatchment, Brand Highway and Muchea North Drain since the addition of new nutrient intervention technologies by the Swan River Trust in 2009/2010 under the Drainage Nutrient Intervention Program (DNIP).
- Identify areas of future rehabilitation, revegetation and waterway protection based on the results of the sampling program.
- Develop Ellen Brook priority sub catchment scale reports to determine emerging trends in water quality over the time of sampling (2005 – 2011). These progress reports could be complemented with an assessment of land use, existing and recommended landcare works in the area.

10. References

ANZECC and ARMCANZ (2000). *National Water Quality Management Strategy: Australia and New Zealand water quality guidelines for freshwater and marine*. Australian and New Zealand Conservation Council, Agriculture and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand.

Bureau of meteorology (2012) *Climate statistics for Australian Locations, Pearce RAAF, Western Australia*. http://www.bom.gov.au/climate/averages/tables/cw_009053_All.shtml

Banfield, K. (2001). *Sustainable Land Management in the Ellen Brook catchment*. Department of Agriculture.

Connell, S (2003). *Ellen Brook catchment Vegetation Survey* unpublished

CSIRO (1994). *Managing nutrient discharge from the Ellen Brook Catchment, Western Australia – Discussion Paper* CSIRO Division of Water Resources, Western Australia.

Deeley DM, Donohue R & Parsons G (1993). *Nutrient loads in surface drainage from Ellen Brook from 1987-1992 – Swan River Trust Report No. 13*. Swan River Trust, Perth.

Department of Water. (2006). *Water Resources Data – Bureau of Meteorology Rainfall Sites; HYSITREP – Site Report 009018 – Gingin –Gingin, 009029 – Muchea Tree Farm, 009053 Pearce RAAF Base*. Retrieved on the 28th January 2011 from portal.water.wa.gov.au/portal/page/portal/WaterManagement/MonitoringAndData/WaterLevelMonitoring

Department of Water. (2006a). *Water Resources Data – Streamflow Sites; HYSITREP – Site Report 616189 – Ellen Brook Railway Parade*. Retrieved on the 10th January 2007 from portal.water.wa.gov.au/portal/page/portal/WaterManagement/MonitoringAndData/WaterLevelMonitoring

Department of Water. (NA). *Swan Region Water Quality Monitoring and Evaluation: Background information for measured parameters*. Retrieved on the 22nd February 2011 from www.water.wa.gov.au/idelve/srwqm/measured.htm

Donohue, R (1994) *Phosphorus and Nitrogen in Ellen Brook 1987-1993* Swan River Trust, Perth WA.

Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group (EBICG). (2006). *Sampling and Analysis Plan*. Unpublished report.

Environmental Protection Authority (2002). *Revised Environmental Quality Criteria Reference Document (Cockburn Sound) – a supporting document to the draft Environmental Protection (Cockburn Sound) Policy 2002*.

Environmental Protection Authority (2002). *Revised Draft Environmental Protection (Cockburn Sound) Policy 2002 – report to the minister for the environment as required under section 28 of the Environmental Protection Act, 1986.*

Gerritse, R (1996). *Leaching of nutrients and pesticides from the Scott River Catchment: A critical overview of existing data and a comparison with the Harvey River, Ellen Brook and Gingin Brook Catchments.* CSIRO Division of Water Resources Report No. 96-37

Horwood W, Swan River Trust (SRT) (1997). *A Walk Through the Ellen Brook Catchment.* Swan River Trust, Perth WA.

http://hermes.erin.gov.au/pls/crg_public/!CRGPPUBLIC.PSTART?strAction=SearchByChemical 2006
National Chemical Reference Guide internet site March 2006

IEA (Institute of Engineers Australia) (2003). *Australian Runoff Quality Guidelines (Draft).* Institute of Engineers Australia, Australia.

Kellogg, Brown & Root Pty Ltd (2003). *Water Study for the Shire of Chittering* Perth, Western Australia.

McTaggart A, 2002. *A Community Guideline to Surface Water Quality Investigations – Version 1.0.* Water and Rivers Commission Aquatic Science Branch.

Micenko, A, 2005. *Sourcing contributing areas to river flow in Ellen Brook, Western Australia, using environmental indicators and mixing models.* Centre for water research: University of Western Australia

NHMRC & ARMCANZ (1996). *Australian Drinking Water Quality Guidelines.* National Health and Medical Research Council and Agriculture and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand.

Parsons Brinckerhoff. (2006). *Acid Sulphate Soil Investigation and Management Plan: Lot 6 Wandena Road, Muchea* WA. Midland Brick Company, Perth WA.

PPK Environment and Infrastructure (Australia) Pty Ltd. (2001). *Draft Ellen Brook Catchment Management Plan.* Acacia Springs Environmental, Australia.

Russell, J. (2001). *Contribution of the particulate fraction to the phosphorous load exported from the Ellen Brook Catchment.* Unpublished bachelor dissertation, University of Western Australia.

Schoknecht, N. (2004). *Acidity in the environment of South Western Australia.* Department of Agriculture, Western Australia.

Smith, RA & Shams R (WRC) (2002). *Hydrogeological Information for management planning in the Ellen Brook Catchment.* Water & Rivers Commission, Perth WA.

Sharma, ML & Craig, AB (1988). *Comparative recharge rates beneath Banksia woodland and two pine plantations on the Gnangara Mound Western Australia.* Balkema Publishing, Boston.

SRT (Swan River Trust) (1999). *Swan Canning Cleanup Program Action Plan: An Action Plan to Clean up the Swan-Canning Rivers and Estuary*. Swan River Trust. Perth, WA.

Swan River Trust (2009). *Local Water Quality Improvement Plan: Ellen Brook*. Swan River Trust. Perth, WA.

Van Looij, E. (2007). *Developing Salt Load Targets for Ellen Brook, Wooroloo Brook and the Brockman River*. Department of Water, Perth WA.

Waters and Rivers Commission (2000) *Wilson Inlet report to the community. Summary of the Wilson Inlet catchment monitoring program*. Waters and Rivers Commission and Wilson Inlet Management Authority, WA.

Water and Rivers Commission (WRC) (2002). *Hydrogeological Information for management planning in the Ellen Brook catchment*. Water & Rivers Commission, Perth WA.

Wikipedia. (2007). *Copper, Chromium, Cadmium, Iron, Lead, Arsenic, Nickel*. Retrieved on the 7th February 2008 from www.wikipedia.org

Appendix A – Water Quality Results (raw)

Physical Parameters

<u>Site Ref No.</u>	<u>Site Name</u>	<u>Date Collected</u>	<u>pH</u>	<u>Conductivity</u>	<u>Temperature</u>	<u>Total Suspended Solids</u>
ANZECC			6.5 - 8	(mS/cm)		7mg/L
EBN19	Belhus	21-Jul-11	6.62	1.507	13.3	6
		30-Aug-11	7.12	1.184	14.8	8
		21-Sep-11	7.13	1.523	15.9	4
		24-Oct-11	7.2	1.872	18.6	<1
EBN26	Egerton	21-Jul-11	7.12	0.241	13.8	2
		30-Aug-11	7.44	0.475	16	2
		21-Sep-11	7.37	0.657	16.6	3
		24-Oct-11	7.7	0.558	18.9	2
EBN25	Sawpit Gully	21-Jul-11	4.91	2.01	14.4	42
		30-Aug-11	6.53	1.619	15.2	10
		21-Sep-11	6.68	1.493	16.1	10
		24-Oct-11	6.8	1.522	17.3	7
EBN29	Roxburgh Ave	21-Jul-11	7.52	1.258	15	<1
		30-Aug-11	7.65	1.258	17.2	2
		21-Sep-11	7.66	1.392	19.3	7
		24-Oct-11	7.6	1.55	20.3	6
EBN18	Gauging Station	21-Jul-11	6.71	1.577	14.6	5
		30-Aug-11	7.09	1.13	17	2
		21-Sep-11	7.16	1.493	17.1	5
		24-Oct-11	7.1	2.19	18.6	2
EBN22	Ki-it Brook	21-Jul-11	7.29	0.1927	14.2	8
		30-Aug-11	7.45	0.831	16.2	1
		21-Sep-11	7.5	1.039	16.5	2
		24-Oct-11	7.5	0.473	18.5	2
EBN17	Warren Road	21-Jul-11	6.29	1.331	12.9	4
		30-Aug-11	6.86	1.032	13.7	14
		21-Sep-11	7	1.49	15.4	8
		24-Oct-11	7.1	1.969	17	33
EBN13	Rutland Road	21-Jul-11	6.95	2.13	15.4	5

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011

<u>Site Ref No.</u>	<u>Site Name</u>	<u>Date Collected</u>	<u>pH</u>	<u>Conductivity</u>	<u>Temperature</u>	<u>Total Suspended Solids</u>
		30-Aug-11	7.28	1.587	16.6	2
		21-Sep-11	7.31	1.698	16.7	7
		24-Oct-11	7.7	2.37	22	2
EBN27	Wandena Road	21-Jul-11	6.55	2.51	14.1	<1
		30-Aug-11	6.81	2.55	16.3	<1
		21-Sep-11	6.76	3.13	16	<1
		24-Oct-11	6.7	3.25	18.5	1
EBN10	Muchea East	21-Jul-11	3.46	7.77	18.7	1
		30-Aug-11	3.85	5.93	20	<1
		21-Sep-11	3.9	5.75	17.9	29
		24-Oct-11	3.4	8.62	23.8	<1
EBN7	Wandena North	21-Jul-11	3.41	7.12	17.4	3
		30-Aug-11	3.65	7.1	20.3	<1
		21-Sep-11	3.75	7.19	18.7	18
		24-Oct-11	3.4	8.4	24.9	1
EBN6	Rocky Gully	21-Jul-11	6.49	3.5	15.2	1
		30-Aug-11	7.38	3.25	16.9	2
		21-Sep-11	7.44	3.38	17.4	1
		24-Oct-11	6.9	3.43	19.8	2
EBN21	Lower Yal Yal	21-Jul-11	7.29	2.55	19.2	20
		30-Aug-11	7.57	2.4	22.9	21
		21-Sep-11	7.28	2.44	20.2	9
		24-Oct-11	7.4	3.91	17.1	40
EBN5	Yal Yal	21-Jul-11	6.78	0.902	16.2	5
		30-Aug-11	6.96	0.87	17.2	6
		21-Sep-11	6.99	0.985	18.4	3
		24-Oct-11	7.4	1.031	21.5	2
EBN28	Upper Yal Yal	21-Jul-11	NA	NA	NA	NA
		30-Aug-11	NA	NA	NA	NA
		21-Sep-11	NA	NA	NA	NA
		24-Oct-11	NA	NA	NA	NA
EBN8	Wandena South	21-Jul-11	4.78	7	16.7	4
		30-Aug-11	5.91	5.3	18.8	17

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011

<u>Site Ref No.</u>	<u>Site Name</u>	<u>Date Collected</u>	<u>pH</u>	<u>Conductivity</u>	<u>Temperature</u>	<u>Total Suspended Solids</u>
		21-Sep-11	5.98	6.21	8.2	10
		24-Oct-11	6.2	6.52	20.7	28
EBN24	Stock Road	22-Jul-11	7.59	0.748	11.8	1
		31-Aug-11	7.55	0.769	14.8	2
		22-Sep-11	7.4	0.852	13.9	1
		25-Oct-11	7.7	0.763	17	5
EBN16	Bulls Brook	22-Jul-11	7.23	0.533	12.1	1
		31-Aug-11	7.33	0.621	15	6
		22-Sep-11	7.32	0.633	14.8	3
		25-Oct-11	7.4	0.704	17.1	15
EBN15a	NSP Out	22-Jul-11	6.68	0.459	13	<1
		31-Aug-11	6.96	0.474	15.9	1
		22-Sep-11	6.92	0.511	14.6	1
		25-Oct-11	7.2	0.472	17.6	1
EBN14a	NSP In	22-Jul-11	6.68	0.465	12.4	<1
		31-Aug-11	6.98	0.466	14.6	1
		22-Sep-11	6.89	0.511	13.3	3
		25-Oct-11	7.1	0.473	16.8	<1
EBN11	Muchea North	22-Jul-11	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D
		31-Aug-11	7.32	1.165	17.6	9
		22-Sep-11	6.97	0.94	14.7	5
		25-Oct-11	7.9	1.877	18.7	<1
EBN4	Chandala South	22-Jul-11	6.57	1.039	12.7	2
		31-Aug-11	6.97	1.033	16	8
		22-Sep-11	6.97	1.032	14.6	7
		25-Oct-11	7.2	1.497	17.8	10
EBN1	Lennard Brook	22-Jul-11	6.62	0.809	14.2	7
		31-Aug-11	6.88	0.936	15	5
		22-Sep-11	6.72	0.92	14.4	4
		25-Oct-11	6.9	0.935	17.5	8
EBN3	Chandala West	22-Jul-11	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D
		31-Aug-11	7.36	1.445	16.5	5
		22-Sep-11	7.57	2.09	14.5	6
		25-Oct-11	7.5	2.35	17.8	32
EBN23	Peters	22-Jul-11	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011

<u>Site Ref No.</u>	<u>Site Name</u>	<u>Date Collected</u>	<u>pH</u>	<u>Conductivity</u>	<u>Temperature</u>	<u>Total Suspended Solids</u>
	Road					
		31-Aug-11	7.72	1.668	19.7	1
		22-Sep-11	7.19	1.028	16	1
		25-Oct-11	8.1	2.07	17.9	<1
EBN9	Brand Hwy	22-Jul-11	6.71	1.733	13.2	3
		31-Aug-11	7.01	1.671	16.2	3
		22-Sep-11	6.91	1.94	16.7	4
		25-Oct-11	6.9	3.05	18.5	5
EBN2	Airfield Road	22-Jul-11	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D
		31-Aug-11	6.8	0.698	16.4	3
		22-Sep-11	6.92	0.953	15.1	6
		25-Oct-11	7.1	0.882	17.2	6

NB: 'NS' represents 'no sample taken at this time due to no flow'; 'NF' represents 'no flow'; 'NA' represents 'not applicable'.

Nutrients

<u>Site Ref No.</u>	<u>Site Name</u>	<u>Date Collected</u>	<u>Ammonia as NH3-N</u>	<u>DOC</u>	<u>SRP as P</u>	<u>Organic Nitrogen - Filterable</u>	<u>TOC</u>	<u>Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (Calc)</u>	<u>Total Nitrogen</u>	<u>Total Oxidised Nitrogen (TON)</u>	<u>Total Phosphorus</u>	<u>Total Phosphorus - Filterable</u>
LOR			<0.010	<1	<0.005	<0.025	<1	<0.025	<0.025	<0.010	<0.005	<0.005
Unit			mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L
ANZECC			0.08		0.04				1.2	0.15	0.065	
EBN19	Belhus	21-Jul-11	0.12	44	0.16	2.1	46	2.5	2.6	0.079	0.3	0.21
		30-Aug-11	0.083	47	0.35	1.9	50	2.2	2.4	0.16	0.51	0.44
		21-Sep-11	0.053	52	0.24	2.4	55	2.6	2.7	0.081	0.39	0.32
		24-Oct-11	0.043	37	0.3	1.6	39	1.7	1.8	0.05	0.41	0.32
EBN26	Egerton	21-Jul-11	0.06	NA	0.038	0.96	NA	1.2	2	0.85	0.067	0.049
		30-Aug-11	0.031	NA	0.063	0.98	NA	1.1	2.1	1	0.11	0.084
		21-Sep-11	0.013	NA	0.074	1.2	NA	1.3	2	0.74	0.11	0.083
		24-Oct-11	0.024	NA	0.038	1	NA	1.3	1.9	0.63	0.08	0.048
EBN25	Sawpit Gully	21-Jul-11	0.027	NA	0.005	0.82	NA	0.94	0.95	0.014	0.055	0.04
		30-Aug-11	0.057	NA	0.19	2.3	NA	2.5	2.5	0.041	0.32	0.22
		21-Sep-11	0.061	NA	0.27	3.2	NA	3.4	3.4	0.026	0.51	0.29
		24-Oct-11	0.051	NA	0.38	2.1	NA	2.3	2.3	0.018	0.53	0.41
EBN29	Roxburgh Ave	21-Jul-11	0.028	NA	<0.005	0.73	NA	0.8	1.1	0.3	0.012	0.009
		30-Aug-11	0.027	NA	<0.005	0.94	NA	0.99	1.5	0.48	0.017	0.013
		21-Sep-11	0.11	NA	0.007	1.1	NA	1.3	1.5	0.28	0.017	0.015
		24-Oct-11	0.049	NA	0.007	1	NA	1.2	1.3	0.073	0.029	0.012
EBN18	Gauging Station	21-Jul-11	0.14	NA	0.2	2.2	NA	2.5	2.6	0.11	0.32	0.24
		30-Aug-11	0.075	NA	0.35	1.9	NA	2	2.2	0.16	0.5	0.42
		21-Sep-11	0.053	NA	0.27	2.5	NA	2.7	2.8	0.074	0.41	0.34
		24-Oct-11	0.043	NA	0.28	1.5	NA	1.7	1.7	0.051	0.38	0.3
EBN22	Ki-it Brook	21-Jul-11	<0.010	NA	0.022	0.47	NA	0.54	0.6	0.067	0.031	0.023
		30-Aug-11	<0.010	NA	0.008	0.58	NA	0.64	0.86	0.22	0.025	0.019
		21-Sep-11	<0.010	NA	<0.005	0.51	NA	0.56	0.59	0.03	0.017	0.012

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011

<u>Site Ref No.</u>	<u>Site Name</u>	<u>Date Collected</u>	<u>Ammonia as NH3-N</u>	<u>DOC</u>	<u>SRP as P</u>	<u>Organic Nitrogen - Filterable</u>	<u>TOC</u>	<u>Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (Calc)</u>	<u>Total Nitrogen</u>	<u>Total Oxidised Nitrogen (TON)</u>	<u>Total Phosphorus</u>	<u>Total Phosphorus - Filterable</u>
		24-Oct-11	<0.010	NA	0.007	0.44	NA	0.48	0.49	0.011	0.017	0.013
EBN17	Warren Road	21-Jul-11	0.69	NA	0.24	2	NA	2.7	2.8	0.038	0.31	0.27
		30-Aug-11	0.44	NA	0.46	2.2	NA	2.8	2.9	0.064	0.78	0.57
		21-Sep-11	0.079	NA	0.29	2.6	NA	2.8	2.8	0.045	0.47	0.36
		24-Oct-11	1.9	NA	0.82	3.6	NA	7.7	7.8	0.06	1.6	0.9
EBN13	Rutland Road	21-Jul-11	0.14	NA	0.14	2	NA	2.2	2.3	0.088	0.24	0.18
		30-Aug-11	0.045	NA	0.29	1.7	NA	1.8	1.9	0.086	0.45	0.36
		21-Sep-11	0.042	NA	0.28	2.5	NA	2.6	2.7	0.062	0.41	0.34
		24-Oct-11	<0.010	NA	0.18	1.3	NA	1.4	1.4	0.01	0.27	0.2
EBN27	Wandena Road	21-Jul-11	0.014	NA	<0.005	0.55	NA	0.58	0.58	<0.010	0.016	0.016
		30-Aug-11	<0.010	NA	0.014	0.48	NA	0.5	0.51	0.016	0.017	0.014
		21-Sep-11	<0.010	NA	<0.005	0.52	NA	0.55	0.57	0.019	0.012	0.011
		24-Oct-11	<0.010	NA	<0.005	0.55	NA	0.58	0.59	0.012	0.011	0.011
EBN10	Muchea East	21-Jul-11	0.24	NA	<0.005	0.37	NA	0.61	0.71	0.11	0.01	0.009
		30-Aug-11	0.09	NA	<0.005	0.33	NA	0.44	0.54	0.1	0.013	0.009
		21-Sep-11	0.1	NA	<0.005	0.71	NA	0.95	1	0.054	0.031	0.005
		24-Oct-11	0.095	NA	<0.005	0.35	NA	0.47	0.5	0.029	<0.005	<0.005
EBN7	Wandena North	21-Jul-11	0.24	NA	<0.005	0.38	NA	0.69	0.83	0.15	0.011	0.007
		30-Aug-11	0.15	NA	<0.005	0.29	NA	0.45	0.53	0.082	0.012	0.009
		21-Sep-11	0.17	NA	<0.005	0.4	NA	0.74	0.79	0.046	0.013	<0.005
		24-Oct-11	0.028	NA	<0.005	0.35	NA	0.4	0.41	0.01	<0.005	<0.005
EBN6	Rocky Gully	21-Jul-11	0.03	NA	<0.005	0.68	NA	0.71	1.2	0.52	0.022	0.015
		30-Aug-11	0.01	NA	0.009	0.77	NA	0.8	1	0.24	0.031	0.024
		21-Sep-11	<0.010	NA	0.01	1	NA	1	1.2	0.21	0.034	0.025
		24-Oct-11	<0.010	NA	0.016	0.84	NA	0.89	0.9	0.01	0.023	0.02
EBN21	Lower Yal Yal	21-Jul-11	0.2	NA	0.12	4.2	NA	4.6	4.7	0.14	0.33	0.24
		30-Aug-11	0.098	NA	0.086	3.1	NA	3.5	3.6	0.066	0.27	0.21

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011

<u>Site Ref No.</u>	<u>Site Name</u>	<u>Date Collected</u>	<u>Ammonia as NH3-N</u>	<u>DOC</u>	<u>SRP as P</u>	<u>Organic Nitrogen - Filterable</u>	<u>TOC</u>	<u>Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (Calc)</u>	<u>Total Nitrogen</u>	<u>Total Oxidised Nitrogen (TON)</u>	<u>Total Phosphorus</u>	<u>Total Phosphorus - Filterable</u>
		21-Sep-11	0.065	NA	0.12	3.5	NA	3.8	3.9	0.041	0.3	0.26
		24-Oct-11	0.016	NA	0.071	3.1	NA	3.5	3.6	0.018	0.32	0.15
EBN5	Yal Yal	21-Jul-11	0.027	NA	0.013	0.23	NA	0.3	1.6	1.3	0.03	0.018
		30-Aug-11	0.029	NA	0.015	0.12	NA	0.36	1.6	1.3	0.03	0.022
		21-Sep-11	0.021	NA	<0.005	0.52	NA	0.62	1.4	0.81	0.025	0.017
		24-Oct-11	0.019	NA	0.015	0.33	NA	0.41	1.2	0.83	0.021	0.017
EBN28	Upper Yal Yal	21-Jul-11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
		30-Aug-11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
		21-Sep-11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
		24-Oct-11	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
EBN8	Wandena South	21-Jul-11	0.082	NA	<0.005	0.76	NA	0.95	0.98	0.033	0.03	0.016
		30-Aug-11	0.04	NA	0.011	0.77	NA	0.91	0.92	0.016	0.056	0.031
		21-Sep-11	0.079	NA	0.02	1.2	NA	1.5	1.5	0.025	0.068	0.036
		24-Oct-11	0.073	NA	0.034	1.3	NA	1.7	1.7	0.012	0.057	0.044
EBN24	Stock Road	22-Jul-11	0.034	NA	0.1	2.4	NA	2.5	2.5	0.01	0.3	0.26
		31-Aug-11	0.052	NA	0.14	2.4	NA	2.7	2.7	0.016	0.32	0.29
		22-Sep-11	0.033	NA	0.12	2.8	NA	2.9	2.9	0.022	0.25	0.23
		25-Oct-11	0.023	NA	0.3	2.5	NA	2.9	2.9	0.069	0.45	0.35
EBN16	Bulls Brook	22-Jul-11	0.085	NA	0.27	2.8	NA	3	3	0.039	0.46	0.44
		31-Aug-11	0.043	NA	0.24	2.6	NA	2.9	3	0.06	0.39	0.36
		22-Sep-11	0.033	NA	0.26	3.1	NA	3.3	3.4	0.042	0.37	0.37
		25-Oct-11	0.025	NA	0.53	3	NA	3.6	3.6	0.018	0.69	0.61
EBN15a	NSP Out	22-Jul-11	0.065	NA	0.52	2.4	NA	2.6	2.6	0.017	0.85	0.81
		31-Aug-11	0.077	NA	0.72	2.4	NA	2.5	2.6	0.027	0.97	0.9
		22-Sep-11	0.055	NA	0.63	2.7	NA	3	3	0.044	0.79	0.79
		25-Oct-11	0.047	NA	0.67	2.4	NA	2.7	2.7	0.041	0.82	0.74
EBN14a	NSP In	22-Jul-11	0.034	NA	0.39	2.3	NA	2.5	2.5	0.015	0.83	0.8
		31-Aug-11	0.043	NA	0.5	2.3	NA	2.4	2.4	0.031	0.94	0.88

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011

<u>Site Ref No.</u>	<u>Site Name</u>	<u>Date Collected</u>	<u>Ammonia as NH3-N</u>	<u>DOC</u>	<u>SRP as P</u>	<u>Organic Nitrogen - Filterable</u>	<u>TOC</u>	<u>Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (Calc)</u>	<u>Total Nitrogen</u>	<u>Total Oxidised Nitrogen (TON)</u>	<u>Total Phosphorus</u>	<u>Total Phosphorus - Filterable</u>
		22-Sep-11	0.041	NA	0.43	2.8	NA	3	3	0.05	0.82	0.81
		25-Oct-11	0.028	NA	0.59	2.4	NA	2.7	2.7	0.02	0.81	0.72
EBN11	Muchea North	22-Jul-11	NS-D	NA	NS-D	NS-D	NA	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D
		31-Aug-11	0.1	NA	2.6	4.8	NA	5.3	5.6	0.3	3.1	3
		22-Sep-11	0.12	NA	2.5	5.8	NA	5.9	6	0.086	2.9	2.8
		25-Oct-11	0.05	NA	4.1	6.8	NA	7.1	7.1	0.077	4.5	4.5
EBN4	Chandala South	22-Jul-11	0.25	NA	0.43	2.8	NA	3.7	3.7	0.048	0.67	0.58
		31-Aug-11	0.1	NA	0.6	2	NA	2.2	2.3	0.072	0.71	0.65
		22-Sep-11	0.063	NA	0.3	2.7	NA	2.8	2.8	0.038	0.47	0.4
		25-Oct-11	0.12	NA	0.45	2.1	NA	2.4	2.4	0.088	0.57	0.52
EBN1	Lennard Brook	22-Jul-11	<0.010	NA	0.053	0.4	NA	0.74	3.1	2.3	0.15	0.088
		31-Aug-11	<0.010	NA	0.094	0.051	NA	0.29	3.2	2.9	0.16	0.13
		22-Sep-11	0.011	NA	0.12	0.68	NA	0.74	3	2.3	0.18	0.15
		25-Oct-11	0.016	NA	0.21	0.86	NA	1	3.3	2.3	0.28	0.21
EBN3	Chandala West	22-Jul-11	NS-D	NA	NS-D	NS-D	NA	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D
		31-Aug-11	0.074	NA	0.57	2.4	NA	2.5	2.5	0.055	0.9	0.69
		22-Sep-11	0.031	NA	0.62	3.4	NA	3.5	3.5	0.033	0.94	0.71
		25-Oct-11	0.097	NA	1	2.7	NA	4.1	5.5	1.4	1.7	1.2
EBN23	Peters Road	22-Jul-11	NS-D	NA	NS-D	NS-D	NA	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D
		31-Aug-11	0.31	NA	0.57	3.8	NA	4.3	4.7	0.38	0.89	0.89
		22-Sep-11	0.058	NA	0.47	3.5	NA	3.6	3.9	0.29	0.64	0.62
		25-Oct-11	0.1	NA	0.51	3.7	NA	4.3	4.6	0.27	0.62	0.59
EBN9	Brand Hwy	22-Jul-11	0.13	NA	0.12	1.6	NA	1.8	1.9	0.095	0.21	0.15
		31-Aug-11	0.077	NA	0.31	1.6	NA	1.7	1.8	0.091	0.43	0.37
		22-Sep-11	0.061	NA	0.28	2.2	NA	2.3	2.5	0.12	0.37	0.31
		25-Oct-11	0.035	NA	0.15	1.1	NA	1.3	1.4	0.061	0.26	0.16
EBN2	Airfield Road	22-Jul-11	NS-D	NA	NS-D	NS-D	NA	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D	NS-D
		31-Aug-11	0.054	NA	1	2.2	NA	2.6	2.7	0.018	1.2	1.1

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011

<u>Site Ref No.</u>	<u>Site Name</u>	<u>Date Collected</u>	<u>Ammonia as NH3-N</u>	<u>DOC</u>	<u>SRP as P</u>	<u>Organic Nitrogen - Filterable</u>	<u>TOC</u>	<u>Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (Calc)</u>	<u>Total Nitrogen</u>	<u>Total Oxidised Nitrogen (TON)</u>	<u>Total Phosphorus</u>	<u>Total Phosphorus - Filterable</u>
		22-Sep-11	0.049	NA	0.7	2.5	NA	2.6	2.6	0.028	0.84	0.74
		25-Oct-11	0.025	NA	0.43	2	NA	2.1	2.1	0.015	0.62	0.5

NB: 'NS-D' represents 'no sample taken at this time due to no flow'; 'NA' represents 'not applicable'; '<' represents a value below the limit or reporting (LOR).

Total heavy metal concentrations in surface water within the Ellen Brook catchment 2010.

<u>Site Ref No.</u>	<u>Site Name</u>	<u>Date Collected</u>	<u>Hardness as CaCO3 (Calc)</u>	<u>Aluminium total</u>	<u>Arsenic total</u>	<u>Cadmium total</u>	<u>Chromium Total</u>	<u>Copper total</u>	<u>Iron total</u>	<u>Lead total</u>	<u>Mercury total</u>	<u>Nickel total</u>	<u>Zinc total</u>
Unit			mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L	mg/L
LOR			<5		<0.001	<0.0001	<0.001	<0.001		<0.001	<0.0001	<0.001	<0.001
ANZEC C				0.055	0.024	0.0002	0.001	0.0014	0.3	0.0034	0.0006	0.011	0.008
EBN19	Belhus Reserve	21-Jul-11	260	0.29	0.001	<0.0001	0.001	0.002	3.1	<0.001	<0.0001	0.003	0.015
		30-Aug-11	220	0.34	0.002	<0.0001	0.0016	0.002	3.3	<0.001	<0.0001	0.002	0.01
		21-Sep-11	190	0.3	0.002	<0.0001	0.0015	0.002	2.4	<0.001	<0.0001	0.002	0.008
		24-Oct-11	260	0.14	0.001	<0.0001	<0.001	0.001	3.5	<0.001	<0.0001	<0.001	<0.001
EBN17	Warren Road	21-Jul-11	210	0.67	0.001	<0.0001	0.0015	0.003	4.1	<0.001	<0.0001	0.002	0.012
		30-Aug-11	170	0.63	0.002	<0.0001	0.0019	0.002	4.3	0.001	<0.0001	0.002	0.007
		21-Sep-11	180	0.26	0.002	<0.0001	0.0017	0.002	2.2	<0.001	<0.0001	0.0025	0.008
		24-Oct-11	230	0.43	0.002	<0.0001	0.0015	<0.001	6.1	0.001	<0.0001	<0.001	0.002
EBN10	Muchea East	21-Jul-11	1200	3.9	<0.001	0.00018	<0.001	<0.001	2.9	0.003	<0.0001	0.026	0.036
		30-Aug-11	860	1.9	<0.001	<0.0001	<0.001	<0.001	3.1	0.002	<0.0001	0.016	0.021
		21-Sep-11	670	1.7	<0.001	<0.0001	0.002	<0.001	4.2	0.002	<0.0001	0.017	0.019
		24-Oct-11	1100	2.8	<0.001	<0.0001	<0.001	<0.001	3.4	0.005	<0.0001	0.023	0.023
EBN8	Wandena North	21-Jul-11	1100	10	<0.001	0.00018	<0.001	<0.001	4.8	0.003	<0.0001	0.052	0.08
		30-Aug-11	980	7.2	<0.001	<0.0001	<0.001	<0.001	4.3	0.003	<0.0001	0.035	0.055
		21-Sep-11	790	8.5	<0.001	<0.0001	0.0013	<0.001	6.9	0.002	<0.0001	0.051	0.062
		24-Oct-11	1000	5.6	<0.001	<0.0001	<0.001	<0.001	3.7	0.003	<0.0001	0.037	0.045
EBN28	Upper Yal Yal	21-Jul-11	1300	12	<0.001	0.00049	0.005	0.014	22	0.004	<0.0001	0.053	0.068
		30-Aug-11	1200	12	<0.001	0.0003	0.005	0.015	22	0.004	<0.0001	0.047	0.051
		21-Sep-11	800	8.8	<0.001	<0.0001	0.004	0.013	14	0.003	<0.0001	0.039	0.043
		24-Oct-11	1200	12	<0.001	0.00039	0.005	0.018	19	0.004	<0.0001	0.057	0.052
EBN7	Wandena	21-Jul-11	930	0.13	<0.001	<0.0001	<0.001	<0.001	2.4	<0.001	<0.0001	0.009	0.018

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011

<u>Site Ref No.</u>	<u>Site Name</u>	<u>Date Collected</u>	<u>Hardness as CaCO3 (Calc)</u>	<u>Aluminium total</u>	<u>Arsenic total</u>	<u>Cadmium total</u>	<u>Chromium Total</u>	<u>Copper total</u>	<u>Iron total</u>	<u>Lead total</u>	<u>Mercury total</u>	<u>Nickel total</u>	<u>Zinc total</u>
	a South												
		30-Aug-11	620	0.16	<0.001	<0.0001	<0.001	<0.001	5.2	<0.001	<0.0001	0.005	0.005
		21-Sep-11	570	0.23	<0.001	<0.0001	<0.001	<0.001	6.6	<0.001	<0.0001	0.005	0.009
		24-Oct-11	610	0.45	0.005	<0.0001	0.0023	<0.001	56	0.001	<0.0001	0.0061	0.003
EBN4	Chandala South	22-Jul-11	160	0.26	0.001	<0.0001	<0.001	0.002	2.2	<0.001	<0.0001	0.002	0.009
		31-Aug-11	120	0.29	0.002	<0.0001	0.001	0.001	2.2	<0.001	<0.0001	0.002	0.004
		22-Sep-11	120	0.23	0.002	<0.0001	0.0016	0.002	2.1	<0.001	<0.0001	0.002	0.006
-		25-Oct-11	210	0.22	0.002	<0.0001	0.0011	<0.001	2.3	<0.001	<0.0001	<0.001	0.002

NB: 'NS-D' represents 'no sample taken at this time due to no flow'; 'NA' represents 'not applicable'; '<' represents a value below the limit or reporting (LOR).

Appendix B – Freshwater Trigger Values and Guidelines

Trigger values and guidelines for nutrient concentrations and physical properties in lowland rivers and freshwater

Guideline	EC mScm	D0 % Sat	pH	Temp °C	TN mg/L	NO _x N mg/L	TP mg/L	FRP mg/L
ANZECC Water Quality Guideline – Recreational (2000)	-	>80 (>6.5 mg/L)	6.5-8.5	-	-	10	-	-
ANZECC Water Quality Trigger Values - lowland river (2000)	0.12-0.3	80-120	6.5-8.0	-	1.2	0.150	0.065	0.04
ANZECC Water Quality Guidelines – Freshwater (1992)	n/a	>80-90 (>6mg/L)	6.5-9.0		<2 increase	20-30	0.01-0.1	n/a

Trigger values and guidelines for toxicants (metals) in freshwater

* Trigger values not corrected for hardness, ID = insufficient data to have ANZECC water quality guideline

Guideline	As mg/L	Cr mg/L	Cu* mg/L	Fe mg/L	Mo mg/L	Mn mg/L	Ni* mg/L
ANZECC Water Quality Guidelines – Recreational (2000)	0.05	0.05	1	0.3	ID	0.1	0.1
ANZECC Water Quality Trigger Values Freshwater 99% (2000)	0.001	0.00001	0.001	ID	ID	1.2	0.008
ANZECC Water Quality Trigger Values Freshwater 95% (2000)	0.024	0.001	0.0014	ID	ID	1.9	0.011
ANZECC Water Quality Trigger Values Freshwater 90% (2000)	0.094	0.006	0.0018	ID	ID	2.5	0.013
ANZECC Water Quality Trigger Values Freshwater 80% (2000)	0.360	0.04	0.0025	ID	ID	3.6	0.017
ANZECC Water Quality Guidelines – Freshwater (1992)	0.05	0.01	0.002-0.005	ID	ID	ID	0.015-0.15
Limit of reporting	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.01	0.005	0.001	0.001

Trigger values and guidelines for toxicants (metals) in freshwater

(continued)

* Trigger values not corrected for hardness, ID = insufficient data to have ANZECC water quality guideline

Guideline	Pb* mg/L	Sn	Sr mg/L	Ti mg/L	V mg/L	Zn* mg/L
ANZECC Water Quality Guidelines – Recreational (2000)	0.05	ID	ID	ID	ID	5
ANZECC Water Quality Trigger Values Freshwater 99% (2000)	0.001	ID	ID	ID	ID	0.0024
ANZECC Water Quality Trigger Values Freshwater 95% (2000)	0.0034	ID	ID	ID	ID	0.008
ANZECC Water Quality Trigger Values Freshwater 90% (2000)	0.0056	ID	ID	ID	ID	0.015
ANZECC Water Quality Trigger Values Freshwater 80% (2000)	0.0094	ID	ID	ID	ID	0.031
ANZECC Water Quality Guidelines – Freshwater (1992)	0.001-0.005	ID	ID	ID	ID	0.005-0.05
Limit of reporting	0.001	0.05	0.001	0.01	0.002	0.001

Appendix C – Photographs of Sample Sites

The following pictures were taken in June 2005 (note sites 17-20 are not included):




EBN1- Lennard Brook




EBN2 – Airfield Road



EBN3 – Chandala West



EBN4 – Chandala south



EBN 5 – Yal Yal Brook



EBN7 – Wandena North



EBN8 – Wandena south



EBN9 – Brand Hwy south



EBN10 – Muchea East



EBN11 – Muchea north



EBN12 – Muchea south



EBN 13 – Rutland Road

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011



EBN14 – Bingham Road (NS outflow)



EBN15 – Nutrient Stripping Pond inflow



EBN16 – Bulls Brook



EBN17 – Warren Road



EBN18 – Gauging Station



EBN19 – Belhus Reserve

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011



EBN20 – All Saints



EBN21 – Lower Yal Yal



EBN22 – Ki-it Brook



EBN23 – Peters Road



EBN24 – Stock Road



EBN25 – Sawpit Gully

Ellen Brook Catchment Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot July – October 2011



EBN26 – Egerton



EBN27 – Wandena Road



EBN28 – Upper Yal Yal (Dam)



EBN29 Roxburgh Ave (The Vines)

Appendix D – Salinity measurements & tolerance limits

Salt Measurement Conversions					
mS/cm	mS/m	ppm,mg/L	ppt	gr/gal	
0	0	0	0	0	↑ distilled water
0.1	10	55	0.06	4	
0.2	20	110	0.11	8	
0.3	30	165	0.17	12	
0.4	40	220	0.22	15	
0.5	50	275	0.28	19	↓ FRESH
0.6	60	330	0.33	23	
0.7	70	385	0.39	27	
0.8	80	440	0.44	31	
0.9	90	495	0.50	35	
1.0	100	550	0.55	39	↑ maximum stonefruit, citrus, peas, onion, carrot
1.5	150	825	0.83	58	
2.0	200	1100	1.10	77	
2.5	250	1375	1.38	96	
2.7	273	1500	1.50	105	
3.0	300	1650	1.65	116	↓ MARGINAL
3.5	350	1925	1.93	135	
4.0	400	2200	2.20	154	
4.5	450	2475	2.48	173	
5.0	500	2750	2.75	193	
5.5	550	3025	3.03	212	↑ maximum for milk cows and poultry, olives, figs
6.0	600	3300	3.30	231	
6.5	650	3575	3.58	250	
7.0	700	3850	3.85	270	
7.5	750	4125	4.13	289	
8.0	800	4400	4.40	308	↓ BRACKISH
8.5	850	4675	4.68	327	
9.0	900	4950	4.95	347	
9.1	910	5005	5.01	350	
9.5	950	5225	5.23	366	
10.0	1000	5500	5.50	385	↑ maximum for horses
10.5	1050	5775	5.78	404	
11.0	1100	6050	6.05	424	
11.5	1150	6325	6.33	443	
12.0	1200	6600	6.60	462	
12.5	1250	6875	6.88	481	↓ maximum lambs, weaners & breeder ewes
13.0	1300	7150	7.15	501	
13.5	1350	7425	7.43	520	
14.0	1400	7700	7.70	539	
14.5	1450	7975	7.98	558	
15.0	1500	8250	8.25	578	↑ SALINE
15.5	1550	8525	8.53	597	
16.0	1600	8800	8.80	616	
16.5	1650	9075	9.08	635	
17.0	1700	9350	9.35	655	
17.5	1750	9625	9.63	674	↓ maximum septic Tanks
18.0	1800	9900	9.90	693	
18.5	1850	10175	10.18	712	
19.0	1900	10450	10.45	732	
19.5	1950	10725	10.73	751	
20.0	2000	11000	11.00	770	↓ maximum beef cattle
20.5	2050	11275	11.28	789	
21	2100	11550	11.55	809	
21.5	2150	11825	11.83	828	
22	2200	12100	12.10	847	
22.5	2250	12375	12.38	866	↓ maximum sheep
23	2300	12650	12.65	886	
23.5	2350	12925	12.93	905	
24	2400	13200	13.20	924	
24.5	2450	13475	13.48	943	
25	2500	13750	13.75	963	↓ sea water
30	3000	16500	16.50	1155	
53	5300	29150	29.15	2041	
64	6400	35200	35.20	2464	
11.97	1197	6584	6.58	461	

Measurement Units

mS/cm = millisiemens per cm
mS/m = millisiemens per metre
ppm = parts per million
mg/L = milligrams per litre
gr/gal = grains per gallon

Conversion Factors

mS/m x 100 = mS/cm
mS/m x 5.5 = mg/L
mS/m x 0.385 = gr/gallon
mS/m x 10 = EC uS/cm
gr/gall x 14.25 = mg/L

Appendix E – Hardness-Modified Trigger Value calculations based on varying water hardness (Table 3.4.4. ANZECC & ARMCANZ, 2000).

Hardness category (mg/L as CaCO₃)	Water Hardness (mg/L as CaCO₃)	Cd	Cr(III)	Cu	Pb	Ni	Zn
Soft (0-59)	30	TV	TV	TV	TV	TV	TV
Moderate (60-119)	90	*2.7	*2.5	*2.5	*4	*2.5	*2.5
Hard (120-179)	150	*4.2	*3.7	*3.9	*7.6	*3.9	*3.9
Very Hard (180-240)	210	*5.7	*4.9	*5.2	*11.8	*5.2	*5.2
Extremely Hard (400)	400	*10	*8.4	*9	*26.7	*9	*9

Appendix F – Daily, monthly and annual Rainfall (mm) recorded at Pearce RAAF Base

(http://www.bom.gov.au/jsp/ncc/cdio/weatherData/av?p_nccObsCode=136&p_display_type=dailyDataFile&p_startYear=2011&p_c=-23667067&p_stn_num=009053) Please note that 'nd' represents no data at time of sourcing records

Day	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December
1	0	1	0	0	0	4	12.8	5	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	29	0	15	10.4	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6.4	0	0.4	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	15.8	4	0	0	0	0
5	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	0.2	12.2	0	0	0
6	6	ND	0	0	0.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	ND	0	0.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	16.2	62.4
8	0	0	0	0.4	0	0	0	6.6	0	0	9	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9.2	0	0	1.4	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.2	0	0
11	0	0	0	2.4	0	0	5.2	0	0	1.8	0	0
12	0	0	0	0.4	0	0	6.4	0	0	0.4	0	1
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	0	1
14	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0.2	1.4	0	0
15	0	0	0	0	0	3.4	2.2	11.2	2.6	0	0	0
16	0	0	0	0	0.2	5.4	0	17.2	8.6	0	0	0
17	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.6	0	0	0	0
18	0	0	0	0	4.8	0	16.6	0	0	7	2.2	0
19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13.4	4.6	0	0
20	0	0	0	0	1	5.8	0.8	0	0	0	0	0
21	0	0	0	0	10.6	0.4	7.6	0	0.8	0	0	0
22	0	0	0	0		0	3.4	24.8	4.8	0	0	0
23	0	0	0	0		0	0	1	0	3.4	0	0
24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.8	0	0	0	0
25	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	27	0	0
26	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.2	0	6	1	0	0
27	0	0	0	1.6	0	22.	0	0	5.4	8.8	0	0
28	0.6	0.6	0	11.8	0	5.2	8.4	0	3	0	0	0
29	0		0	0	0	31.2	16.2	0	0	0	0	0
30	0		0	0	19.6	0.6	0	0	0	0	0	0
31	0		0		2.2		20.8	3		0		0
Monthly Total	11	1.6	0	17.4	40.2	111	136.6	103	67.4	57.2	28.8	64.4
Annual Total	638.6											

Appendix G – Sampling and Analysis Plan
Sampling and Analysis Plan
Ellen Brook Catchment
Water Quality Monitoring Snapshot
2011



Plate 1: Wetland at the top of Rocky Creek Catchment, a subcatchment of the Ellen Brook (EBICG, 2010).

Prepared by Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment group: May 2011



This project is co-funded by the Australian and Western Australian Government's investment in the Caring for Country administered by the Perth Region NRM.

Table of Contents

1. BACKGROUND.....	134
2. CHANGES TO THE PROJECT.....	134
3. SAMPLING SITE LOCATION	134
<i>Table 1: Location and description of sampling sites in the Ellen Brook catchment.</i>	<i>134</i>
4. SAMPLING FREQUENCY	134
5. MEASURED PARAMETERS.....	134
6. QUALITY ASSURANCE AND QUALITY CONTROL	134
6.1. Blank Samples.....	134
6.2. Field Blanks (FB)	134
6.3. Replicates Samples (RS)	134
7. STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES.....	134
8. SAMPLING OPERATION REQUIREMENTS.....	134
<i>Table 2: Measurement parameters analysed at a given number of EBN sites on five sampling runs.</i>	<i>134</i>
9. SAMPLE BOTTLE REQUIREMENTS	134
<i>Table 3: Number of bottles required to sample for all identified measurement parameters, field blanks and replicates.</i>	<i>134</i>
10.	LABELLING
134	
11.	PERSONAL SAFETY
134	
12.	LIMITS OF REPORTING (LORs) FOR NMI LABORATORY
134	
<i>Table 4: Analysis Methods and Limit of Reporting (LOR) for NMI.</i>	<i>134</i>
13.	SENDING SAMPLES TO THE LABORATORY
134	
14.	MANAGEMENT AND REPORTING OF DATA
134	
15.	COMPARISON OF RESULTS WITH GUIDELINES
134	
16.	ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
134	
<i>Table 5: Costs of water quality analysis of the Ellen Brook catchment 2010 sampling program at NMI.</i>	<i>134</i>
<i>Table 6: Budget for the 2010 Ellen Brook catchment monitoring project.</i>	<i>134</i>
17. REFERENCES	134
APPENDIX A: ANALYTICAL REQUIREMENTS	134
APPENDIX B: EQUIPMENT LIST FOR COLLECTING WATER SAMPLES (DOW, 2006B)	134

List of Figures

Figure 1: Location of the Ellen Brook and Brockman River Catchments.	134
Figure 2: Ellen Brook Catchment land-use map.	134
Figure 3: Water Quality sampling sites within the Ellen Brook catchment in 2010.	134

1. Background

The Ellen Brook catchment is located 20 kilometres north-east of Perth and is the largest coastal sub-catchment of the Swan-Canning estuary, with an approximate area of 800km² (). The Ellen Brook discharges an average of 37 million cubic metres of water annually into the Swan River, which represents 12% of the Swan's total flow. Although a relatively low portion, it contributes 30% of the total phosphorous load and 15% of the total nitrogen load entering the Swan (SRT, 2009).

The Ellen Brook has been identified by the Swan River Trust as a priority catchment with the highest concentration of phosphorous of any of the monitored tributary entering the Swan Riverpark. This makes a significant contribution to the eutrophication and subsequent toxic algal blooms within the system (Horwood, 1997). As a result, the Swan River Trust produced the "Local Water Quality Improvement Plan (WQIP): Ellen Brook Catchment" through the Australian Government's Coastal Catchments Initiative (CCI) in 2009. The document aims to trace the pathway of nutrients through the catchment from their source to the discharge point, and to provide stakeholders with a mechanism to prioritise recommendations and resources, and funding to improve water quality.

Running north-south, the central portion of the catchment has been extensively cleared for agriculture, urban and industrial development. According to SRT (2009) land use is predominantly cattle grazing and horticulture in the north, and small scale light industry including mining and extractive industries together with an expanding region of urban and rural residential development to the south ().

Monitoring involves observations and measurements that are analysed and reported for the purpose of providing information and knowledge about catchments and waterways (DoW, 2006). With support from Tiwest and the Department of Water (DoW), the Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group (EBICG) commenced an annual sampling program focusing on nutrients, physical parameters, total suspended solids and heavy metals at a number of sites within the Ellen Brook catchment in 2005. Sampling occurred once per month over a four month period commencing with the first consistent winter flows. As more funding became available, eight strategically identified sites within the Ellen Brook catchment were added to the program in 2007, making a total of 27 sampling sites ().

The water quality monitoring program for 2011 will be funded by the Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group and the Swan River Trust. Sampling will be undertaken once a month over four months, and will commence with the first consistent winter flows.

The aim of this sampling and analysis plan is to provide a report on the development of the Ellen Brook water quality monitoring program, to ensure that sampling is conducted according to the relevant guidelines, ensuring that data standards are met and data quality continuity maintained (DoW, 2006). The aim of sampling from twenty-eight strategically identified sites along the Ellen Brook is to determine and monitor the priority sub-catchments, which are those that are contributing levels of nutrients and heavy metals in concentrations above the ANZECC Water Quality Guidelines. The SAP and the sampling program will continue to add to established baseline data for surface water quality within the catchment.

2. Changes to the project

This project commenced in winter/spring of 2005, please refer to the sampling and analysis plan for details of the project in 2005.

In 2006 the following changes were made to the project:

- All chemical analysis was carried out by NMI in 2006; (in 2005 this was done by MPL, through TiWest).
- The suite of heavy metals was changed to Al, As, Cd, Co, Cr, Cu, Fe, Hg, Mn, Mo, Ni, Pb, Se and Zn.
- Total water hardness (as Ca and Mg) was included in the chemical analysis from sites where samples were collected for heavy metals analysis.

In 2007 the following changes were made to the project:

- Muchea South (site EBN 12) was removed from the project, as results were consistently low and it was decided the money could be better spent investigating a new site.
- The heavy metals analysis suite was reduced from 14 to 10 metals, specifically Al, As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Fe, Hg, Ni, Pb, and Zn.
- Eight new sites were added to the project (sites EBN 21-28). Sites 21-27 were sampled for physical parameter and nutrients only (the same as for the majority of sites included in the project and water collected from site EBN 28 was analysed for Al, As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Fe, Hg, Ni, Pb, Zn and total water hardness (as Ca and Mg) only.
- Total and dissolved organic carbon were both added to the list of analysed parameters at the bottom of catchment site only (EBN 20).
- The sampling frequency was every three weeks for 4 events (instead of the previous monthly for 4 events).
- Dissolved organic nitrogen and nitrogen as ammonia were added to the suite of nutrient determined from water samples.

In 2008 the following changes were made to the project:

- One new site Roxburghe Ave (EBN 29) was added to the project. Water samples from this site were analysed for the standard suite of nutrients but also for dissolved organic phosphorus.
- The method for collection of organic carbon samples was changed. Both total and dissolved organic samples are now rinsed three times prior to final sample collection and filled to the top of the bottle with no air bubbles. This is to minimise the differences in collection and sampling methods between two parameters that are often compared.

In 2009 the following changes were made to the project:

- The sampling frequency has returned to monthly over four months.
- Total Filterable Phosphorous will be analysed rather than Dissolved Organic Phosphorous.

In 2010 the following changes were made to the project:

- Swan River Trust will be funding the project given that their funding applications are approved. If not, the program will be funded through the Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group and the Local Government Authorities where possible.
- All Saints Church (EBN20) sampling site will not be sampled in 2010 unless access to the site is reopened to the public. 2009 sampling at this site was cancelled due to the questionable integrity of the stairway that leads down to the Confluence of the Ellen Brook and Swan River. Sampling parameters from All Saints will be sampled from Belhus Reserve (EBN19), which is the main body of the Ellen Brook on Millhouse Road.
- Nutrient Inflow (EBN14) and Nutrient Outflow (EBN15) sampling sites have been shifted further upstream (EBN14A) and further downstream (EBN15). This has been requested by the Swan River Trust due to the nutrient intervention works that have been undertaken at this site. A bund and spillway was installed in 2009/2010 to hold back the water and create a seasonal wetland. New GIS coordinates have been entered in Table 1.
- Nutrient Inflow (EBN14) is now referred to as EBN14A because it was moved greater than 100m from its original position. See Table 1 for GIS coordinates. It has been re-registered with WIN database as a 'new' sampling site under this program.

In 2011 the following changes were made to the project:

- All Saints Church (EBN20) sampling site will not be sampled in 2011 unless access to the site is reopened to the public. 2009 sampling at this site was cancelled due to the questionable integrity of the stairway that leads down to the Confluence of the Ellen Brook and Swan River. Sampling parameters from All Saints will be sampled from Belhus Reserve (EBN19), which is the main body of the Ellen Brook on Millhouse Road.
- Chandala West (EBN3) will not be sampled for metals in 2011, It has not had any significant pH or metal concentrations in several years.
- Chandala South (EBN4) will be sampled for the full suite of metals in 2011 to investigate potential cause in decreased pH recorded in 2010




Figure 33: Location of the Ellen Brook and Brockman River Catchments.




Figure 34: Ellen Brook Catchment land-use map.

3. Sampling Site Location

Water samples will be taken from twenty-eight sites within the Ellen Brook catchment (). These sites have been selected to be representative of a particular part of the catchment; to determine their relative nutrient and metal contribution to the Ellen Brook; and whether they are situated upstream or downstream of potentially high impact land uses or of likely contaminant sources. lists the EBN sampling sites by site number, site name and relative waterway component. Site location is also provided using street names, northings and eastings. It should be noted that GIS coordinates for Nutrient Inflow (EBN14) and Nutrient Outflow (EBN15) were changed in 2010 due to works undertaken by the Swan River Trust's Drainage Nutrient Intervention Program (DNIP). The installation of a bund and native vegetation filter has caused the original sampling points to be shifted a few metres further west (inflow), now sampled at the stock crossing, and east (outflow), this continues indefinitely.

Table 8: Location and description of sampling sites in the Ellen Brook catchment.

Site no.	Site Name	Waterway section/ Component	Location	Northing	Easting
EBN1	Lennard Brook	Lennard Brook	Lennard Brook Road	6527771	0396613
EBN2	Airfield Road	North Chandala/Ellen Brook (Bambun Lakes)	Airfield Road	6519428	0397101
EBN3	Chandala West	Chandala Brook West	Brand Hwy west loc # 853	6511801	0400463
EBN4	Chandala South	Chandala Brook South	Brand Hwy east / TIWest	6510846	0401302
EBN5	Yal Yal Brook	Yal Yal Brook	Reserve Road	6514458	0404923
EBN6	Rocky Gully Creek	Rocky Gully Creek	Old Gingin Rd	6509047	0403714
EBN7	Wandena North	Waterway to Ellen Brook	Wandena North - Great Northern Highway	6507384	0404384
EBN8	Wandena South	Waterway to Ellen Brook	Wandena South - Great Northern Highway	6506686	0404561
EBN9	Brand Highway Bridge	Ellen Brook - Muchea Central	Bridge on Brand Hwy south	6505838	0404093
EBN10	Muchea East	Waterway to Ellen Brook Muchea East	Great Northern/Brand Highways	6505833	0404780
EBN11	Muchea North	Waterway to Ellen Brook -	Muchea south /Railway Rd 491 chit/swan sign	6500336	0404611
EBN13	Rutland Road	Ellen Brook (upper)	Rutland Road bridge	6498117	0406044
EBN14A	Nutrient Inflow	Waterway – Nutrient stripping inflow taken at stockcrossing	Bingham Road/ Department of Defence	6496881	0405499
EBN15	Nutrient Outflow	Waterway - Nutrient stripping Pond outflow	Bingham Road/ Department of Defence	6496883	0405807
EBN16	Bulls Brook	Bullsbrook	Sth past Strachan on Railway Rd	6495684	0405054
EBN17	Warren Road	Mid Ellen Brook	Warren Road	6493379	0406685
EBN18	Gauging Station	Ellen Brook - Almeria Gauging Station	Almeria Parade/Apple Street	6486743	0407638
EBN19	Belhus Reserve	Lower Ellen Brook	Belhus Reserve Millhouse Rd Bridge	6483685	0406519
EBN20	All Saints	Swan River confluence	All Saints Church – West Swan Road	6481570	0405651
EBN21	Lower Yal Yal	Yal Yal Brook South	Old Gingin Road	6509922	0403110
EBN22	Ki-it Brook	Ki-it Brook	Warren Road	6493382	0406959
EBN23	Peters Road	Waterway to Ellen Brook – Muchea townsite	Peters Road	6505232	0403580
EBN24	Stock Road	Waterway to Ellen Brook West	Railway Parade	6492415	0405221
EBN25	Sawpit Gully	Waterway to Ellen Brook – The Vines north	Lot 4/285 Railway Parade, Upper Swan	6486777	0407430
EBN26	Egerton	Waterway from Egerton Estate to Ellen Brook	Corona Way	6483859	0405129
EBN27	Wandena Road	Waterway to Ellen Brook	Corner of Great Northern Hwy and Wandena Road	6502590	0406553
EBN28	Upper Yal Yal	Yal Yal Brook North	Great Northern Hwy	6516783	0409421
EBN29	Roxburghe Avenue	Drain leading to Ellen Brook from The Vines east	Roxburghe Avenue	6486603	0406975




Figure 35: Water Quality sampling sites within the Ellen Brook catchment in 2011.

4. Sampling frequency

Initial sampling will take place from the first consistent winter flows (June-July) then once every month over a four month period.

5. Measured parameters

All sites, except EBN 28, will be analysed in the field using pH and salinity meters.

All sites, except EBN 28, will also be sampled for the analysis of total suspended solids and nutrients including total phosphorous (TP), total filterable phosphorous (TFP), total nitrogen (TN), Soluble reactive phosphorous (SRP), Soluble organic nitrogen (SOrgN), total oxidised nitrogen (TON) and nitrogen as ammonia (NH₄-N). The confluence of the Ellen Brook and the Swan River (EBN 20-All Saints) is no longer accessible, therefore Belhus Reserve will be analysed for dissolved organic carbon (DOC) and total organic carbon (TOC).

Samples will be collected from Upper Yal Yal (EBN28), Chandala South (EBN4), Wandena North (EBN7), Wandena South (EBN8), Muchea east (EBN10), Warren Road (EBN17) and Belhus Reserve (EBN19), for analysis of total water hardness and total metals; including iron, aluminium, copper, arsenic, lead, nickel, zinc, chromium, mercury and cadmium at seven sites. Refer to Appendix A for a tabular format of the selected parameters to be measured in surface waters of the sampling sites within the Ellen Brook catchment.

6. Quality Assurance and Quality Control

It is important to collect quality control samples as firm conclusions cannot be drawn from sampling data unless the quality of the data is known. The number and the types of quality control samples depend on the final use of the data, as well as the amount of time and money available for the monitoring program (DOW). This monitoring program will include one field blank and one replicate taken on two sampling occasions to ensure quality assurance and quality control of water quality data.

6.1. Blank Samples

Blanks are clean samples of deionised or distilled water, introduced at various stages of sampling. They are collected to detect and measure contamination in the sampling process as a result of ineffective field procedures, containers, equipment and transport. Often it is not possible to achieve absolutely no contamination, but rather only stable, minimal contamination levels. You need to set acceptable limits for these contamination levels, and when blanks are collected that fall outside this, you have a contamination issue that will require further investigation (DOW).

6.2. Field Blanks (FB)

Extra containers are taken to the site. Take a stock container of deionised/distilled water. On site, containers are opened and closed and the contents handled just as if these were normal samples being collected during transfer and storage, except they are filled with deionised/distilled water (leave or add appropriate preservative in the bottle if required– depending on which parameters the field blank is checking). These detect mainly contamination of sample during the collection procedure. Ideally at least one of these is collected per sampling team, per sampling trip, for all measured analytes (DOW).

6.3. Replicates Samples (RS)

Replicate samples are two or more samples collected from the same site and time, using exactly the same method. They can indicate the natural variations in the environment and variations caused by the field sampling method. It provides the experimental error and thus a measure of sampling accuracy. Two replicates will only indicate that variation exists (if there is any) but three replicates will enable some assessment of precision and bias (DOW).

7. Standard Operating Procedures

To reduce contamination of samples with disturbed sediment, sampling is to begin at the most downstream site within the catchment (Belhus Reserve – EBN19) and to be continued upstream.

Physical parameters will be measured using WTW meters at the same time as the water samples are collected. Calibration of the meters will need to occur prior to and at the end of the sampling with all calibration records kept in a logbook.

Grab surface water samples for chemical analysis of nutrients and heavy metals is collected just below the surface, avoiding any surface scums or debris (DoW, 2006a). Measuring of physical parameters, direct sampling and taking filtered samples are to be conducted using the ‘Guideline for Field Sampling for Surface Water Quality Monitoring Programs’, by the Water Science Branch, Department of Water (2006a).

7.1. Physical Parameter Sampling (DoW, 2006a).

- Lower the clean, maintained and calibrated data logger into the water body near or at the same site where the water samples were taken. Minimise disturbance to the sediment.
- Ensure that all probes are fully submerged. Ideally the probes should be approximately 10cm under the water surface and 10cm above the sediment.
- The probes should be kept in a gentle motion while taking care not to stir up the sediments.
- If the probe has a built in circulator ensure this is turned on.
- Allow sufficient time for the probe to stabilise, and then take the readings.
- Store the physical results electronically on the instrument's console, or on the Field Observation Form.

7.2. Grab Pole Sampling (DoW, 2006a)

- Ensure that labelling on the bottle to be filled is correct and that the sample number matches the number on the paperwork (Field Observation Form and Chain of Custody form).
- Check that the grab pole sampler is clean.
- Extend the pole sampler so that it will reach the point that you wish to sample.
- Lower the grab sampler into the water with the mouth of the bottle facing upstream into the flow of water to a depth of 15cm. Keep the bottle moving forwards, into the flow of water whilst it is filling (Standards Australia AS/NZS 566.6:1998 5.3.1).
- Allow to partially fill, take the bottle out of the water, swirl around and tip out the rinsate downstream of sampling site.
- Repeat two more times so that the grab pole sampler has been rinsed three times.
- Then, fill the grab sampler at a depth of 15cm, with the mouth of the bottle facing upstream, slowly moving the bottle forward, into the flow of water.
- Use this sample to rinse the labelled sample container three times. Cap, shake well, and pour the rinsate downstream of yourself.
- Remove the cap from the sample container only at the time of sampling and replace the cap immediately after collection of the sample.
- Fill the bottle to the shoulder.

- Metal samples do not require nitric acid in the sample bottles as the laboratory nitrifies the water sample in the lab.
- Do not touch the opening of the sample container with any part of the grab pole bottle or your hands as this can introduce contaminants.
- Cap and store the sample container in an ice-esky overnight. The samples will be delivered (chilled) to NMI laboratory the following day.

7.3. Filtering a Nutrient Sample

Refer to DoW (2006a) for details on setting up a Filter Tower.

- Shake the sample gently before filtering.
- Pour a small amount of the sample into the top of the cleaned and assembled filter tower.
- Use the vacuum pump and the rubber bung.
- Swirl the filtered sample by carefully pouring it through both vacuum ports.
- Put the rubber bung back on and reattach the pump.
- Pour the required amount of sample plus a bit extra (for rinsing the sample container) into the top of the filter tower.
- Use the vacuum pump to filter the sample.
- Once the sample is filtered remove the vacuum from the collection chamber.
- Pour a small amount of the filtered sample into the pre-labelled sample container.
- Remove the cap from the sample container only at the time of sampling and replace the cap immediately after collection of the sample.
- Cap, swirl around the filtrate and discard.
- Repeat twice to ensure that the sample container is well rinsed.
- Fill the labelled sample container with the filtrate to the required level.
- Cap and store the sample container in an esky on ice-bricks.

7.4. DOC/TOC Sampling

- Rinse both DOC and TOC sample bottles three times prior to filling
- When filling the bottles fill all the way to the top (i.e. leave no air bubble).
- As a standard use a filter tower to filter your sample.

8. Sampling operation requirements

Table 9: Measurement parameters analysed at a given number of EBN sites on five sampling runs.

Sample Run	Field personnel	Number of sites	Measurement parameters
1	Bonny Dunlop	26/28 (EBN 1-11, 13-27, 29)	<u>Water</u> Nutrients, physical properties total suspended solids
	Megan O'Grady	1/28 (EBN 19)	TOC/DOC
	Sue Pedrick	7/28(EBN 4, 7, 8, 10, 17, 19, 28)	Heavy Metals and total water hardness (from TSS, except site EBN 28, collected separately)
2	Bonny Dunlop	26/28 (EBN 1-11, 13-27, 29)	<u>Water</u> Nutrients, DOC, TOC, physical properties and total suspended solids Heavy Metals
	Megan O'Grady	1/28 (EBN 19)	TOC/DOC
	Sue Pedrick	7/28 (EBN 4, 7, 8, 10, 17, 19, 28)	Heavy Metals and total water hardness (from TSS, except site EBN 28, collected separately)
		1/28 Random site	Field Blank and Replicate
3	Bonny Dunlop	26/28 (EBN 1-11, 13-27, 29)	<u>Water</u> Nutrients, physical properties total suspended solids
	Megan O'Grady	1/28 (EBN 19)	TOC/DOC
	Sue Pedrick	7/28 (EBN 4, 7, 8, 10, 17, 19, 28)	Heavy Metals and total water hardness (from TSS, except site EBN 28, collected separately)
4	Bonny Dunlop	26/28 (EBN 1-11, 13-27, 29)	<u>Water</u> Nutrients, DOC, TOC, physical properties and total suspended solids Heavy Metals
	Megan O'Grady	1/28 (EBN 19)	TOC/DOC
	Sue Pedrick	7/28 (EBN 4, 7, 8, 10, 17, 19, 28)	Heavy Metals and total water hardness (from TSS, except site EBN 28, collected separately)
		1/28 Random site	Field Blank and Replicate

9. Sample bottle requirements

Table 10: Number of bottles required to sample for all identified measurement parameters, field blanks and replicates.

Matrix	Parameters	Bottle type	Sites	Sampling events	Samples/site	Replicates	Field blanks	Total bottles
Water	Total nutrients	250mL plastic	27	4	1	2	2	112
	Dissolved nutrients	250mL plastic	27	4	1	2	2	112
	Total heavy metals	125mL plastic, acidified	7	4	1	2	2	32
	TSS and total water hardness	1L plastic	27	4	1	2	2	112
	TOC	125mL dark glass with Teflon liner cap	1	4	1	1	1	6
	DOC	125mL dark glass with Teflon liner cap	1	4	1	1	1	6

10. Labelling

The sample containers should be labelled with sequential sample registration numbers, the date of collection, the type of preservation (if any) and the client identification. Water samples are to be accompanied by field notes, field observation forms and chain of custody forms.

The sample bottle will be labelled prior to the time of sampling and collection in the field to ensure efficiency and organisation.

Sample number	200638340
Date	22/06/2010
Parameters	TN/TP
Agency	EBICG
Depth	0 meters

Figure 4: Example of bottle label

11. Personal Safety

A separate safety plan will be prepared and approved by the Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group prior to field sampling. Field sampling should not commence until the safety plan has been signed off by all parties involved in the sampling. The safety plan will indicate all areas of potential

risk to personnel before, during and after the sampling, and develop specific strategies to minimise the risk.

12. Limits of Reporting (LORs) for NMI Laboratory

Table provides the NMI Laboratory method codes and limits of reporting (mg/L) for the measurement parameters selected for the Ellen Brook catchment sampling program. The measurement parameters cannot be detected below these limits provided.

Table 4: Analysis Methods and Limit of Reporting (LOR) for NMI.

Method description	LOR (mg/L)
Total phosphorus	0.005
Total nitrogen	0.025
Total organic nitrogen	0.025
Soluble reactive phosphorus	0.005
Total oxidised nitrogen	0.010
Nitrogen as ammonia	0.010
Dissolved organic nitrogen	0.025
Total filterable phosphorous	0.005
Total Suspended Solids	1.0
Total organic carbon	1.0
Dissolved organic carbon	1.0
Total water hardness	1.0
Arsenic – total	0.005
Aluminium – total	0.005
Cadmium – total	0.0001
Chromium – total	0.001
Copper – total	0.001
Iron – total	0.005
Lead – total	0.001
Nickel – total	0.005
Zinc – total	0.005
Mercury – total	0.0001

NMI is an accredited analytical laboratory which has been identified to analyse the water samples for the Ellen Brook water quality monitoring program. Table provides information on the analytical methods and limits of reporting used by the laboratory. Following analysis NMI must produce a laboratory report which must provide details on the following in both electronic and final laboratory reports:

- Date and time of sample analysis
- Method code and description

- All laboratory Quality Control results including analyte recovery, accepted recovery range, lab blanks, lab duplicates, lab blank spike recovery, matrix spike recovery.

13. Sending samples to the laboratory

Collected samples will be stored in an esky chilled to 4 °C with ice bricks out in the field and overnight in a refrigerator, as the sampling will be conducted over 2 days. The samples will be delivered to NMI in the afternoon of the day after sampling for analysis at the latest. A completed chain of custody (COC) must be included in the esky for the laboratory and a copy kept at the Chittering Landcare Centre. Turnaround time is 10 days from sample date to completion of analysis. Once the samples are received the results will be emailed directly to the Chittering Landcare Centre.

14. Management and Reporting of data

The sampling program and sampling sites will be registered with the Water Information Branch (WIN database) of the Department of Water. Water samples collected from the Ellen Brook will be sent for analysis to the National Measurement Institute (NMI), a laboratory accredited by the National Association of Testing Authorities (NATA) and independently audited by the Department of Water. Analytical results will be returned to the Chittering Landcare Centre. Results will be sent to the Department of Water to be entered onto the publicly accessible Water Information (WIN) database. However, this is dependent on whether or not it will incur a cost. The water quality monitoring results will be validated and verified, collated, analysed and published as a water quality report for the Ellen Brook, where data will be compared to previous years sampling.

15. Comparison of Results with Guidelines

The Australian and New Zealand Water Quality Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality (ANZECC & ARMCANZ, 2000) provides trigger values for both ecosystems and human health protection, as well as the following environmental values: aquatic ecosystems; primary industries; recreation and aesthetics; and drinking water.

The Guidelines recognise three levels of protection for aquatic ecosystems: areas which high conservation value, slightly to moderately disturbed ecosystems; and highly disturbed ecosystems. To assess the level of toxicant contamination in aquatic ecosystems, trigger values were developed from data using toxicity testing on a range of test species (ANZECC & ARMCANZ, 2000). The trigger values (99%, 95%, 90% and 80%) approximately correspond to the protection levels described above. An exceedance of the trigger value indicates that there is the *potential* for an impact to occur and should thus trigger a management response such as further investigation and possible remediation or adaptation of the guidelines according to local conditions (ANZECC & ARMCANZ, 2000).

The water quality results of the Ellen Brook sampling and analysis program will be compared to the 95% protection level for slight to moderately disturbed ecosystems. This snapshot will compare the results to the guideline trigger values for aquatic ecosystems and for livestock drinking water where appropriate.

16. Roles and Responsibilities

- Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group (EBICG)/Chittering Landcare Centre will have overall responsibility for this project.
- NMI will be responsible for providing the sample bottles and analysing the collected samples.
- EBICG, Shire of Chittering and City of Swan will fund the program with support from Swan River Trust for staff.

Table 5: Costs of water quality analysis of the Ellen Brook catchment 2010 sampling program at NMI.

Parameter	Number of Sites	Number of Sampling Occasions	Cost of Analysis (\$)	Total Cost of Sampling (\$)
Nutrients			<i>2010 Prices</i>	<i>Based on 2010 Prices</i>
TSS	27	4	13.15	1420.20
TN	27	4	16.50	1782.00
TP	27	4	13.25	1431.00
Ammonia-N	27	4	9.80	1058.40
NO _x -N (Total O _x N)	27	4	8.20	885.60
SRP	27	4	8.20	885.60
DOrganicN	27	4	16.50	1782.00
TorganicN	26	4	0 (Calculated)	
TFP	27	4	13.25	1431.00
Setup Cost (fee)		4	12.55	50.20
Total Metals				
Al	7	4	6.30	176.40
As	7	4	6.30	176.40
Cd	7	4	6.30	176.40
Cr	7	4	6.30	176.40
Cu	7	4	6.30	176.40
Fe	7	4	6.30	176.40
Hg	7	4	6.30	176.40
Ni	7	4	6.30	176.40
Pb	7	4	6.30	176.40
Zn	7	4	6.30	176.40
Setup Cost (fee)	27	4	14.20	56.80
Total Water Hardness	7	4	0	
DOC/TOC	2	4	56.65	226.60
DOC Setup			12.55	50.20
Blanks		2	188.60	377.20
Replicates		2	188.60	377.20
Admin Fee		4	47.6	190.40
Total (not inc GST)				13 768.4
Total (inc GST)			1376.84	15 145.24

Table 6: Budget for the 2011 Ellen Brook catchment monitoring project.

Item	Hours	People	Hourly Rate	Cost
SALARY COSTS				
1. Preparation of SAP	15	1	\$33.89	\$508.36
2. Sampling preparation	7.5	1	\$33.89	\$254.18
3. Sample collection	60	2	\$33.89	\$4066.80
4. Data management (site & program registration, data entry, verification/validation)	7.5	2	\$33.89	\$508.36
5. Preparation/assistance with Report	37.5	2	\$33.89	\$2541.76
6. Travel costs/courier costs	-	-	-	\$1200
CONSUMABLE COSTS				
1. Analysis costs – Ellen Brook Water Quality Monitoring Program 2011 (Based on 2010 laboratory analytical prices)	-	-	-	\$15145.24
TOTAL (inc GST)				\$24, 224

17. References

ANZECC and ARMCANZ (2000). *National Water Quality Management Strategy: Australia and New Zealand Water Quality Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality*. Australian and New Zealand Conservation Council, Agriculture and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand

Department of Water. (2006). Section 1: Water Quality Monitoring Program Design; A Guideline to the Development of Surface Water Quality Monitoring Programs. Perth, Western Australia: Water Science Branch, Department of Water.

Department of Water. (2006a). Section 2: Field Sampling Guidelines; A Guideline for Field Sampling for Surface Water Quality Monitoring Programs. Perth, Western Australia: Water Science Branch, Department of Water.

Department of Water. (2006b). Section 3: Technical Appendices; Standard Operating Procedures Water Sampling Methods and Analysis – Parameter Based. Perth, Western Australia: Water Science Branch, Department of Water.

NHMRC & ARMCANZ (1996). *Australian Drinking Water Quality Guidelines*. National Health and Medical Research Council and Agriculture and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand.

PPK Environment & Infrastructure (2000). *Ellen Brook Draft Catchment Management Plan* in association with Acacia Springs Environmental, Land Assessment, Hames Sharley, ERM Mitchell McCotter and V & C Semeniuk Research Group.

Swan River Trust. (2009). *Local Water Quality Improvement Plan: Ellen Brook catchment*.

Appendix A: Analytical Requirements

(To be attached to all COC forms)

Project: SG-C-Ellen Brook

COC numbers: _____

Group	Analytes	Special instructions
A	Dissolved Nutrients:	To be reported at standard LORs
	Total Nitrogen	0.05mg/L
	Total oxidised nitrogen	0.01 mg/L
	Nitrogen as ammonia	0.01 mg/L
	Total Phosphorous	0.01mg/L
	Soluble reactive phosphorus	0.005 mg/L
	Total Filterable Phosphorous	0.005mg/L
	Soluble organic nitrogen	0.025 mg/L
B	Total heavy metals:	To be reported at limits of reporting for analysis using ANZECC guideline trigger values:
	Cd & Hg	0.1 µg/L (0.0001 mg/L)
	Cr, Cu & Pb	1.0 µg/L (0.001 mg/L)
	Al, As, Fe, Ni & Zn	5.0 µg/L (0.005 mg/L)
C	Total Organic Carbon & Dissolved Organic Carbon	1.0 mg/L (both)
D	Total Filterable Phosphorous	0.005 mg/L

Please note:

Total water hardness (LOR of 1.0 mg/L) to be extracted from TSS bottle.

Appendix B: Equipment List for Collecting Water Samples (DoW, 2006b)

- Twenty-six 500ml HDPE bottles. Two of the five sampling runs will require two extra for blanks and replicates. The metal sampling run will require an extra six bottles for Total Water Hardness.
- Calibrated Quanta probe for measurement of in-situ parameters, including the probe cover, protection cap and surveyor (provided by the Department of Water).
- Field filtering equipment – hand pump, filter tower, filter paper and tweezers.
- Deionised water for field blanks.
- Deionised water spray bottle for cleaning the filter tower.
- Tap water for filling the probe protection cap, and drinking water.
- Bucket for measurement probes/surveyor.
- Sampling and Analysis Plan (SAP)
- Safety Plan
- Chain of Custody (COC) forms
- Field Observation (FOF) forms
- Eskies with ice bricks.
- Masking tape
- Nitrile gloves, gumboots, waders, coveralls, safety glasses, sunscreen, hat, and other protective gear.
- Map of sites.
- GPS (if required)
- Permanent marker, pencil and pen

Appendix H - Safety Plan

Ellen Brook Catchment
Water Quality Monitoring Program
2010



Plate 1: Fish and Fisheries Research staff at Clune Park, Bindoon (2010).
Prepared by Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment group:
March 2010



This project is co-funded by the Ellen Brockman Integrated Catchment Group, and the Australian and Western Australian Government's investment in the Caring for Country administered by the Perth Region NRM.

Table of contents

1.	INTRODUCTION.....	137
2.	SITE ASSESSMENT	138
3.	SAMPLING SITE LOCATIONS.....	138
	TABLE 1: LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLING SITES IN THE ELLEN BROOK CATCHMENT	138
4.	PERSONAL PROTECTION AND EQUIPMENT	141
5.	ACCESS TO MEDICAL HELP.....	142
6.	IMPORTANT CONTACT NUMBERS:.....	142
	TABLE 2: EMERGENCY CONTACT LIST	142
7.	HAZARD IDENTIFICATION.....	143
	TABLE 3: RISK ASSESSMENT	143
8.	EXPERIENCE OF SAMPLING PERSONNEL	144

List of Plates

Plate 1: Ellen Brook (2006)

List of Figures

Figure 1: Location of Sampling Sites within the Ellen Brook catchment. 140
Error! Reference source not found.

1. Introduction

The purpose of the safety plan is to provide personnel undertaking water quality sampling within the Ellen Brook catchment with safety and health requirements. The safety plan indicates all potential areas of risk to personnel before, during and after the sampling and recommends specific strategies to minimise this risk. Occupational health, safety and welfare in the workplace is a shared responsibility and the Chittering Landcare Centre relies on consultation, commitment and participation from all officers.

All employees have the responsibility for ensuring their own health, safety and welfare, reporting hazards in the work area and following established practices and procedures aimed at providing a safe and healthy work environment for all. This plan should be used in conjunction with the Chittering Landcare Centre's Occupational Health & Safety Policy, particularly the following protocol related to officers undertaking field work:

- Before departing the office for field work, the worker must ensure that they;
 - Post their itinerary including specific details of times, location and contact mobile telephone on the staff notice board. If possible a contact landholder name and phone number should be provided.
 - Are suitably clothed with protective clothing and boots for the task.
 - Have all their safety equipment, adequate drinking water and first aid equipment in their vehicle.
 - Have their mobile phone with them and the battery is charged.
 - Have adequate fuel in their vehicle for the task.
- The worker is to contact a staff member at the Chittering Landcare Centre no later than **1 hour** after their nominated time of return. The details of these checks are to be recorded next to the worker's name on the notice board.
- If no contact has been made within one (1) hour of the lone worker's nominated time of return, Chittering Landcare Centre officers are instructed to attempt to make contact with the worker, either by using the contact details posted on the notice board, or the designated mobile telephone.
- If no response is received from the worker following attempts to make contact, inform the staff, Chittering Landcare Centre Manager or a senior officer from the Shire of Chittering (CEO, Deputy CEO or Shire Ranger) whose contact details are posted on the notice board. A search will then be initiated using the lone worker's stated itinerary.

2. Site assessment

All sites involve foreshore environments and are accessed by road, and the issues involved for all sites are included in the “Hazard Identification” Table within this plan. Most sites are publicly available and accessible, with the exception of EBN4 (Chandala South) which is located on Tiwest land. As such, the policies of the mining company must be adhered to whilst sampling at this site. This includes wearing a safety vest, helmet, protective eyewear and signing in/out at reception when entering & exiting the site.

3. Sampling site locations

Table 11: Location and description of sampling sites in the Ellen Brook Catchment

Site no.	Site Name	Waterway section/ Component	Location	Northing	Easting
EBN1	Lennard Brook	Lennard Brook	Lennard Brook Road	6527771	0396613
EBN2	Airfield Road	North Chandala/Ellen Brook (Bambun Lakes)	Airfield Road	6519428	0397101
EBN3	Chandala West	Chandala Brook West	Brand Hwy west loc # 853	6511801	0400463
EBN4	Chandala South	Chandala Brook South	Brand Hwy east / TIWest	6510846	0401302
EBN5	Yal Yal Brook	Yal Yal Brook	Reserve Road	6514458	0404923
EBN6	Rocky Gully Creek	Rocky Gully Creek	Old Gingin Rd	6509047	0403714
EBN7	Wandena North	Waterway to Ellen Brook	Wandena North - Great Northern Highway	6507384	0404384
EBN8	Wandena South	Waterway to Ellen Brook	Wandena South - Great Northern Highway	6506686	0404561
EBN9	Brand Highway Bridge	Ellen Brook - Muchea Central	Bridge on Brand Hwy south	6505838	0404093
EBN10	Muchea East	Waterway to Ellen Brook Muchea East	Great Northern/Brand Highways	6505833	0404780
EBN11	Muchea North	Waterway to Ellen Brook -	Muchea south / Railway Rd 491 chit/swan sign	6500336	0404611
EBN13	Rutland Road	Ellen Brook (upper)	Rutland Road bridge	6498117	0406044
EBN14	Nutrient Inflow	Waterway – Nutrient stripping inflow	Bingham Road/ Department of Defence	6496871	0405690
EBN15	Nutrient Outflow	Waterway - Nutrient stripping Pond outflow	Bingham Road/ Department of Defence	6496885	0405757
EBN16	Bulls Brook	Bullsbrook	Sth past Strachan on Railway Rd	6495684	0405054
EBN17	Warren Road	Mid Ellen Brook	Warren Road	6493379	0406685
EBN18	Gauging Station	Ellen Brook - Almeria Gauging Station	Almeria Parade/Apple Street	6486743	0407638
EBN19	Belhus Reserve	Lower Ellen Brook	Belhus Reserve Millhouse Rd Bridge	6483685	0406519
EBN20	All Saints	Swan River confluence	All Saints Church – West Swan Road	6481570	0405651
EBN21	Lower Yal Yal	Yal Yal Brook South	Old Gingin Road	6509922	0403110
EBN22	Ki-it Brook	Ki-it Brook	Warren Road	6493382	0406959
EBN23	Peters Road	Waterway to Ellen Brook – Muchea townsite	Peters Road	6505232	0403580
EBN24	Stock Road	Waterway to Ellen Brook West	Railway Parade	6492415	0405221
EBN25	Sawpit Gully	Waterway to Ellen Brook – The Vines north	Lot 4/285 Railway Parade, Upper Swan	6486777	0407430
EBN26	Egerton	Waterway from Egerton Estate to Ellen Brook	Corona Way	6483859	0405129
EBN27	Wandena Road	Waterway to Ellen Brook	Corner of Great Northern Hwy and Wandena Road	6502590	0406553
EBN28	Upper Yal Yal	Yal Yal Brook North	Great Northern Hwy	6516783	0409421

EBN29	Roxburghe Avenue	Drain leading to Ellen Brook from The Vines east	Roxburghe Avenue	6486603	0406975
-------	------------------	---	------------------	---------	---------




Figure 36: Location of Sampling Sites within the Ellen Brook catchment.

4. Personal protection and equipment

Officers involved in water sampling activities should heed the following to ensure that their personal safety outside of the office is made a priority.

- A mobile phone should be carried so that contact can be made with the office at specified times or for emergency.
- All work vehicles should be equipped with a first aid kit.
- All work vehicles should be equipped with a current fire extinguisher.
- All workers who work in isolated conditions in the field should have a current Senior First Aid certificate or first aid training to suit their particular needs.
- Workers driving four wheel drive vehicles should be trained in driving in such conditions.
- Personnel should wear thin nitrile gloves and eye protection whilst collecting water samples.
- If entering the water, waders or gum boots should be worn. The alternative to gum boots if not entering the water is steel capped, enclosed leather boots.
- Normal sun-protection should be adopted (hat, long sleeves and sunscreen) as the sampling is an outdoor activity. In the case of rain, a raincoat or weatherproof jacket should be worn.
- Adequate water (at least 5 litres) should be carried on board the vehicle at all times and is located in the tray of the ute. Drinking water regularly when out in the field is vital to prevent dehydration, particularly in warmer months.

5. Access to medical help

At least one of the sampling officers must have a current first aid certificate. In this case, Amy Salmon is the first aid officer. The car used for sampling always has a first aid kit – it is located in the tray of the vehicle in a plastic box. At least one operational mobile phone will be with the officers at all times. If more than simple first aid treatment is required then the **emergency number 000** should be dialled and an ambulance ordered to escort the injured person to hospital.

A map showing direction and routes to the nearest hospital must be provided to all personnel prior to departure in the field.

The nearest hospital is:

Swan District Hospital

Eveline Road
Middle Swan 6056

(08) 9347 5244

To get to the Swan District Hospital, follow the Great Northern Highway south, then right onto Eveline Road.

6. Important Contact Numbers:

If any other situation arises, the following table gives useful contact details.

Table 12: Emergency Contact List

Name/Service	Contact phone	Mobile
Chittering Landcare Centre - Bonny Dunlop-Heague	(08)95714351	0428434351
Chittering Landcare Centre - Kay Reid	(08)95710400	0428528030
Chittering Landcare Centre - Rosanna Hindmarsh (co-ordinator)	(08)95710400	0429887715
Chittering Landcare Centre – Sue Metcalf	(08)95710200	0427203929
City of Swan – Patrick Hedges (Ranger)	(08)92679267	0419192055
Fire Brigade – Lower Chittering (Max Brown)	(08)95718149	0427089677
Fire Station – Muchea (Dennis Harvey)	(08)95714122	0427092356
Medical Centre - Bindoon	(08)95761222	
Police Midland	(08)92221111	
Shire of Chittering – Craig (Ranger)	(08)95760282	0427699700
Shire of Gin Gin – Michael Pimm (Ranger)	(08)6551286	
Perth Region NRM – Administration	(08)93743333	
Tiwest – Parveen Naidoo (Environmental Officer)	(08)95719246	0417174834

Tiwest – Reception	(08)95719333	
---------------------------	--------------	--

7. Hazard identification

All personnel must be trained in identification of potential hazards at a sampling site. This involves listing potential dangers to sampling personnel when at the sampling site, such as collapse of stream bank, falling into the stream, and contact with water from the stream, exposure to heat, wind and rain.

All personnel must be briefed of potential hazards at sample sites.

There is a potential for exposure to very acidic waters. Entry into the drains/waterways must be done wearing protective clothing unless pH has been determined to be within safe limits (pH 5.5-8).

Table 13: Risk Assessment

Identified Risk	Precautions
Exposure to chemicals and handling of contaminated samples & sampling or entering potentially low pH waters.	Wear protective clothing at all times: field boots or gum boots, nitrile gloves (waders if expecting to go into water at above ankle level).
Physical injury from falling (especially steep slopes with sandy banks)	Inspect accessibility to site before transferring equipment from car. If site is too steep, unstable or otherwise dangerous do not sample.
Insect, spider, rodent or snake bites.	Inspect site prior to sampling, especially drain culvert openings and wear long pants and high boots for walking through long grass.
Traffic on roads near sites	Bright safety vest with reflective strip should be worn when working along road sides and care should be taken to watch out for traffic at all times. Hazard lights should be left on vehicle whilst sampling.
Manual handling of heavy equipment and eskies/samples	Wear work boots and lift heavy objects ensuring no risk to back. If necessary, use two people to lift larger eskies.
Sampling at sites where algal scums are present	Always wear nitrile gloves when sampling and avoid contact with water. Take care when handling food after sampling.
Sunburn, exposure (dehydration and heat stroke, exposure to cold).	Apply sunscreen, wear hats, rain jackets, work pants, jumpers as appropriate. Take plenty of drinking water (labelled as drinking water and kept separate from sample bottles).

8. Experience of sampling personnel

Samples should only be collected by personnel who have received training from the Aquatic Science Branch of the Department of Environment or a recognised authority.