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Goals and Motivations

• The artificial isolation of floodplain wetlands from inundation has been one of the most widespread causes of ecological decline across the globe.

• Wetlands are biodiversity hotspots in the landscape, and their isolation from floodwaters and, on the coast, flood tide inundation has led to the degradation of ecological services including reductions in fisheries production, waterbird habitat, and habitat refugia.

• Scientific and policy interest has recently turned to the value of coastal wetlands for carbon sequestration (“Blue Carbon”).

• Coastal mangrove and saltmarsh restorations are now at the forefront of developments for ecosystem-based climate change mitigation and adaptation.

• The 2013 (Wetlands Supplement) to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories provides a framework for the incorporation of wetland carbon sequestration in national carbon accounts.
Goals and Motivations

• Tomago wetland located near Newcastle, NSW, Australia is undergoing rehabilitation restoring tidal inundation to a previously leveed floodplain.

• It is hypothesised that the restoration of tidal inundation would convert a methane source into a sink as a consequence of soil salinization.

• A Before-After-Control-Impact experimental design has been applied to measure the impact of tidal reinstatement on wetland floodplain accretion and gas flux.
Methodology

- 4 months prior to tidal reinstatement, we have installed an extensive set of environmental measurements at impacted and control sites.

- Hydrodynamic modelling identified the sites within the wetland predicted to remain disconnected from tidal flow.

- Eddy covariance tower at disturbed site, Gill Windmaster, LICOR 7500, 7700 open path (CO₂, CH₄, H₂O).

- LICOR smart flux system, eddypro software, QA/QC procedures, telemetry

- 4 component radiation (Kipp and Zonen cnr1), soil surface temperature (thermocouple).
Methodology

- Electron conductivity and water temperature (HOBO® U24)
- RSET-MH: Surface elevation, surface accretion, and continuous water level (HOBO U20L) inundation regime.
- Soil microbial community sampling and analysis (16S rRNA gene milliseq).
- Local Air samples for carbon isotopes of CO₂ and CH₄ including hydrogen isotopes for methane.
- Meteorological data from nearby (10 Km) Williams Town air base including precipitation
- Soil sampling, vegetation surveys
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Results

- Eddy covariance measurements began August 4, 2015 and is ongoing.

- Tidal reinstatement was mid November 2015.

- Presented are preliminary results from August 2015 to May 2016.
Results

**CO₂**

Flux (g m⁻² h⁻¹)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Flux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CH₄**

Flux (mg m⁻² h⁻¹)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Flux</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Temperature (C)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Temperature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rainfall (mm)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Rainfall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

- William Town climatology: 60 yr. record of rainfall and temperature 1942 to 2002
- Study period to date anomalous with respect to precipitation input
Results: monthly and seasonal

**CH$_4$**

Flux (mg m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$)

- Aug, Sept, Oct
- Nov, Dec
- Jan, Feb
- March, April
- May

**CO$_2$**

Flux (g m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$)

- Aug, Sept, Oct
- Nov, Dec
- Jan, Feb
- March, April
- May

**CH$_4$**

Flux (mg m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$)

- Sept, Oct, Nov
- Dec, Jan, Feb
- March, Apr, May
- June, July, Aug

**CO$_2$**

Flux (g m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$)

- Sept, Oct, Nov
- Dec, Jan, Feb
- March, Apr, May
- June, July, Aug
Results: Before and After Flooding

**CO₂**

- Flux (g m⁻² h⁻¹)
- Before (Aug-Oct): -0.2, 0.0, 0.2, 0.4
- After (Dec-May): -0.4, 0.0, 0.4, 0.8

**CH₄**

- Flux (mg m⁻² h⁻¹)
- Before (Aug-Oct): -6, -4, -2, 0, 2
- After (Dec-May): -4, -2, 0, 2, 4

**CO₂**

- Flux (g m⁻² h⁻¹)
- Before (Aug-Oct): 0.0
- After (Dec-May): 0.0

**CH₄**

- Flux (mg m⁻² h⁻¹)
- Before (Aug-Oct): 0.0
- After (Dec-May): -0.3, 0.3, 0.3
Results: Comparison

- To date we are not seeing a clear signal from tidal re-enstatement, especially for methane.
- Averaging CO$_2$ before and after tidal re-instatement does show, coincidently, a change from a sink to a source.
- Over the ten months of measurements methane is a small source to the atmosphere.
- CO$_2$ is the dominate source of carbon to the atmosphere.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CO$_2$ (g m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>CH$_4$ (g m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>-0.0850</td>
<td>0.000113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>-0.0000734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>0.374</td>
<td>-0.0000221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum (NOT including Nov when flooding occurred and we have no CH$_4$ data)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wetlands GWP after flooding (after Nov)</th>
<th>CO$_2$ (g m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>CH$_4$ expressed as CO$_2$ (g m$^{-2}$ h$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>SUM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100 yr GWP (CH$_4$ x 21)</td>
<td>0.1163</td>
<td>-0.00154</td>
<td>0.1148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 yr GWP (CH$_4$ x 31)</td>
<td>0.1163</td>
<td>-0.00227</td>
<td>0.1140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Results: Air sampling CH$_4$ stable isotope signatures**

- **$\delta^{13}$C signatures of CH$_4$ indicate carbon source** (Whiticar 1999)
  - Biogenic $\delta^{13}$C \textless -50
  - Thermogenic/fossil fuel $\delta^{13}$C \textgreater -50

- **September**
  - Wind direction: 140° to 204°
  - Input signature: -57.6
    - Biogenic input signature

- **December**
  - Wind direction: 68° to 85°
  - Input signature: -44.1
    - Thermogenic/fossil fuel
Results: atmospheric isotopic sampling

Wind: 140° to 170°
Input signature: -67.1

Wind: 190° to 204°
Input signature: -74.9
Results: December

CH4 (ppm)

- >= 5.0
- 4.5 - 5.0
- 4.0 - 4.5
- 3.5 - 4.0
- 3.0 - 3.5
- 2.5 - 3.0
- 1.8 - 2.5
- Calms: 0.00%

CO2 ppm (x100)

- >= 8.0
- 7.0 - 8.0
- 6.0 - 7.0
- 5.0 - 6.0
- 4.0 - 5.0
- 3.0 - 4.0
- 2.0 - 3.0
- Calms: 0.00%
Results: September

CH$_4$ (ppm)

Resultant Vector
320 deg - 9%

Calms: 7.94%

CO$_2$ ppm (x100)

Resultant Vector
161 deg - 13%

Calms: 0.00%
Conclusions

- Tidal re-instatement in impounded wetlands potentially represents an important “blue carbon” opportunity in Australia.

- Tidal re-instatement does not prevent periodic freshening and associated greenhouse gas production.

- In the first 10 months carbon budget dominated by freshwater inputs as opposed to signal from tidal re-instatement.

- Site may be influenced by anthropogenic atmospheric input to background air (military base).

- As complete data set is collected/analysed and integrated to describe the carbon budget at this site the full impact of restoration is unknown.
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