

Interactive comment on “Major flood dominates 14 year sediment and nutrient budgets for two subtropical reservoirs” by K. R. O’Brien et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 8 July 2016

Reviewer 2 General comments:

This paper deals with some important issues about the challenges that are faced in some catchments and reservoirs where peak flows, despite very rare, have a huge influence on the load budget. On the same time these peak flows are the most difficult to monitor and represent very short time periods which complicates data interpretation.

The paper is generally well written with a fluent and precise language and very few grammatical errors. The paper is well structured and both data and methods are described in sufficient detail and it is an interesting data set with a long time series of both flow and nutrient and sediment concentrations. In that sense I find that the paper does have a sufficient quality and some relevance for the general readership of HESS. However, I find that the weak part of the paper is the fact that I do not see that this paper makes a substantial contribution to our current knowledge about nutrient budget estimations or nutrient and sediment transport processes. It is fairly well known that peak flows can contribute substantially to transport of nutrients and sediment and that monitoring of these peak flows are difficult because any time averaging (which is mostly done during normal flow periods) introduces a huge uncertainty on the peak flow load estimates. Therefore I suggest that it could be considered if this paper might be more suitable for a targeted engineering journal, for instance with special interest in reservoir and dam dynamics and their impacts on freshwater ecosystems.

Author response: We thank the reviewer for their detailed response, and constructive advice. The reviewer recognizes the quality and importance of the paper, and noted that it was “well-structured”, with “interesting data set with a long time series of both flow and nutrient and sediment concentrations” and of “sufficient quality and some relevance for the general readership of HESS.”

We agree that the paper is suitable for HESS readership, and that we must ensure it makes a “substantial contribution to our current knowledge about nutrient budget estimations or nutrient and sediment transport processes”.

To this end, our paper highlights the hazards of presenting sediment and nutrient budgets in static form, particularly in catchments with highly episodic flow. This finding applies to catchment budgets generally, and is not restricted to reservoirs. The evidence is taken from a comprehensive long-term dataset. Our paper does not therefore simply convey that peak flows contribute to nutrient and sediment budgets or that these events are difficult to monitor, but goes far further, making a substantial contribution to current knowledge on the fundamental nature of budget estimations and transport processes.

We agree there is room to articulate this important contribution more clearly and have clarified this in our revision, for example by:

- **Modifying the title to “Sediment and nutrient budgets are inherently dynamic: evidence from a long-term study of two subtropical reservoirs”.**
- **Modifying the Discussion, as outlined below, to emphasize the paper’s key conclusion: that catchment budgets are inherently dynamic, particularly in river systems with episodic flow.**
- **The Discussion now also explains the significance of the reservoir siltation rates for regional water supply.**

Reviewer 2: There is an excessive use of references to supplementary material. I find it somewhat problematic that such a large part of the paper relies on

supplementary material. In my opinion supplementary material should function as a supplement, not as an essential extension of the paper. I therefore suggest that the supplementary material is critically reviewed and condensed.

Constructing a comprehensive catchment budget is difficult, due to the issues in reconciling data collected over a variety of spatial and temporal scales, and in estimating uncertainty (Walling and Collins 2008, Parsons 2011, Carpenter et al. 2015).

We have included in Supplementary Material the calculations and assumptions we used in our robust quantification of uncertainty. This ensures confidence in our final uncertainty estimates, and provides a thorough method for others constructing a catchment budget. This highly detailed and specific technical information would distract from the main findings if included in the main body. Additionally, we are confident that readers who choose not consult this Supplementary Material will understand our paper. We have therefore decided to retain the information in the Supplementary Material.

We would certainly agree, under the Editor's advice, to this material being critically reviewed.

Reviewer 2: Generally I think that the Conclusion section is more a Perspectives section. I suggest that the conclusion should be rewritten to sum up the findings rather than discussing perspectives and implications.

Author response: We have modified the conclusion to include clearer reference to the findings of the current study.

Specific comments

Reviewer 2: P. 7 line 5: You write that you do not expect a good relationship between TN and turbidity. However in the plot (Fig. S2) the relationship looks just as good as for TP and TSS? Could you comment on this?

Author response: Relationships with turbidity are commonly used to estimate [TSS], and less commonly for [TP], which is strongly associated with sediment. It is unusual to estimate [TN] from turbidity because dissolved compounds typically make up a large component of total nitrogen, we have done so here because no other data is available during the critical January 2011 flood period. We have modified the text to clarify this point.

Reviewer 2: P 8 line 15: For output loads the uncertainty is estimated as deviation of Method 3 from method 4, but why is method 4 used? and not one of the others?

Author response: We have added the following sentence to the text: "Thus the estimated uncertainty is the difference between loads estimated from monthly monitoring, and the loads estimated from daily turbidity readings. Monthly monitoring and turbidity datasets were both complete for these time periods (water years 2008 and 2009)."

Reviewer 2: P 8 line 6: In method 3 why are loads not calculated based on the two monthly measurements, rather than just one? Would two measurements not give a better estimate, simply due to less interpolation and more real data?

Author response: Monthly monitoring occurred once per month, at the surface and the bottom. Surface and/or bottom concentrations were used to calculate loads, depending on the method of reservoir release, as explained in section 2.3.1.

Reviewer 2: P. 11 line 19: Do you mean flow-TSS correlations as conducted by Grinham et al.

(2012). Slightly confused with what is your method and what is done by others.

Author response: Agreed, this is ambiguous, we have modified the sentence to read "Thus the TSS inputs to Wivenhoe calculated by Grinham et al. (2012) using the event-mean and flow correlation methods are one and two orders of magnitude, respectively, above our estimate of 0.2 Mt (Table 2)."

Reviewer 2: P. 13 line 3-4: You repeat what you just said above about the size of the relative uncertainty compared to input and output uncertainty.

Author response: Agreed, we have deleted the second sentence.

Reviewer 2: P 13 line 7: That uncertainty is high in unmeasured elements is quite trivial I think. You could either leave this out or state it differently.

Agreed, we have rephrased this to state "uncertainty is particularly high in quantities which are calculated from other budget terms, rather than independently determined".

Reviewer 2: P. 12-13: There is a really large focus on this other study, but I do not see clearly how this study advances our knowledge compared to the Parson (2011) paper?

Author response: We have clarified this significantly in the text, and particularly in the final paragraph of this section: “Therefore we propose that Parsons’ three principles of catchment budgets can be refined to two principles: 1. Budgets should be presented as time-series rather than static quantities to clearly display temporal variability and 2. Uncertainty should be quantified for all budget terms, and accounted for in any interpretation of results.”

Reviewer 2: P. 13 line 13-15: Do you mean comparison between methods 1-4 or comparison between the two different reservoirs? Please clarify.

Author response: We agree, this sentence was ambiguous, and has been rephrased as follows “This point is illustrated by the uncertainty in retention and trapping efficiency of water, sediment and nutrients (Tables 2-3), as follows.”

Reviewer 2: P. 13 line 20-24. Are you more confident using trapping efficiency during peak flows or in general? I do not find it completely clear why you come to the conclusion about more confidence in trapping efficiency than in retention, since both are a function of inflow?

Author response: Both. We’ve modified the paragraph as follows to make these points clearer: "Correct propagation of uncertainty also affects interpretation of reservoir budgets. Uncertainty is higher over shorter time periods, and thus confidence in budget values is lower for the flood year than for the whole study period (Tables 2-3). Net retention of TSS, TN and TP occurred over the 14 year study period in both reservoirs, except for TP in Wivenhoe, where uncertainty was higher than the difference between input and output loads. The flood year dominated the retention of TSS, TN and TP in both reservoirs (e.g. 25 % and 40 % of TSS retained in Somerset and Wivenhoe were captured during the flood year), however the higher relative uncertainty in the values determined for this shorter timeframe means that retention of water, sediment and nutrients in both reservoirs in the flood year was only significantly different to zero for TSS in Somerset.

Uncertainty in trapping efficiency (retention divided by input) is lower than uncertainty in retention, as outlined in Section 2.4. Thus while retention was not significant for most loads during the flood period, trapping efficiency was quantifiable for all sediment and nutrients across the study period, and for TSS in both reservoirs and TN in Somerset during the flood year (Table 2). Together, these findings engender greater confidence in the proportion of sediment and nutrients retained by the reservoirs (i.e. trapping efficiency) than in the mass retained, and in budget terms calculated for multi-year periods.”

Reviewer 2: P. 13. Line 24. Do you have any suggestions to how this could be achieved?

Author response: The sentence has been modified to clarify this point: “For a fuller assessment of trapping efficiency in reservoirs with variable flow, such as Wivenhoe and Somerset, hydraulic retention should be calculated on shorter (i.e. monthly) timescales, as outlined in Lewis et al. (2013).

Reviewer 2: P. 13 line 27 – P 14 line 1-4: I suggest that this should be moved to the results section?

Author response: Ideally this would appear in the results section, however we feel that it would confuse readers if presented earlier, because the calculations use information from Grinham et al. 2012 which is first introduced in the Discussion. The paragraph also uses the results to draw further conclusions. Therefore we propose to leave this section in the Discussion.

Reviewer 2: P. 13 line 27 – P 14 line 1-4: I miss a comment of the importance/implications. Do you believe in these numbers, given the uncertainty in loads, and what is then concluded? I suppose that loss of storage volume seems not to be an issue in these two reservoirs, despite and overall net retention of sediment and nutrients?

Author response: We have added extra text and an additional reference to verify the numbers, and explain the significance for regional water supply. The additional text reads as follows:

“Using the input loads calculated in this study, decline in storage volume is estimated as only 0.04 %-1.1 % for Wivenhoe over the 14 year study period (Table 4), i.e. 0.003 %-0.1 % per year. Average annual decline in storage volume is two orders of magnitude lower in Wivenhoe compared to Mosul Dam, Iraq, where reservoir volume reduced by more than 10 % due to siltation between 1986 and 2011, i.e. 0.4 % per year on average (Issa et al., 2015). While trapping efficiency of Wivenhoe is slightly less than that estimated for Mosul Dam, the large difference in siltation between these two reservoirs is due primarily to the difference in sediment loads. Mosul Dam has approximately ten times the storage volume of Wivenhoe, but sediment loads entering Mosul Dam are of order 100-1000 higher than those entering Wivenhoe (Issa et al., 2015).

While the relative siltation rates in both Somerset and Wivenhoe may seem low (Table 4), the corresponding loss in water supply volume is regionally significant. We estimated that the decline in storage capacity over the study period was approximately 4 000 ML for Somerset loss and 5 000- 12 000 ML for Wivenhoe (Table 4). Four of the 15 water supply reservoirs in the region have capacity of less than 5 000 ML, and fewer than half have a capacity greater than 12 000 ML (Leigh et al., 2010). Hence the volume of storage capacity lost in Somerset and Wivenhoe over the 14 year study period is equivalent to the closure of one of more of the smaller reservoirs. Somerset and Wivenhoe supply water to southeast Queensland, a region of rapid population growth which has recently experienced major drought, and where alternatives water sources have much higher greenhouse gas intensity than water supplied from existing reservoirs (e.g. Hall et al. 2011). Therefore any economic assessment of methods to reduce the catchment sediment load in this region should account for costs associated with reservoir siltation and associated loss of water supply volume. Direct measurement of reservoir volume is required for more accurate estimates of storage loss due to siltation.”

Reviewer 2: P 14 line 15-17: Is this your conclusion (this is the impression I get) or one by Lewis et al. (2013)? Either rephrase so that this is clear or delete reference.

Author response: This sentence has been deleted.

Reviewer 2: P. 14 Line 22: I do not understand this sentence. Less is released and this leads to net export? And where is Brisbane water supply located? Are water pumped from lake Wivenhoe to the water supply? Could you rephrase this sentence?

Author response: We’ve clarified the sentence to reduce ambiguity as follows: “However Wivenhoe was frequently a net exporter of TN (Figure 7), typically during drought years when releases for water supply were less than reservoir inflows (Figure 3).”

Reviewer 2: P 1 line 30 p. 15 line 1-2: I suggest that this section is rewritten to be more specific about this particular study. It is a rather general statement but as I understand it is based on the findings in this study?

Author response: Yes, and it has been modified to make this clearer: “Ratios of total and dissolved inorganic N: P were substantially higher in both reservoirs than in the UBR.”

Reviewer 2: P. 15 line 9-10: This should be moved to the discussion session.

Author response: As outlined earlier, we differ with the reviewer’s opinion on this matter, and await the Editor’s decision.

Technical corrections

Reviewer 2: P. 2 Line 16: please correct typing mistake in “reservpors”.

Author response: corrected.

Reviewer 2: Please be consistent in the use of spelling out “concentration” or writing in in brackets (example p. 10 line 2 and 16).

Author response: As a matter of style, we feel it’s preferable to write out concentration in some contexts, and use the bracket notation in others. We will take the Editor’s advice on this matter.

Reviewer 2: P. 13 line 6: please replace “than” with “that”.

Author response: corrected.

Reviewer 2: P. 14, line 27: You already defined DIN, no need to repeat it.

Author response: DIN replaced with [DIN].

Reviewer 2: P 14, line 29: Please replace “dissolve” with “dissolved” and write “N and P” rather than N:P.

Author response: corrected.

Reviewer 2: Fig. 6. Please include units on y axis rather than in the figure text.

Author response: corrected

Reviewer 2: Figure S3. The figure would be easier to read if the plots were bigger relative to the text.

Author response: corrected

Reviewer 2: Figure S4. The figure would be easier to read if the plots were bigger relative to the text.

Author response: corrected

Reviewer 2: Table 1. I find this table very difficult to read and I suggest that it is restructured or left out as there is a quite comprehensive description of data in the main text.

Author response: We leave this to the editor’s discretion

Reviewer 2: Table S4: What does “Method 3: Method 1”, is it the deviation between the two? _____

Author response: the caption has modified to clarify the difference between the two methods for estimating output loads of sediment and nutrients: “Method 1 uses historical mean concentrations and Method 3 uses monthly monitoring data supplemented by turbidity profile data.”

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., doi:10.5194/hess-2016-89, 2016.

References:

- Carpenter, S. R., E. G. Booth, C. J. Kucharik, and R. C. Lathrop. 2015. Extreme daily loads: role in annual phosphorus input to a north temperate lake. *Aquatic Sciences* **77**:71-79.
- Hall, M. R., West, J., Sherman, B., Lane, J., and de Haas, D.: Long-term trends and opportunities for managing regional water supply and wastewater greenhouse gas emissions, *Environmental science & technology*, 45, 5434-5440, 2011.
- Issa, I. E., Al-Ansari, N., Knutsson, S., and Sherwany, G.: Monitoring and evaluating the sedimentation process in Mosul Dam Reservoir using trap efficiency approaches, *Engineering*, 7, 190-202, doi: 10.4236/eng.2015.74015, 2015.
- Leigh, C., Burford, M. A., Connolly, R. M., Olley, J. M., Saeck, E., Sheldon, F., Smart, J. C., and Bunn, S. E.: Science to support management of receiving waters in an event-driven ecosystem: from land to river to sea, *Water*, 5, 780-797, doi:10.3390/w5020780, 2013.
- Parsons, A. J. 2011. How useful are catchment sediment budgets? *Progress in Physical Geography*:1-12.
- Walling, D., and A. Collins. 2008. The catchment sediment budget as a management tool. *environmental science & policy* **11**:136-143.

1 ~~Major flood dominates 14 year sediment and nutrient budgets~~
2 ~~for two subtropical reservoirs~~
3 Sediment and nutrient budgets are inherently dynamic:
4 evidence from a long-term study of two subtropical reservoirs

5 Katherine R. O'Brien¹, Tony R. Weber², Catherine Leigh^{3,4} and Michele A. Burford³

6 ¹School of Chemical Engineering, The University of Queensland, St Lucia, Queensland 4075, Australia

7 ² Integrated Catchment Assessment and Management Unit, ANU College of Medicine, Biology and
8 Environment, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200 Australia

9 ³ Australian Rivers Institute, Griffith University, Nathan, Queensland 4111, Australia

10 ⁴IRSTEA, UR-MALY, 5 rue de la Doua, CS70077 69626 VILLEURBANNE Cedex, France

11
12 *Correspondence to:* Katherine R. O'Brien (k.obrien@uq.edu.au)

13 **Abstract.** Accurate reservoir budgets are important for understanding regional fluxes of sediment and
14 nutrients. Here we present a comprehensive budget of sediment (based on total suspended solids, TSS), total
15 nitrogen (TN) and total phosphorus (TP) for two subtropical reservoirs on rivers with highly intermittent flow
16 regimes. The budget is completed from July 1997 to June 2011 on Somerset and Wivenhoe reservoirs in
17 southeast Queensland, Australia, using a combination of monitoring data and catchment model predictions. A
18 major flood in January 2011 accounted for more than 50% of the water entering and leaving both reservoirs in
19 that year, and more than 30% of water delivered to and released from Wivenhoe over the 14 year study
20 period. The flood accounted for an even larger proportion of total TSS and nutrient loads: in Wivenhoe 40% of
21 TSS inputs and 90% of TSS outputs between 1997 and 2011 occurred during January 2011. During non-flood
22 years, mean historical concentrations provided reasonable estimates of TSS and nutrient loads leaving the
23 reservoirs. Calculating loads from historical mean TSS and TP concentrations during January 2011, however,
24 would have substantially underestimated outputs over the entire study period, by a factor of up to ten. The
25 results have important implications for sediment and nutrient budgets in catchments with highly episodic flow.
26 Firstly, quantifying inputs and outputs during major floods is essential for producing reliable long-term
27 budgets. Secondly, sediment and nutrient budgets are dynamic, not static. Characterizing uncertainty and
28 variability is therefore just as important for meaningful reservoir budgets as accurate quantification of loads.

1 **1 Introduction**

2 Over the past century, human activities have caused unprecedented changes in water, sediment and nutrient
3 movement between the atmosphere, lithosphere, hydrosphere and biosphere (Rockström et al., 2009). Modification of
4 these natural biogeochemical cycles on a range of scales has the potential to alter fundamental earth system processes and
5 undermine the ecosystem services on which human societies depend (Steffen et al., 2015; Vörösmarty and Sahagian,
6 2000). For example, artificial fixation of atmospheric nitrogen by humans exceeds fixation rates by all natural processes
7 combined, contributing to a range of environmental problems including acidification, eutrophication and climate change
8 (Gruber and Galloway, 2008; de Vries et al., 2013). The rate of application of P to erodible soil is unsustainable in many
9 parts of the world (Carpenter and Bennett, 2011) and may threaten future food security (Cordell et al., 2009; Van Vuuren
10 et al., 2010).

11 Managing soil and nutrient resources more sustainably is therefore imperative, requiring reliable, quantitative
12 sediment and nutrient budgets at local, regional and global scales (e.g. Syvitski et al., 2005; Radach and Pätsch, 2007;
13 Metson et al., 2012). Reservoirs have a major impact on nutrient and sediment budgets due to their high residence times
14 and burial rates relative to free-flowing rivers (Sherman et al., 2001; Friedl and Wüest, 2002; Bosch and Allan, 2008; Kunz
15 et al., 2011). Reservoirs are also more effective than lakes at retaining both phosphorus (P) and nitrogen (N) (Harrison et
16 al., 2009; Köiv et al., 2011). Globally, ~~reservoirs~~ **reservoirs** are estimated to trap 26 % of the modern export of sediment to
17 the coastal zone, and billions of tonnes of sediment have been impounded within reservoirs since the mid-20th century
18 (Syvitski et al., 2005).

19 While quantifying sediment and nutrient loads is essential for closing local and regional nutrient budgets (Metson
20 et al., 2012; Walling and Collins, 2008), estimating uncertainty in these loads is a major challenge (Walling and Collins,
21 2008; Parsons, 2011; Carpenter et al., 2015). Sediment and nutrient retention in reservoirs depends on many factors,
22 including delivery (which is related to catchment size, land use and geology and river discharge volumes), sediment particle
23 size, storage capacity and water release practices (Issa et al., 2015; Mahmood, 1987; Graf et al., 2010; Leigh et al., 2010). In
24 tropical and subtropical river systems, large and episodic fluctuations in discharge due to seasonal and inter-decadal cycles
25 in rainfall patterns mean that large sediment and nutrient inputs can be delivered in relatively short time-frames (Kennard
26 et al., 2010; Lewis et al., 2013). For example, in one reservoir in subtropical Australia, net phosphorus retention over a 6-
27 year drought period was driven by moderate-flow events over just 12 days (Burford et al., 2012). Thus reservoir budgets
28 can vary across different time periods (Parsons, 2011). The greater the climatic variability in the catchment, the longer the
29 budget timeframe required to capture representative data.

1 This study aims to complete budgets of sediment and nutrients (N and P) for two large subtropical reservoirs. The
2 catchments of both reservoirs are characterised by high intensity episodic rainfall and runoff events, therefore the budgets
3 are conducted over more than a decade to capture a wide range of climatic conditions. More specifically, the study
4 assesses the effect of variability in flow on both the magnitude and uncertainty in sediment and nutrient loads entering,
5 leaving and retained within the reservoirs.

6 **2 Materials and Methods**

7 Sediment and nutrient budgets were completed for Somerset and Wivenhoe reservoirs over 14 years from July
8 1997 to June 2011. For this study, sediment is defined as the mixture of inorganic and organic matter, measured by dry
9 weight of filtered solids, i.e. total suspended solids (TSS). Inputs and outputs of water, TSS, total **N-nitrogen** (TN) and total **P**
10 **phosphorus** (TP) were estimated using a combination of catchment model predictions and monitoring data, measured at
11 intervals ranging from hourly to monthly. Output loads of TSS, TN and TP were estimated using four different methods to
12 deal with missing data.

13 **2.1 Study area**

14 Somerset and Wivenhoe reservoirs are major drinking water and flood mitigation reservoirs in southeast
15 Queensland, Australia (27° 24' S, 152° 36' E and 27° 7' S, 152° 33' E, respectively) linked by the Stanley River. The Stanley
16 River was dammed to form Somerset reservoir in 1959, and the Wivenhoe dam wall was constructed further downstream
17 below the confluence of the Stanley River and upper Brisbane River (UBR) in 1984 (Figure 1). The catchment areas of
18 Somerset and Wivenhoe reservoirs are 1 340 and 7 020 km², respectively. At full supply capacity, Somerset holds 0.380
19 km³, with a mean water depth of 9.3 m and a surface area of 42 km². Wivenhoe holds 1.165 km³ with a mean water depth
20 of 10.5 m, and surface area 107 km² (Leigh et al., 2015). Both reservoirs are eutrophic and warm-monomictic, with
21 overturn in the austral autumn and stratification in the austral summer that results in anoxic bottom waters (Burford and
22 O'Donohue, 2006). Water is released continuously from Wivenhoe reservoir for water treatment downstream.

23 Mean annual rainfall in the region is 743 mm (Bureau of Meteorology, bom.com.au, Figure 2). Inflows enter
24 Somerset reservoir primarily from the Stanley River. Controlled releases from Somerset reservoir combine with inflows
25 from the Upper Brisbane River (UBR) and lateral inflows to supply Wivenhoe reservoir (Figure 1). Stanley River and UBR
26 have highly unpredictable and intermittent flow regimes (Kennard et al., 2010), although major discharge events tend to
27 occur in summer (the 'wet season'). Therefore, 'water years' were defined from July to June in all analyses to capture the
28 entire austral summer wet season within each water year.

1 During the study period, there were three above-average flow events of note: in February 1999 (water year 1998),
2 February 2008 (water year 2007) and January 2011 (water year 2010). From 9-16 January 2011, a large flood with extreme
3 rainfall occurred within the Wivenhoe and Somerset catchments (Seqwater, 2011). It was the second highest flood
4 recorded in the lower Brisbane River over the past century (the highest was in 1974), and water from the Wivenhoe
5 catchment contributed to significant flood damage downstream (van den Honert and McAneney, 2011). The February 1999
6 and 2008 events were small by comparison (e.g. as indicated by rainfall volumes in Figure 2; see also van den Honert and
7 McAneney, 2011). Therefore, water year 2010 (July 2010-June 2011) is referred to hereafter as the “flood year” and all
8 other water years during the study period are denoted as “non-flood years”. The non-flood years (July 1997 to June 2010)
9 comprised a range of hydrological conditions, including the 1999 and 2008 flow events and the 2001-2009 drought (Dijk et
10 al., 2013) which was characterised by low rainfall and low inflows to both reservoirs (Leigh et al., 2015).

11 2.2 Catchment inputs: flows, loads and uncertainty

12 Daily flow and TSS, TN and TP loads from the catchments into Somerset and Wivenhoe reservoirs were estimated
13 using the SourceCatchments (SC) model (Weber et al., 2009). The model was parameterized for hydrology and stream
14 routing using one stream gauge in the Somerset catchment, and four stream gauges in the Wivenhoe catchment. The
15 model used global, land-use-based event-mean concentrations (EMC) and dry weather concentrations (DWC), estimated
16 from water quality information collected across the southeast Queensland region, with a particular focus on those event
17 monitoring sites that adequately characterized the pollutant export from land uses and soil types typical of the regions
18 being modelled. Calibration and validation were undertaken using a combination of manual and automated techniques.

19 The event mean concentrations (EMCs) were derived from event monitoring and continuous sampling within the
20 catchments of interest (Thomson et al. 2013), and thus implicitly represent the range of sediment and nutrient generation
21 processes present within the catchment. The EMCs are attributed to land uses rather than specific generation processes.
22 This attribution is relatively consistent with the spatial characterisation of sediment generation within the catchment as
23 quite often the generation processes are strongly tied to the land management of particular land activities (unpublished
24 data). For channel erosion, denuded areas within the river reaches which are aligned to land uses such as horticulture and
25 grazing where land clearing activities have been conducted to the channel edge. Further improvements in the model would
26 require better data representing individual processes which currently doesn't exist for many parts of the catchment
27 studied.

28 Uncertainty in the SC model was estimated by comparing SC predictions with flow and loads measured at two
29 gauging stations: Woodford Weir on the Stanley River, and Gregors Creek on the UBR (Figure 1, Table 1). Flow volume
30 recorded for the gauging stations spanned many orders of magnitude, making it difficult to distinguish between zero flow

1 and missing data. Therefore, model predictions were only compared with non-zero recorded flows. When plotted against
2 flow measured at the gauging stations, SC predictions in both the Stanley River and UBR were scattered around the 1:1 line
3 on the log-log scale (Figure S1). Variability between gauged and predicted water input was highest at low flow, and lowest
4 when predictions and data were integrated to a yearly time-step (Figure S1). The adjusted R^2 for log annual flow (SC) vs log
5 annual flow (gauged) was 0.96 for the Stanley River and 0.95 for the Upper Brisbane River (UBR), and the 95 % confidence
6 interval for the slope contained 1.0 for both rivers. Root mean square error of the difference between measured and
7 predicted flow was 70% of the mean annual flow, when averaged across the Stanley and UBR gauging stations for available
8 data during the study period.

9 Uncertainty in SC predictions of TSS and nutrients was more difficult to quantify, due to the limited data
10 availability (Table 1). TN, TP and TSS loads predicted by SC were compared with event loads measured at the Stanley River
11 and UBR gauging stations (Figure 1), for 32 and 15 high flow events, respectively, during the study period (Table 1). During
12 each high flow event, the concentrations of TSS, TN and TP were measured by the local water authority, Seqwater, at the
13 gauging stations. Water samples were automatically collected using a refrigerated autosampler triggered by the change in
14 height of the depth-gauge above a base-flow threshold. For TN and TP, whole samples were kept on ice until frozen in the
15 laboratory. They were later analyzed using the persulfate digestion method and run through an autoanalyzer (Burford and
16 O'Donohue, 2006; APHA, 1995). For TSS samples, a known volume was filtered onto a pre-weighed and combusted glass
17 fibre filter, then dried and reweighed (APHA, 1995).

18 Loads were determined using the linear-interpolation method, with at least 10 measurements per event, and
19 sampling on both rising and falling limbs of the hydrographs (Olley et al., 2014). TSS, TN and TP loads predicted by SC were
20 well correlated with the loads estimated from the event-sampling data collected for both gauging stations (Figure S2). Total
21 loads across all measured events differed from SC predictions by 24% for TSS, 45% for TN and 26% for TP (and 42% for
22 flow) when averaged across the two sites, verifying that the SC predictions were consistent with flow and loads in the
23 major tributaries during high flow events. However this information did not provide a measure of uncertainty in annual
24 predicted loads to the two reservoirs.

25 To estimate uncertainty in annual inputs, an empirical model was used to predict TN and TP loads at each gauging
26 station based on measured daily flow (Kerr, 2009; Burford et al., 2012). The model was validated against the event loads
27 (Figure S2) and then compared with SC predictions at daily, monthly and annual time steps using gauged flow data (Figure
28 S1). Unfortunately an empirical model was not available for TSS.

29 During high flow events, the empirical model predictions agreed with the SC predictions and the measured TN and
30 TP event loads (Figure S2). Daily, monthly and annual predictions of both TN and TP from the empirical model agreed with

1 SC predictions (Figure S1). Difference between the two models was lowest for the Stanley River site (Woodford Weir), even
2 though the empirical model was developed for the UBR. Variation between the models was lowest when information was
3 integrated to an annual time-step (Figure S1). Over the entire study period, the root mean square difference between the
4 two models as a proportion of mean annual loads was 60% for TN and 45% for TP, when averaged across the Stanley and
5 UBR gauging stations. Uncertainty could not be estimated for TSS, and flow was the only variable for which SC predictions
6 could be directly compared with data. Uncertainty in loads is unlikely to be lower than uncertainty in flow, which was
7 estimated as 70 %, as outlined above. Therefore we assumed an uncertainty of 70% in annual SC model predictions of flow,
8 TSS, TN and TP inputs to both reservoirs (Table S1).

9 **2.3 Reservoir outputs**

10 Loads of TSS, TN and TP exported from the reservoirs each month were calculated by multiplying concentrations
11 ([TSS], [TN] and [TP], in mg L^{-1}) measured at the dam walls by the volumes of water released. The volume of monthly water
12 released from each reservoir was determined by summing daily release values, except during the period 1 July 1997 to 30
13 June 2001 for Wivenhoe reservoir, for which monthly release data were directly available (Table 1).

14 **2.3.1 Data sources: [TSS], [TN] and [TP] at dam walls**

15 Concentrations of TSS, TN and TP in water released from the reservoirs were determined from routine monthly
16 monitoring and sub-daily turbidity profiles collected near the dam walls.

17 Monthly monitoring data collected by Seqwater were available for surface and bottom concentrations of TSS, TN,
18 TP, ammonium (NH_4), nitrite plus nitrate (NO_2+NO_3), dissolved inorganic P (DIP) at the dam wall of each reservoir from July
19 1997 to June 2011. Surface samples were taken using a 3 m depth-integrated sampler and bottom samples were taken
20 using a van Dorn sampler. TN and TP samples were kept on ice until frozen in the laboratory. They were later analyzed
21 using the persulfate digestion method and run through an autoanalyzer (Burford and O'Donohue, 2006; APHA, 1995). For
22 dissolved nutrients, samples were filtered through 0.45 μm membrane filters in situ, and kept on ice until frozen in the
23 laboratory. Samples were analyzed using standard colorimetric methods with an autoanalyzer (Burford and O'Donohue,
24 2006; APHA, 1995). For TSS samples, a known volume was filtered onto a pre-weighed and combusted glass fibre filter,
25 then dried and reweighed (APHA, 1995). Samples were filtered as needed in situ, stored on ice until frozen in the laboratory
26 and processed using standard methods (Burford and O'Donohue, 2006; APHA, 1995).

27 Depth profiles of turbidity (NTU) were also measured at the dam wall in each reservoir, recorded by a calibrated
28 nephelometer deployed on a fixed buoy. Turbidity profiles at 1 m intervals through the water column were available

1 approximately every hour for water years 2009-2010 in Somerset reservoir and water years 2008-2010 in Wivenhoe
2 reservoir (Table 1).

3 In Somerset reservoir, water release occurs when the dam gates open from the bottom. For low release volumes,
4 “bottom” waters are released, but at higher release rates water from higher in the water column will be entrained. To
5 account for this, the concentrations of nutrients and TSS in the Somerset release water were assumed equal to bottom
6 concentrations when daily release was $< 500 \text{ ML d}^{-1}$. At higher flows (i.e. $\geq 500 \text{ ML d}^{-1}$), TSS and nutrient concentrations in
7 the water released were assumed equal to the average of surface and bottom concentrations. Wivenhoe reservoir is a
8 near-surface water-releasing reservoir, so monthly exports of nutrients and TSS were calculated from surface
9 concentrations only.

10 2.3.2 Estimating sediment and nutrient loads from turbidity profiles

11 Monthly monitoring data were available for the entire 14 year study period, but data were missing for December
12 2010 and January 2011, when release volumes and turbidity were both unusually high (Grinham et al., 2012). Turbidity
13 profiles were available for December 2010 and January 2011, but were only available for a short portion of the entire study
14 period (two water years in Somerset and three water years in Wivenhoe, Table 1). Hence the datasets needed to be
15 combined in some way to provide a meaningful long-term budget for the reservoirs.

16 The turbidity profile data could only be used to estimate loads released from the reservoirs if a meaningful
17 relationship could be established between turbidity and sediment and nutrient concentrations ([TSS], [TP], and [TN]). It is
18 quite common to develop local relationships between [TSS] and turbidity. Since P is strongly associated with sediment
19 particles, a relationship between turbidity and [TP] might also be expected. ~~However~~ ~~Since~~ ~~Because~~ dissolved compounds
20 typically make up a large component of [TN], ~~so a strong the~~ relationship ~~between with~~ turbidity ~~and TN~~ was not be
21 expected to be as strong for [TN] as for [TSS] and [TP].

22 Routine monthly surface and bottom measurements of [TSS], [TN] and [TP] were correlated with mean daily
23 surface and bottom turbidity measured on the same day, where data from both sources were available (Table 1). Daily
24 surface and bottom turbidity were determined from readings in the top 3 m and the bottom 2 m respectively, averaged
25 across each day. Since the objective was to determine concentrations during turbid floodwaters when routine monitoring
26 was unavailable, [TN] and [TP] were only used where NTU > 15 . Turbidity data were cleaned prior to analysis: spikes
27 associated with calibration were removed by inspection. Where gaps in the record were no greater than two days, they
28 were replaced with the average turbidity of the preceding and subsequent day.

29 Linear regression in matlab was used to determine the correlation coefficients for the relationship described by:

1 $[y]=a+b \text{ NTU}$ (1)

2 where $[y]$ is [TSS], [TN] or [TP], and a and b are the corresponding intercept and slope (Table S2). Eq (1) was then
3 used to calculate daily estimates for [TSS], [TN], [TP] from surface and bottom mean daily turbidity.

4 2.3.3 Reservoir outputs calculated from multiple data sources

5 There were a number of ways in which the monthly monitoring and turbidity profile data could be combined to
6 calculate sediment and nutrient outputs from Somerset and Wivenhoe reservoirs over the study period. We compared four
7 such methods of estimating output loads:

- 8 • *Method 1 Mean historical concentration*: Surface and bottom concentrations [TSS], [TN] and [TP] at dam
9 wall sites in each reservoir were estimated from the mean concentration of monthly monitoring data
10 1997-2011 (Table S3). This had the advantage of a consistent data source for the full timeframe of the
11 study, and was justified because variation in release volume is orders of magnitude above variation in
12 [TSS], [TN] and [TP] at the dam wall. However this method may underestimate the output loads of TSS,
13 TN and TP during very large floods, when water leaving the reservoir has unusually high TSS and nutrient
14 concentrations (e.g., Lewis et al., 2013). Note that mean [TSS] was determined from log-transformed
15 data, due to small numbers of very high values;
- 16 • *Method 2 Monthly measured concentration*, with missing data replaced by mean historical concentration
17 (as defined in Method 1). This makes better use of the information available, but will not provide much
18 advantage over Method 1 in dealing with the flood year, since monitoring data were unavailable for
19 December 2010 and January 2011, when large volumes of water were released and turbidity at the dam
20 wall was very high (Grinham et al., 2012);
- 21 • *Method 3 Monthly measured concentration*, with missing data replaced by information from turbidity
22 profiles where available, and by mean historical concentration otherwise. This enables better estimation
23 of [TSS], [TN] and [TP] during January 2011, and does not rely on turbidity correlations where direct
24 measurements of those concentrations are available;
- 25 • *Method 4 Concentration calculated from turbidity profiles*, with missing data replaced by monthly
26 measured concentrations where available, and by mean historical concentration otherwise. This makes
27 best use of the high resolution turbidity profile information, but relies strongly on the correlation
28 between turbidity and [TSS], [TN] and [TP].

1 The output loads of TSS, TN and TP used in the final budget were calculated from Method 3. The uncertainty in
 2 budget output loads (Table S1) was estimated at 40 % of TSS and TP and 10 % for TN, based on the relative mean
 3 difference between annual loads predicted by Methods 3 and 4 for the only non-flood years for which turbidity data were
 4 fully available: Somerset water year 2009, and Wivenhoe water year 2008-2009 (Table S1). Thus the estimated uncertainty
 5 is the difference between loads estimated from monthly monitoring, and the loads estimated from daily turbidity. Monthly
 6 monitoring and turbidity datasets were both complete for these time periods (water years 2008 and 2009).

7 **2.4 Reservoir budgets: inter-annual comparisons and propagation of error**

8 Annual accumulation of TSS, TN and TP in each reservoir was calculated as the sum of catchment inputs (SC model
 9 predictions) and loads from the upstream reservoir (in the case of Wivenhoe), minus reservoir outputs. Where data were
 10 combined (e.g. Wivenhoe input loads were the sum of SC model predictions and Somerset output loads), uncertainty was
 11 determined using the law of propagation of errors, assuming that errors were independent (Ku, 1966). Thus errors in total
 12 loads over a given timeframe ($\Delta \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$) were calculated from the square root of the sum of squares of errors in
 13 individual loads (ΔX_i):

$$14 \quad \Delta \left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \right) = \sqrt{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \Delta X_i^2 \right)} \quad (2)$$

15 Relative error in mean load was assumed to equal relative error in total load. Annual retention of TSS, TN and TP
 16 for each reservoir was compared against hydraulic retention time (reservoir volume at full supply divided by annual inflow
 17 volume). Trapping efficiency (TE) was calculated from input and output loads as follows:

$$18 \quad TE = \frac{Input - Output}{Input} \quad (3)$$

19 In accordance with the law of propagation of errors, again assuming errors in input and output loads are
 20 independent (Ku, 1966), the uncertainty in trapping efficiency ΔTE was calculated from the relative errors in input and
 21 output loads ($\Delta Input/Input$ and $\Delta Output/Output$ respectively) as follows:

$$22 \quad \Delta TE = (1 - TE) \sqrt{\left(\frac{\Delta Input}{Input} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{\Delta Output}{Output} \right)^2} \quad (4)$$

1 3 Results

2 The flood year (water year 2010: July 2010-June 2011) dominated inputs and outputs of water, sediment and
3 nutrients for both reservoirs. Inputs of water, TSS, TN and TP to Somerset and Wivenhoe were 5-10 times higher in 2010
4 than on average during the 13 non-flood years (Figure 3, Table 2). Reservoir outputs were approximately 10-50 times
5 higher than during the non-flood years (Figure 3, Table 2). The biggest effect of the flood year was on output of TSS, which
6 was 40 - 50 times higher in the flood year. Wivenhoe inflows were particularly impacted: whereas the input of water,
7 sediment and nutrient to both reservoirs was very similar during non-flood years, inputs to Wivenhoe were more than
8 double those to Somerset during the flood year.

9 The flood month, January 2011, also had a major impact on the reservoir budgets. The volumes of water entering
10 and leaving Somerset and Wivenhoe during January 2011 (i.e. 0.6% of the study period) accounted for 50% and 60%
11 respectively of the ~~loads~~ total water volume inputs and outputs for the 2010 water year, and 10% and 30% respectively of
12 the loads over the entire study period (Table 2, Figure 4). The impact of the flood month on the total budget was greatest
13 for TSS and nutrient loads. Based on [TSS], [TN] and [TP] estimated from the turbidity profiler at the dam walls, the loads of
14 TSS and nutrient outputs from Somerset during January 2011 accounted for 50 -70% of output loads during water year
15 2010, and 20-50% of output loads over the study period (Figure 4). The flood month had the greatest impact on Wivenhoe:
16 TSS and nutrient exported in January 2011 accounted for 70-90% of export loads during the water year, and 40-70% of
17 export loads over the entire 14 year study period.

18 Inter-annual variability in water-release volumes from both reservoirs was much higher than variability in the
19 [TSS], [TN] and [TP] at the dam wall during non-flood years (Figures 3, S3), implying that variation in reservoir output was
20 driven by variation in the volume of water released rather than the concentrations of sediments and nutrients in the water.
21 As a result, there was little difference between output loads estimated from historical mean concentrations (Method 1)
22 and from monthly monitoring (Method 2) during non-flood years (Figure 5). The only non-flood year for which turbidity
23 ~~data was~~ data were available for both reservoirs was 2009, and there was little difference between loads calculated using
24 mean concentrations, monthly monitoring data or [TSS], [TN] and [TP] calculated from the turbidity profiler at the dam wall
25 for that year (Methods 1-4, Figure 5).

26 The combination of extremely high releases and unusually high turbidity, however, meant long-term historical
27 mean concentrations did not provide a good estimate of reservoir outputs of TSS or TP during the flood year (Figure 5).
28 Monthly monitoring ~~data was~~ data were unavailable during January 2011 (Table 1), when turbidity, inflows and releases of
29 water were very high for both reservoirs (Figure 6). If TSS and nutrient outputs were estimated from mean concentrations
30 (Methods 1 or 2), the TSS export during January 2011 and water year 2010 would have been underestimated by an order of

1 magnitude (Table S4). Additionally, TP output loads during this period would have been underestimated by a factor of two
2 in Somerset, and five in Wivenhoe. However the mean concentrations provided a reasonable estimate for TN loads,
3 because TN concentrations were less affected by the flood than TSS or TP (Figure 6).

4 TSS trapping efficiency was very high during the non-flood period, regardless of the hydraulic residence time
5 (Figure 7). While the majority of TN and TP delivered to both reservoirs over the entire non-flood period was retained
6 (Table 3), Wivenhoe was a net exporter of TN in many water years (Figure 7) due to high concentrations of dissolved
7 inorganic N accumulating in the bottom waters of the reservoir (Figure S3). In water year 2010 the net retention or export
8 of water, TSS, TN and TP was less than the bounds of uncertainty (Table 3), with the exception of retention of TSS in
9 Somerset.

10 As noted earlier, both the flood year and flood month had greater effects on Wivenhoe than Somerset. Wivenhoe
11 has three times the full supply volume of Somerset, and four times the catchment area. Despite the difference in
12 catchment area, mean inputs to Wivenhoe and Somerset were very similar during the non-flood period (hence the
13 hydraulic retention time was typically shorter for Somerset, as shown in Figure 7). However during the flood year, inputs to
14 Wivenhoe were double or triple those to Somerset (Table 2, Figure 3). Wivenhoe receives water from two sources:
15 controlled releases from Somerset and episodic inputs from the catchment, which are dominated by flows from the UBR.
16 Catchment flows account for about half (50-60%) of water inflows and the majority of TSS and nutrient inputs in both flood
17 and non-flood years (Figure 3).

18 [TSS], [TN] and [TP] measured in the main tributary supplying inflows to Wivenhoe, the UBR, were typically
19 greater than in water leaving the reservoirs (Figure S3). The proportion of dissolved nutrients and the N:P ratios, however,
20 differed between the reservoirs and the river inputs (Figure S4). DIP concentrations were higher in the UBR than in either
21 of the reservoirs, while dissolved inorganic N (DIN) concentrations were higher in the bottom waters of the reservoirs
22 than in either the UBR or surface waters of the reservoirs (Figure S3). As a result, DIN:DIP and TN:TP ratios and the
23 proportion of TN in readily bioavailable form (DIN) were all higher in the bottom of the reservoirs than in the rivers (Figure
24 S4). In all cases, a higher proportion of P than N was available in dissolved inorganic form, and DIP:TP was higher in the UBR
25 than in the reservoirs.

26 **4 Discussion**

27 **4.1 Flood impacts on reservoir budgets: implications for monitoring and management**

28 Our budget calculations show that the January 2011 flood dominated inputs, outputs and retention of sediment
29 and nutrient for both reservoirs over the 14 year study period. We have very high confidence in this conclusion because

1 the inputs calculated here for January 2011 represent a lower bound estimate. The catchment model and reservoir release
2 data in this study predicted that 2.1 TL of water flowed into Wivenhoe during the peak of the flood (9-16 January 2011),
3 which is 26 % lower than the 2.64 TL inflow estimated by Seqwater (2011). TSS input to Wivenhoe in January 2011 was
4 estimated by Grinham et al. (2012) as 1.8 Mt, based on event mean concentrations, and 21 Mt, based on a correlation
5 between flow and TSS. Thus the TSS inputs to Wivenhoe calculated by Grinham et al. (2012) using the event-mean and flow
6 correlation methods ~~These estimates~~ are one and two orders of magnitude, respectively, above our estimate of 0.2 Mt
7 (Table 2). Event mean concentrations do not account for the shape of the flood peak, and there is an order of magnitude
8 difference between the loads estimated from the event mean concentration method and the flow-load correlations. This
9 demonstrates the difficulty not only in determining loads for reservoir budgets, but also in finding meaningful estimates of
10 uncertainty.

11 Our uncertainty analysis was as thorough as possible given the data available, but our estimate of 70 % confidence
12 in SC model predictions may not be valid for major floods. While the predictions of TSS loads generated by the SC model
13 agreed well with measured loads in flow events at gauging stations on both the Stanley River and UBR, the January 2011
14 event was so large in magnitude that it was outside the calibration range of the SC model and the rating curves at the
15 gauging stations. Refining the estimates of input and output loads during January 2011 is the key to both reducing and
16 better quantifying uncertainty in long-term sediment and nutrient budgets for the reservoirs.

17 Reliable reservoir budgets require reliable data. During non-flood years, mean historical concentrations provided
18 reasonable estimates of TSS and nutrient loads leaving the reservoirs. However calculating loads from historical mean TSS
19 and TP concentrations during January 2011 would have underestimated outputs over the entire study period by a factor of
20 2-10 (Figure 5, Table S4). Since extreme flow events generate both the highest inputs and outputs of TSS and nutrients, and
21 the highest uncertainty in loads, more intensive monitoring data from high flow events is required to increase confidence
22 in these long-term reservoir budgets. Reducing the frequency of routine monitoring and using these savings to fund
23 measurements during extreme events may therefore be a cost-effective way to reduce uncertainty in reservoir budgets.

24 The hydrological regimes of both Somerset and Wivenhoe are typical of the unpredictable and intermittent flow
25 regimes found in rivers on the eastern coastal fringe of Australia (Kennard et al. 2010). Hence our findings will be
26 particularly relevant in tropical and subtropical systems, where intra- and inter-annual variability are particularly high
27 (Lewis et al. 2013). Because major floods play such a dominant role in the sediment and nutrient budgets of reservoirs with
28 highly variable flow regimes, sustainable management of soil and nutrient resources will mean addressing sediment
29 erosion and nutrient inputs during major floods. Land use change is the key factor responsible for changes in sediment and
30 nutrient delivery to downstream water bodies throughout Australian catchments and no doubt in similarly modified
31 landscapes beyond (Harris, 2001; Bartley et al., 2012; Powers et al., 2015). In the subtropical catchments of southeast

1 Queensland reservoirs, for example, river channel erosion is the main source of sediment inputs, and restoring riparian
2 vegetation is the main mechanism by which these loads can be reduced (Wallbrink, 2004; Leigh et al., 2013; Olley et al.,
3 2014).

4 **4.2 Uncertainty and variability in reservoir budgets**

5 ~~While catchment and reservoir budgets can be very useful, constructing accurate budgets is difficult due to limited~~
6 ~~availability of data, and the challenges in reconciling data collected on different spatial and temporal scales, and over~~
7 ~~different time periods. Given these issues, Parsons (2011) identified three criteria for useful catchment budgets: 1. an~~
8 ~~explicit statement of the timeframe over which it is valid; 2. quantities determined from the difference between measured~~
9 ~~loads should be treated with caution; and 3). uncertainty should be specified on all values. † This study enables us to~~
10 ~~refine and update these three catchment budget principles of Parsons (2011) provide a useful framework for~~
11 ~~understanding the results of this study.~~

12 ~~Parsons proposed that 1) specifying the timeframe of validity for catchment budgets is important; 2) quantities~~
13 ~~determined from the difference between measured loads should be treated with caution; and 3) uncertainty should be~~
14 ~~specified on all values. Our results highlight connections between these three principles. For example, Our results~~
15 ~~demonstrate that~~ the timeframe of the budget affects the uncertainty in budget estimates in two ways. Firstly, if there are
16 no systematic errors in budget loads, relative error in total loads will decline as duration of the study increases, as can be
17 seen from Eq (2). This explains why relative uncertainty in mean loads over the non-flood years and retention over the
18 entire study period are much lower than uncertainty during the flood year (Table 3). Secondly, budgets conducted over
19 longer timeframes are more likely to capture a realistic representation of climatic conditions, particularly in tropical and
20 subtropical systems where variation in flow can be extremely high (Kennard et al., 2010; Burford et al., 2012; Lewis et al.,
21 2013). Variation in input and output loads was very high even in the 13 non-flood years (Fig 3); the standard deviation of
22 input and output loads was typically similar or equal to the mean load for both reservoirs (Table 2). ~~In systems such as our~~
23 ~~study sites, where flow is highly episodic, a static budget of water, sediment or nutrient loads will have limited value, and~~
24 ~~budgets are best presented as time series.~~

25 While quantifying uncertainty in reservoir budgets is important (Parsons, 2011), it can be extremely difficult, due
26 to the necessity of combining data and predictions from different sources, across different spatial and temporal scales
27 (Walling and Collins, 2008; Hobgen et al., 2014). ~~In this study/Here,~~ we were able to quantify uncertainty in all loads, using a
28 range of methods, including verification of the catchment model SC against both event loads and independent empirical
29 models. Relative uncertainty was highest in reservoir retention (Table 3), because retention is the difference between input
30 and output loads, and uncertainty in retention depends on the addition of input and output errors squared (Eq 2). ~~This~~
31 ~~means the magnitude of retention is less than either input or output loads, but uncertainty in retention is higher than in~~

1 ~~either inputs or outputs; hence relative uncertainty in retention can be very large (Tables 2-3).~~ Full quantification of
2 uncertainty in all components of the budget (Parsons' third principle of catchment budgets) makes it clear ~~than that~~
3 uncertainty is particularly high in ~~"unmeasured elements"~~ quantities which are calculated from other budget terms, rather
4 than independently determined (Parsons' second principle). Thus these two principles can be

5 ~~Thus if combined.~~

6 Therefore we propose that Parsons' three principles of catchment budgets can be refined to two principles: 1.
7 Budgets should be presented as time-series rather than static quantities to clearly display temporal variability and 2.
8 Uncertainty is should be quantified for all budget terms, and the accounted for in any interpretation of results.

9 ~~variability in the system is adequately accounted for, then the three principles of catchment budgets proposed by~~
10 ~~Parsons (2011) will be met.~~

11 ~~In systems such as our study sites, where flow is highly episodic, a static budget of water, sediment or nutrient~~
12 ~~loads will have limited value, and budgets are best presented as time series.~~

13 4.3 Sediment and nutrient trapping

14 Correct propagation of uncertainty also affects interpretation of reservoir budgets. Uncertainty is higher over
15 shorter time periods, and. ~~Comparison of the magnitudes and uncertainties in retention and trapping efficiency of water,~~
16 ~~sediment and nutrients (Tables 2-3) thus confidence in budget values is lower for the flood year than for the whole study~~
17 ~~period. (Tables 2-3) clearly illustrates this point, as follows.~~ Net retention of TSS, TN and TP occurred over the 14 year study
18 period in both reservoirs, except for TP in Somerset Wivenhoe, where uncertainty was higher than the difference between
19 input and output loads. The flood year dominated the retention of TSS, TN and TP in both reservoirs (e.g. 25 % and 40 % of
20 TSS retained in Somerset and Wivenhoe were captured during the flood year), however the higher relative uncertainty in
21 the values determined for this shorter timeframe means that. ~~Uncertainty is higher over shorter time periods, however, as~~
22 ~~outlined earlier, so~~ retention of water, sediment and nutrients in both reservoirs in the flood year was only significantly
23 different to zero for TSS in Somerset.

24 Uncertainty in trapping efficiency (retention divided by input) is lower than uncertainty in retention, as outlined in
25 Section 2.4. Thus while retention was not significant for most loads during the flood period. ~~In contrast,~~ trapping efficiency
26 ~~(retention divided by input)~~ was quantifiable for all sediment and nutrients across the study period, and for TSS in both
27 reservoirs and TN in Somerset during the flood year (Table 2). Together, these findings engender greater confidence in the
28 proportion of sediment and nutrients retained by the reservoirs (i.e. trapping efficiency) than in the mass retained, and in
29 budget terms calculated for multi-year periods. For a fuller assessment of trapping efficiency in reservoirs -with variable

1 flow, such as Wivenhoe and Somerset, hydraulic retention ~~en~~ should be calculated on shorter (i.e. monthly) timescales, as
2 outlined in is required (Lewis et al. (2013)).

3 Retention of sediments in reservoirs can represent a loss of terrestrial productivity, and reduce the volume
4 available for water supply and flood mitigation. ~~For example, sedimentation in Mosul Dam, Iraq, reduced reservoir volume~~
5 ~~by more than 10 % between 1986 and 2011 (Issa et al., 2015).~~ To determine volume occupied by sediment retained in
6 Somerset and Wivenhoe over our study period, we divided the mass of sediment retained (Table 3) by an estimated
7 sediment bulk density of 0.95 g cm^{-3} , using the appropriate unit conversions. The sediment bulk density used here
8 represented an average of the range reported by Avnimelech et al. (2001). For Wivenhoe, we used TSS inputs from two
9 sources for January 2011: 1. TSS inputs from this study (Table 2) and 2) mean TSS input estimated by Grinham et al. (2012;
10 ~~$\pm 11.4 \pm 9.6 \text{ Mt}$~~). In the most extreme case (i.e. highest estimates of sediment inputs during January 2011), Wivenhoe
11 storage volume is estimated to decline by only 1 % over the 14 year study period (Figure 5). Using the input loads
12 calculated in this study, decline in storage volume ~~over 14 years~~ is estimated as only 0.04 % ~~0.1 %~~ for Wivenhoe over the
13 14 year study period (Table 4), i.e. 0.003 % 0.1 % per year. Average annual decline in storage volume is two orders of
14 magnitude lower in Wivenhoe compared to ~~For example, sedimentation in Mosul Dam, Iraq, reduced where reservoir~~
15 ~~volume reduced by more than 10 % due to siltation between 1986 and 2011 (Issa et al., 2015), i.e. 0.4 % per year on~~
16 average (Issa et al., 2015). While trapping efficiency of Wivenhoe is slightly less than that estimated for Mosul Dam, the
17 large difference in siltation between these two reservoirs is due primarily to the difference in sediment loads. Mosul Dam
18 has approximately ten times the storage volume of Wivenhoe, but sediment loads entering Mosul Dam are of order 100-
19 1000 higher than those entering Wivenhoe (Issa et al., 2015). ~~Direct measurement of reservoir volume is required for more~~
20 ~~accurate estimates of storage loss due to sedimentation.~~

21 ~~While the relative siltation rates in both Somerset and Wivenhoe may seem low (Table 4), the corresponding loss~~
22 in water supply volume is regionally significant. We estimated that the decline in storage capacity over the study period
23 was approximately 4 000 ML for Somerset loss and 5 000- 12 000 ML for Wivenhoe (Table 4). Four of the 15 water supply
24 reservoirs in the region have capacity of less than 5 000 ML, and fewer than half have a capacity greater than 12 000 ML
25 (Leigh et al., 2010). Hence the volume of storage capacity lost in Somerset and Wivenhoe over the 14 year study period is
26 equivalent to the closure of one of more of the smaller reservoirs. Somerset and Wivenhoe supply water to southeast
27 Queensland, a region of rapid population growth which has recently experienced major drought, and where alternatives
28 water sources have much higher greenhouse gas intensity than water supplied from existing reservoirs (e.g. Hall et al.
29 2011). Therefore any economic assessment of methods to reduce the catchment sediment load in this region should
30 account for costs associated with reservoir siltation and associated loss of water supply volume. Direct measurement of
31 reservoir volume is required for more accurate estimates of storage loss due to siltation. ~~Direct measurement of reservoir~~
32 ~~volume is required for more accurate estimates of storage loss due to sedimentation.~~

1 Clear differences between TSS, TN and TP retention were observed across both reservoirs, reflecting the different
2 processing pathways of sediment, nitrogen and phosphorus in aquatic systems. TSS trapping was very high, with lower
3 variability and relative uncertainty than TN and TP, and a stronger correlation to hydraulic residence time (Figure 7). This
4 reflects sediment dynamics, which are strongly controlled by the physical processes of advection and settling. TP retention
5 was lower and more variable than TSS retention in either reservoir, but was also related to hydraulic residence time (Figure
6 7), similar to the findings of a long-term study of an arid lake system in Australia (Cook et al., 2010). P retention has been
7 demonstrated in reservoirs throughout the world (Josette et al., 1999; Bosch and Allan, 2008). However TP retention was
8 more variable than TSS retention because P can be transformed via chemical and biological processes into a range of
9 organic and inorganic forms. TP is associated with the finer fractions of TSS, which are less likely to settle and hence more
10 likely to be transported through the reservoir during periods of short retention time (Kerr et al., 2011), increasing the
11 proportion of P likely to be transported through the reservoir during periods of overflow. ~~A full analysis of residence time
12 impact on TSS and TP retention is likely to require flow data on shorter timescales, e.g. daily rather than annual inflow
13 (Lewis et al., 2013).~~

14 Interpreting retention of N is more complicated than either TSS or TP. Whereas both nutrients and sediments can
15 be deposited from the atmosphere and buried in sediments, N can also be exported via denitrification and imported
16 through N fixation by cyanobacteria. These processes are not included in the budget, thus uncertainty in TN loads and
17 retention will be underestimated. N is typically retained in reservoirs globally (Harrison et al., 2009), and was consistently
18 retained in Somerset throughout the study period. However Wivenhoe was frequently a net exporter of TN (Figure 7),
19 typically during drought years when ~~Wivenhoe~~ releases for ~~Brisbane~~ water supply were less than reservoir inflows (Figure
20 3).

21 The impact of reservoirs on downstream aquatic ecosystems depends of the form of nutrients released as well as
22 the total loads (Kunz et al., 2011). Overall, TN is retained by both reservoirs over the study period (Table 3). However the
23 concentration of dissolved inorganic nitrogen (~~DIN~~) leaving the bottom of both reservoirs was typically higher than the
24 concentration of DIN measured in the UBR during events (Figure S3), probably due to anoxic conditions in reservoir bottom
25 waters (Burford and O'Donohue, 2006). Ratios of total and dissolved inorganic N: P were substantially higher in ~~both the~~
26 reservoirs ~~compared with~~ than in the UBR. Therefore the impacts of reservoirs on downstream nutrient conditions will
27 depend on the timing and magnitude of sediment and nutrients loads into the reservoirs, trapping efficiency and
28 transformation processes within the reservoirs themselves.

1 **5. Conclusions**

2 Major floods ~~are likely to dominate~~ d the 14 year-long term sediment and nutrient budgets determined here for in
3 ~~reservoirs such as~~ Somerset and Wivenhoe, subtropical reservoirs subject to episodic flow. Our results demonstrate that
4 reliable sediment and nutrient budgets depend on the availability of ~~Accurate quantification of inputs and outputs data~~
5 during high flow periods, and that such budgets may be inherently dynamic ~~is therefore essential for reliable sediment and~~
6 ~~nutrient budgets. For these two subtropical reservoirs a~~ Static budgets of water, sediment or nutrients is/would be
7 meaningless at best, and misleading at worst, ~~for these reservoirs~~, because both the magnitude and timing of loads are
8 highly dynamic. Understanding variability and uncertainty are therefore just as important as quantifying loads in
9 characterizing reservoir budgets in regions with intermittent and variable flow. This is especially relevant in a world in
10 which many once-perennial rivers are expected to transition to intermittent flow regimes (Döll and Schmied, 2012) and the
11 pace of dam construction in many regions continues to escalate (Winemiller et al., 2016).

12 **6. Acknowledgments and Data**

13 We thank Andrew Watkinson, Kate Smolders and the staff at Seqwater for the long-term reservoir data, Badin Gibbes and
14 Alistair Grinham for useful discussions, Stephen Faggotter for the map and Phil Keymer for data checking. This project was
15 funded by Seqwater and an ARC Linkage project LP0776375 “Sources of phosphorus promoting cyanobacteria in
16 subtropical reservoirs”. MAB has a long-term research collaboration with Seqwater. We also thank ~~two anonymous~~
17 reviewers for their comments on the manuscript. Data supporting the conclusions will be submitted to an online data
18 repository once this manuscript is accepted for publication.

19 **References**


20
21
22 | APHA: American Public Health Association: Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater, Washington, DC, 1995.
23
24 Avnimelech, Y., Ritvo, G., Meijer, L. E., and Kochba, M.: Water content, organic carbon and dry bulk density in flooded sediments,
25 Aquacultural Engineering, 25, 25-33, doi:10.1016/S0144-8609(01)00068-1, 2001.
26
27 Bartley, R., Speirs, W. J., Ellis, T. W., and Waters, D. K.: A review of sediment and nutrient concentration data from Australia for use in
28 catchment water quality models, Marine Pollution Bulletin, 65, 101-116, doi: 10.1016/j.marpolbul.2011.08.009, 2012.
29
30 Bosch, N., and Allan, J.: The influence of impoundments on nutrient budgets in two catchments of Southeastern Michigan,
31 Biogeochemistry, 87, 325-338, doi: 10.1007/s10533-008-9187-6, 2008.
32
33 Burford, M. A., and O'Donohue, M. J.: A comparison of phytoplankton community assemblages in artificially and naturally mixed
34 subtropical water reservoirs, Freshwater Biology, 51, 973-982, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2427.2006.01536.x, 2006.
35

1 Burford, M. A., Green, S. A., Cook, A. J., Johnson, S. A., Kerr, J. G., and O'Brien, K. R.: Sources and fate of nutrients in a subtropical
2 reservoir, *Aquatic Sciences - Research Across Boundaries*, 74, 179-190, 10.1007/s00027-011-0209-4, 2012.
3
4 Carpenter, S. R., and Bennett, E. M.: Reconsideration of the planetary boundary for phosphorus, *Environmental Research Letters*, 6,
5 014009, doi:10.1088/1748-9326/6/1/014009, 2011.
6
7 Carpenter, S. R., Booth, E. G., Kucharik, C. J., and Lathrop, R. C.: Extreme daily loads: role in annual phosphorus input to a north
8 temperate lake, *Aquatic Sciences*, 77, 71-79, 10.1007/s00027-014-0364-5, 2015.
9
10 Cook, P. L. M., Aldridge, K., Lamontagne, S., and Brookes, J. D.: Retention of nitrogen, phosphorus and silicon in a large semi-arid
11 riverine lake system, *Biogeochemistry*, 99, 49-63, doi: 10.1007/s10533-009-9389-6, 2010.
12
13 Cordell, D., Drangert, J.-O., and White, S.: The story of phosphorus: Global food security and food for thought, *Global Environmental*
14 *Change*, 19, 292-305, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2008.10.009, 2009.
15
16 de Vries, W., Kros, J., Kroeze, C., and Seitzinger, S. P.: Assessing planetary and regional nitrogen boundaries related to food security and
17 adverse environmental impacts, *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, 5, 392-402, doi: 10.1016/j.cosust.2013.07.004, 2013.
18
19 Dijk, A. I., Beck, H. E., Crosbie, R. S., Jeu, R. A., Liu, Y. Y., Podger, G. M., Timbal, B., and Viney, N. R.: The Millennium Drought in
20 southeast Australia (2001–2009): natural and human causes and implications for water resources, ecosystems, economy, and society,
21 *Water Resources Research*, 49, 1040-1057, doi: 10.1002/wrcr.20123, 2013.
22
23 Döll, P., and Schmied, H.M., How is the impact of climate change on river flow regimes related to the impact on mean annual runoff? A
24 global-scale analysis, *Environmental Research Letters*, 7, 14-37, 2012.
25
26 Friedl, G., and Wüest, A.: Disrupting biogeochemical cycles - consequences of damming, *Aquatic Sciences*, 64, 55-65, 10.1007/s00027-
27 002-8054-0, 2002.
28
29 Graf, W. L., Wohl, E., Sinha, T., and Sabo, J. L.: Sedimentation and sustainability of western American reservoirs, *Water Resources*
30 *Research*, 46, doi:10.1029/2009WR008836, 2010.
31
32 Grinham, A., Gibbes, B., Gale, D., Watkinson, A., and Bartkow, M.: Extreme rainfall and drinking water quality: a regional perspective,
33 *Water Pollution XI*, WIT, UK, 2012.
34
35 Gruber, N., and Galloway, J. N.: An Earth-system perspective of the global nitrogen cycle, *Nature*, 451, 293-296, doi:
36 10.1038/nature06592, 2008.
37
38 [Hall, M. R., West, J., Sherman, B., Lane, J., and de Haas, D.: Long-term trends and opportunities for managing regional water supply and
39 wastewater greenhouse gas emissions, *Environmental science & technology*, 45, 5434-5440, 2011.](#)
40
41 Harris, G. P.: Biogeochemistry of nitrogen and phosphorus in Australian catchments, rivers and estuaries: effects of land use and flow
42 regulation and comparisons with global patterns, *Marine and Freshwater Research*, 52, 139-149, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1071/MF00031>,
43 2001.
44
45 Harrison, J., Maranger, R., Alexander, R., Giblin, A., Jacinthe, P.-A., Mayorga, E., Seitzinger, S., Sobota, D., and Wollheim, W.: The
46 regional and global significance of nitrogen removal in lakes and reservoirs, *Biogeochemistry*, 93, 143-157, doi: 10.1007/s10533-008-
47 9272-x, 2009.
48
49 Hobgen, S. E., Myers, B. A., Fisher, R. P., and Wasson, R. J.: Creating a sediment budget in a data poor context: an example from eastern
50 Indonesia, *Geografiska Annaler: Series A, Physical Geography*, 96, 513-530, doi: 10.1111/geoa.12076, 2014.
51
52 Issa, I. E., Al-Ansari, N., Knutsson, S., and Sherwany, G.: Monitoring and evaluating the sedimentation process in Mosul Dam Reservoir
53 using trap efficiency approaches, *Engineering*, 7, 190-202, doi: 10.4236/eng.2015.74015, 2015.
54
55 Josette, G., Leporcq, B., Sanchez, N., and Philippon, X.: Biogeochemical mass-balances (C, N, P, Si) in three large reservoirs of the Seine
56 Basin (France), *Biogeochemistry*, 47, 119-146, doi: 10.1023/a:1006101318417, 1999.
57

1 Kennard, M. J., Pusey, B. J., Olden, J. D., MacKay, S. J., Stein, J. L., and Marsh, N.: Classification of natural flow regimes in Australia to
2 support environmental flow management, *Freshwater Biology*, 55, 171-193, doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2427.2009.02307.x, 2010.
3
4 Kerr, J. G.: The Transformation of Catchment Phosphorus in Dry Subtropical River Systems. PhD, Australian Rivers Institute, Griffith
5 University, Brisbane, 2009.
6
7 Kerr, J. G., Burford, M. A., Olley, J. M., Bunn, S. E., and Udy, J.: Examining the link between terrestrial and aquatic phosphorus
8 speciation in a subtropical catchment: the role of selective erosion and transport of fine sediments during storm events, *Water research*, 45,
9 3331-3340, doi:10.1016/j.watres.2011.03.048, 2011.
10
11 Kõiv, T., Nõges, T., and Laas, A.: Phosphorus retention as a function of external loading, hydraulic turnover time, area and relative depth
12 in 54 lakes and reservoirs, *Hydrobiologia*, 660, 105-115, doi: 10.1007/s10750-010-0411-8, 2011.
13
14 Ku, H.: Notes on the use of propagation of error formulas, *Journal of Research of the National Bureau of Standards*, 70, 263-273, 1966.
15
16 Kunz, M. J., Wüest, A., Wehrli, B., Landert, J., and Senn, D. B.: Impact of a large tropical reservoir on riverine transport of sediment,
17 carbon, and nutrients to downstream wetlands, *Water Resources Research*, 47, W12531, doi: 10.1029/2011WR010996, 2011.
18
19 Leigh, C., Burford, M. A., Roberts, D. T., and Udy, J. W.: Predicting the vulnerability of reservoirs to poor water quality and
20 cyanobacterial blooms, *Water research*, 44, 4487-4496, doi:10.1016/j.watres.2010.06.016, 2010.
21
22 Leigh, C., Burford, M. A., Connolly, R. M., Olley, J. M., Saack, E., Sheldon, F., Smart, J. C., and Bunn, S. E.: Science to support
23 management of receiving waters in an event-driven ecosystem: from land to river to sea, *Water*, 5, 780-797, doi:10.3390/w5020780, 2013.
24
25 Leigh, C., Watkinson, A., and Burford, M. A.: Effects of extreme inflows on the water quality and phytoplankton of seven reservoirs in
26 subtropical Australia, *Inland Waters*, 5, 240-252, 2015.
27
28 Lewis, S. E., Bainbridge, Z. T., Kuhnert, P. M., Sherman, B. S., Henderson, B., Dougall, C., Cooper, M., and Brodie, J. E.: Calculating
29 sediment trapping efficiencies for reservoirs in tropical settings: a case study from the Burdekin Falls Dam, NE Australia, *Water Resources*
30 *Research*, 49, 1017-1029, doi:10.1002/wrcr.20117, 2013.
31
32 Mahmood, K.: Reservoir sedimentation: impact, extent, and mitigation. Technical paper PB-88-113964/XAB; WORLD-BANK-TP-71
33 United States Wed Feb 06 23:56:58 EST 2008 NTIS MF A01.GRA; GRA-88-52076; EDB-88-030676 English, Medium: X; Size: Pages:
34 133, 1987.
35
36 Metson, G. S., Hale, R. L., Iwaniec, D. M., Cook, E. M., Corman, J. R., Galletti, C. S., and Childers, D. L.: Phosphorus in Phoenix: a
37 budget and spatial representation of phosphorus in an urban ecosystem, *Ecological applications*, 22, 705-721, DOI: 10.1890/11-0865.1,
38 2012.
39
40 Olley, J., Burton, J., Hermoso, V., Smolders, K., McMahon, J., Thomson, B., and Watkinson, A.: Remnant riparian vegetation, sediment
41 and nutrient loads, and river rehabilitation in subtropical Australia, *Hydrological Processes*, 2290-2300, DOI: 10.1002/hyp.10369, 2014.
42
43 Parsons, A. J.: How useful are catchment sediment budgets? *Progress in Physical Geography*, 1-12, DOI: 10.1177/0309133311424591,
44 2011.
45
46 Powers, S. M., Tank, J. L., and Robertson D. M.: Control of nitrogen and phosphorus transport by reservoirs in agricultural landscapes,
47 *Biogeochemistry*, 124, 417-439, 2015.
48
49 Radach, G., and Pätsch, J.: Variability of continental riverine freshwater and nutrient inputs into the North Sea for the years 1977-2000
50 and its consequences for the assessment of eutrophication, *Estuaries and Coasts*, 30, 66-81, 10.1007/bf02782968, 2007.
51
52 Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin III, F. S., Lambin, E., Lenton, T. M., Scheffer, M., Folke, C., and
53 Schellnhuber, H.: Planetary boundaries: exploring the safe operating space for humanity, *Ecology and Society*, 14, 32, 2009.
54
55 Seqwater: January 2011 flood event: Report on the operation of Somerset Dam and Wivenhoe Dam, SEQ Water, Brisbane, 2011.
56


1 Sherman, B., Ford, P., Hatton, P., Whittington, J., Green, D., Baldwin, D., Oliver, R., Shiel, R., van Berkel, J., and Beckett, R.: The
2 Chaffey Dam Story – final report to CRC Freshwater Ecology, Canberra, Australia, 2001.
3
4 Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., Cornell, S. E., Fetzer, I., Bennett, E. M., Biggs, R., Carpenter, S. R., de Vries, W., de Wit, C.
5 A., Folke, C., Gerten, D., Heinke, J., Mace, G. M., Persson, L. M., Ramanathan, V., Reyers, B., and Sörlin, S.: Planetary boundaries:
6 guiding human development on a changing planet, *Science*, 10.1126/science.1259855, 2015.
7
8 Syvitski, J. P., Vörösmarty, C. J., Kettner, A. J., and Green, P.: Impact of humans on the flux of terrestrial sediment to the global coastal
9 ocean, *Science*, 308, 376-380, DOI: 10.1126/science.1109454, 2005.
10
11 [Thomson, B., Orr, D., Ferguson, B., Gardiner, R., Turner, R., and Warne, M. S. J.: South East Queensland Event Monitoring Program:
12 Sediment and nutrient loads for 2011–2012. Department of Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts, Brisbane, 2013.](#)
13
14 van den Honert, R. C., and McAneney, J.: The 2011 Brisbane floods: causes, impacts and implications, *Water*, 3, 1149-1173,
15 doi:10.3390/w3041149, 2011.
16
17 Van Vuuren, D. P., Bouwman, A. F., and Beusen, A. H. W.: Phosphorus demand for the 1970–2100 period: a scenario analysis of resource
18 depletion, *Global Environmental Change*, 20, 428-439, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2010.04.004, 2010.
19
20 Vörösmarty, C. J., and Sahagian, D.: Anthropogenic disturbance of the terrestrial water cycle, *Bioscience*, 50, 753-765, 2000.
21
22 Wallbrink, P. J.: Quantifying the erosion processes and land-uses which dominate fine sediment supply to Moreton Bay, Southeast
23 Queensland, Australia, *Journal of Environmental Radioactivity*, 76, 67-80, doi:10.1016/j.jenvrad.2004.03.019, 2004.
24
25 Walling, D., and Collins, A.: The catchment sediment budget as a management tool, *environmental science & policy*, 11, 136-143,
26 doi:10.1016/j.envsci.2007.10.004, 2008.
27
28 Weber, T., Stewart, J., Anderssen, R., Braddock, R., and Newham, L.: Benefits and limitations of current approaches to whole of
29 catchment modelling, Proceedings of the 18th World IMACS Congress and MODSIM09 International Congress on Modelling and
30 Simulation, Cairns, Australia, 2009.
31
32 Winemiller, K.O., McIntyre, P.B., Castello, L., Fluet-Chouinard, E., Giarrizzo, T., Nam, S., Baird, I.G., Darwall, W., Lujan, N.K.,
33 Harrison, I. and Stiassny, M.L.J., Balancing hydropower and biodiversity in the Amazon, Congo, and Mekong. *Science*, 351, 128-129,
34 2016.
35
36

1




2

3 **Figure 1: Somerset and Wivenhoe reservoirs in subtropical Australia. The major tributaries are Stanley River and Upper**
4 **Brisbane River (UBR), respectively. Flow gauging stations are indicated.**




1
2 **Figure 2: Annual rainfall (mm per water year) measured at a rainfall station near Wivenhoe and Somerset reservoirs (Bureau of**
3 **Meteorology, bom.com.au). Horizontal line shows long-term mean rainfall.**
4




1
2
3
4
5

Figure 3: Annual input and output loads of water (ML y^{-1}), TSS and nutrients (kt y^{-1}) for Somerset (o) and Wivenhoe (▶) reservoirs for water years 1997-2010, and the percentage contribution of Somerset to Wivenhoe input loads.





1
2
3
4
5

Figure 4: Summary of January 2011 input and output loads, as percentage of total loads in and out during the flood year, and across the entire study period



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9


Figure 5: Comparison of four methods for calculating mean annual TSS, TN and TP output loads (kt y^{-1}), using [TSS], [TN] and [TP] from: 1. \blacktriangleright Mean historical concentration of monthly monitoring data water years 1997-2010; 2. $*$ Monthly monitoring, with missing data replaced by mean historical concentration; 3. \blacksquare Monthly monitoring, with missing data replaced by concentration estimated from turbidity profiles, and mean historical concentration where turbidity data unavailable; 4. \bullet Turbidity profiles, with missing data replaced by monthly monitoring, and mean historical concentration otherwise.



1 | Figure 6: [TSS], [TN] and [TP] (mg L^{-1}) at dam outlets measured during monthly monitoring (round symbols), calculated from the
2 daily measured turbidity profile (solid lines) and mean historical concentrations (broken lines). Surface concentrations are
3 denoted by open circles and thin lines, bottom readings are closed circles and heavy lines. Note that TSS mean is from log-
4 transformed data.

5

6



1
 2 **Figure 7: Percentage of annual TSS, TN and TP loads retained in Somerset and Wivenhoe reservoirs compared to hydraulic**
 3 **residence time (y). Dashed line indicates zero trapping, boundary between net positive import and export.**

4
 5

1 **Table 1: Summary of information used to construct reservoir budgets, including spatial and temporal resolution. S = Somerset**
 2 **reservoir, W = Wivenhoe reservoir.**

	Catchment inputs	Reservoir releases
Flow	<i>Flow gauged at sub-daily time-step</i>	<i>Monthly data</i>
	S: Woodford Weir, Stanley River Jul 2002-Jun 2011	S & W: Jul 1997 – Jun 2001
	W: Gregors Creek, UBR Jul 1997-Jun 2011	<i>Daily data</i>
	<i>Daily catchment flow predicted by Source Catchments (SC) model</i>	S & W: Jul 2001 – Jun 2011
	S & W: Jul 1997 – Jun 2011	
TSS, TN, TP	<i>Daily catchment loads predicted by Source Catchments (SC) model-</i>	<i>Concentrations measured monthly at the dam wall, top and bottom of water column</i>
	S & W: Jul 1997 – Jun 2011	S & W: Jul 1997 – May 2011
	<i>Catchment inputs at gauging stations estimated from flow and concentration measured during high flow events</i>	<i>Concentrations estimated from turbidity profiles taken hourly throughout the water column at the dam wall</i>
	S: 32 events at Woodford Weir, Stanley River , 6 Dec 2003 -26 Jul 2009	S: Jul 2009 – Jun 2011
	W: 15 events at Gregors Creek, UBR 25 Dec 2002- 3 Jul 2009	W: Jul 2008 – Jun 2011
	<i>TN, TP only: Daily loads at Woodford Weir and Gregors Crossing estimated from daily gauged flow using an empirical model (Kerr 2009)</i>	
	S & W: Jul 2002 – Jun 2011	

3
4
5

1 **Table 2: Inputs and output loads of water, TSS, TN and TP for Somerset and Wivenhoe reservoirs from June 1997 to July 2011 ±**
2 **uncertainty, σ is the standard deviation of annual values over non-flood years. Water years are defined from July to June. Water**
3 **year 2010 is the flood year, other years are non-flood years. January 2011 is the flood month. S = Somerset reservoir, W =**
4 **Wivenhoe reservoir**

5

		Input loads			Output loads		
		<i>Mean,</i>			<i>Mean,</i>		
		<i>non-flood</i>	<i>Flood</i>	<i>Flood</i>	<i>non-flood</i>	<i>Flood</i>	<i>Flood</i>
		<i>years</i>	<i>year</i>	<i>month</i>	<i>years</i>	<i>year</i>	<i>month</i>
Water,	S	0.32±0.07	1.6 ±1.1	0.8	0.20	1.7	0.9
10⁹ m³		$\sigma=0.21$			$\sigma=0.16$		
(10³ GL)	W	0.39 ±0.06	4.2±1.8	2.7	0.33	4.8	2.9
		$\sigma=0.36$			$\sigma=0.32$		
TSS, kt	S	23±6	130 ±90	73	0.8±0.1	27± 10	19
		$\sigma=19$			$\sigma=0.9$		
	W	25±8	310 ±200	235	2.6±1	120± 50	104
		$\sigma=37$			$\sigma=7$		
TN, kt	S	0.36±0.1	2.0 ±1.4	1.1	0.13±0.01	1.1 ±0.1	0.6
		$\sigma=0.27$			$\sigma=0.14$		
	W	0.4 ±0.1	4.5 ±2.4	3.1	0.18 ±0.01	3.4 ±0.3	2.2
		$\sigma=0.5$			$\sigma=0.22$		
TP, kt	S	0.04±0.01	0.2±0.14	0.1	0.01±0.002	0.14±0.06	0.1
		$\sigma=0.03$			$\sigma=0.01$		
	W	0.04±0.01	0.5±0.3	0.4	0.01±0.004	0.57±0.2	0.4
		$\sigma=0.05$			$\sigma=0.03$		

1 **Table 3: Retention of water, TSS, TN and TP in Somerset and Wivenhoe reservoirs from June 1997 to July 2011. Water year 2010**
 2 **is the flood year. S = Somerset reservoir, W = Wivenhoe reservoir**

3

		Retention		Trapping efficiency = Retention/Input loads	
		<i>Entire study period</i>	<i>Flood year</i>	<i>Entire study period</i>	<i>Flood year</i>
Water,	S	1.44±1.46	-0.14 ±1	25±19%	-9±76%
10⁹ m³					
(10³ GL)	W	0.21±1.91	-0.56 ±2	2 ±20%	-13 ±47%
TSS, kt	S	400± 120	100 ± 90	92 ±3%	79 ±60%
	W	480± 230	190 ±200	76 ±12%	61 ±30%
TN, kt	S	3.8±1.8	0.9 ±1.4	57 ±12%	44 ±39%
	W	4.0±2.6	1.1 ±2.4	41 ±16%	24 ±41%
TP, kt	S	0.40±0.19	0.05 ±0.1	60 ±14%	26 ±60%
	W	0.36±0.39	-0.03 ±0.36	33±28%	-5±69%

1 **Table 4. TSS retention and estimated decline in storage capacity for Somerset and Wivenhoe reservoirs from June 1997 to July**
 2 **assuming sediment bulk density of 0.95 gcm⁻³; * calculated from information in Table 2; ** input of TSS in water year 2010 based**
 3 **on January 2011 TSS loads estimated by Grinham et al., 2012; all other information from Table 2.**

4

	TSS retention, kt	Total decrease in storage capacity, km³	Relative decrease in storage capacity
Somerset*	400 ± 120	0.0042 ± 0.00013	0.11 ± 0.03 %
Wivenhoe*	480 ± 230	0.0051± 0.00024	0.04 ± 0.02 %
Wivenhoe**	11600 ± 9600	0.012±0.01	1.1 ± 0.9 %