

**MONITORING AND MODELLING NATURAL AND ANTHROPOGENIC
INPUTS OF NITROGEN INTO AN UNCONFINED AQUIFER IN THE
SOUTH EAST OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

Submitted by

Phil Gorey, B.App.Sc. (Nat. Res. Man.) (Hon.)

As Requirement in Full for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the

School of Chemistry, Physics and Earth Science,

Flinders University,

30 November 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION TO RESEARCH | 1 |
| 1.1. Introduction | 1 |
| 1.2. Purpose | 2 |
| 1.3. Objectives | 2 |
| 1.4. Regional Description..... | 2 |
| 1.5. Significance of the Research | 4 |
| 1.6. Previous Research | 9 |
| 1.7. Understanding the Cause of Nitrate Contamination in the Study Area..... | 12 |
| 1.8. Study Area Description | 14 |
| CHAPTER 2. GEOLOGY AND HYDROGEOLOGY OF THE STUDY AREA..... | 17 |
| 2.1. Introduction | 17 |
| 2.2. Methodology - Geology..... | 18 |
| 2.3. Methodology - Hydrogeology | 20 |
| 2.4. Results - Geology | 20 |
| 2.5. Results - Hydrogeology..... | 35 |
| 2.6. Discussion | 41 |
| 2.7. Conclusion | 42 |
| CHAPTER 3. TREND ANALYSIS OF HISTORICAL DATA..... | 44 |
| 3.1. Introduction..... | 44 |
| 3.2. Methods | 45 |
| 3.3. Results..... | 57 |
| 3.4. Discussion | 76 |
| 3.5. Conclusions | 83 |
| CHAPTER 4. ESTIMATING THE VARIABILITY OF RECHARGE RATES AND ITS RELATIONSHIP TO GROUNDWATER NITRATE CONCENTRATIONS..... | 84 |
| 4.1. Introduction | 84 |
| 4.2. Methods | 90 |
| 4.3. Results..... | 98 |
| 4.4. Discussion | 111 |
| 4.5. Conclusion | 115 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| CHAPTER 5. STATISTICAL AND PROFILING METHODS FOR DETERMINING PATHWAYS..... | 116 |
| 5.1. Introduction..... | 116 |
| 5.2. Methods..... | 116 |
| 5.3. Results..... | 117 |
| 5.4. Discussion..... | 129 |
| 5.5. Conclusions..... | 132 |
| CHAPTER 6. ISOTOPIC COMPOSITION OF NITRATE AS A DETERMINATION OF SOURCES OF POLLUTION..... | 134 |
| 6.1. Introduction..... | 134 |
| 6.2. Methodology..... | 146 |
| 6.3. Results..... | 148 |
| 6.4. Discussion..... | 159 |
| 6.5. Conclusion..... | 161 |
| CHAPTER 7. THE PREDICTABILITY OF DIFFUSE NITRATE CONTAMINATION OF GROUNDWATER..... | 163 |
| 7.1. Introduction..... | 163 |
| 7.2. Methodology..... | 167 |
| 7.3. Model Inputs..... | 167 |
| 7.4. Results..... | 178 |
| 7.5. Discussion..... | 192 |
| 7.6. Conclusions..... | 198 |
| CHAPTER 8. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS..... | 200 |
| 8.1. Conclusions..... | 200 |
| 8.2. Recommendations..... | 206 |
| REFERENCES..... | 208 |

APPENDICES

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| APPENDIX 1: GEOLOGICAL BORE RECORDS USED IN ASSESSMENT..... | 239 |
| APPENDIX 2: NITRATE IN GROUNDWATER DATA..... | 298 |
| APPENDIX 3: BORES FOR GROUNDWATER TREND ANALYSIS..... | 318 |
| APPENDIX 4: BORE DETAILS FOR TRITIUM MODEL INPUT..... | 319 |
| APPENDIX 5: TRITIUM PRECIPITATION AND TRITIUM INPUT FUNCTION DATA..... | 320 |
| APPENDIX 6: WATER QUALITY DATA FOR DEPTH PROFILES..... | 327 |
| APPENDIX 7: NITRATE ISOTOPE CHARACTERISTICS FROM LITERATURE..... | 346 |
| APPENDIX 8: LEACHN MODEL INPUT FILES FOR SCENARIOS..... | 353 |
| APPENDIX 9: SOIL PROPERTIES FROM REFERENCE PROFILES..... | 415 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Figure 1.1: The South East Region of South Australia | 3 |
| Figure 1.2: The location of study area within South East region..... | 3 |
| Figure 1.3: Previously defined plume of elevated nitrate concentration in groundwater..... | 12 |
| Figure 1.4: Study Area Map..... | 15 |
| Figure 2.1: The location of the study area within the Otway Basin | 21 |
| Figure 2.2: A cross-sectional presentation of the Cretaceous-Tertiary geology of study area | 24 |
| Figure 2.3: Top of the Gambier Limestone unit (mAHD) | 27 |
| Figure 2.4: The recorded extent of the unnamed clay unit based upon reinterpretation of drillhole information | 29 |
| Figure 2.5: A cross-sectional presentation of the Quaternary geology of study area..... | 30 |
| Figure 2.6: The dominant soils types within study area..... | 32 |
| Figure 2.7: The dominant soil textures within study area..... | 33 |
| Figure 2.8: An example of the depth of soil within the study area (Coonawarra township) | 34 |
| Figure 2.9: An example of the depth of soil within the study area (western part of study area)..... | 34 |
| Figure 2.10: The shallow depth to groundwater of the unconfined aquifer as modelled from groundwater measurements from 44 wells between 2000 and 2004 | 36 |
| Figure 2.11: Water level elevation of the unconfined aquifer and inferred groundwater flow directions..... | 37 |
| Figure 2.12: Depth and seasonal responses in the unconfined aquifer in selected bores | 38 |
| Figure 2.13: The presented hydrostratigraphy of the study area | 40 |
| Figure 3.1: The ratio of historical SAGEODATA NO ₃ -N values against sourced hardcopy values | 50 |
| Figure 3.2: A presentation of the non-random temporal distribution of nitrate results for the study area | 60 |
| Figure 3.3: The histogram of nitrate concentrations showing the dominance of low concentration values..... | 60 |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Figure 3.4: Proportion of bores with a maximum nitrate concentration above or below 10 mg/L against the number of times the bores are sampled..... | 61 |
| Figure 3.5: The mean groundwater nitrate concentrations and standard errors for each multi-year period | 64 |
| Figure 3.6: The percentage of records having a nitrate concentration less than 4.5 mg/L for a running five year averaging period (n≥25)..... | 66 |
| Figure 3.7: The percentage of records having a nitrate concentration greater than or equal to 4.5 mg/L but less than 10 mg/L for a running five year averaging period (n≥25)..... | 67 |
| Figure 3.8: The percentage of records having a nitrate concentration greater than or equal to 10 mg/L but less than 15 mg/L for a running five year averaging period (n≥25)..... | 68 |
| Figure 3.9: The percentage of records having a nitrate concentration greater than or equal to 15 mg/L but less than 20 mg/L for a running five year averaging period (n≥25)..... | 68 |
| Figure 3.10: The percentage of records having a nitrate concentration greater than or equal to 20 mg/L for a running five year averaging period (n≥25) | 69 |
| Figure 3.11: The percentage of records having a nitrate concentration greater than 10 mg/L for a running five year (n≥25) and ten year averaging periods (n≥50) using first bore record only | 70 |
| Figure 3.12: The change in mean and median nitrate concentrations over time for those bores with repeated sampling (n≥5)..... | 72 |
| Figure 3.13: The cumulative slope of change in nitrate concentration over time for those bores with repeated sampling (n≥5) indicating an overall trend in nitrate concentrations..... | 73 |
| Figure 3.14: The location and individual nitrate concentration trends over time for wells with longer term data, with inferred groundwater flow direction..... | 74 |
| Figure 3.15: Variation of the ratio of nitrate ions to chloride ions with nitrate concentration. Circled points are considered outliers. | 76 |

| | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Figure 3.16: The unprotected well head for bore 702302964 (left), and lockable well cap (but at surface level) for bore 702303000 (right) | 79 |
| Figure 3.17: Poor well head protection for bore 702302800 (a tin cap and rock) | 80 |
| Figure 4.1: The bore locations of tritium sampling in study area with all known bore locations plotted (grey)..... | 91 |
| Figure 4.2: The location of tritium rainfall monitoring sites relative to the study area..... | 94 |
| Figure 4.3: The calculated Tritium Input Function of recharge water and the recorded tritium concentrations in precipitation | 98 |
| Figure 4.4: Conceptual cross-section of the unconfined aquifer illustrating the assumed aquifer flow and sampling contributions for the model | 100 |
| Figure 4.5: The groundwater samples (October 1976) compared to predicted tritium concentrations for recharge estimates | 103 |
| Figure 4.6: The groundwater samples (March 1977) compared to predicted tritium concentrations for recharge estimates | 104 |
| Figure 4.7: Modelled tritium concentrations in composite groundwater samples corrected to each sample date..... | 105 |
| Figure 4.8: Estimated recharge rates predicted from the October 1976 dataset compared to all other sample date datasets..... | 107 |
| Figure 4.9: Estimated recharge rates predicted from the March 1977 dataset compared to other sample date | 107 |
| Figure 4.10: The frequency of recharge rate estimates for the study area assuming aquifer matrix porosity of 40%..... | 108 |
| Figure 4.11: The estimated recharge rates within study area (matrix porosity of 40%) based upon summer and winter modelling periods | 109 |
| Figure 4.12: The average estimated recharge rates between the centre of the study area (inferred area of high recharge) and the outer parts of the study area based upon summer and winter modelling (matrix porosity of 40%)..... | 110 |

| | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Figure 5.1: Nitrate concentrations of groundwater in the study area collected between 1974 and 1983..... | 118 |
| Figure 5.2: Nitrate concentrations of groundwater in the study area collected between 1994 and 2003..... | 119 |
| Figure 5.3: Mean nitrate concentrations (with standard error bars) for the calculated higher and lower recharge areas..... | 120 |
| Figure 5.4: Mean nitrate concentrations of different well types for period 1974-1983 | 123 |
| Figure 5.5: Mean nitrate concentrations of different landuses for period 1974-1983 | 124 |
| Figure 5.6: Bores where geochemistry profiles are available | 125 |
| Figure 5.7: Nitrate profiles and nitrate concentrations at the water table and at least at one depth for selected bores | 126 |
| Figure 5.8: Geochemistry profiles of bore 702303765 showing possible unnamed clay unit aquitard at 17-20m | 128 |
| Figure 6.1: A simplified nitrogen cycle for the study area, adapted from Payne (1981), Sprent (1987) and Kendall (1998)..... | 137 |
| Figure 6.2: The $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ of nitrate from different sources from literature summarised in Appendix 7 | 145 |
| Figure 6.3: The $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ of nitrate from different sources from literature summarised in Appendix 7 | 145 |
| Figure 6.4: Schematic representation of nitrate sources based upon the $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ signatures..... | 146 |
| Figure 6.5: The $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ data for groundwater samples from within the study area plotted against literature values and showing the denitrifying trend line | 150 |
| Figure 6.6: The categorisation of wells sampled for nitrate isotopes | 152 |
| Figure 6.7: The nitrogen and oxygen isotope comparisons of groundwater within the study area..... | 153 |
| Figure 6.8: Categorized nitrate isotope comparisons in groundwater within the study area (see text for dotted line) | 154 |

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Figure 6.9: Nitrate concentrations and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ of nitrate categorised within the study area (means and standard errors of septic waste impacted wells and soil microbial nitrification sources included). Significance of the dotted line is discussed in the text | 156 |
| Figure 7.1: A simplified conceptual framework of the LEACHN model illustrating the main fluxes and pools for water and nitrogen.. | 166 |
| Figure 7.2: Number of frost risk days 1966-2005 | 170 |
| Figure 7.3: The average annual drainage and nitrate leached below the root zone from the modelled scenarios (with standard errors)..... | 179 |
| Figure 7.4: A quantified nitrogen budget for irrigated vineyards using LEACHN..... | 182 |
| Figure 7.5: A quantified nitrogen budget for non-irrigated vineyards using LEACHN | 184 |
| Figure 7.6: A quantified nitrogen budget for native vegetation using LEACHN..... | 185 |
| Figure 7.7: A quantified nitrogen budget for pasture grazing using LEACHN..... | 186 |
| Figure 7.8: A quantified nitrogen budget for legume cropping using LEACHN..... | 188 |
| Figure 7.9: Modelled groundwater nitrate profiles; Grazing (top-left), Irrigated vineyards (top-right), cropping (lower-left), non-irrigated vineyards (lower-right) | 191 |
| Figure 7.10: Examples of variations in vineyard management; (1) a cover crop and frost fans | 195 |
| Figure 7.11: Examples of variations in vineyard management; (2) a mown/herbicide-sprayed cover crop..... | 195 |
| Figure 7.12: Examples of variations in vineyard management; (3) no inter-row crop | 196 |
| Figure 7.13: Examples of variations in vineyard management; (4) stock grazing part-cover crops..... | 196 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | |
|------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Table 3.1: | The collated groundwater nitrate records and sources for the study area..... | 58 |
| Table 3.2: | The mean groundwater nitrate concentrations for each multi-year period..... | 64 |
| Table 4.1: | Recorded tritium concentrations in groundwater with analytical precision in brackets..... | 92 |
| Table 5.1: | Multiple regression analysis of nitrate concentrations 1974-1983 and environmental variables..... | 121 |
| Table 5.2: | Number of wells classified for multiple regression analysis of nitrate concentrations 1974-1983 and environmental variables..... | 122 |
| Table 6.1: | Isotopic analysis of wells within the study area | 149 |
| Table 7.1: | Soil physical and chemical properties used for determining water retention curves for the vineyard scenario | 169 |
| Table 7.2: | Soil physical and chemical properties used for determining water retention curves for the native vegetation scenario | 172 |
| Table 7.3: | Soil physical and chemical properties used for determining water retention curves for the grazing scenario..... | 174 |
| Table 7.4: | Soil physical and chemical properties used for determining water retention curves for the legume cropping scenario | 176 |
| Table 7.5: | The mean annual drainage and nitrogen leaching from the root zone for each of the five land use scenarios as calculated by the LEACHN model | 180 |
| Table 7.6: | The net organic nitrogen mineralisation (N kg/ha/yr) predicted for each scenario | 189 |

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to apply a variety of investigative methods to identify the causes of elevated concentrations of nitrate reported in an unconfined aquifer around the township of Coonawarra in the South East region of South Australia. For nearly 30 years elevated nitrate concentrations have been of concern to Government Departments, however the source of these elevated nitrate concentrations remained unknown.

Examination of an extensive historical water quality dataset for the study area identified that while nitrate concentrations were elevated during the late 1970s – early 1980s, they have declined since this time. The study demonstrates a variety of inherent biases that can exist within nitrate groundwater datasets, and presents methods that can be used for determining temporal trends in concentration that minimise the impacts of these characteristics.

The quantification and spatial variability of diffuse recharge was investigated using groundwater tritium concentrations measured in the aquifer during the late 1970s. The modelling produced estimated recharge rates that were generally below those now adopted for the study area, and the methodology may not be appropriate in areas where high irrigation rates are occurring. The assessment of the variability of recharge illustrates that the high recharge areas corresponded to the previously identified areas of higher nitrate concentrations in groundwater.

This correlation was further investigated statistically, and used a dual isotopic technique that applied the natural variability of nitrogen and oxygen isotopes (of nitrate) to source determination. The statistical approach was only able to explain 39% of the variability observed in groundwater nitrate concentrations using field observations. This approach indicated that there was a significant spatial relationship between bores located in close proximity to septic tanks and elevated nitrate concentrations in groundwater. The applications of the dual nitrate isotopic method further demonstrated that nitrate in the

groundwater is from multiple sources, with septic tanks being a probable source of nitrate. This isotopic method is shown to be effective in source determination, with the results comparing well to literature and field observations.

Modelling of diffuse inputs from the main landuse types supports the conclusion that the elevated nitrate levels are most likely due to localised sources.

It is concluded that while high nitrate concentrations have existed within the Coonawarra area, the data interpretation methods previously used to report the 'plume' of nitrate contamination have over-estimated the extent of nitrate in groundwater. The elevated nitrate concentrations in the groundwater are primarily the result of anthropogenic sources (e.g. septic tanks) and natural sources (e.g. the mineralisation of soil organic nitrogen).

CANDIDATE DECLARATION

I certify that this thesis does not incorporate without acknowledgement any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any university; and that to the best of my knowledge and belief does not contain any material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text.

Full Name: Phillip Galvin Gorey

Signed.....

Date..... *30 November 2008*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research described in this thesis was only possible with the support of a number of organisations and individuals that I would like to acknowledge.

Firstly, my initial primary supervisor Dr Nick Turozcy, who provided the catalyst for the research and invaluable advice on sampling and research techniques. Special thanks to Associate Professor John Sherwood who subsequently took over the role as my primary supervisor, and provided ongoing support and comment that improved the chapters of the thesis; but most of all provided enthusiasm for the research. My thanks to Professor Frank Stagnitti who provided modelling and statistically (and planning) advice that greatly assisted the completion of the work. Ultimately my thanks to Dr John Hutson who provided both advice and support in undertaking the modelling components of this research.

This study was undertaken with the support of the Environment Protection Authority (South Australia), and I particularly thank Max Harvey for recognising the importance of undertaking the research. Also my thanks to Jonathan Irvine for rectifying all of the aerial photographs that were incorporated into the land use component of this project, and to Helen King for the advice on hydrogeological processes, and her access to a wealth of hydrogeology resource material. My thanks also to Robyn at Grooming the Printer for formatting the geological cross-section diagrams and the hydrostratigraphy diagram.

I am indebted to Cathy Healy, Jacque Lawson, George MacKenzie, Jeff Lawson, Fred Stadter and the staff of the Naracoorte and Mount Gambier office's of the Department for Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation for all their support in collating historical records and references and providing advice that was critical to understanding the background work that had been undertaken.

My thanks to Peter Airey (Australian Nuclear Science and Technology

Organisation) for the collation of the groundwater tritium results and providing subsequent comment on Chapter 4. Also to Peter Cook for providing valuable advice on recharge assessment techniques.

I would specifically like to acknowledge all the winery operators, residents and landholders of the Coonawarra area that assisted in this project by allowing my unfettered access to well locations and showed genuine interest in understanding the issues of groundwater contamination. I am grateful also for the assistance given by Lee Hazelgrove for providing practical advice regarding the project, and who was invaluable in providing key contacts with the winery industry.

Finally, my thanks to my wife Ange Gorey for her support and encouragement during the research and write up of the thesis.

THE REPORTED NITROGEN CONCENTRATIONS

A variety of methods have been used to report the concentration of nitrogen compounds in previous investigative studies and research, and it is recognised that a range of previous studies within the region have reported nitrate concentrations as nitrate; i.e. mg/L (as NO₃). Recently, the preference has been to report the concentration of nitrate and nitrite as the mass of only the nitrogen atoms; i.e. mg/L (as N).

In order to assist in interpretation of this thesis, all nitrogen species are reported as concentrations of nitrogen unless otherwise noted. The nomenclature adopted for reporting these concentrations within this thesis is *mg/L (as N)*.

THE REPORTED BOREHOLE REFERENCES

Up until the early 1980s, boreholes were referenced in a variety of ways (i.e. various numbering systems, names). The convention used in this study is the full unique well bore identifier allocated by the Department for Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation. This convention has the first four numbers as the 1:100,000 map number (the study area is within the 7023 map sheet), and the remaining five numbers being the incremental counter of bores within the 1:100,000 map sheet. Observation bore numbers and names are included as a secondary name (when known).