National Research FLAGSHIPS
Water for a Healthy Country

CSIRO

www.csiro.au

Assessment of Acid Sulfate Soil Materials (Phase 2) Ukee Boat Club wetland, South Australia

P. Shand, S. Grocke, A.K. Baker, M. Raven, R.W. Fitzpatrick, L. Smith, C. Fiebiger, G. Cozens & R.H. Merry

March 2011

Report to Murray-Darling Basin Authority

Water for a Healthy Country Flagship Report series ISSN: 1835-095X

Australia is founding its future on science and innovation. Its national science agency, CSIRO, is a powerhouse of ideas, technologies and skills.

CSIRO initiated the National Research Flagships to address Australia's major research challenges and opportunities. They apply large scale, long term, multidisciplinary science and aim for widespread adoption of solutions. The Flagship Collaboration Fund supports the best and brightest researchers to address these complex challenges through partnerships between CSIRO, universities, research agencies and industry.

The Water for a Healthy Country Flagship aims to provide Australia with solutions for water resource management, creating economic gains of $3 billion per annum by 2030, while protecting or restoring our major water ecosystems.

For more information about Water for a Healthy Country Flagship or the National Research Flagship Initiative visit www.csiro.au/org/HealthyCountry.html

Citation: Shand P, Grocke S, Baker AK, Raven M, Fitzpatrick RW, Smith L, Fiebiger C, Cozens G & Merry RH 2011. Assessment of Acid Sulfate Soil Materials (Phase 2) Ukee Boat Club wetland. CSIRO: Water for a Healthy Country National Research Flagship

Copyright and Disclaimer

Cover Photograph:

Ukee Boat Club wetland
Photographer: Rob Fitzpatrick

CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was funded by the Murray-Darling Basin Authority. We are particularly grateful to Rob Kingham and his team from the Murray-Darling Basin Authority for support throughout this project. We would like to thank the many landholders who allowed access through their properties and contributed their local knowledge about the wetland and history of the areas.

The following CSIRO staff members are thanked for their outstanding turnaround of analytical data: Julie Smith, Claire Wright, John Gouzos and Michelle Smart. We are grateful to Rob Kingham, Lucy Paterson and Lea Weekes-Randall from the Murray-Darling Basin Authority and internal peer reviewers from CSIRO for constructively reviewing the report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An initial Phase 1 acid sulfate soil investigation of the Ukee Boat Club wetland in February 2008 showed acid sulfate soils to be a priority concern within this wetland complex. Based on Phase 1 recommendations, a Phase 2 investigation was undertaken for the Ukee Boat Club wetland to determine the nature, severity and the specific risks associated with acid sulfate soil materials. The wetland was dry at the time of sampling.

The 24 hour **reactive metals** tests were undertaken to determine those metals and metalloids extractable with a moderately strong acid i.e. potentially available from binding sites on soil minerals such as iron (Fe), manganese (Mn) and aluminium (Al) oxides. Although comparisons can be made with soil and sediment quality guidelines, these are defined for total concentrations and not partial extractions. The reactive metals results showed that concentrations were below sediment quality guidelines (SQG) and soil ecological investigation levels (EIL). Although none of the elements had concentrations that breached sediment quality guidelines and soil ecological investigation level trigger values, the concentrations of many elements were high enough that they may impact water quality if mobilised, particularly for aluminium (Al), iron (Fe) and nickel (Ni).

The **contaminant and metalloid dynamics** tests were undertaken to assess the release of metals during a water extraction, and to assess dynamics in response to saturation over time by incubating soil materials for periods of 1, 7, 14 and 35 days. The degree to which metal and metalloid concentrations exceed guideline values (ANZECC/ARMCANZ 2000) was used to characterise the degree of hazard. For Ukee Boat Club wetland, aluminium (Al), cobalt (Co), iron (Fe) and zinc (Zn) were assigned a high hazard with concentrations exceeding ANZECC/ARMCANZ environmental protection guidelines by more than 100 times, while cadmium (Cd), chromium (Cr), copper (Cu), nickel (Ni) and vanadium (V) were assigned a moderate hazard with concentrations exceeding ANZECC/ARMCANZ environmental protection guidelines by more than 10 times. The dominant control on metal solubility is the pH of the sediments at the time of the extractions. The soils displayed little trend in pH throughout the tests, with some remaining very acidic. The presence of iron hydroxysulfates in the soils is considered to be important in buffering the pH to low values as well as providing metals and metalloids to solution during wetting of the soils. Over the duration of the analysis, there was a slight decrease in Eh, which is thought to be partly responsible for increasing iron (Fe) solubility over time.

The Ukee Boat Club wetland has been classified as medium conservation status by the SA Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board (Miles *et al*. 2010). The main hazards considered in this study that may impact on wetland values are acidification, contaminant mobilisation and deoxygenation. The wetland has been allocated a **very high** risk rating due to **acidification** and **contaminant mobilisation** of **soils**. For **surface waters**, the risk is largely dependent on surface and sub-surface hydrology and is thus scenario dependent. Taking into account the range of likely scenarios, from very low flows (highest risk) to very high flows (lowest risk), the risk to surface waters in the wetland has been allocated **medium** (minor consequence) to **very high** (major consequence) risk rating due to both **acidification** and **contaminant mobilisation**. The risk associated with **deoxygenation** was determined to be **low** as there was no identified hazard associated with monosulfide formation.

In designing a management strategy for dealing with acid sulfate soils in Ukee Boat Club wetland, other values and uses of the wetland need to be taken into account to ensure that any intervention is compatible with other management plans and objectives for the wetland.

The wetland soils studied were dry at the time of sampling, therefore management options considered should relate to controlling or treating acidification and the protection of connected or adjacent wetlands. Due to the very high risks to the wetland values associated with acidification and contaminant mobilisation in Ukee Boat Club wetland, a monitoring program is strongly recommended during any disturbance to the soils.

1. INTRODUCTION

At its March 2008 meeting, the Murray–Darling Basin Ministerial Council discussed the emerging issue of inland acid sulfate soils and the associated risks to Murray–Darling Basin waterways and agreed that the extent of the threat posed by this issue required assessment. The purpose of the Murray–Darling Basin Acid Sulfate Soils Risk Assessment Project was to determine the spatial occurrence of, and risk posed by, acid sulfate soils at priority wetlands in the River Murray system, wetlands listed under the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance and other key environmental sites in the Murray–Darling Basin. The project involved the selection of wetlands of environmental significance, as well as those that may pose a risk to surrounding waters. These wetlands were then subjected to a tiered assessment program, whereby wetlands were screened through a desktop assessment stage, followed by a rapid on-ground appraisal, and then detailed on-ground assessment if results of previous stages indicated an increased likelihood of occurrence of acid sulfate soils.

Detailed assessments of acid sulfate soils within the Murray-Darling Basin (MDB) are conducted as a two-phase process under the MDB Acid Sulfate Soils Risk Assessment Project (ASSRAP). Phase 1 investigations are initially undertaken to determine whether or not acid sulfate soil materials are present in the study area, and provide characterisation of the properties and types of acid sulfate soils. Phase 2 investigations are only conducted if the acid sulfate soil materials from Phase 1 are determined to be a priority concern for the study area and, based on Phase 1 recommendations, selected samples undergo further investigations to determine the nature, severity and the specific risks associated with the acid sulfate soil materials. Phase 2 activities include: (i) soil laboratory analysis to confirm and refine the hazards associated with contaminant mobilisation and/or deoxygenation, (ii) a risk assessment, and (iii) interpretation and reporting, including discussion on broad acid sulfate soil management options.

Detailed Phase 1 acid sulfate soil assessments were undertaken at almost 200 wetlands and river channels throughout the Murray-Darling Basin. In South Australia, 56 wetlands along the River Murray between Lock 1 and Lock 5 were investigated by CSIRO Land and Water (Grealish *et al*. 2010). From these Phase 1 investigations, 13 wetlands were selected for further investigation. Nearly all of the wetlands along the River Murray between Wellington and Blanchetown (Lock 1) in South Australia also received detailed Phase 1 acid sulfate soil assessments (Grealish *et al*. 2011) and of these 23 wetlands were selected for further investigation in Phase 2. This included some wetlands below Lock 1 from earlier studies (Fitzpatrick *et al*. 2008; Fitzpatrick *et al.* 2010).

This report outlines the results of Phase 2 activities on selected surface soil samples from the Ukee Boat Club wetland.

Ukee Boat Club wetland was selected for Phase 2 detailed assessment following analysis of results from the Phase 1 detailed assessment (Fitzpatrick *et al*. 2010) and the priority ranking criteria adopted by the Scientific Reference Panel of the MDB ASSRAP (see Table 1-1). Sampling sites from Phase 1 are shown on Figure 1-1. The Phase 1 assessment identified 3 high priority sites based on the presence of sulfuric materials, all of which also contained sulfidic material with up to 0.5 % S_{CR}. Phase 2 investigations were carried out on selected surface soil samples from high priority sites identified in the Phase 1 assessment (Fitzpatrick *et al*. 2008).

A summary of the soil laboratory analyses undertaken as part of the Phase 2 assessment and the sample selection criteria for each analysis is given in Table 1-2. Soil samples identified to undergo Phase 2 laboratory analysis are primarily from the surface and near-surface layers, as these are the soils most likely to have initial contact with water. A list of the samples selected for Phase 2 analysis for the Ukee Boat Club wetland is presented in Table 1-3.

Table 1-1 Priority ranking criteria adopted by the Scientific Reference Panel of the Murray-Darling Basin Acid Sulfate Soils Risk Assessment Project, from MDBA (2010).

Priority	Soil material
High Priority	All sulfuric materials.
	All hypersulfidic materials (as recognised by either 1) incubation of sulfidic materials or 2) a positive net acidity result with a Fineness Factor of 1.5 being used).
	All hyposulfidic materials with S_{CR} contents ≥ 0.10% S.
	All surface soil materials (i.e. within 0-20 cm) with water soluble sulfate (1:5 soil:water) contents ≥100 mg kg^{-1} SO_4.
	All monosulfidic materials.
Moderate Priority	All hyposulfidic materials with S_{CR} contents < 0.10% S.
No Further Assessment	Other acidic soil materials.
	All other soil materials.

Table 1-2 Rationale for Phase 2 sample selection, from MDBA (2010)

Parameter	Samples selected
Reactive metals	Conducted on selected upper two surface samples.
Contaminant and metalloid dynamics	Conducted on selected upper two surface samples.
Monosulfide formation potential	Conducted on surface samples of dry sites that meet the water extractable sulfate criteria for monosulfides.
Mineral identification by X-ray diffraction (XRD)	Conducted on limited number of selected crystals and minerals (if present). Most likely to be associated with sulfuric layers to confirm acid mineral presences.
Acid base accounting data	Conducted only on samples from wetlands below Lock 1 and Burnt Creek/Loddon River if not previously analysed and pH_{KCl}<4.5.

Table 1-3 Summary of Ukee Boat Club wetland samples analysed for Phase 2 assessment.

Soil Laboratory Test	Ukee Boat Club wetland samples	Sample depth (cm)	Number of samples analysed
Reactive metals	UKE3.3	1-8	6
	UKE3.4	8-12	
	UKE5.2	0.5-10	
	UKE5.3	10-30	
	UKE6.1	0-5	
	UKE6.2	5-20	
Contaminant and metalloid dynamics	UKE3.3	1-8	6
	UKE3.4	8-12	
	UKE5.2	0.5-10	
	UKE5.3	10-30	
	UKE6.1	0-5	
	UKE6.2	5-20	
Monosulfide formation potential	-		-
Mineral identification by X-ray diffraction (XRD)	UKE3.3	1-8	5
	UKE3.4	8-12	
	UKE5.2	0.5-10	
	UKE6.1	0-5	
	UKE6.2	5-20	

Figure 1-1 Ukee Boat Club wetland aerial photograph with Phase 1 sampling sites identified.

2. LABORATORY METHODS

2.1. Laboratory analysis methods

2.1.1. Summary of laboratory methods

A list of the method objectives for the Phase 2 assessment are summarised below in Table 2-1. All soil samples analysed in this Phase 2 assessment were collected and subsequently stored as part of the Phase 1 field assessment.

Table 2-1 Phase 2 data requirements - list of parameters and objective for conducting the test, from MDBA (2010).

Parameter	Objective
Reactive metals	Assists with determining impacts on water quality by determining weakly to moderately strongly bound metals.
Contaminant and metalloid dynamics	Assists with determining impacts on water quality by simulating longer time frames that create anaerobic conditions. Identifies metal release concentrations that may occur over a 5 week time frame.
Monosulfide formation potential	Determine relative propensity for monosulfides to form following inundation.
Mineral identification by X-ray diffraction (XRD)	Characterisation and confirmation of minerals present.

Guidelines on the approaches that were followed as part of this Phase 2 assessment are presented in full in the detailed assessment protocols (MDBA 2010).

2.1.2. Reactive metals method

The guidelines for the reactive metals method are outlined as an addendum to the detailed assessment protocols (MDBA 2010). In this method, samples were prepared by disaggregation (not grinding) using a jaw crusher, and then sieved to include only the <2 mm fine earth fraction. A total of 2.5 g soil was added to 40 ml of 0.1 M HCl, gently mixed for 1 hour and filtered through a pre-acid washed 0.45 µm nitro-cellulose filter. The metals examined comprised silver (Ag), aluminium (Al), arsenic (As), cadmium (Cd), cobalt (Co), chromium (Cr), copper (Cu), iron (Fe), manganese (Mn), nickel (Ni), lead (Pb), antimony (Sb), selenium (Se), vanadium (V) and zinc (Zn).

2.1.3. Contaminant and metalloid dynamics method

The guidelines for the contaminant and metalloid dynamics method are outlined in Appendix 7 of the detailed assessment protocols (MDBA 2010). The contaminant and metalloid dynamics method was designed to determine the release of metals and metalloids in soils after 24 hours. The data represent the availability of metals and metalloids from a weak extraction (water, and thus easily bioavailable) of saturated soils, and for dry wetland soils, those easily mobilised from mineral surfaces and readily soluble mineral phases (such as salts). The exercise was repeated in a batch process for longer time periods (7 days, 14 days, 35 days). The latter approach was aimed at understanding changes in concentrations over time. This is particularly important for dried soils which have been in contact with the

atmosphere. The soil materials and the release/uptake of metals/metalloids are expected to change as the chemical environment changes from oxidising to reducing. The data can be compared to existing water quality guidelines, although care should be taken when extrapolating to surface waters without knowledge of hydrological conditions and natural chemical barriers. The impact on surface waters will be governed by the upward chemical flux which is a function of soil type, water flow, diffusion and the chemistry of the soils near the sediment-water interface.

Redox potential (Eh) and pH were determined using calibrated electrodes linked to a TPS WP-80 meter; Eh measurements were undertaken in an anaerobic chamber to minimise the rapid changes encountered due to contact with the atmosphere, and are presented relative to the standard hydrogen electrode (SHE). Specific electrical conductance (SEC) was determined using a calibrated electrode linked to a TPS WP-81 meter. All parameters were measured on filtered (0.45 µm) water samples.

2.1.4. Monosulfide formation potential method

The guidelines for the monosulfide formation potential method are outlined in Appendix 8 of the detailed assessment protocols (MDBA 2010). In this study 3.6 g/L sucrose was used as an organic substrate instead of the 7.2 g/L outlined in the protocols. In addition to sampling after seven weeks, water samples were collected and analysed immediately after inundating the soils (i.e. Day 0). The pore-water pH and Eh were determined at Day 0.

The reactive iron (Fe) fraction in field moist sediments was extracted using 1.0 M HCl (Claff *et al.* 2010). The ferrous iron (Fe^{2+}) and total iron (Fe^{2+} + Fe^{3+}) fractions were immediately fixed following extraction. The ferrous iron trap was made up from a phenanthroline solution with an ammonium acetate buffer (APHA 2005), and the total iron trap also included a hydroxylamine solution (APHA 2005). The iron species were quantified colorimetrically using a Hach DR 2800 spectrophotometer.

Redox potential and pH were determined using calibrated electrodes linked to a TPS WP-80 meter; Eh measurements are presented versus the standard hydrogen electrode. In this study the solid phase elemental sulfur fraction was extracted using toluene as a solvent and quantified by high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) (McGuire and Hamers 2000). Pore-water sulfide was preserved in zinc acetate prior to determination by the spectrophotometric method of Cline (1969).

2.1.5. Mineral identification by x-ray diffraction

The guidelines for mineral identification by x-ray diffraction are outlined in the detailed assessment protocols (MDBA 2010).

2.2. Quality assurance and quality control

For all tests and analyses, the quality assurance and quality control procedures were equivalent to those endorsed by NATA (National Association of Testing Authorities). The standard procedures included the monitoring of blanks, duplicate analysis of at least 1 in 10 samples, and the inclusion of standards in each batch.

Reagent blanks and method blanks were prepared and analysed for each method. All blanks examined here were either at, or very close to, the limits of detection. On average, the frequencies of quality control samples processed were: 10% blanks, 10% laboratory duplicates, and 10% laboratory controls. The analytical precision was ±10% for all analyses. In addition, for all samples, reactive metals and contaminant and metalloid dynamics were duplicated. For the reactive metals, two International Standards (Reference Stream

Sediment STSD-2 and STSD-3 Canadian Certified Reference Materials) were processed in an identical manner to the samples. Precision was excellent with the coefficient of variation (standard deviation/mean*100) typically being in the range < 1 to 2 %.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Summary of soil laboratory results

3.1.1. Reactive metals data

The data are presented on a dry weight basis (mg kg^{-1}) and shown in Table 3-1. The 24 hour reactive metals studies provide an indication of those metals and metalloids which are more strongly bound to minerals (or weakly soluble with an acid extraction) than would be soluble with a water extraction, and thus have the potential to be released. The use of a moderately strong acid (0.1 M HCl) should provide an indication of "stored metals" and metalloids associated with iron (Fe) and manganese (Mn) oxides and organic materials as well as acid soluble minerals. It is commonly found that the concentrations of metals and metalloids released using extractions are much higher than those found in solution (Gooddy *et al*. 1995). Although guideline values exist for soils and sediments, these are generally for total soil concentrations, and therefore, are not directly appropriate for the data from metal mobilisation studies. Nevertheless, they provide a basis for comparison; and concentrations close to or above guideline values indicate an elevated hazard.

The concentrations of metals and metalloids were below sediment quality guideline (SQG) values and soil ecological investigation levels (EIL) for those elements where guidelines are available (Table 3-1). The concentrations for most reactive metals and metalloids are relatively low, but relatively high for aluminium (Al), iron (Fe) and for some samples including nickel (Ni).

Table 3-1 Ukee Boat Club wetland reactive metals data.

Concentrations in mg kg^{-1} and µg kg^{-1} as indicated.

Sample	Ag*	Al	As	Cd*	Co	Cr*	Cu	Fe	Mn	Ni	Pb	Sb*	Se*	V	Zn
UKE 3.3	2.7	1035	0.96	65	6.5	528	9.5	2940	58	11	0.46	< 10	55	16	20
UKE 3.4	5.2	357	0.73	33	2.0	86	2.8	741	42	4.6	3.5	< 13	45	6.0	3.4
UKE 5.2	9.5	361	0.81	19	2.7	190	4.6	1839	57	4.8	0.44	< 10	41	8.1	7.9
UKE 5.3	6.9	434	0.98	34	1.7	46	2.4	810	52	5.3	2.0	< 14	55	8.8	3.1
UKE 6.1	4.2	1318	1.1	82	9.7	395	6.6	1859	86	17	0.11	< 11	108	12	19
UKE 6.2	8.5	845	1.1	67	4.1	247	4.4	2736	68	9.9	5.7	< 17	87	10	5.6
[1]SQG	1000	-	20	1500	-	80000	65	-	-	21	50	2000	-	-	200
[2]Soil EIL	-	-	20	3000	-	-	100	-	500	60	600	-	-	50	200

* Units are in µg kg^{-1}
< value is below detection limit
[1]SQG: Sediment Quality Guideline Value (Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality 2000)
[2]Soil EIL: Soil – Ecological Investigation Level (NEPC 1999)

3.1.2. Contaminant and metalloid dynamics data

The contaminant and metalloid dynamics data for the six Ukee Boat Club wetland soil materials examined are presented in Appendix 2, summarised in Table 3-2 and plotted against time in Figure 3-1 to Figure 3-3. Table 3-2 also compares the pore-water metal contents to the relevant national water quality guideline for environmental protection (ANZECC/ARMCANZ 2000).

Table 3-2 Summary of contaminant and metalloid dynamics data

Parameter	units	ANZECC Guidelines	Ukee Boat Club weland		
			Min.	Median	Max.
pH		6.5-8.0	**2.9**	**3.9**	**9.5**
EC*	µS cm^{-1}	2200	105	974	**2770**
Eh	mV	-	4	453	694
Ag	µg l^{-1}	0.05	<0.01	<0.5	<0.5
Al[A]	mg l^{-1}	0.055	<0.06	**3.9**	**33**
As[B]	µg l^{-1}	13	<0.2	4.2	**40**
Cd	µg l^{-1}	0.2	<0.05	**0.69**	**4.0**
Co	µg l^{-1}	2.8	0.23	**99**	**492**
Cr[C]	µg l^{-1}	1	<0.3	**5.3**	**20**
Cu[H]	µg l^{-1}	1.4	0.60	**9.1**	**74**
Fe[I]	mg l^{-1}	0.3	<0.1	**20**	**323**
Mn	µg l^{-1}	1700	3.5	**2021**	**5942**
Ni[H]	µg l^{-1}	11	<1	**148**	**744**
Pb[H]	µg l^{-1}	3.4	<0.4	<10	<20
Sb	µg l^{-1}	9	<1	<10	<100
Se	µg l^{-1}	11	<0.08	<2	2.8
V	µg l^{-1}	6	<0.1	**22**	**271**
Zn[H]	µg l^{-1}	8	1.8	**219**	**980**

Exceeded ANZECC Guideline (x1) ***Exceeded ANZECC Guideline (x10)*** ***Exceeded ANZECC Guideline (x100)***

Notes.
The ANZECC guideline values for toxicants refer to the Ecosystem Protection – Freshwater Guideline for protection of 95% of biota in 'slightly-moderately disturbed' systems, as outlined in the Australian Water Quality Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality (ANZECC/ARMCANZ 2000).
** ANZECC water quality upper guideline (125-2200 µS cm^{-1}) for freshwater lowland rivers in South-east Australia is provided for salinity (there are currently no trigger values defined for 'Wetlands'.)*

[A] Guideline is for Aluminium in freshwater where pH > 6.5.
[B] Guideline assumes As in solution as Arsenic (AsV).
[C] Guideline for Chromium is applicable to Chromium (CrVI) only.
[H] Hardness affected (refer to Guidelines).
[I] Fe Guideline for recreational purposes.

The pH of the soil materials were, with the exception of one sample (UKE 5.3), very acidic. Four of the samples remained acidic for the duration of the 35 days, but showed a continuous increase in pH. Two samples from deeper in the profile (UKE 5.3 and UKE 3.4) both increased dramatically after 14 days to pH greater than pH 9 (Figure 3-1).

The Eh was initially very high, reflecting the strongly oxidised nature of these wetland soils. All samples showed a consistent decrease in Eh, especially the surface layers (Figure 3-1). The SEC showed little variation, however two of the soils showed an increase followed by a decrease on day 35. There was considerable variation with SEC from ca. 100 to nearly 3000 µS cm^{-1} (Figure 3-1).

Manganese (Mn) concentrations were high in the contaminant and metalloid dynamics tests, with most samples being above the ANZECC/ARMCANZ environmental protection guideline value. Iron was also very high, in some cases being greater than 300 mg l^{-1}, and in general increasing over time (Figure 3-2). The highest concentrations were in the surface soil layers.

A large number of samples had metal and metalloid concentrations present at very high concentrations. Aluminium (Al) was initially very high in two samples (> 28 mg l^{-1}), but concentration showed a general decrease with time (Figure 3-1). Arsenic (As) increased dramatically in three of the samples in the 14 day tests, subsequently decreasing slightly, but higher than ANZECC/ARMCANZ environmental protection guidelines.

Cadmium (Cd), cobalt (Co), nickel (Ni) and zinc (Zn) displayed a similar trend to manganese (Mn), and maximum concentrations were much higher than the ANZECC/ARMCANZ environmental protection guidelines (Table 3-2).

Vanadium (V) increased in several samples over the 35 day period (Figure 3-3), but the highest concentrations were from the surface layer of profile UKE 3, which decreased over time.

The magnitude of metal mobilisation is affected by many factors that include but are not exclusive to: 1) the abundance and form of metal and metalloid contaminants; 2) the abundance and lability of organic matter; 3) the abundance and reactivity of iron minerals; 4) availability of sulfate; 5) acid/alkalinity buffering capacity; 6) pH; 7) EC; 8) clay content; 9) microbial activity; 10) temperature; and 11) porosity (MDBA 2010). Overall, the samples displayed a relatively clear trend with pH (Figure 3-4), with the highest concentrations of most metals and metalloids being present in the lowest pH waters (Figure 3-4). The correlation of iron (Fe) and manganese (Mn) with these metals suggests a control by dissolution of iron and manganese oxyhydroxides and mobilisation of the sorbed metals and metalloids.

The dissolution of iron-minerals by reductive dissolution is also likely to have played a major role in controlling the solubility of both metals and metalloids. The release of iron (Fe) and manganese (Mn) by dissolution of hydroxysulfate minerals is thought to be responsible for the initial rapid release of iron (Fe), manganese (Mn) and other metals and metalloids. For the soil layers with high pH (UKE 3.4 and 5.3), it appears that iron (Fe) and manganese (Mn) precipitation is important, limiting the mobility of metals and metalloids in solution.



Figure 3-1 Contaminant and metalloid dynamics results for Ukee Boat Club wetland soil materials for pH, SEC, Eh, silver (Ag), aluminium (Al) and arsenic (As).

Note: silver (Ag) was all < detection limit, data represent detection limits which vary according to required dilutions.



Figure 3-2 Contaminant and metalloid dynamics results for Ukee Boat Club wetland soil materials for cadmium (Cd), cobalt (Co), chromium (Cr), copper (Cu), iron (Fe) and manganese (Mn).



Figure 3-3 Contaminant and metalloid dynamics results for Ukee Boat Club wetland soil materials for nickel (Ni), lead (Pb), antimony (Sb), selenium (Se), vanadium (V) and zinc (Zn).

Note: lead (Pb) in most samples, and antimony (Sb) in all samples, were < detection limit, data represent detection limits which vary according to required dilutions.



Figure 3-4 Selected trace elements plotted against pH.

3.1.3. Monosulfide formation potential data

No samples were selected from this wetland for monosulfide formation potential studies.

3.1.4. Mineral identification by x-ray diffraction

Four surface mineral efflorescences were sampled from the profiles in the Ukee Boat Club wetland: UKE 3.1, 5.1, 6.1 and 6.4 corresponding to the profiles studied for reactive metals and contaminant and metalloid dynamics tests. The mineralogy is shown on Table 3-3, and

photographs and XRD patterns provided in Appendix 3. The salts detected were all sulfate and hydroxysulfate minerals including jarosite ($KFe_3(SO_4)_2(OH)_6$), natrojarosite ($NaFe_3(SO_4)_2(OH)_6$), gypsum ($CaSO_4.2H_2O$), hexahydrite ($MgSO_4.6H_2O$) and possibly sideronatrite ($Na_2Fe^{3+}(SO_4)_2OH.3H_2O$). The salts gypsum and hexahydrite may have an impact on salinity in surface waters, but do not generate acidity upon dissolution. The iron hydroxysulfate minerals, however, act as stores of acidity and may generate acidity during dissolution. The rare mineral sideronatrite is stable at lower pH than natrojarosite and jarosite and was found on the edges of peds where evaporation during drying led to extremely low pH (Fitzpatrick *et al*. 2010).

Table 3-3 Summary of X-ray diffraction results

Sample number	Depth (cm)	Mineralogy
UKE3.1	0-0.05	Co-dominant gypsum and quartz, minor hexahydrite, trace albite, orthoclase and mica
UKE5.1	0-0.05	Co-dominant gypsum, natrojarosite and/or jarosite and quartz trace albite, orthoclase and mica
UKE6.1	0-5	Dominant quartz, sub-dominant gypsum, natrojarosite and/or natrojarosite, trace mica, albite, orthoclase and hexahydrite
UKE6.4	0-0.5	Dominant quartz, sub-dominant gypsum, jarosite and/or natrojarosite, trace mica, albite, orthoclase, hexahydrite and possible sideronatrite

It is likely that the acid-generating iron-hydroxysulfate salts also store metals and metalloids which are released during dissolution of these minerals following rewetting.

3.2. Interpretation and discussion of results

The reactive metals and contaminant and metalloid dynamics tests undertaken as part of this Phase 2 assessment assist in determining the impacts on water quality by simulating the release of metal and metalloid concentrations that may occur under saturated conditions.

The 24 hour **reactive metals** studies provide an indication of those metals and metalloids which are more strongly bound to minerals (or weakly soluble with an acid extraction), and thus have the potential to be released. The use of a moderately strong acid (HCl) should provide an indication of “stored metals” and metalloids associated with iron (Fe) and manganese (Mn) oxides and organic materials as well as acid soluble minerals. It is commonly found that the concentrations of metals and metalloids released using extractions are much higher than those found in solution (Gooddy *et al*. 1995). Although guideline values exist for soils and sediments, these are generally for total soil concentrations, and therefore, are not directly appropriate for the data from metal mobilisation studies. Nevertheless, they provide a basis for comparison; and concentrations close to or above guideline values indicate an elevated hazard.

All metal and metalloid concentrations in the acid extracts were below the sediment quality guidelines (SQG) and the soil ecological investigation level values (Table 3-1). Although the concentrations were generally less than guideline values, the concentrations of some metals were moderately high for this partial extraction technique, particularly for aluminium (Al), iron (Fe) and nickel (Ni). Nevertheless, the concentrations of many metals are sufficiently high (mg kg^{-1}) compared to water quality guidelines (generally µg kg^{-1}) that significant release could pose a hazard to soil and surface water quality.

The **contaminant and metalloid dynamics** method was designed to determine the release of metals and metalloids in soils. The data represent the availability of metals and metalloids from a weak extraction (water, and thus easily bioavailable) of saturated soils, and for dry wetland soils (especially below Lock 1), those easily mobilised from mineral surfaces and readily soluble mineral phases (such as salts). The exercise was undertaken in a batch process for time periods of 1 day, 7 days, 14 days, and 35 days. This approach was aimed at understanding changes in concentrations over time. This is particularly important for dried soils which have been in contact with the atmosphere. The soil materials and the release/uptake of metals/metalloids are expected to change as the chemical environment changes from oxidising to reducing. Typical changes would be a reduction in redox potential (Eh), providing sufficient organic matter or other reducing agents are present, and an increase in pH (providing the soils contain or have the capacity to generate acid neutralising agents). The data can be compared to existing water quality guidelines, although care should be taken when extrapolating to surface waters without knowledge of hydrological conditions and natural chemical barriers. The impact on surface waters will be governed by the upward chemical flux which is a function of soil type, water flow, diffusion and the chemistry of the soils near the sediment-water interface. The mobility of most metals is commonly is related to the stability of iron (Fe) and manganese (Mn) minerals. Under oxidising conditions iron (Fe) and manganese (Mn) oxide minerals are important sorbents for trace metals, whilst under very reducing conditions they may be incorporated into sulfide minerals. However, under moderately reducing conditions i.e. during the transition (suboxic) from oxidising to reducing conditions, iron (Fe) and manganese (Mn) are soluble and this is the period where metals may be released into solution and pose the greatest hazard.

It is evident that reductive processes have begun in the samples with a significant decrease in Eh for most samples by day 35. The largest decreases in Eh are typically in the surface samples. This is probably due to elevated organic matter typical of shallow soils in wetlands. This is also consistent with the increase in pH for all wetland soils. Large increases were noted for two of the deeper soil materials (Figure 3-1). Nevertheless, the pH in most soils remained acidic, with pH varying from pH 3.28 to 5.11 on day 35 of the contaminant and metalloid dynamics work.

The low pH and high availability of many metals has led to very high concentrations of metals and metalloids in the soil pore-waters during the contaminant and metalloid dynamics experiments. It is likely that many were incorporated into the hydroxysulfate minerals identified by X-ray diffraction. Dissolution of these minerals would help buffer the pH to low values, as well as release metals and metalloids to solution. It is likely that these species would remain in solution until pH increases by further reduction reactions. The data suggest that this may take some time.

The degree to which samples exceed guideline concentrations has been used to assign a degree of hazard (Table 3-4). For some samples which required dilution, the detection limits were slightly above ANZECC/ARMCANZ environmental protection guideline values due to required dilution. Antimony (Sb) was below detection limit for all samples (detection limit varying between 0.6 and 100 µg l^{-1}). It is therefore not possible to group antimony (Sb), lead (Pb) and silver (Ag) in Table 3-4, although it can be concluded that it either sits in the 'no hazard' to 'moderate hazard' grouping.

Of particular significance for Ukee Boat Club wetland are the high and moderate hazard rankings for a number of elements (Table 3-4). The data are consistent with the generally high net acidities noted by Fitzpatrick *et al*. (2008), which varied from 7 up to 8,525 mol H^+/tonne, which means that the soils are likely to take considerable time to recover from drying and any associated local acidification.

Table 3-4 Summary of the degree of hazard associated with the measured contaminant and metalloid concentrations in the Ukee Boat Club wetland.

Degree of Hazard	Guideline Threshold	Metal/Metalloid
No Hazard	Value below ANZECC/ARMCANZ guideline threshold	Se
Low Hazard	Value exceeds ANZECC/ARMCANZ guideline threshold, but is less than 10x exceedance	As, Mn
Moderate Hazard	Value exceeds ANZECC/ARMCANZ guideline threshold by 10x or more, but is less than 100x exceedance	Cd, Cr, Cu, Ni, V
High Hazard	Value exceeds ANZECC/ARMCANZ guideline threshold by 100x or more	Al, Co, Fe, Zn

Note: Ag, Pb and Sb are below detection limits due to dilutions, and therefore are likely to be in the no hazard, low hazard or moderate hazard classification.

4. RISK ASSESSMENT

4.1. Risk assessment framework

Risk is a measure of both the consequences of a hazard occurring, and the likelihood of its occurrence (MDBA 2011). According to the National Environment Protection Measures (NEPM), risk is defined as "*the probability in a certain timeframe that an adverse outcome will occur in a person, a group of people, plants, animals and/or the ecology of a specified area that is exposed to a particular dose or concentration of a hazardous agent, i.e. it depends on both the level of toxicity of hazardous agent and the level of exposure*" (NEPC 1999).

The MDB Acid Sulfate Soils Risk Assessment Project developed a framework for determining risks to wetland values from acid sulfate soil hazards (MDBA 2011). The risk assessment framework has been applied in this study to determine the specific risks associated with acidification, contaminant mobilisation and de-oxygenation. In this risk assessment framework, a series of standardised tables are used to define and assess risk (MDBA 2011). The tables determine the consequence of a hazard occurring (Table 4-1), and a likelihood rating for the disturbance scenario for each hazard (Table 4-2). These two factors are then combined in a risk assessment matrix to determine the level of risk (Table 4-3).

Table 4-1 determines the level of consequence of a hazard occurring, ranging from insignificant to extreme, and primarily takes account of the environmental and water quality impacts, to the wetland values and/or adjacent waters.

Table 4-1 Standardised table used to determine the consequences of a hazard occurring, from MDBA (2011).

Descriptor	Definition
Extreme	Irreversible damage to wetland environmental values and/or adjacent waters; localised species extinction; permanent loss of drinking water (including stock and domestic) supplies.
Major	Long-term damage to wetland environmental values and/or adjacent waters; significant impacts on listed species; significant impacts on drinking water (including stock and domestic) supplies.
Moderate	Short-term damage to wetland environmental values and/or adjacent waters; short-term impacts on species and/or drinking water (including stock and domestic) supplies.
Minor	Localised short-term damage to wetland environmental values and/or adjacent waters; temporary loss of drinking water (including stock and domestic) supplies.
Insignificant	Negligible impact on wetland environmental values and/or adjacent waters; no detectable impacts on species.

Table 4-2 determines the likelihood (i.e. probability) of disturbance for each hazard, ranging from rare to almost certain. This requires an understanding of the nature and severity of the materials (including the extent of acid sulfate soils, the acid generating potential and the buffering capacity of wetland soil materials) as well as contributing factors influencing the risk (MDBA 2011). Examples of disturbance include: (i) rewetting of acid sulfate soil materials

after oxidation, (ii) acid sulfate soil materials that are currently inundated and may be oxidised, or (iii) acid sulfate soil materials that are currently inundated and may be dispersed by flushing (e.g. scouring flows) (MDBA 2011). As mentioned previously, the consequence of a hazard occurring and the likelihood rating for the disturbance scenario for each hazard are then ranked using a standardised risk assessment matrix (Table 4-3).

Table 4-2 Likelihood ratings for the disturbance scenario, from MDBA (2011).

Descriptor	Definition
Almost certain	Disturbance is expected to occur in most circumstances
Likely	Disturbance will probably occur in most circumstances
Possible	Disturbance might occur at some time
Unlikely	Disturbance could occur at some time
Rare	Disturbance may occur only in exceptional circumstances

Table 4-3 Risk assessment matrix, adapted from Standards Australia & Standards New Zealand (2004).

Likelihood category	Consequences category				
	Extreme	Major	Moderate	Minor	Insignificant
Almost certain	Very High	Very High	High	Medium	Low
Likely	Very High	High	Medium	Medium	Low
Possible	High	High	Medium	Low	Low
Unlikely	High	Medium	Medium	Low	Very low
Rare	High	Medium	Low	Very low	Very low

It is suggested that:

• For very high risk immediate action is recommended.

• For high risk senior management attention is probably needed.

• Where a medium risk is identified management action may be recommended.

• Where the risk is low or very low, routine condition monitoring is suggested.

These categories of management responses have been kept quite broad to acknowledge that jurisdictional authorities and wetland managers may choose to adopt different approaches in dealing with acid sulfate soils. The imprecise nature of these management responses is intended to provide flexibility in jurisdictional and wetland manager responses to the risk ratings associated with the acid sulfate soil hazards (MDBA 2011).

4.2. Assessment of risks

Realisation of the main risks associated with acid sulfate soil hazards (acidification, contaminant mobilisation and deoxygenation) is highly dependent on transport and therefore on the surface and sub-surface hydrology. The risks are thus scenario dependent, and difficult to quantify without predicted changes of water flows and inputs and hydrogeological controls.

The consequences of a hazard, as outlined in Table 4-1, relate to reversible or irreversible damage to wetland values. Few studies have documented in sufficient detail the short or long term damage to inland wetland ecosystems and values caused by acid sulfate soil hazards, but short term consequences have been clearly illustrated e.g. for water quality and ecosystem impacts (McCarthy *et al*. 2006; Shand *et al*. 2010). Irreversible damage is difficult to assess due to lack of sufficient data over longer timescales and lack of knowledge, for example, on sub-surface soil recovery and metal mobilisation impacts on benthic organisms. Nevertheless, the following sections detail the hazards and likelihood of a number of scenarios and discuss consequences based on limited previous work (e.g. McCarthy *et al*. 2006; Shand *et al*. 2010). The risks to soil water quality and surface water quality are necessarily different. The risks to soil water quality in terms of acidification and contaminant release are easier to assess from the tests carried out in this study than the risks posed to surface water quality. The impacts on surface water quality will be largely controlled by upward flux of acidity and metals from the soils and sediments into the water column. This will be controlled by *inter alia* surface water volume and groundwater connectivity and level, soil type, hydraulic conductivity, degree and depth of soil cracking.

The Ukee Boat Club wetland has been classified as medium conservation status by the SA Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board (Miles *et al*. 2010).

4.2.1. Risks associated with acidification

The high to very high net acidities in samples from Ukee Boat Club wetland indicate that the acidification hazard is high. Net acidities were very high in most samples and any original acid neutralising capacity (ANC), if present, was consumed during the oxidation process. The dominant component of the net acidity is titratable actual acidity (TAA), although both retained acidity and potential sulfidic acidity (S_{CR}) were significant.

The probability of soil acidification is very high as evidenced by the generally high positive net acidities in most samples studied in the wetland and the abundance of sulfuric materials. Due to the wetlands location adjacent to the river and connectivity, the likelihood of disturbance is considered **almost certain** as flows return to normal in the future. Due to the low hydraulic conductivities in the clayey soils in this wetland, it is unlikely that soil acidification will be mediated by high flows. The consequences are likely to be significant for soil ecology, but the timescale for soil recovery from acidification cannot be assessed with existing information. Studies in other wetlands e.g. Nelwart Lagoon (Shand *et al*. 2010) indicate that in areas with strongly acidic soils, the timescale is likely to be months to years. A **major** rating is therefore applied for consequence as long-term damage to soil water chemistry is considered likely. This provides a *risk rating for soil acidification* of **very high** (Table 4-4). A rating for surface water acidification will depend on surface and sub-surface hydrology. The highest risk (major consequence) is likely to be during low flows where the soil to water ratio is high: acidity will be most concentrated. The risk to surface water acidification is considered lowest (minor consequence) where high flows are available to both dilute acidity and transport acidity downwards in the soil profile. The *risk to surface water acidification* is therefore likely to vary from **medium to very high** (Table 4-4) depending on future scenarios.

4.2.2. Risks associated with contaminant mobilisation

The risks of metal and metalloid mobilisation are controlled primarily by metal abundance and availability, geochemical controls on speciation and transport mechanisms. The master variables pH and Eh exert a direct major influence on the solubility of individual metals and metalloids and minerals such as iron (Fe), iron (Fe) and manganese (Mn) oxides and hydroxides which are important sorbents of metal and metalloids species. The high acidification hazard due to the oxidation of sulfide minerals means that if metals and metalloids have been released they are likely to be mobile. Although reduction processes may lead to reincorporation of metals and metalloids into sulfide minerals (following sulfate reduction), at intermediate redox potentials mobility may be high where iron (Fe) and manganese (Mn) are soluble. The reactive metals and contaminant and metalloid dynamics results attest to the availability and mobility of a number of metals, particularly aluminium (Al), cadmium (Cd), cobalt (Co), iron (Fe), nickel (Ni) and zinc (Zn). At the concentrations measured (>10-100 x ANZECC/ARMCANZ environmental protection guidelines), the consequences are likely to be significant for soil pore-waters and soil/sediment ecology. As in assessing the acidification risk, the timescales cannot be assessed with existing information. However, comparisons with other studies (e.g. Nelwart Lagoon, Shand *et al*. 2011), soil recovery in such acidic systems is likely to mean that at least short term impacts are likely. Since pH remained low in soil samples from the middle of the wetland, a **major** rating is applied for consequence as short-term damage to soil ecology is considered likely. This provides a risk rating for contaminant mobilisation in soils of **very high** (Table 4-4).

A rating for surface water impacts from metals and metalloids will depend on surface and sub-surface hydrology. The consistently low pH values in this study, however, means that short term impacts are likely if hydrological conditions allow a flux of metals towards overlying surface water. The highest risk (major consequence) is likely to be during low flows where the soil to water ratio is high: metals will be most concentrated. The risk to surface water acidification is considered lowest (minor consequence) where high flows are available to both dilute metal and metalloid concentrations and transport these downwards in the soil profile. The risk is therefore likely to vary from **medium to very high** (Table 4-4) depending on future scenarios.

4.2.3. Risks associated with de-oxygenation

Monosulfidic materials are considered the main cause of deoxygenation risk in acid sulfate soils. Monosulfidic black ooze was not identified in the wetland during the Phase 1 survey (Fitzpatrick *et al*. 2008). Water soluble sulfate concentrations were not measured but are considered likely to be high. At the pH values observed, it is more likely that pyrite, rather than monosulfides will form. As there was no identified hazard associated with monosulfide formation the consequence is considered to be **insignificant** and therefore the risk associated with deoxygenation is **low** (Table 4-4).

Table 4-4 Summary of risks associated with acid sulfate soil materials in Ukee Boat Club wetland.

Acidification Risk		Contaminant mobilisation		Deoxygenation
Soil	*Water*	*Soil*	*Water*	
Very High	Medium-Very High	Very High	Medium-Very High	Low

5. BROAD ACID SULFATE SOIL MANAGEMENT OPTIONS

The options available for rehabilitation of inland waterways containing acid sulfate soils has recently been reviewed (Baldwin & Fraser 2009) and incorporated into the *National guidance on managing acid sulfate soils in inland aquatic ecosystems* (EPHC & NRMMC 2011; see Table 5-1). The national guidance document provides a hierarchy of management options for managing acid sulfate soils in inland aquatic ecosystems including:

1. *Minimising the formation of acid sulfate soils in inland aquatic ecosystems.*
2. *Preventing oxidation of acid sulfate soils, if they are already present in quantities of concern or controlled oxidation to remove acid sulfate soils if levels are a concern but the water and soil has adequate neutralising capacity.*
3. *Controlling or treating acidification if oxidation of acid sulfate soils does occur.*
4. *Protecting connected aquatic ecosystems/other parts of the environment if treatment of the directly affected aquatic ecosystem is not feasible.*
5. *Limited further intervention.*

In designing a management strategy for dealing with acid sulfate soils in affected inland wetlands, other values and uses of a wetland need to be taken into account to ensure that any intervention is compatible with other management plans and objectives for the wetland. The medium conservation status for this wetland suggests that the management responses required should align with those suggested following the risk assessment ratings (Table 4-3).

A number of options for treating acid sulfate soils in inland wetlands have been identified (see Table 5-1). By far the best option is not to allow acid sulfate soils to build up in the first instance. This requires removing the source of sulfate from the wetland, for example, by lowering saline water tables and/or introducing frequent wetting and drying cycles to the wetland so that the amount of sulfidic material that can build up in the sediments during wet phases is limited, hence reducing the likely environmental damage (acidification, metal release or deoxygenation) that would occur as a consequence of drying.

If acid sulfate soils have formed, prevention of oxidation, usually by keeping the sediments inundated to sufficient depth, is a potential strategy. If oxidation of acid sulfate soils occurs and the sediment and/or water column acidifies, neutralisation may be necessary.

The major risks identified in this study are due to soil and water acidification and contaminant mobilisation. The likelihood of water refilling the wetland is high as flows return to normal levels. The limited number of case studies on refilling wetlands makes prediction of risk difficult in terms of determining whether reversible or irreversible damage is likely to occur. However, short term risks from acid and contaminant mobilisation are likely if hydrological conditions are such that there is a significant flux of acidity and metals from the soils to the overlying water column.

As the wetland has previously dried and undergone oxidation, management options 1 and 2 in Table 5-1 are not relevant to the current study, although minimising further oxidation could have been an option prior to recent high flows down the River Murray. Treatment options currently remain a viable option should water quality impacts e.g. acidification of surface water and/or high metal concentrations be seen. Since the risks are scenario dependent, it is strongly recommended that surface water and soil pore-water monitoring be undertaken at this wetland. Based on the data from this study and elsewhere (Shand *et al*. 2010), it is likely that soil recovery will be slow.

The impacts on surface and sub-surface ecosystems are not well understood and are worthy of further work, particularly long term impacts on ecosystem functionality and diversity.

Table 5-1 Summary of management options and possible activities, from EPHC & NRMMC (2011).

Management Objective	Activities
1. Minimising the formation of acid sulfate soils in inland aquatic ecosystems	**Reduce secondary salinisation through:** • Lowering saline water tables • Maintaining the freshwater lens between saline groundwater and the aquatic ecosystem • Stopping the delivery of irrigation return water • Incorporating a more natural flow regime.
2. Preventing oxidation of acid sulfate soils or controlled oxidation to remove acid sulfate soils	**Preventing oxidation:** • Keep the sediments covered by water • Avoid flow regimes that could re-suspend sediments. **Controlled oxidation:** • Assess whether neutralising capacity of the sediments and water far exceeds the acidity produced by oxidation • Assess the risk of deoxygenation and metal release. Monitor intervention and have a contingency plan to ensure avoidance of these risks.
3. Controlling or treating acidification	• Neutralise water column and/or sediments by adding chemical ameliorants • Add organic matter to promote bioremediation by micro-organisms • Use stored alkalinity in the ecosystem.
4. Protecting adjacent or downstream environments if treatment of the affected aquatic ecosystem is not feasible	• Isolate the site • Neutralise and dilute surface water • Treat discharge waters by neutralisation or biological treatment.
5. Limited further intervention	• Assess risk • Communicate with stakeholders • Undertake monitoring • Assess responsibilities and obligations and take action as required.

REFERENCES

ANZECC/ARMCANZ 2000 *Australian and New Zealand Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality,* Australian and New Zealand Environment and Conservation Council and agriculture and Resource Management Council of Australia and New Zealand, Canberra.

APHA 2005 Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater (21st Ed.). (American Public Health Association - American Water Works Association: Baltimore, USA).

Baldwin D & Fraser M 2009 Rehabilitation options for inland waterways impacted by sulfidic sediments. *Journal of Environmental Management* 91:311–319.

Claff SR, Sullivan LA, Burton ED & Bush RT 2010 A sequential extraction procedure for acid sulfate soils: Partitioning of iron. *Geoderma* **155**, 224-230.

Cline ID 1969 Spectrophotometric determination of hydrogen sulfide in natural waters. *Limnology and Oceanography* **14**, 454-458.

EPHC & NRMMC (Environment Protection and Heritage Council and Natural Resource Management Ministerial Council) 2011 National Guidance for the management of acid sulfate soils in inland aquatic ecosystems, Canberra, ACT.

Fitzpatrick RW, Shand P, Thomas M, Grealish G, McClure S, Merry RH & Baker A 2010 Acid Sulfate Soil investigations of vertical and lateral changes with time in five managed wetlands between Lock 1 and Wellington. CSIRO Land and Water Science Report 03/10.

Fitzpatrick RW, Shand P, Thomas M, Merry RH, Raven MD & Simpson S 2008 Acid sulfate soils in subaqueous, waterlogged and drained soil environments of nine wetlands below Blanchetown (Lock 1), South Australia: properties, genesis, risks and management. CSIRO Land and Water Science Report 42/08.

Gooddy DC, Shand P, Kinniburgh DG & Van Riemsdijk WH 1995 Field-based partition coefficients for trace elements in soil solutions. *Journal of Soil Science*, 46, 265-285.

Grealish G, Fitzpatrick RW & Shand P 2011 Assessment of Acid Sulfate Soil Materials in the Lock 1 to Wellington Region of the Murray-Darling Basin. CSIRO: Water for a Healthy Country National Research Flagship.

Grealish G, Shand P, Grocke S, Baker A, Fitzpatrick R & Hicks W 2010 Assessment of Acid Sulfate Soil Materials in Lock 1 to Lock 5 Region of the Murray-Darling Basin. CSIRO: Water for a Healthy Country National Research Flagship. 769 pp.

McCarthy B, Conalin A, D'Santos P & Baldwin DS 2006 Acidification, salinisation and fish kills at an inland wetland in south-eastern Australia following partial drying. Ecological Management and Restoration, vol. 7, pp. 218–23.

McGuire MM & Hamers RJ 2000 Extraction and quantitative analysis of elemental sulfur from sulfide mineral surfaces by high-performance liquid chromatography. *Environmental Science & Technology* **34**, 4651-4655.

MDBA 2010 Detailed Assessment of Acid Sulfate Soils in the Murray–Darling Basin: Protocols for sampling, field characterisation, laboratory analysis and data presentation. MDBA Publication No. 57/10, 58 pp.

MDBA 2011 Acid sulfate soils in the Murray–Darling Basin, Murray–Darling Basin Authority, Canberra. MDBA Publication No. 147/11.

Miles M, Wainwright P, Gonzalez D, Turner R, Frankiewicz D & Jones L 2010 Application of the South Australian River Murray wetland prioritisation methodology, Department for Environment and Heritage, Adelaide.

NEPC 1999 National environment protection (assessment of site contamination) measure 1999. National Environment Protection Council.

Shand P, Merry R, Grocke S, Thomas M, Fitzpatrick RW, Thomas B, Baker A & Creeper N 2010 Water and soil quality impacts during reflooding of Nelwart Lagoon, South Australia. CSIRO: Water for a Healthy Country National Research Flagship. 158 pp.

Standards Australia & Standards New Zealand 2004, HB 436: 2004, Risk Management, Sydney, NSW

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 REACTIVE METALS DATA

Ukee Boat Club wetland

Sample	Depth	Analysis	Ag*	Al	As	Cd*	Co	Cr*	Cu	Fe	Mn	Ni	Pb	Sb*	Se*	V	Zn
UKE 3.3	1-8	a	2.7	1051	0.98	65	6.6	531	9.5	2966	59	11	0.48	< 10	55	16	20
		b	2.6	1018	0.94	65	6.4	525	9.5	2915	57	10	0.45	< 10	56	16	20
UKE 3.4	8-12	a	5.1	355	0.66	32	1.9	83	2.6	712	41	4.3	3.3	< 13	41	5.5	3.2
		b	5.3	359	0.80	35	2.1	89	2.9	770	44	4.9	3.7	< 13	48	6.5	3.6
UKE 5.2	0.5-10	a	9.3	373	0.79	20	2.8	187	4.6	1839	60	5.0	0.42	< 10	40	8.1	8.1
		b	9.8	349	0.83	18	2.7	192	4.7	1839	55	4.7	0.45	< 10	43	8.0	7.7
UKE 5.3	10-30	a	6.8	454	0.96	33	1.7	47	2.3	842	50	5.4	1.9	< 14	57	8.8	3.1
		b	7.0	414	1.0	35	1.6	44	2.6	778	54	5.1	2.1	< 14	53	8.8	3.2
UKE 6.1	0-5	a	4.1	1302	1.0	82	9.5	390	6.5	1868	86	17	0.10	< 11	103	12	19
		b	4.3	1335	1.1	83	9.9	401	6.7	1850	87	17	0.11	< 11	113	12	20
UKE 6.2	5-20	a	8.6	840	1.1	68	4.1	247	4.5	2739	68	9.8	5.8	< 17	84	10	5.9
		b	8.3	849	1.1	65	4.1	247	4.4	2733	67	10	5.6	< 17	90	9.6	5.4

Units are in mg kg^{-1} unless indicated otherwise as below

* Units are in µg kg^{-1}

< value is below detection limit*

APPENDIX 2 CONTAMINANT AND METALLOID DYNAMICS DATA

Ukee Boat Club wetland

Sample	Day	Depth cm	Analysis	Eh mV	EC µS/cm	pH	Ag µg/L	Al mg/L	As µg/L	Cd µg/L	Co µg/L	Cr µg/L	Cu µg/L	Fe mg/L	Mn µg/L	Ni µg/L	Pb µg/L	Sb µg/L	Se µg/L	V µg/L	Zn µg/L
UKE 3.3	1	1-8	a	405	2026	2.87	<0.1	29	3.3	2.8	262	18	66	32	3080	377	<6	<10	0.64	267	720
			b	410	2085	2.87	<0.1	29	5.7	2.4	276	19	81	31	3336	400	<6	<10	0.54	276	768
	7		a	300	2338	3.18	<0.5	31	<5	4.0	344	16	20	200	4195	480	<10	<50	<2	160	820
			b	275	2497	3.21	<0.5	32	5.0	4.0	363	16	20	208	4535	512	<10	<50	<2	170	840
	14		a	170	2440	3.48	<0.1	27	40	2.0	396	20	<20	253	5163	544	<20	<30	<2	170	980
			b	135	2473	3.48	<0.1	26	40	2.0	391	20	<20	238	5049	520	<20	<30	<2	170	980
	35		a	-60	2280	4.26	<0.05	6.2	<20	0.66	274	8.1	<10	336	3867	291	<20	<100	3.5	44	22
			b	-35	2150	4.19	<0.05	13	<20	0.75	266	11	<10	302	3441	322	<20	<100	2.2	74	473
UKE 3.4	1	8-12	a	355	810	4.06	<0.05	0.51	<1	0.50	35	<2	9.8	<0.1	1107	55	<3	<5	0.12	<2	28
			b	345	697	4.13	<0.05	0.42	1.3	0.48	31	<2	7.2	<0.1	1010	50	<3	<5	0.12	<2	24
	7		a	320	534	4.25	<0.02	0.15	<0.2	0.36	31	0.20	0.80	<0.1	938	45	<0.4	<2	<0.08	<0.4	19
			b	325	523	4.53	<0.02	<0.05	<0.2	0.24	22	0.20	<0.4	<0.1	1000	35	<0.4	<2	<0.08	<0.4	14
	14		a	195	722	4.41	<0.01	0.12	<1	0.40	37	<1	<2	0.09	1397	50	<2	<3	<0.2	<0.5	28
			b	250	757	4.10	<0.01	0.26	<0.4	0.48	44	<0.4	1.6	0.26	1238	68	0.80	<1	<0.06	<0.2	44
	35		a	65	292	9.06	<0.01	<0.05	<0.6	0.15	20	0.22	0.78	0.11	720	21	<0.8	<4	0.12	<0.1	16
			b	180	305	9.09	<0.01	0.06	<0.6	0.19	31	0.43	3.0	1.0	796	34	<0.8	<4	0.10	0.13	49
UKE 5.2	1	0.5-10	a	375	1367	3.32	<0.1	2.7	<2	<0.3	60	<3	20	7.7	1943	64	<6	<10	0.43	15	181
			b	370	1477	3.34	<0.1	2.2	<2	<0.3	65	3.4	14	6.3	2230	64	<6	<10	0.35	22	207
	7		a	270	1613	3.59	<0.1	2.9	5.0	0.60	89	7.0	8.0	92	2630	114	<2	<10	<0.4	30	264
			b	240	1660	3.60	<0.1	3.1	6.0	0.30	96	8.4	4.0	96	2830	124	<2	<10	0.40	34	228
	14		a	90	1856	4.24	<0.02	2.0	28	0.40	103	10.0	<4	148	3157	130	<4	<6	0.90	41	255
			b	75	1840	4.22	<0.02	2.1	24	0.40	109	10.0	<4	131	3408	136	<4	<6	0.90	40	258
	35		a	-205	698	4.97	<0.01	0.86	17	0.14	28	16	<2	121	1090	24	<4	<20	2.4	43	<3
			b	-185	345	5.25	<0.01	0.32	16	0.10	16	11	<2	95	527	27	<4	<20	2.5	37	3.6
UKE 5.3	1	10-30	a	260	197	7.07	<0.01	0.18	1.1	<0.03	0.17	<0.3	1.3	0.18	2.9	<1	<0.6	<1	0.30	7.5	1.4
			b	245	148	6.01	<0.01	0.28	1.4	<0.03	0.28	<0.3	1.9	0.31	4.0	<1	<0.6	<1	0.28	9.7	2.2
	7		a	210	110	5.65	<0.4	16	<4	<1	1.6	6.0	<8	9.6	16	3.0	<8	<40	<2	<8	<20
			b	205	101	5.86	<0.4	15	<4	<1	2.4	9.0	<8	9.3	20	6.0	<8	<40	<2	16	<20
	14		a	85	206	6.60	<0.01	1.2	3.0	<0.1	1.9	<1	4.0	0.93	26	5.2	<2	<3	0.20	25	10.0
			b	95	187	6.21	<0.01	1.3	2.0	<0.1	1.3	<1	2.0	1.1	20	4.0	<2	<3	<0.2	25	8.0
	35		a	-150	105	9.63	<0.01	0.36	<2	<0.05	0.41	<0.5	1.7	0.29	6.1	2.0	<2	<10	0.49	12	3.3
			b	-140	108	9.35	<0.01	0.55	<2	0.06	0.87	<0.5	2.8	0.41	17	3.3	<2	<10	0.46	14	6.8
UKE 6.1	1	0-5	a	415	2136	3.05	<0.2	37	7.5	3.3	380	9.9	32	14	4436	559	<10	<20	0.46	75	721
			b	420	2045	3.12	<0.2	30	5.4	2.5	331	10	<20	12	3953	479	<10	<20	0.48	61	678
	7		a	285	2280	3.34	<0.5	28	5.0	4.0	355	12	20	138	4085	556	<10	<50	<2	50	660
			b	260	2620	3.40	<0.5	31	10.0	4.0	406	16	20	158	4505	672	<10	<50	<2	60	760

Sample	Day	Depth cm	Analysis	Eh mV	EC µS/cm	pH	Ag µg/L	Al mg/L	As µg/L	Cd µg/L	Co µg/L	Cr µg/L	Cu µg/L	Fe mg/L	Mn µg/L	Ni µg/L	Pb µg/L	Sb µg/L	Se µg/L	V µg/L	Zn µg/L
	14		a	110	2610	3.74	<0.1	24	30	3.0	474	10.0	<20	291	5754	720	<20	<30	<2	75	920
			b	105	2930	3.83	<0.1	25	30	3.0	509	20	<20	322	6129	768	<20	<30	<2	70	980
	35		a	-135	894	4.29	<0.05	3.6	<20	0.50	260	6.5	<10	289	3391	281	<20	<100	1.4	20	167
			b	-110	2270	4.37	<0.05	13	<20	0.86	330	10.0	<10	356	3740	388	<20	<100	1.2	35	367
UKE 6.2	1	5-20	a	485	905	3.32	<0.05	7.4	3.0	1.4	97	<2	10	1.3	1852	195	8.5	<5	0.35	<2	103
			b	480	893	3.31	<0.05	6.6	2.4	1.4	100	<2	9.2	0.86	2037	205	8.5	<5	0.20	<2	104
	7		a	490	1062	3.33	<0.1	5.9	<1	1.5	100	1.4	12	12	1914	193	<2	<10	<0.4	<2	180
			b	500	921	3.34	<0.1	5.0	<1	1.5	98	1.4	12	8.6	1761	196	2.0	<10	<0.4	<2	196
	14		a	415	901	3.40	<0.02	3.9	<2	1.4	100	<2	12	24	1887	189	<4	<6	<0.3	<0.9	234
			b	420	1046	3.40	<0.03	5.2	<3	1.5	126	<3	12	32	2506	230	<6	<9	<0.5	<1	260
	35		a	325	859	3.13	<0.01	3.7	13	1.3	106	1.9	6.6	90	2069	171	<4	<20	0.62	4.1	234
			b	340	816	3.43	<0.01	2.6	9.5	1.1	101	1.7	6.9	69	1841	156	<4	<20	0.28	3.1	254

< value is below detection limit

APPENDIX 3 X-RAY DIFFRACTION DATA

Sample ID: UKE 3.1



File Name: c:\...\xpert data\2327_p_shand_salts\32581.xpt

Sample ID: UKE 5.1



File Name: c:\...\xpert data\2327_p_shand_salts\32582.xpt

Sample ID: UKE 6.1



File Name: c:\...\xpert data\2327_p_shand_salts\32583.xpt

Sample ID: UKE 6.4



File Name: c:\...\xpert data\2327_p_shand_salts\32584.xpt

Contact Us
Phone: 1300 363 400
+61 3 9545 2176
Email: enquiries@csiro.au
Web: www.csiro.au

Your CSIRO

Australia is founding its future on science and innovation. Its national science agency, CSIRO, is a powerhouse of ideas, technologies and skills for building prosperity, growth, health and sustainability. It serves governments, industries, business and communities across the nation.