

Quantifying Catchment Sediment Yields in Auckland

September 2013

Technical Report 2013/042

Auckland Council Technical report, TR2013/042 ISSN 2230-4525 (Print) ISSN 2230-4533 (Online)

ISBN 978-1-927266-20-5 (Print) ISBN 978-1-927266-21-2 (PDF) This report has been peer reviewed by the Peer Review Panel using the Panel's terms of reference

Submitted for review on 24 July 2013

Review completed on 10 September 2013

Reviewed by two reviewers

Approved for Auckland Council publication by:

Name: Greg Holland

Position: Manager, Research, Investigations and Monitoring Unit

Date: 10 September 2013

Recommended citation:

Curran-Cournane F, Holwerda N, Mitchell F (2013). Quantifying catchment sediment yields in Auckland. Auckland Council technical report, TR2013/042

© 2013 Auckland Council

This publication is provided strictly subject to Auckland Council's copyright and other intellectual property rights (if any) in the publication. Users of the publication may only access, reproduce and use the publication, in a secure digital medium or hard copy, for responsible genuine non-commercial purposes relating to personal, public service or educational purposes, provided that the publication is only ever accurately reproduced and proper attribution of its source, publication date and authorship is attached to any use or reproduction. This publication must not be used in any way for any commercial purpose without the prior written consent of Auckland Council. Auckland Council does not give any warranty whatsoever, including without limitation, as to the availability, accuracy, completeness, currency or reliability of the information or data (including third party data) made available via the publication and expressly disclaim (to the maximum extent permitted in law) all liability for any damage or loss resulting from your use of, or reliance on the publication or the information and data provided via the publication. The publication, information, and data contained within it are provided on an "as is" basis.

Quantifying catchment sediment yields in Auckland

Dr Fiona Curran-Cournane Nicholas Holwerda Francess Mitchell

Research, Investigations and Monitoring Unit Auckland Council

Executive Summary

The Auckland region has many significant marine estuaries and harbours. These have great recreational, cultural, seafood harvesting and aesthetic values. They also support a wide variety of marine organisms and bird life. Loss of sediment from land to water increases turbidity which adversely affects the activity and diversity of many biota. An increase in sediment delivery to water bodies also has the potential to disrupt primary production. Sediment is also a vector for other pollutants such as phosphorus and heavy metals.

A key state of the environment (SoE) requirement is to report sediment yield, with sediment monitoring being conducted across the Auckland region. Sediment monitoring was officially adopted by Auckland Council in and around 2009. This study reports sediment yield (t) and specific sediment yields (SSY, t/km²/yr) for ten sediment monitored catchments across Auckland.

The table below is a summary of specific sediment yields recorded at the ten catchments in Auckland for sampled events and using the sediment event yield (kg) vs Qpeak (I/s) rating for missing events. Specific sediment yield was sensitive to large infrequent storm events particularly for catchments with short spanning sediment records.

| Site (dominant land cover) | Specific sediment yield (t/km ² /yr) | Length of sediment record (yrs) |
|------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|
| Awanohi (indigenous forest) | 48.3 | 4 |
| Hoteo (pasture) | 74.3 | 2.6 |
| Kaipara (pasture) | 32.3 | 1 |
| Kaukapakapa (pasture) | 75.8 | 2.6 |
| Mangemangeroa (pasture) | 167.0 | 1 |
| Orewa (pasture) | 80.0 | 3.5 |
| Vaughan (pasture) | 45.8 | 9.6 |
| Wairoa (pasture) | 47.4 | 2.6 |
| Weiti (plantation forest) | 32.1 | 4.7 |
| West Hoe (indigenous forest) | 26.3 | 1 |

Excluding the sites with only one year of record, the SSY range across catchments (32-80 t/km²/yr) was relatively tight. The SSY reported for sites in the current study were similar in range, if not at the lower end, to recently reported Waikato yields which mostly fell within the 40-100 t/km²/yr range.

It is recommended that future work explores an empirical model for predicting sediment yield within the Auckland region so that yields from unmonitored catchments can be estimated. Sediment yield analyses from previous studies in Auckland, Waikato and Northland can potentially be pooled together to locally calibrate the chosen model.

Several considerations and approaches to measure the Auckland Plan target, which is to reduce sediment yields from 2012 levels by 15% by 2040, have been discussed. It is recommended that future work concentrate on the approach used to measure change when sediment data becomes more refined

and reliable for all sites over time. This will provide an improved measure of annual variability and so will inform on an appropriate averaging period.

Contents

| Execu | utive Summary | iv | | | | | | |
|-------|---|----|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1.0 | Introduction 1 | | | | | | | |
| 2.0 | Background | 2 | | | | | | |
| 3.0 | Materials and methods | 3 | | | | | | |
| 3.1 | Data collected for sediment yield analysis | 3 | | | | | | |
| 3 | .1.1 Automatic sampling | 3 | | | | | | |
| 3 | .1.2 Suspended sediment laboratory methods | 3 | | | | | | |
| 3 | .1.3 Sediment rating | 4 | | | | | | |
| 3.2 | Catchment characteristics | 7 | | | | | | |
| 4.0 | Results for individual catchments | 11 | | | | | | |
| 4.1 | Awanohi | 11 | | | | | | |
| 4.2 | Hoteo | 15 | | | | | | |
| 4.3 | Kaipara | 18 | | | | | | |
| 4.4 | Kaukapakapa | 20 | | | | | | |
| 4.5 | Mangemangeroa | 23 | | | | | | |
| 4.6 | Orewa | 25 | | | | | | |
| 4.7 | Vaughan | 28 | | | | | | |
| 4.8 | Wairoa | 33 | | | | | | |
| 4.9 | Weiti | 36 | | | | | | |
| 4.10 | 0 West Hoe | 39 | | | | | | |
| 5.0 | Discussion | 41 | | | | | | |
| 5.1 | Sediment yield comparisons between current sites and wider studies | 41 | | | | | | |
| 5.2 | Sediment modelling considerations | 45 | | | | | | |
| 5.3 | Auckland Plan target | 46 | | | | | | |
| 6.0 | Conclusion | 49 | | | | | | |
| 7.0 | Acknowledgements | 50 | | | | | | |
| 8.0 | References | 51 | | | | | | |
| 9.0 | Appendices | 54 | | | | | | |
| 9.1 | Appendix A: Schematic example of hydrograph | 54 | | | | | | |
| 9.2 | Appendix B: SSC and TSS background for individual sites | 55 | | | | | | |
| 9.3 | Appendix C: Gauging results including Cmean/Cpoint values for the various sites | 55 | | | | | | |
| 9.4 | Appendix D: Event sediment yield ratings for individual sites | 56 | | | | | | |
| 9.5 | Appendix E: Return period distributions | 61 | | | | | | |

1.0 Introduction

The Auckland region has many significant marine estuaries and harbours. These have great recreational, cultural, seafood harvesting and aesthetic values. They also support a wide variety of marine organisms and bird life. The Auckland public put great value on these marine environments and there is concern that the delivery of sediment to both marine and freshwater receiving water bodies degrades such systems. Loss of sediment from land to water increases turbidity, which adversely affect the activity and diversity of many biota (Bilotta and Brazier 2008; 2010). An increase in sediment delivery to water bodies also has the potential to disrupt primary production. Sediment is also a vector for other pollutants such as phosphorus (Haygarth *et al.* 2006), heavy metals and PAHs (Mills *et al.* 2012).

A key state of the environment (SoE) requirement is to report sediment yield, with sediment monitoring being conducted across the Auckland region. A scientifically robust and defensible sediment monitoring plan was designed for Auckland Council in 2009 that is spatially representative and stratified by geology, climate and land cover (Hicks *et al.* 2009a). A subsequent sediment monitoring methods report for Auckland Council was released in 2011 to ensure accurate sediment monitoring in Auckland (Hicks 2011).

Ten catchments have been selected for sediment monitoring purposes across Auckland (Figure 1) that meet these latter reports' objectives. These ten catchments include Okura at Awanohi (hereafter referred to as Awanohi), Hoteo at Gubbs (Hoteo), Kaipara at Waimauku (Kaipara), Kaukapakapa at Taylors (Kaukapakaka), Mangemangeroa at Craigs (Mangemangeroa), Orewa at Kowhai Ave (Orewa), Vaughan at Lower Weir (Vaughan), Wairoa at Tourist Road (Wairoa), Okura at Weiti forest (Weiti) and West Hoe at Hall Farm (West Hoe) (Figure 1 and Table 1).

The objectives of the study are to report results to date (up to 31 December 2012) for:

- determining and reporting each of the sites' dominant characteristics;
- the analyses of sediment yields for ten sediment monitoring catchment sites for the period since the site was first established;
- comparing specific sediment yields;
- sediment modelling considerations;
- considerations and approaches to measure the Auckland Plan target which is to reduce sediment yields from 2012 levels by 15% by 2040.

2.0 Background

A sampling programme for sediment monitoring has been designed that is regionally representative and stratified by geology, climate and land cover (Hicks *et al.* 2009a). Sites for sediment monitoring have been selected on the basis of the latter, and the duration that the site is monitored depends on the number of events sampled and the site type. Typically, this could take between 2-10 years depending on the site. Reference sites are established for long term monitoring to determine background yields, those uninfluenced by anthropogenic activity. There are four types of sites for various monitoring purposes:

- Calibration/baseline requires relatively uniform catchment land use; small catchments; short term duration; monitoring event sediment yields. Kaukapakapa is the only calibration site. While the Kaukapakapa site is a relatively large site (62km²⁾, it was suggested as a priority calibration site in the sediment monitoring plan (Hicks *et al.* 2009a) by virtue of its Northland Allochthon terrane to provide broader lithological variation for the region.
- Validation requires large catchments; medium term duration; annual and mean annual data. These sites currently have sediment management schemes in place, and/or deliver sediment to sensitive coastal environments. Validation sites include Hoteo, Kaipara, Mangemangeroa, Orewa, Vaughan and Wairoa.
- Reference requires catchments that are relatively pristine and are expected to remain so, with no significant development or land use change planned; uniform lithology and land cover; ongoing sediment yield monitoring. West Hoe is the only reference site which was recently established in 2012.
- Compliance requires typically small catchments subject to development or activity requiring resource consent/ permitted activity, often with mitigation measures in place (such as sediment retention ponds). Awanohi and Weiti are categorised as compliance sites.

The basis for developing the regional picture would be a spatially-distributed sediment yield model that would be responsive to rainfall, land cover and erosion treatment measures. Monitoring is undertaken to service a sediment yield model and its predictions in time. It is proposed that monitoring is split between tactical (short term monitoring at small uniform catchments focusing on filling gaps in current land use-lithology knowledge) and strategic objectives (long-term monitoring at key receiving environments and measuring sediment yields from larger mixed use catchments). The calibration and validation sites are selected to provide calibration and validation data for the intended sediment regional yield model. The calibration sites will also provide baseline data for catchments and the latter validate the effectiveness of sediment management policies.

3.0 Materials and methods

3.1 Data collected for sediment yield analysis

3.1.1 Automatic sampling

Automatic water samplers (ISCO model 3700s) are set up at each site. These samplers operate in a flow-proportional manner, triggered during storm events to collect one sample per bottle or to composite eight sub-samples per bottle (24 bottles in an ISCO sampler). The latter is known as 'composite sampling' and allows greater resolution through storm events. Except for the Hoteo, Weiti and West Hoe catchments, all sites are set up to collect composite samples. The trigger is set to capture sediment yield during storm events, when the bulk of suspended sediment is generated (Basher *et al.* 2011). The trigger is site specific and is based on winter thresholds. For the purposes of this report, an event has been defined as a storm event whereby the flow reaches the trigger level and triggers the ISCO to automatically sample suspended sediment. Once triggered, an ISCO is set up to sample based on a certain volume of flow accumulation, with more regular samples occurring at the peak of the event when the flow is greater and flow accumulation is quicker. When the flow or water level drops below the trigger the ISCO stops sampling which marks the end of the event. This process is automated and run by the datalogger on site. The Research, Investigations and Monitoring Unit (RIMU) staff can remotely monitor this through RIMU's in-house telemetry system. The amount of flow between samples also varies depending on the site and is set so the whole event will be well sampled (Appendix A).

3.1.2 Suspended sediment laboratory methods

The sediment samples are sent to an ISO (International Organisation for Standardisation) accredited laboratory for analysis, allowing reliable quality control on data. Samples are analysed for Total Suspended Sediment (TSS) (APHA 2005 2540 D, E Method) and Suspended Sediment Concentration (SSC) (APHA 2005 2540 D Method).

The total suspended sediment (TSS) laboratory method was originally used to quantify sediment concentration from samples collected from catchments in Auckland. Briefly, this involved stirring and pipetting a shaken sub-sample from the original sample and passing it through a glass-fibre filter. While this sub-sample represents a surrogate for the larger sample and is a commonly practiced laboratory method, it can under estimate coarser particles that quickly settle out of suspension and do not get captured in the pipette. It therefore potentially under- (or over-) estimates the true suspended sediment concentrations (SSC) of the full sample depending on the sediment size grade (Guo 2006). Consequently, in 2012 all sites, except for the Hoteo, were converted to analyse for suspended sediment concentration (SSC) whereby the whole sample is shaken and used. A second auto sampler was installed at the Hoteo site in September 2012 to analyse SSC but for the purposes of this report TSS will

only be reported for this site. Furthermore, while both SSC and TSS is being analysed at the West Hoe site, a TSS and turbidity relationship was used to develop the site's rating which will be discussed in more detail in the next section. A TSS and SSC relationship was developed for sites to covert previous TSS data to SSC data (Appendix B).

Manual sediment gaugings are undertaken at sites during storm events to determine how representative the bank-side concentration sampled by the ISCO auto samplers is of the cross-section mean sediment concentration, i.e. Cmean/Cpoint. If Cmean/Cpoint=1, it infers good mixing. The sediment gaugings are used to calculate the Cmean/Cpoint ratio which is subsequently used to correct the SSC value from the laboratory (Appendix C). More gaugings better refine the factorial standard error of the estimate of the relationship, and an acceptable value is generally a factor of 1.25 (Hicks 2011). For the purposes of this report, SSC data has not been corrected using the Cmean/Cpoint relation because of too few gaugings to date. Thus the assumption is that Cmean/Cpoint = 1.

3.1.3 Sediment rating

A sediment rating was developed for each site to correct for gaps in the auto-sampled record. These gaps appear for various reasons including when a sampler runs out of bottles or may malfunction. These gaps have been filled using event yield vs peak discharge ratings. This requires the yield from the unsampled event to be estimated using a rating based on data from identified well-developed/sampled events. Individual storm events were assessed to determine whether they were well sampled by examining their hydrographs using the continuous water level data collected by RIMU, managed in accordance with ISO 9001, and stored in RIMU's HYDSTRA Time-series Database. When the bottles were sampled over the majority of the quickflow portion of the event, the event was then deemed to be well sampled. Quickflow is the fast moving discharge that flows through a catchment during a storm event. We also used the split between the baseflow and quickflow portion of the hydrograph to determine if an event had single or multiple peaks. Single peak events were primarily used for the rating while both single and multi-peak events were used to calculate total yield per event.

Ratings for each site appear in Appendix D. All sites have been calculated using this method except for:

- West Hoe: whereby a TSS and turbidity relationship was developed due to the poor number of samples. Although SSC is also being analysed for the site, the rating appeared more sensible using this relationship than the SSC- turbidity rating. The SSC data will be used in time once more events are captured and the site becomes better established.
- Weiti: whereby prior to 03/2012 a rating between event yield and event runoff was utilized (Hoyle 2012).

Errors in the rating-derived event yields were based on the standard error of the estimate of the ratings.

The error in the yield induced by this event-infilling is accumulated over the record period by the rootsum-square approach. This gives the error in tonnes for the total yield over all events (t). Dividing this by the total estimated yield (t) gives an overall % error. The % estimate error in rating-estimated yield is presented for each site in Appendix D.



Figure 1. Distribution of the ten sediment monitoring catchment sites across Auckland. Yellow circles indicate the exact location of the sediment stations per site.

Table 1. Site name, number and coordinates.

| Site name | Site number | NZTM Easting | NZTM Northing |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| Okura at Awanohi | 7502 | 1751391 | 5938700 |
| Hoteo at Gubbs | 45703 | 1735424 | 5972357 |
| Kaipara at Waimauku | 45311 | 1733345 | 5930348 |
| Kaukapakapa at Taylors | 45415 | 1735809 | 5945031 |
| Mangemangeroa at Craigs | 8304 | 1772261 | 5910514 |
| Orewa at Kowhai Ave | 7202 | 1748295 | 5948502 |
| Vaughan at Lower Weir | 7506 | 1755422 | 5938731 |
| Wairoa at Tourist Road | 8516 | 1782663 | 5901676 |
| Okura at Weiti Forest | 7505 | 1751872 | 5940969 |
| West Hoe at Hall Farm | 7206 | 1748302 | 5950580 |

3.2 Catchment characteristics

ArcGIS software was used to calculate catchment area and boundary, and was also used to determine the catchments' dominant characteristics including land cover, slope (Table 2), geology and Soil Order. Briefly, a union was created for catchment boundary against land cover, slope, geology and soil layers which was then dissolved and geometry calculated for the given catchment (Table 3). Mean annual rainfall (Figure 2 and Table 3) and runoff data (Table 3) were extracted from telemetered hydrological monitoring stations set up across the region and information determined for corresponding sites. As per Hicks (2009b), mean annual runoff was calculated based on mean annual discharge over the period of the flow record, divided by the catchment area and multiplied by the number of seconds in a year. This is then multiplied by 1000 to give runoff in mm/yr. A summary of the dominant site specific characteristics is presented in Table 3.



Figure 2. Mean annual rainfall (mm) patterns across the Auckland region (data generated from over 60 rainfall sites using RIMU automatic rain gauge network, Metservice and Watercare Laboratory Services datasets).

Soil Order, slope and land cover information were determined from the appropriate layers in the Land Resource Inventory (LRI) (NZLRI 2010a; b; c). Soil Order is the most generalised level of soil classification, and there are a total of 15 Soil Orders in New Zealand (Hewitt 1998). Soil Orders can be broken down further into 73 groups and 272 sub groups demonstrating the diversity of soils that can stem from Soil Order. According to the Fundamental Soil Layer (FSL), Ultic soils are the most dominant Soil Order in Auckland representing about 38-40% total area following by Granular soil representing 17% of total area. Geology data was sourced from GNS.

The land cover database version 3 (LCDBv3), which is based on 2008 aerial photography, was used to derive surrounding land cover information and data for each site.

Slope is broken into seven groups and is summarised in Table 2. More site specific soil, slope and land cover detail is described for individual sites in the results section and in Figures 13 and 14.

Table 2. Slope description adapted from Lynn et al (2009).

| Slope group | Slope | Description |
|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| A | 0-3degree | Flat to gently undulating |
| В | 4-7 degree | Undulating |
| С | 8-15degree | Rolling |
| D | 16-20degree | Strongly rolling |
| E | 21-25degree | Moderately steep |
| F | 26-35degree | Steep |
| G | >35 degree | Very Steep |

Table 3. Summary of catchment characteristics.

| Characteristic | Site name | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|------------------------|---|---|--|---|---------------------------|
| | Awanohi | Hoteo | Kaipara | Kaukapakapa | Mangemangeroa | Orewa | Vaughan | Wairoa | Weiti | West Hoe |
| Catchment size (km ²) | 5.5 | 268 | 163 | 62 | 4.5 | 9.7 | 2.3 | 114 | 1.7 | 0.5 |
| Geology | Waitemata (75%) Mudstone (22%) Limestone (2%) Alluvium (1%) | Waitemata (77%) Mudstone (8%) Alluvium (8%) Limestone (6%) Greywacke (<1%) | Waitemata (45%) Alluvium (34%) Sand/sand dune 10% Conglomerate (9%) Mudstone (2%) | Mudstone (33%) Waitemata (25%) Alluvium (23%) Conglomerate (16%) Limestone (3%) | Waitemata (100%) | Mudstone (50%) Waitemata (26%) Alluvium (23%) Limestone (1%) | Waitemata (97%) Limestone (3%) | Greywacke (58%) Waitemata (33%) Alluvium (6%) Mudstone (2%) | Mudstone (51%) Limestone (42%) Waitemata (4%) Greywacke (3%) | Waitemata (100%) |
| Land cover Indigenous | 60% | 21% | 10% | 13% | 37% | 14% | 27% | 23% | 2% | 07% |
| vegetation Pasture Exotic vegetation | 33% 7% | 56% 23% | 60% 23% | 80% 6% | 56% 6% | 83% 3% | 61% 6% | 63% 14% | 13% 84% | 3% |
| Other | | <0.5% | 1% | 1% | <2% | <1% | 6% | | | |
| Soil Order ² (most dominant) | Ultic (97%) Gley (3%) | Ultic (75%) Recent (16%) | Ultic (43%) Allophanic (25%) | Ultic (74%) Allophanic (13%) | Ultic (100%) | Ultic (89%) Gley (11%) | Ultic (90%) Organic (8%) | Granular (36%) Ultic (28%) | Ultic (100%) | Ultic (100%) |
| Slope³ (most dominant) | Moderately steep (61%) | Moderately steep (44%) | Rolling (35%) | Rolling (39%) | Strongly rolling (51%) | Rolling 52% | Strongly rolling (53%) | Moderately steep (29%) | Rolling (51%) | Moderately steep (74%) |
| Mean annual rainfall (mm/yr) | 1330 | 1387 | 1278 | 1283 | 1210 | 1232 | 1067 | 1413 | 1330 | 1232 |
| Mean annual runoff (mm/yr) | 436 | 659 | 567 | 651 | 344 | 547 | 508 | 731 | 316 | 536 |

¹Other includes cropland, orchard, built up area, urban parkland, surface mine and lake/pond. ²Full breakdown of Soil Orders described for individual sites in the results section. ³Full breakdown of slopes for individual sites is illustrated in Figure 13.

4.0 Results for individual catchments

4.1 Awanohi

Awanohi catchment is 5.5km² and is predominately covered in indigenous vegetation followed by pasture and exotic land (Table 3). Soils mapped in the catchment include Soil Orders Ultic (97%) and Gley (3%). The majority (61%) of the catchment is on slopes of 21-25 degrees and is defined as moderately steep. Nineteen percent of the area has been mapped as rolling land, 18% strongly rolling and 3% flat to undulating. Awanohi is a compliance sediment monitoring site.

A sediment yield summary for the Awanohi catchment is presented in Table 5 (which will appear in each section for all of the sites except West Hoe). Below is an example of how this information is presented and how it should be interpreted:

Example sediment summary and interpretation:

| Descrip | otion | Value (unit) | |
|---------|---|-----------------|--|
| 1. | Total sediment across all events | t | |
| 2. | Total sediment across sampled events | t | |
| 3. | Total predicted sediment using rating | t | |
| 4. | Error of predicted sediment yield | t | |
| 5. | % total error of predicted sediment yield | % | |
| 6. | % total sediment yield sampled | % | |
| 7. | Length of record | yr _ | |
| 8. | Catchment area | km ² | |
| 9. | Specific sediment yield | t/km²/yr | |
| 10. | Yield trend | t/day | |
| 11. | Specific yield trend | t/km²/yr | |

- 1. Interpreted as total sediment yield for the site.
- 2. Sediment yield sampled by the automatic ISCO sediment sampler.
- 3. Sediment yield predicted for unsampled events via the rating.
- 4. The error indicates how reliable the rating predicted yield is. Briefly, the error on each rating predicting event yield is the factorial standard error of the rating function (expressed as a %) multiplied by the event's yield predicted from the rating. The total error for the site from all predicted events is accumulated using the RMS method.
- 5. Proportional error (%) on the total yield (sampled + predicted).
- 6. Proportion (%) of total sediment yield sampled (the residual % is that needing to be predicted using the rating). This indicates the performance of the auto-sampling.
- 7. Length of sediment record.
- 8. Catchment area.
- 9. Specific sediment yield (SSY) this value should be the used when comparing across sites.
- 10. The trend-based yield result (t/day) taken from the cumulative yield plot for each site is an alternative yield estimate that is less sensitive to the events at the start and end of the record i.e. it provides a result less sensitive to the dominant/bounding events. Cumulative yield plots have

been presented to illustrate inter-annual variability in yield, i.e. the influence one (or multiple) dominant event(s) can have on annual yield and SSY.

11. Specific yield trend (t/km²/yr) is an estimate of the SSY using the yield trend.

It should also be noted that for several sites, when calculating yield, the time span taken covered the full period of observation, which is often longer than the time span between the first and last events.

At Awanohi, the observation period spans from 01/01/2009 to 31/12/2012 (i.e. four years), but the time span between the first and last events was shorter. Event sediment yields were calculated for the 128 events occurring throughout the 4 year duration of sediment monitoring in the Awanohi catchment. The total sediment yield from storm events over the monitoring period was 1062 t (Tables 4 and 5), equating to a specific sediment yield of 48.3 t/km²/year.

| Event | Event start | Event | Event | Event start | Event | Event | Event start | Event |
|-------|-------------|-----------|-------|-------------|-----------|-------|-------------|-----------|
| no. | date | yield (t) | no. | date | yield (t) | no. | date | yield (t) |
| 1* | 20/02/2009 | 1.3 | 44 | 4/08/2010 | 3.3 | 87* | 10/10/2011 | 1.3 |
| 2* | 28/02/2009 | 6.1 | 45 | 7/08/2010 | 2.4 | 88* | 13/10/2011 | 16.3 |
| 3* | 6/03/2009 | 5.5 | 46 | 14/08/2010 | 5.2 | 89* | 17/10/2011 | 7.2 |
| 4* | 9/05/2009 | 0.9 | 47 | 20/08/2010 | 7.5 | 90* | 1/11/2011 | 6.3 |
| 5* | 10/05/2009 | 2.5 | 48 | 25/08/2010 | 6.3 | 91* | 15/12/2011 | 11.5 |
| 6* | 11/05/2009 | 1.0 | 49* | 7/09/2010 | 4.0 | 92* | 29/12/2011 | 7.2 |
| 7* | 25/05/2009 | 1.2 | 50* | 11/09/2010 | 3.9 | 93* | 7/01/2012 | 2.3 |
| 8* | 9/06/2009 | 7.5 | 51* | 16/09/2010 | 5.2 | 94* | 15/02/2012 | 3.2 |
| 9* | 12/06/2009 | 2.2 | 52* | 17/09/2010 | 3.2 | 95* | 11/03/2012 | 3.6 |
| 10* | 14/06/2009 | 3.9 | 53* | 22/09/2010 | 1.4 | 96* | 19/03/2012 | 27.0 |
| 11* | 28/06/2009 | 5.3 | 54* | 19/12/2010 | 5.1 | 97* | 25/03/2012 | 1.2 |
| 12* | 29/06/2009 | 5.1 | 55 | 23/01/2011 | 23.5 | 98* | 8/05/2012 | 4.1 |
| 13 | 30/06/2009 | 5.2 | 56* | 28/01/2011 | 75.7 | 99* | 14/05/2012 | 1.2 |
| 14 | 11/07/2009 | 14.9 | 57 | 21/03/2011 | 33.0 | 100* | 15/05/2012 | 1.4 |
| 15 | 17/07/2009 | 9.3 | 58* | 26/03/2011 | 2.9 | 101* | 16/05/2012 | 2.3 |
| 16* | 24/07/2009 | 1.4 | 59* | 16/04/2011 | 1.9 | 102* | 16/05/2012 | 1.0 |
| 17* | 1/08/2009 | 1.2 | 60 | 25/04/2011 | 63.9 | 103* | 16/05/2012 | 1.0 |
| 18* | 14/08/2009 | 2.8 | 61* | 2/05/2011 | 0.9 | 104* | 7/06/2012 | 1.5 |
| 19* | 15/08/2009 | 0.9 | 62* | 2/05/2011 | 2.6 | 105* | 26/06/2012 | 1.5 |
| 20* | 15/08/2009 | 0.9 | 63 | 3/05/2011 | 54.1 | 106* | 28/06/2012 | 1.0 |
| 21* | 16/08/2009 | 1.0 | 64 | 7/05/2011 | 4.7 | 107* | 3/07/2012 | 1.1 |
| 22* | 26/08/2009 | 2.4 | 65* | 11/05/2011 | 4.5 | 108* | 3/07/2012 | 34.7 |
| 23* | 30/08/2009 | 1.3 | 66* | 26/05/2011 | 10.1 | 109* | 4/07/2012 | 0.9 |
| 24* | 30/08/2009 | 2.4 | 67* | 4/06/2011 | 1.9 | 110* | 16/07/2012 | 2.5 |
| 25* | 24/09/2009 | 1.1 | 68* | 10/06/2011 | 10.5 | 111* | 17/07/2012 | 1.1 |
| 26* | 26/09/2009 | 5.2 | 69* | 17/06/2011 | 11.9 | 112* | 22/07/2012 | 24.1 |
| 27* | 29/09/2009 | 28.2 | 70* | 19/06/2011 | 1.2 | 113* | 24/07/2012 | 1.1 |
| 28 | 3/10/2009 | 1.1 | 71* | 20/06/2011 | 3.4 | 114* | 25/07/2012 | 1.1 |
| 29 | 15/10/2009 | 16.9 | 72* | 24/06/2011 | 1.7 | 115* | 29/07/2012 | 52.6 |
| 30 | 4/12/2009 | 87.5 | 73* | 25/06/2011 | 2.8 | 116 | 8/08/2012 | 19.8 |
| 31 | 21/05/2010 | 13.7 | 74* | 25/06/2011 | 5.0 | 117* | 17/08/2012 | 1.4 |
| 32* | 24/05/2010 | 6.9 | 75* | 28/06/2011 | 2.1 | 118* | 18/08/2012 | 2.0 |
| 33* | 26/05/2010 | 1.3 | 76* | 8/07/2011 | 5.0 | 119* | 19/08/2012 | 1.1 |
| 34 | 28/05/2010 | 3.3 | 77* | 9/07/2011 | 1.0 | 120* | 19/08/2012 | 6.1 |
| 35 | 1/06/2010 | 11.1 | 78* | 12/07/2011 | 2.1 | 121* | 21/08/2012 | 1.6 |
| 36* | 7/06/2010 | 2.0 | 79* | 14/07/2011 | 3.4 | 122* | 23/08/2012 | 2.0 |
| 37* | 13/06/2010 | 1.9 | 80* | 21/07/2011 | 7.4 | 123* | 24/08/2012 | 0.9 |
| 38 | 25/06/2010 | 6.3 | 81* | 22/07/2011 | 27.9 | 124* | 25/08/2012 | 0.9 |
| 39* | 30/06/2010 | 1.2 | 82* | 11/08/2011 | 11.9 | 125* | 3/09/2012 | 26.3 |
| 40* | 4/07/2010 | 11.5 | 83* | 12/08/2011 | 0.9 | 126* | 12/09/2012 | 1.4 |
| 41* | 16/07/2010 | 1.6 | 84* | 15/08/2011 | 1.6 | 127* | 15/09/2012 | 3.7 |
| 42 | 21/07/2010 | 51.3 | 85* | 11/09/2011 | 1.7 | 128* | 6/12/2012 | 2.5 |
| 43* | 2/08/2010 | 2.4 | 86* | 13/09/2011 | 1.6 | | | |

 Table 4. Event sediment yields for the Awanohi catchment between 01/01/2009-31/12/2012.

* denotes missing events which are predicted based on the event peak flow rating.



Figure 3. Cumulative sediment yields and peak discharge (A) and rainfall (B) for the Awanohi sediment monitoring record from January 2009-December 2012. The slope of the cumulative curve (units t/day) provides the Yield trend value in Table 5.

| Table 5. Sediment | yield summary for the | Awanohi catchment. |
|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| | | |

| Description | Value (unit) |
|---|---------------------|
| Total sediment across all events | 1062 t |
| Total sediment across sampled events | 445 t |
| Total predicted sediment using rating | 617 t |
| Error of predicted sediment yield | 57 t |
| % total error of predicted sediment yield | 5 % |
| % total sediment yield sampled | 42 % |
| Length of record | 4 yr _ |
| Catchment area | 5.5 km ² |
| Specific sediment yield | 48.3 t/km²/yr |
| Yield trend | 0.8 t/day |
| Specific yield trend | 55.2 t/km²/yr |

4.2 Hoteo

The Hoteo catchment (268 km²) is predominantly pastoral land overlaying Waitemata rock (Table 3). Dominant soil types include Ultic (75%) and Recent (16%) Soil Orders with pockets of Granular (4%), Allophanic (3%), Gley (1%) and Brown soils (1%). The Hoteo is predominantly moderately steep (44%) with the full slope breakdown illustrated in Figure 13. The Hoteo site has been selected as a validation site.

The sediment record at Hoteo spans from May 2010 to December 2012, hence a record of 2.6 years. Event sediment yields were calculated for 48 events occurring over this 2.6 year period (Table 6 and Figure 4). The total sediment yield from storm events over the monitoring period was 51748 t, equating to a specific sediment yield of 74.27 t/km²/year (Tables 6 and 7).

It should also be noted that the sediment record of 2.6 years at the Hoteo catchment captures sediment yield for three winters and two summers. Considering that the majority of the sediment load occurs during the winter and early spring period (Basher *et al.* 2011; Hicks *et al.* 2011; McDowell and Srinivasan 2009; Srinivasan and McDowell 2009), the predominance of winter captured at this site could potentially over-estimate the sediment yield. To avoid skewing the data the SSY was also calculated for the two complete physical years (2011-12) which yielded a SSY of 78.8 t/km²/yr. This figure is more than that calculated for the complete sediment record for the site and suggests that the summer storm event in January 2011 (event 17 Table 6) had a dominating influence on sediment yields.

Only 16% of the sediment yield was auto-sampled at the Hoteo catchment (Table 7), and therefore the site had one of the poorest performing auto-samplers, the other being the Vaughan site. The majority of the yield was therefore derived from the rating. Furthermore, the largest event occurring across the entire record between 23-31/01/2011, when the peak discharge (Qpeak) was recorded as 306 m³/s (Figure 4), was unsampled. The ISCO failed to sample because the event was so large it uplifted the ISCO which was top heavy and therefore tipped and spilled the bottles. Such an event has a 1:25 year return period based on flow (Appendix E1). The Qpeak recorded for this event is much larger than the largest Qpeak used to compile the rating (112 m³/s) so for the higher flows the rating accuracy is unknown. This can potentially over- or under-estimate the site's annual yield and SSY.

| Event no. | Event | Event | Event | Event | Event | Event | Event | Event yield |
|-----------|------------|-----------|-------|------------|-----------|-------|------------|-------------|
| | start date | yield (t) | no. | start date | yield (t) | no. | start date | (t) |
| 1* | 21/05/2010 | 1284.57 | 17* | 28/01/2011 | 22395.09 | 33* | 15/12/2011 | 508.47 |
| 2* | 24/05/2010 | 844.67 | 18* | 22/03/2011 | 387.23 | 34* | 30/12/2011 | 919.65 |
| 3* | 28/05/2010 | 430.03 | 19* | 26/03/2011 | 638.60 | 35 | 19/03/2012 | 2490.21 |
| 4* | 1/06/2010 | 1065.64 | 20* | 26/04/2011 | 155.65 | 36* | 9/05/2012 | 205.13 |
| 5* | 13/06/2010 | 141.44 | 21 | 2/05/2011 | 464.50 | 37* | 3/07/2012 | 982.64 |
| 6 | 26/06/2010 | 92.99 | 22 | 12/05/2011 | 91.20 | 38* | 22/07/2012 | 1655.49 |
| 7 | 5/07/2010 | 1784.56 | 23 | 26/05/2011 | 1215.06 | 39* | 26/07/2012 | 320.04 |
| 8* | 22/07/2010 | 1316.13 | 24 | 5/06/2011 | 21.03 | 40* | 30/07/2012 | 1055.47 |
| 9* | 4/08/2010 | 389.55 | 25* | 18/06/2011 | 149.35 | 41* | 2/08/2012 | 835.60 |
| 10* | 8/08/2010 | 184.70 | 26 | 26/06/2011 | 668.93 | 42* | 4/08/2012 | 128.66 |
| 11* | 14/08/2010 | 527.62 | 27 | 29/06/2011 | 272.06 | 43* | 5/08/2012 | 122.14 |
| 12* | 26/08/2010 | 348.51 | 28* | 14/07/2011 | 348.51 | 44* | 5/08/2012 | 156.05 |
| 13* | 7/09/2010 | 195.00 | 29 | 22/07/2011 | 806.81 | 45* | 9/08/2012 | 279.66 |
| 14* | 16/09/2010 | 252.11 | 30* | 11/10/2011 | 159.85 | 46* | 12/08/2012 | 935.02 |
| 15* | 19/12/2010 | 667.74 | 31* | 12/10/2011 | 394.54 | 47* | 3/09/2012 | 1858.81 |
| 16* | 23/01/2011 | 1109.18 | 32 | 20/10/2011 | 295.02 | 48* | 16/09/2012 | 197.46 |

 Table 6. Event sediment yields for the Hoteo catchment between 21/05/2010-31/12/2012.

* denotes missing events which are predicted based on the event peak flow rating.



Figure 4. Cumulative sediment yields and peak discharge (A) and rainfall (B) for the Hoteo sediment monitoring record from May 2010-December 2012. Note **X** indicate sediment gauging events.

|--|

| Description | Value (unit) |
|---|----------------------------|
| Total sediment across all events | 51748 t |
| Total sediment across sampled events | 8202 t |
| Total predicted sediment using rating | 43546 t |
| Error of predicted sediment yield | 13497 t |
| % total error of predicted sediment yield | 26 % |
| % total sediment yield sampled | 16 % |
| Length of record | 2.6 yr |
| Catchment area | 268 km ² |
| Specific sediment yield | 74.3 t/km²/yr |
| Yield trend | 55.5 t/day |
| Specific yield trend | 75.6 t/km ² /yr |

4.3 Kaipara

Dominant geology and land cover in the Kaipara catchment include Waitemata Formation and pastoral land, respectively (Table 3). Dominant soils at the site include Ultic and Allophanic representing 43% and 25% total area, respectively, followed by Granular (23%), Gley (5%) and Recent (3%) soils. The Kaipara is predominantly rolling (35%) with the full slope breakdown illustrated in Figure 13. The Kaipara site has been selected as a validation site.

The sediment record at the Kaipara site spans for 1 physical year (01/01/2012-31/12/2012) although no events above the trigger level occurred for the first two and last three months of the year.

Event sediment yields were calculated for the 19 events occurring throughout the 1-year duration of sediment monitoring in the Kaipara catchment (Table 8 and Figure 5). The total sediment yield from storm events over the monitoring period was 5259 t, equating to a specific sediment yield of 32.3 t/km²/year (Tables 8 and 9).

| Event no. | Event no. Event start | | Event no. | Event start | Event yield (t) |
|-----------|-----------------------|---------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|
| | date | | | date | |
| 1* | 12/03/2012 | 95.79 | 11 | 22/07/2012 | 476.89 |
| 2 | 19/03/2012 | 593.34 | 12 | 30/07/2012 | 1246.66 |
| 3* | 25/03/2012 | 36.68 | 13 | 8/08/2012 | 121.25 |
| 4 | 9/05/2012 | 65.38 | 14 | 12/08/2012 | 610.44 |
| 5* | 17/05/2012 | 33.04 | 15 | 15/08/2012 | 108.16 |
| 6* | 7/06/2012 | 43.58 | 16* | 18/08/2012 | 47.25 |
| 7* | 25/06/2012 | 39.74 | 17 | 19/08/2012 | 155.77 |
| 8* | 28/06/2012 | 42.32 | 18* | 3/09/2012 | 266.95 |
| 9 | 3/07/2012 | 1063.04 | 19* | 16/09/2012 | 108.17 |
| 10* | 16/07/2012 | 104.56 | | | |

 Table 8. Event sediment yields for the Kaipara catchment between 31/01/2012-31/12/2012.

* denotes missing events which are predicted based on the event peak flow rating.



Figure 5. Cumulative sediment yields and peak discharge (A) and rainfall (B) for the Kaipara sediment monitoring record from January 2012-December 2012. Note X's indicate sediment gauging events.

Table 9. Sediment yield summary for the Kaipara catchment

| Description | Value (unit) |
|---|---------------------|
| Total sediment across all events | 5259 t |
| Total sediment across sampled events | 4440 t |
| Total predicted sediment using rating | 818 t |
| Error of predicted sediment yield | 159 t |
| % total error of predicted sediment yield | 3 % |
| % total sediment yield sampled | 84 % |
| Length of record | 1 yr |
| Catchment area | 163 km ² |
| Specific sediment yield | 32.3 t/km²/yr |
| Yield trend | 21 t/day |
| Specific yield trend | 48 t/km²/yr |

4.4 Kaukapakapa

Mudstone and pastoral land are the dominant geology and land cover, respectively, in the Kauakapakapa catchment (Table 3). Dominant soil types at the site include Ultic and Allophanic soils (Table 3) followed by smaller pockets of Recent (10%), Melanic (2%) and Gley (1%) soils. The Kaukapakapa site is predominantly rolling (39%) with the full slope breakdown illustrated in Figure 13. The Kaukapakapa site has been selected as a calibration site.

The sediment record at Kaukapakapa spans from May 2010 to December 2012, hence a record of 2.6 years. However, the last events do not align with the full physical record because there were no events after 16/09/2012. Event sediment yields were calculated for 66 events occurring throughout the 2.6 year duration (21/05/2010- 31/12/2012) of sediment monitoring in the Kaukapakapa catchment (Table 10 and Figure 6). The total sediment yield from storm events over the monitoring period was 12194 t, equating to a specific sediment yield of 76 t/km²/year (Tables 10 and 11).

Similarly, to the Hoteo catchment the SSY for the two physical years at the Kaukapakapa catchment was calculated in order to avoid skewing the SSY for three winters and two summers captured at this site. The SSY for 2011-12 at this catchment was 69.0 t/km²/year (Table 10). Therefore, the figure above using a record spanning for 2.6 years is potentially biased towards the contribution of winter sediment yields. This also suggests that the very large storm event in January 2011 did not have such an over-riding influence at the Kaukapakapa catchment as it did at the Hoteo catchment.

| Event | Event start | Event | Event | Event start | Event | Event | Event start | Event |
|-------|-------------|--------|-------|-------------|--------|-------|-------------|--------|
| no. | date | yield | no. | date | yield | no. | date | yield |
| | | (t) | | | (t) | | | (t) |
| 1* | 21/05/2010 | 515.06 | 23* | 22/03/2011 | 197.94 | 45 | 8/03/2012 | 31.46 |
| 2* | 24/05/2010 | 124.58 | 24* | 26/03/2011 | 29.18 | 46 | 12/03/2012 | 87.11 |
| 3* | 1/06/2010 | 226.03 | 25* | 16/04/2011 | 35.11 | 47 | 19/03/2012 | 295.48 |
| 4* | 6/06/2010 | 63.13 | 26 | 26/04/2011 | 46.66 | 48 | 21/03/2012 | 314.30 |
| 5* | 11/06/2010 | 78.72 | 27 | 2/05/2011 | 57.09 | 49 | 9/05/2012 | 41.47 |
| 6* | 25/06/2010 | 742.56 | 28 | 7/05/2011 | 86.07 | 50 | 14/05/2012 | 78.37 |
| 7* | 4/07/2010 | 623.84 | 29* | 26/05/2011 | 164.13 | 51* | 21/06/2012 | 20.34 |
| 8 | 16/07/2010 | 23.76 | 30* | 4/06/2011 | 47.76 | 52* | 24/06/2012 | 20.65 |
| 9 | 21/07/2010 | 527.20 | 31* | 10/06/2011 | 146.04 | 53* | 26/06/2012 | 38.67 |
| 10 | 2/08/2010 | 39.48 | 32 | 18/06/2011 | 288.72 | 54* | 28/06/2012 | 24.83 |
| 11 | 4/08/2010 | 97.33 | 33 | 10/07/2011 | 106.07 | 55 | 3/07/2012 | 834.83 |
| 12 | 7/08/2010 | 70.65 | 34 | 21/07/2011 | 812.66 | 56 | 16/07/2012 | 70.17 |
| 13 | 14/08/2010 | 100.64 | 35 | 11/08/2011 | 131.94 | 57 | 22/07/2012 | 574.91 |
| 14 | 25/08/2010 | 176.69 | 36 | 13/09/2011 | 311.85 | 58* | 26/07/2012 | 25.18 |
| 15* | 15/09/2010 | 30.60 | 37 | 18/10/2011 | 221.27 | 59 | 30/07/2012 | 414.48 |
| 16* | 16/09/2010 | 60.81 | 38 | 15/12/2011 | 155.72 | 60 | 2/08/2012 | 838.00 |
| 17* | 21/09/2010 | 20.14 | 39 | 30/12/2011 | 80.79 | 61 | 8/08/2012 | 70.52 |
| 18* | 22/09/2010 | 29.77 | 40 | 8/01/2012 | 38.12 | 62 | 11/08/2012 | 352.28 |
| 19* | 19/12/2010 | 35.70 | 41* | 15/02/2012 | 198.28 | 63 | 15/08/2012 | 77.95 |
| 20* | 23/01/2011 | 64.29 | 42* | 16/02/2012 | 24.83 | 64* | 23/08/2012 | 21.36 |
| 21 | 28/01/2011 | 512.71 | 43* | 17/02/2012 | 140.87 | 65* | 3/09/2012 | 385.57 |
| 22* | 6/03/2011 | 20.95 | 44* | 23/02/2012 | 37.49 | 66* | 16/09/2012 | 32.77 |

Table 10. Event sediment yields for the Kaukapakapa catchment between 21/05/2010-31/12/2012.

* denotes missing events which are predicted based on the event peak flow rating.



Figure 6. Cumulative sediment yields and peak discharge (A) and rainfall (B) for the Kaukapakapa sediment monitoring record from May 20010-December 2012. Note X indicate sediment gauging events.

| Description | Value (unit) |
|---|----------------------|
| Total sediment across all events | 12194 t |
| Total sediment across sampled events | 7967 t |
| Total predicted sediment using rating | 4227 t |
| Error of predicted sediment yield | 686 t |
| % total error of predicted sediment yield | 6 % |
| % total sediment yield sampled | 65 % |
| Length of record | 2.6 yr |
| Catchment area | 61.9 km ² |
| Specific sediment yield | 76 t/km²/yr |
| Yield trend | 11 t/day |
| Specific yield trend | 63 t/km²/yr |

4.5 Mangemangeroa

Mangemangeroa catchment geology and soils include Waitemata and Ultic, respectively. Dominant land cover includes pasture land followed by indigenous vegetation (Table 3). The majority (51%) of the catchment slopes at 16-20 degrees and is defined as strongly rolling. Forty percent of the area has been mapped as moderately steep and 9% as undulating (Figure 13). The Mangemangeroa site has been selected as a validation site.

The sediment record at Mangemangaroa spans from 01/01/2012 to 31/12/12, and event sediment yields were calculated for 27 events occurring throughout the 1 year duration of sediment monitoring (Table 12 and Figure 7). The total sediment yield from storm events over the monitoring period was 752.4 t, equating to a specific sediment yield of 167.2 t/km²/year (Tables 12 and 13). The event occurring in 24-26/7/12 (event number 13 Table 12) contributed over one third of the annual yield recorded at this site and such an event has a return period, in terms of flow (m³/s), of about 1:10 year (Appendix E2). This will be discussed in more detail in the discussion.

| Event no. | Event start | Event yield (t) | Event no. | Event start | Event yield (t) |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|
| | date | | | date | |
| 1* | 15/02/2012 | 1.93 | 15 | 30/07/2012 | 7.03 |
| 2* | 15/02/2012 | 1.42 | 16 | 31/07/2012 | 6.41 |
| 3* | 28/02/2012 | 24.98 | 17 | 9/08/2012 | 12.61 |
| 4* | 19/03/2012 | 2.88 | 18 | 12/08/2012 | 4.24 |
| 5* | 21/03/2012 | 76.35 | 19 | 13/08/2012 | 10.17 |
| 6* | 8/05/2012 | 4.16 | 20 | 18/08/2012 | 75.61 |
| 7* | 9/05/2012 | 4.67 | 21 | 19/08/2012 | 18.49 |
| 8* | 7/06/2012 | 1.84 | 22 | 20/08/2012 | 4.81 |
| 9 | 3/07/2012 | 24.73 | 23* | 3/09/2012 | 106.01 |
| 10* | 15/07/2012 | 1.54 | 24* | 4/09/2012 | 3.60 |
| 11 | 16/07/2012 | 11.54 | 25* | 15/09/2012 | 7.74 |
| 12 | 22/07/2012 | 25.14 | 26* | 16/09/2012 | 24.98 |
| 13 | 24/07/2012 | 253.30 | 27* | 13/11/2012 | 2.45 |
| 14 | 29/07/2012 | 33.75 | | | |

Table 12. Event sediment yields for the Mangemangeroa catchment between 01/01/2012 and 31/12/2012.

* denotes missing events which are predicted based on the event peak flow rating.



Figure 7. Cumulative sediment yields and peak discharge (A) and rainfall (B) for the Mangemangeroa sediment monitoring record from January-December 2012. Note X's indicate sediment gauging events.

| Table 13. | Sediment v | /ield summary | / for the Ma | angemangeroa | catchment. |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|
| 1 4 5 1 6 1 6 1 | o countronic j | nora o'anninai | | angonnangoroc | outornitorn |

| Description | Value (unit) |
|---|--------------------|
| Total sediment across all events | 752 t |
| Total sediment across sampled events | 488 t |
| Total predicted sediment using rating | 265 t |
| Error of predicted sediment yield | 41 t |
| % total error of predicted sediment yield | 5 % |
| % total sediment yield sampled | 65 % |
| Length of record | 1 yr |
| Catchment area | 4.5 km^2 |
| Specific sediment yield | 167 t/km²/yr |
| Yield trend | 2.9 t/day |
| Specific yield trend | 233 t/km²/yr |

4.6 Orewa

Waitemata and pasture are the dominant geology and land cover, respectively, in the Orewa catchment (9.7 km²), and the dominant soils are Ultic and Gley (Table 3). The majority of the catchment is rolling (52%) followed by strongly rolling (17%), undulating (15%) and flat to undulating (15%) land (Figure 13). The Orewa site has been selected as a validation site.

The sediment record at Orewa spans from 29 June 2009 to 31 December 2012. Event sediment yields were calculated for 90 events occurring throughout the 3.5 year duration of sediment monitoring (Table 14 and Figure 8). The total sediment yield from storm events over the monitoring period was 2721.3 t, equating to a specific sediment yield of 80.2 t/km²/year (Tables 14 and 15).

The SSY for the Orewa catchment for the three physical years, 2010-12, is 68.0 t/km²/year (Table 14). Therefore, the figure above using a record spanning for 3.5 years that captures four winters and three summers is potentially biased towards the contribution of winter sediment yields.

Orewa was one of the best sampled sites (the other being Wairoa), sampling 87% of the recorded sediment yield and rendering it an appropriate validation site for the purposes of a spatially-distributed sediment yield model for the region.

Table 14. Event sediment yields for the Orewa catchment between 29/06/2009-31/12/2012,

| Event | Event start | Event | Event | Event start Event | | Event | Event start | Event |
|-------|-------------|-----------|-------|-------------------|-----------|-------|-------------|-----------|
| no. | date | yield (t) | no. | date | yield (t) | no. | date | yield (t) |
| 1* | 29/06/2009 | 181.16 | 31 | 4/07/2010 | 64.65 | 61 | 25/03/2011 | 2.51 |
| 2 | 5/07/2009 | 4.07 | 32* | 16/07/2010 | 4.31 | 62* | 16/04/2011 | 2.41 |
| 3 | 11/07/2009 | 38.47 | 33 | 21/07/2010 | 138.57 | 63 | 25/04/2011 | 15.12 |
| 4* | 15/07/2009 | 2.68 | 34* | 27/07/2010 | 0.61 | 64 | 2/05/2011 | 13.46 |
| 5* | 16/07/2009 | 0.75 | 35* | 28/07/2010 | 0.64 | 65 | 6/05/2011 | 5.91 |
| 6 | 17/07/2009 | 53.15 | 36 | 2/08/2010 | 22.68 | 66 | 11/05/2011 | 6.98 |
| 7* | 22/07/2009 | 2.48 | 37 | 7/08/2010 | 11.88 | 67 | 16/05/2011 | 13.37 |
| 8* | 24/07/2009 | 0.86 | 38* | 14/08/2010 | 5.10 | 68 | 4/06/2011 | 2.37 |
| 9* | 24/07/2009 | 0.63 | 39* | 18/08/2010 | 0.66 | 69 | 10/06/2011 | 1.20 |
| 10* | 1/08/2009 | 2.15 | 40* | 19/08/2010 | 0.87 | 70 | 18/06/2011 | 28.51 |
| 11* | 14/08/2009 | 10.91 | 41* | 20/08/2010 | 1.09 | 71 | 28/06/2011 | 35.99 |
| 12* | 17/08/2009 | 0.63 | 42* | 21/08/2010 | 0.77 | 72* | 21/07/2011 | 1.46 |
| 13* | 27/08/2009 | 3.32 | 43* | 22/08/2010 | 0.65 | 73 | 22/07/2011 | 344.19 |
| 14* | 31/08/2009 | 4.77 | 44* | 23/08/2010 | 0.71 | 74 | 19/09/2011 | 52.07 |
| 15* | 26/09/2009 | 3.90 | 45* | 25/08/2010 | 4.39 | 75 | 19/10/2011 | 2.56 |
| 16 | 29/09/2009 | 115.74 | 46* | 27/08/2010 | 3.29 | 76* | 1/11/2011 | 1.05 |
| 17* | 3/10/2009 | 0.95 | 47* | 30/08/2010 | 2.67 | 77 | 15/12/2011 | 4.26 |
| 18* | 4/10/2009 | 1.15 | 48 | 7/09/2010 | 9.96 | 78 | 30/12/2011 | 4.44 |
| 19* | 5/10/2009 | 1.29 | 49* | 9/09/2010 | 0.76 | 79 | 15/02/2012 | 23.83 |
| 20* | 15/10/2009 | 21.77 | 50* | 11/09/2010 | 2.54 | 80 | 12/03/2012 | 1.85 |
| 21 | 4/12/2009 | 292.56 | 51* | 15/09/2010 | 1.05 | 81 | 19/03/2012 | 33.78 |
| 22 | 21/05/2010 | 35.17 | 52* | 16/09/2010 | 6.00 | 82 | 8/05/2012 | 5.63 |
| 23 | 24/05/2010 | 2.26 | 53* | 17/09/2010 | 1.00 | 83 | 26/06/2012 | 198.65 |
| 24* | 25/05/2010 | 0.66 | 54* | 22/09/2010 | 0.88 | 84* | 16/07/2012 | 1.09 |
| 25 | 26/05/2010 | 1.70 | 55* | 19/12/2010 | 3.02 | 85 | 22/07/2012 | 70.24 |
| 26 | 28/05/2010 | 5.42 | 56 | 23/01/2011 | 7.94 | 86* | 29/07/2012 | 61.02 |
| 27 | 1/06/2010 | 16.90 | 57 | 28/01/2011 | 126.64 | 87 | 1/08/2012 | 60.17 |
| 28 | 6/06/2010 | 3.49 | 58* | 6/03/2011 | 0.70 | 88 | 8/08/2012 | 35.11 |
| 29 | 25/06/2010 | 306.72 | 59* | 16/03/2011 | 1.15 | 89 | 19/08/2012 | 103.39 |
| 30* | 30/06/2010 | 2.42 | 60 | 21/03/2011 | 44.54 | 90 | 16/09/2012 | 0.83 |

* denotes missing events which are predicted based on the event peak flow rating.



Figure 8. Cumulative sediment yields and peak discharge (A) and rainfall (B) for the Orewa sediment monitoring record from June 2009-December 2012. Note X's indicate sediment gauging events.

 Table 15. Sediment yield summary for the Orewa catchment.

| Description | Value (unit) |
|---|--------------------------|
| Total sediment across all events | 2721 t |
| Total sediment across sampled events | 2369 t |
| Total predicted sediment using rating | 352 t |
| Error of predicted sediment yield | 104 t |
| % total error of predicted sediment yield | 4 % |
| % total sediment yield sampled | 87 % |
| Length of record | 3.5 yr |
| Catchment area | 9.7 km ² |
| Specific sediment yield | 80 t/km²/yr |
| Yield trend | 2.0 t/day |
| Specific yield trend | 76 t/km ² /yr |

4.7 Vaughan

The Vaughan catchment (2.3 km^2) is predominantly Waitemata geology and pastoral land cover (Table 3). A small town makes up 2% of the catchment area. Dominant soils include Ultic and Organic. The Vaughan catchment is predominantly strongly rolling (53%) with the full slope classification illustrated in Figure 13. The Vaughan site has been selected as a validation site.

The sediment record at the Vaughan site spans from June 2003 to December 2012, and it is the longest established site. Event sediment yields were calculated for the 485 events occurring throughout the 9.6 year duration (1/06/2003 - 31/12/2012) of sediment monitoring (Table 16 and Figure 9). The total sediment yield from storm events over the monitoring period was 1077 t, equating to a specific sediment yield of 48.8 t/km²/year (Tables 16 and 17).

Only 12% of the yield was sampled, with the majority being derived from the rating, indicating a poor performing auto-sampler. However, this is largely due to the auto-sampler only sampling storm-based sediment between 2004-2005 and not again until 2012 onwards (Table 16)

However, the highest Qpeak (17.4 m³/s recorded on 01/07/2010) used in the rating was not too much larger than the highest sampled Qpeak (9.99 m³/s recorded on 27/07/2012). Therefore, the rating was not largely extrapolated particularly in contrast to the Hoteo case, whereby the largest Qpeak was substantially larger than the largest sampled Qpeak and substantial rating extrapolation was required.

The specific yield trend is very similar to the specific sediment yield at the Vaughan catchment by virtue of the long record (Table 17). This was also the case for the Hoteo, Orewa, Wairoa and Weiti sites. The cumulative yield plot rises relatively steadily, indicating a stable sediment discharge at the Vaughan (Figure 9). This catchment is currently undergoing extensive housing development, and the future sediment record is expected to show land use change effects on SSY over time.

| Event | Event start | Event | Event | Event start | Event | Event | Event start | Event |
|-------|-------------|-----------|-------|-------------|-----------|-------|-------------|-----------|
| no. | date | yield (t) | no. | date | yield (t) | no. | date | yield (t) |
| 1 | 15/06/2003 | 0.20 | 163 | 25/01/2006 | 1.36 | 325 | 14/06/2009 | 0.24 |
| 2 | 15/06/2003 | 0.17 | 164 | 2/04/2006 | 0.29 | 326 | 28/06/2009 | 27.27 |
| 3 | 15/06/2003 | 0.17 | 165 | 2/04/2006 | 0.24 | 327 | 4/07/2009 | 0.22 |
| 4 | 15/06/2003 | 0.18 | 166 | 10/04/2006 | 0.18 | 328 | 6/07/2009 | 0.28 |
| 5 | 16/06/2003 | 0.25 | 167 | 25/04/2006 | 6.89 | 329 | 6/07/2009 | 0.42 |
| 6 | 17/06/2003 | 0.21 | 168 | 27/04/2006 | 22.70 | 330 | 11/07/2009 | 6.88 |
| 7 | 17/06/2003 | 0.68 | 169 | 29/04/2006 | 0.17 | 331 | 15/07/2009 | 0.20 |
| 8 | 18/06/2003 | 0.35 | 170 | 29/04/2006 | 4.69 | 332 | 17/07/2009 | 5.98 |
| 9 | 29/06/2003 | 0.85 | 171 | 2/05/2006 | 0.22 | 333 | 19/07/2009 | 0.17 |
| 10 | 1/07/2003 | 0.17 | 172 | 2/05/2006 | 0.51 | 334 | 24/07/2009 | 0.21 |
| 11 | 3/07/2003 | 1.57 | 173 | 5/05/2006 | 0.48 | 335 | 1/08/2009 | 0.40 |
| 12 | 7/07/2003 | 5.61 | 174 | 9/05/2006 | 0.30 | 336 | 14/08/2009 | 0.29 |
| 13 | 8/07/2003 | 0.17 | 175 | 10/05/2006 | 0.19 | 337 | 15/08/2009 | 0.17 |
| 14 | 17/07/2003 | 0.38 | 176 | 11/05/2006 | 0.18 | 338 | 16/08/2009 | 0.17 |
| 15 | 28/07/2003 | 0.95 | 177 | 12/05/2006 | 0.17 | 339 | 26/08/2009 | 0.84 |

| Table 16. | Event | sediment | yields fo | or the ' | Vaughan | catchment between | 01/06/2003 | and 31/12 | 2/2012. |
|-----------|-------|----------|-----------|----------|---------|-------------------|------------|-----------|---------|
|-----------|-------|----------|-----------|----------|---------|-------------------|------------|-----------|---------|

| 16 | 28/07/2003 | 0.19 | 178 | 12/05/2006 | 0.50 | 340 | 31/08/2009 | 0.34 |
|----------|------------|-------|-----|------------|-------|------|--------------|-------|
| 17 | 20/07/2002 | 0.00 | 170 | 12/05/2006 | 0.64 | 244 | 20/00/2000 | 0.40 |
| 17 | 29/01/2003 | 0.90 | 179 | 13/05/2006 | 0.04 | 341 | 20/09/2009 | 0.10 |
| 18 | 31/07/2003 | 38.24 | 180 | 14/05/2006 | 0.65 | 342 | 26/09/2009 | 2.74 |
| 10 | 4/00/0000 | 0 4 7 | 404 | 00/05/0000 | 0.00 | 0.40 | 00/00/0000 | 0.00 |
| 19 | 1/08/2003 | 0.17 | 181 | 23/05/2006 | 0.22 | 343 | 29/09/2009 | 8.30 |
| 20 | 11/08/2003 | 0.57 | 182 | 23/05/2006 | 5 67 | 344 | 1/10/2009 | 0.20 |
| 20 | 11/00/2000 | 0.07 | 102 | 20/00/2000 | 0.07 | 011 | 1/10/2000 | 0.20 |
| 21 | 20/08/2003 | 6.50 | 183 | 25/05/2006 | 0.17 | 345 | 3/10/2009 | 0.31 |
| 22 | 22/00/2002 | 0.41 | 10/ | 26/05/2006 | 7 1 5 | 246 | 1/10/2000 | 0.17 |
| 22 | 23/00/2003 | 0.41 | 104 | 20/03/2000 | 7.15 | 540 | 4/10/2003 | 0.17 |
| 23 | 27/08/2003 | 0.52 | 185 | 28/05/2006 | 0.17 | 347 | 4/10/2009 | 0.17 |
| | 0/00/0000 | 0.75 | 100 | 4/00/0000 | 4.40 | 0.40 | E/40/0000 | 0.00 |
| 24 | 2/09/2003 | 0.75 | 180 | 4/06/2006 | 1.12 | 348 | 5/10/2009 | 0.28 |
| 25 | 4/09/2003 | 2 55 | 187 | 5/06/2006 | 0 45 | 349 | 15/10/2009 | 6 4 9 |
| 20 | 1/00/2000 | 2.00 | 107 | 0/00/2000 | 0.10 | 010 | 10/10/2000 | 0.10 |
| 26 | 21/09/2003 | 0.39 | 188 | 12/06/2006 | 0.40 | 350 | 4/12/2009 | 0.20 |
| 27 | 21/00/2003 | 1 04 | 180 | 13/06/2006 | 0.26 | 351 | 1/12/2000 | 22.85 |
| 21 | 21/03/2003 | 1.04 | 109 | 13/00/2000 | 0.20 | 551 | 4/12/2003 | 22.05 |
| 28 | 28/09/2003 | 12.03 | 190 | 16/06/2006 | 0.18 | 352 | 1/02/2010 | 0.32 |
| 20 | 20/00/2002 | 1 20 | 101 | 16/06/2006 | 1 00 | 252 | 27/04/2010 | 0.10 |
| 29 | 30/09/2003 | 1.29 | 191 | 10/00/2000 | 1.99 | 303 | 21/04/2010 | 0.10 |
| 30 | 3/10/2003 | 28.47 | 192 | 19/07/2006 | 1.62 | 354 | 21/05/2010 | 2.73 |
| 24 | 0/10/2002 | 4 00 | 102 | E/00/0000 | 0.07 | 255 | 01/0E/0010 | 1 20 |
| 31 | 9/10/2003 | 4.02 | 193 | 0/00/2000 | 0.37 | 300 | 24/05/2010 | 1.20 |
| 32 | 11/10/2003 | 22 42 | 194 | 8/08/2006 | 0 17 | 356 | 28/05/2010 | 3 62 |
| 00 | 00/40/0000 | 0.47 | 101 | 0/00/2000 | 0.47 | 055 | 4/00/0040 | 7.50 |
| 33 | 28/10/2003 | 0.17 | 195 | 8/08/2006 | 0.17 | 357 | 1/06/2010 | 7.58 |
| 34 | 28/10/2003 | 0.23 | 196 | 8/08/2006 | 0 17 | 358 | 6/06/2010 | 0.22 |
| 0 | 20/10/2000 | 0.20 | 100 | 0/00/2000 | 0.17 | 000 | 0/00/2010 | 0.22 |
| 35 | 28/10/2003 | 0.18 | 197 | 8/08/2006 | 0.17 | 359 | 7/06/2010 | 0.22 |
| 26 | 24/11/2002 | 0.00 | 100 | 26/00/2006 | 0.66 | 260 | 7/06/2010 | 0.20 |
| 30 | 24/11/2003 | 0.22 | 190 | 20/00/2000 | 0.00 | 300 | 1/06/2010 | 0.30 |
| 37 | 26/11/2003 | 0.19 | 199 | 9/09/2006 | 4.92 | 361 | 13/06/2010 | 0.61 |
| 00 | 20/11/2000 | 0.10 | 000 | 40/00/2000 | 0.47 | 001 | 10/00/2010 | 0.40 |
| 38 | 26/11/2003 | 0.18 | 200 | 10/09/2006 | 0.17 | 362 | 14/06/2010 | 0.18 |
| 30 | 26/11/2003 | 0.18 | 201 | 10/09/2006 | 0 19 | 363 | 25/06/2010 | 0 49 |
| 00 | 20/11/2000 | 0.10 | 201 | 10/00/2000 | 0.10 | 000 | 20/00/2010 | 0.40 |
| 40 | 26/11/2003 | 0.93 | 202 | 11/09/2006 | 6.93 | 364 | 30/06/2010 | 0.21 |
| /1 | 27/11/2003 | 0.45 | 203 | 1/10/2006 | 13.06 | 365 | 5/07/2010 | 2.08 |
| 41 | 21/11/2005 | 0.45 | 205 | 1/10/2000 | 13.00 | 505 | 5/07/2010 | 2.00 |
| 42 | 9/12/2003 | 0.41 | 204 | 4/10/2006 | 0.17 | 366 | 16/07/2010 | 0.29 |
| 12 | 10/12/2002 | 0.40 | 205 | 1/10/2006 | 0 17 | 267 | 21/07/2010 | 7 79 |
| 43 | 10/12/2003 | 0.40 | 205 | 4/10/2000 | 0.17 | 307 | 21/07/2010 | 1.10 |
| 44 | 21/01/2004 | 0.24 | 206 | 4/10/2006 | 0.22 | 368 | 23/07/2010 | 1.91 |
| 45 | 24/04/2004 | 0.00 | 207 | 40/40/0000 | 0.47 | 200 | 0/00/0010 | 0.70 |
| 45 | 31/01/2004 | 0.20 | 207 | 10/10/2000 | 0.17 | 369 | 2/06/2010 | 0.76 |
| 46 | 31/01/2004 | 0.20 | 208 | 23/10/2006 | 1 14 | 370 | 4/08/2010 | 2.33 |
| 47 | 4/00/0004 | 07.07 | 200 | 40/44/0000 | 0.00 | 074 | 7/00/0040 | 0.00 |
| 47 | 1/02/2004 | 37.07 | 209 | 13/11/2006 | 0.26 | 371 | 7/08/2010 | 0.83 |
| 48 | 4/02/2004 | 1 86 | 210 | 13/11/2006 | 0 17 | 372 | 9/08/2010 | 0.23 |
| 40 | | 1.00 | 210 | 10/11/2000 | 0.17 | 572 | 5/00/2010 | 0.20 |
| 49 | 20/02/2004 | 0.88 | 211 | 17/12/2006 | 0.28 | 373 | 13/08/2010 | 0.19 |
| 50 | 20/02/2004 | 22.00 | 212 | 10/12/2006 | 0.22 | 274 | 12/00/2010 | 0.19 |
| 50 | 20/02/2004 | 52.09 | 212 | 19/12/2000 | 0.25 | 5/4 | 13/00/2010 | 0.10 |
| 51 | 29/04/2004 | 0.99 | 213 | 20/12/2006 | 0.60 | 375 | 13/08/2010 | 0.19 |
| 50 | 4/05/0004 | 4.40 | 014 | 40/04/0007 | 0.40 | 070 | 11/00/0010 | 0.50 |
| 52 | 1/05/2004 | 1.43 | 214 | 10/01/2007 | 0.42 | 376 | 14/08/2010 | 2.50 |
| 53 | 12/05/2004 | 0 18 | 215 | 28/01/2007 | 0.25 | 377 | 19/08/2010 | 0 19 |
| - | 12/00/2001 | 0.10 | 210 | 20/01/2007 | 0.20 | 077 | 10/00/2010 | 0.10 |
| 54 | 12/05/2004 | 0.22 | 216 | 29/01/2007 | 0.20 | 378 | 20/08/2010 | 0.66 |
| 55* | 11/05/2001 | 17 50 | 217 | 12/03/2007 | 0.23 | 370 | 21/08/2010 | 0.18 |
| 55 | 14/03/2004 | 17.55 | 217 | 12/03/2007 | 0.20 | 513 | 21/00/2010 | 0.10 |
| 56 | 25/05/2004 | 0.18 | 218 | 29/03/2007 | 13.63 | 380 | 22/08/2010 | 0.17 |
| 57 | 20/05/2004 | 0.25 | 210 | 10/04/2007 | 0.10 | 201 | 25/09/2010 | 1 00 |
| 57 | 20/05/2004 | 0.55 | 219 | 10/04/2007 | 0.19 | 301 | 25/06/2010 | 1.09 |
| 58 | 29/05/2004 | 0.17 | 220 | 28/04/2007 | 0.22 | 382 | 27/08/2010 | 0.28 |
| 50 | 20/05/2004 | 0.19 | 221 | 20/04/2007 | 0.22 | 202 | 21/00/2010 | 0.27 |
| 59 | 29/03/2004 | 0.10 | 221 | 50/04/2007 | 0.22 | 505 | 51/00/2010 | 0.27 |
| 60 | 29/05/2004 | 0.20 | 222 | 1/05/2007 | 0.17 | 384 | 7/09/2010 | 1.77 |
| 61 | 20/05/2004 | 0.17 | 222 | 1/05/0007 | 0.47 | 205 | 0/00/2010 | 0.44 |
| 01 | 29/05/2004 | 0.17 | 223 | 1/05/2007 | 0.17 | 300 | 9/09/2010 | 0.44 |
| 62 | 30/05/2004 | 0.51 | 224 | 20/06/2007 | 0.21 | 386 | 11/09/2010 | 3.75 |
| <u> </u> | E/00/0004 | 0.00 | 205 | 00/00/0007 | 0.00 | 207 | 1 = /00/2010 | 0.00 |
| 63 | 5/06/2004 | 0.28 | 225 | 22/06/2007 | 0.30 | 387 | 15/09/2010 | 0.60 |
| 64 | 5/06/2004 | 0.22 | 226 | 29/06/2007 | 1 03 | 388 | 16/09/2010 | 5 27 |
| 07 | 40/00/2001 | 10.22 | 220 | 20/00/2007 | 1.00 | 000 | 10/00/2010 | 0.21 |
| 65° | 18/06/2004 | 18.00 | 227 | 30/06/2007 | 0.31 | 389 | 17/09/2010 | 0.41 |
| 66 | 21/06/2004 | 0 17 | 228 | 1/07/2007 | 0.18 | 300 | 21/09/2010 | 0 19 |
| 00 | 21/00/2004 | 0.17 | 220 | 1/01/2001 | 0.10 | 530 | 21/03/2010 | 0.13 |
| 67 | 21/06/2004 | 0.17 | 229 | 1/07/2007 | 0.61 | 391 | 22/09/2010 | 0.27 |
| 60 | 21/06/2004 | 0 52 | 220 | 2/07/2007 | 0.20 | 202 | 16/12/2010 | 0.20 |
| 00 | 21/00/2004 | 0.55 | 230 | 2/01/2001 | 0.20 | 392 | 10/12/2010 | 0.30 |
| 69 | 27/06/2004 | 0.64 | 231 | 4/07/2007 | 2.53 | 393 | 17/12/2010 | 0.24 |
| 70 | 2/07/2004 | 0.62 | 222 | E/07/2007 | 0.17 | 204 | 10/10/0010 | 0.10 |
| 10 | 2/07/2004 | 0.03 | 232 | 5/07/2007 | 0.17 | 394 | 18/12/2010 | 0.19 |
| 71 | 3/07/2004 | 0 17 | 233 | 5/07/2007 | 0 17 | 395 | 19/12/2010 | 1 95 |
| 70 | 0/07/2004 | 0.17 | 200 | 5/07/2001 | 0.17 | 000 | | 1.00 |
| 72 | 3/07/2004 | 0.17 | 234 | 5/07/2007 | 0.17 | 396 | 23/01/2011 | 8.12 |
| 73 | 6/07/2004 | 0.24 | 225 | 6/07/2007 | 6 40 | 307 | 28/01/2011 | 20 72 |
| 15 | 0/01/2004 | 0.24 | 200 | 0/01/2007 | 0.40 | 531 | 20/01/2011 | 23.13 |
| 74 | 6/07/2004 | 1.29 | 236 | 10/07/2007 | 1.57 | 398 | 4/03/2011 | 0.46 |
| 75 | 0/07/2004 | 0.17 | 227 | 16/07/2007 | 6 52 | 200 | E/02/2011 | 0.20 |
| 10 | 0/01/2004 | 0.17 | 231 | 10/07/2007 | 0.00 | 299 | 3/03/2011 | 0.30 |
| 76 | 15/07/2004 | 0.17 | 238 | 21/07/2007 | 0.73 | 400 | 6/03/2011 | 0.50 |
| | 00/07/0004 | 0.04 | | 00/07/0007 | 0.47 | 404 | 04/00/0044 | 0.47 |
| 11 | 20/07/2004 | 3.81 | 239 | 22/07/2007 | 0.17 | 401 | 21/03/2011 | 0.17 |
| | | | | | | | | |

| 78 | 22/07/2004 | 0.19 | 240 | 29/07/2007 | 10.33 | 402 | 21/03/2011 | 0.19 |
|-----|------------|------|-----|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------|-------|
| 79 | 23/07/2004 | 0 17 | 241 | 30/07/2007 | 0 71 | 403 | 21/03/2011 | 0.18 |
| 00 | 20/07/2004 | 0.17 | 241 | 4/00/0007 | 0.00 | 404 | 21/00/2011 | 40.74 |
| 80 | 27/07/2004 | 0.20 | 242 | 4/08/2007 | 0.82 | 404 | 21/03/2011 | 10.74 |
| 81 | 28/07/2004 | 0.34 | 243 | 6/08/2007 | 0.48 | 405 | 22/03/2011 | 0.17 |
| 82 | 4/08/2004 | 1.08 | 244 | 8/08/2007 | 0 17 | 406 | 26/03/2011 | 0.31 |
| 02 | -,00,200+ | 0.47 | 244 | 0/00/2007 | 0.17 | 407 | 20/00/2011 | 0.01 |
| 83 | 6/08/2004 | 0.17 | 245 | 8/08/2007 | 0.17 | 407 | 16/04/2011 | 0.92 |
| 84 | 7/08/2004 | 0.97 | 246 | 8/08/2007 | 0.17 | 408 | 25/04/2011 | 21.79 |
| 85 | 10/08/2004 | 0.30 | 247 | 10/08/2007 | 0.22 | 409 | 27/04/2011 | 0 17 |
| 00 | 10/00/2004 | 0.00 | 247 | 10/00/2007 | 0.22 | 400 | 27/04/2011 | 0.17 |
| 86 | 11/08/2004 | 0.22 | 248 | 12/08/2007 | 0.23 | 410 | 27/04/2011 | 0.17 |
| 87 | 15/08/2004 | 0.20 | 249 | 16/08/2007 | 31.64 | 411 | 27/04/2011 | 0.17 |
| 88 | 16/08/2004 | 0.31 | 250 | 27/08/2007 | 1 75 | 112 | 27/04/2011 | 0.18 |
| 00 | 10/00/2004 | 0.01 | 250 | 21/00/2001 | 1.75 | 412 | 27/04/2011 | 0.10 |
| 89 | 22/08/2004 | 0.37 | 251 | 28/08/2007 | 0.24 | 413 | 27/04/2011 | 0.17 |
| 90 | 2/09/2004 | 0.40 | 252 | 10/09/2007 | 0.17 | 414 | 27/04/2011 | 0.17 |
| Q1 | 13/09/2004 | 0 17 | 253 | 16/09/2007 | 3 53 | <i>4</i> 15 | 27/04/2011 | 0 17 |
| 00 | 05/00/2004 | 0.17 | 200 | 10/00/2007 | 0.00 | 410 | 27/04/2011 | 0.17 |
| 92 | 25/09/2004 | 2.41 | 254 | 23/09/2007 | 0.24 | 416 | 27/04/2011 | 0.17 |
| 93 | 1/10/2004 | 0.22 | 255 | 23/09/2007 | 0.19 | 417 | 28/04/2011 | 0.21 |
| 94 | 5/10/2004 | 0.31 | 256 | 24/09/2007 | 0 40 | 418 | 2/05/2011 | 0 33 |
| 05* | 7/40/0004 | 0.01 | 200 | 2-1/00/2007 | 0.40 5.40 | 440 | 2/00/2011 | 0.00 |
| 95" | 7/10/2004 | 9.41 | 257 | 25/09/2007 | 5.13 | 419 | 2/05/2011 | 0.40 |
| 96 | 8/10/2004 | 0.37 | 258 | 1/10/2007 | 49.89 | 420 | 3/05/2011 | 6.36 |
| 97 | 9/10/2004 | 0 17 | 259 | 5/10/2007 | 0.31 | 421 | 7/05/2011 | 5 31 |
| 00 | 0/10/2004 | 0.17 | 200 | 10/2007 | 0.01 | 421 | 1/05/2011 | 4.00 |
| 98 | 29/10/2004 | 1.04 | 260 | 13/10/2007 | 0.67 | 422 | 11/05/2011 | 1.83 |
| 99 | 14/11/2004 | 0.19 | 261 | 15/10/2007 | 0.24 | 423 | 26/05/2011 | 6.13 |
| 100 | 1//11/200/ | 0.17 | 262 | 17/10/2007 | 0 32 | 121 | 1/06/2011 | 0.46 |
| 100 | 14/11/2004 | 0.17 | 202 | 17/10/2007 | 0.52 | 424 | 4/00/2011 | 0.40 |
| 101 | 14/11/2004 | 0.44 | 263 | 6/11/2007 | 0.18 | 425 | 18/06/2011 | 12.49 |
| 102 | 15/11/2004 | 0.20 | 264 | 6/12/2007 | 0.29 | 426 | 20/06/2011 | 0.53 |
| 103 | 1/12/2001 | 0 /3 | 265 | 6/12/2007 | 0 17 | 127 | 23/06/2011 | 0.27 |
| 105 | 4/12/2004 | 0.45 | 200 | 0/12/2007 | 0.17 | 427 | 23/00/2011 | 0.27 |
| 104 | 6/12/2004 | 0.17 | 266 | 6/12/2007 | 0.18 | 428 | 24/06/2011 | 2.16 |
| 105 | 6/12/2004 | 0.17 | 267 | 23/02/2008 | 0.45 | 429 | 27/06/2011 | 0.17 |
| 106 | 15/12/2004 | 0.30 | 268 | 15/04/2008 | 1 18 | 130 | 27/06/2011 | 0.17 |
| 100 | 10/12/2004 | 0.50 | 200 | 13/04/2000 | 1.10 | 400 | 21/00/2011 | 0.17 |
| 107 | 16/12/2004 | 0.18 | 269 | 29/04/2008 | 5.03 | 431 | 28/06/2011 | 0.18 |
| 108 | 16/12/2004 | 0.22 | 270 | 1/05/2008 | 0.75 | 432 | 28/06/2011 | 0.55 |
| 109 | 18/12/2004 | 0 19 | 271 | 4/05/2008 | 11 54 | 433 | 29/06/2011 | 0 17 |
| 100 | 10/12/2004 | 0.13 | 271 | 4/05/2000 | 0.40 | 40.4 | 20/00/2011 | 0.17 |
| 110 | 18/12/2004 | 0.17 | 272 | 9/05/2008 | 0.19 | 434 | 8/07/2011 | 3.69 |
| 111 | 18/12/2004 | 0.17 | 273 | 26/05/2008 | 0.47 | 435 | 12/07/2011 | 0.58 |
| 112 | 18/12/2004 | 0 17 | 274 | 26/05/2008 | 0 17 | 436 | 14/07/2011 | 0.62 |
| 112 | 10/12/2004 | 0.17 | 075 | 20/00/2000 | 0.17 | 407 | 04/07/2011 | 0.02 |
| 113 | 18/12/2004 | 0.17 | 275 | 8/06/2008 | 0.22 | 437 | 21/07/2011 | 8.32 |
| 114 | 18/12/2004 | 0.24 | 276 | 16/06/2008 | 0.47 | 438 | 22/07/2011 | 7.17 |
| 115 | 30/12/2004 | 0 40 | 277 | 22/06/2008 | 3 88 | 439 | 25/07/2011 | 0.18 |
| 110 | 7/04/0005 | 0.40 | 070 | 22/00/2000 | 0.00 | 400 | 20/07/2011 | 0.10 |
| 116 | 7/01/2005 | 0.36 | 278 | 23/06/2008 | 0.18 | 440 | 11/08/2011 | 0.76 |
| 117 | 8/01/2005 | 0.17 | 279 | 24/06/2008 | 0.28 | 441 | 11/08/2011 | 0.24 |
| 118 | 5/02/2005 | 0.29 | 280 | 25/06/2008 | 1 25 | 442 | 12/08/2011 | 0.28 |
| 110 | 40/02/2000 | 0.20 | 200 | 20/00/2000 | 1.20 | 440 | 12/00/2011 | 0.20 |
| 119 | 12/02/2005 | 0.18 | 281 | 27/06/2008 | 4.50 | 443 | 15/08/2011 | 0.50 |
| 120 | 12/02/2005 | 0.17 | 282 | 4/07/2008 | 0.17 | 444 | 11/09/2011 | 0.87 |
| 121 | 23/02/2005 | 0.21 | 283 | 4/07/2008 | 0.23 | 445 | 12/09/2011 | 0.22 |
| 100 | 24/02/2005 | 0.10 | 201 | E/07/2000 | 0.00 | 116 | 12/00/2011 | 0.71 |
| 122 | 24/03/2005 | 0.19 | 204 | 5/07/2006 | 0.02 | 440 | 13/09/2011 | 0.71 |
| 123 | 25/03/2005 | 0.75 | 285 | 7/07/2008 | 0.17 | 447 | 19/09/2011 | 0.75 |
| 124 | 30/03/2005 | 0.17 | 286 | 7/07/2008 | 0.17 | 448 | 3/10/2011 | 6.75 |
| 105 | 15/05/2005 | 0.22 | 200 | 17/07/2000 | 0.22 | 440 | 10/10/2011 | 0.21 |
| 125 | 15/05/2005 | 0.23 | 207 | 17/07/2008 | 0.33 | 449 | 10/10/2011 | 0.31 |
| 126 | 17/05/2005 | 0.18 | 288 | 19/07/2008 | 3.05 | 450 | 12/10/2011 | 1.08 |
| 127 | 17/05/2005 | 0.23 | 289 | 20/07/2008 | 0.26 | 451 | 13/10/2011 | 7.89 |
| 100 | 22/05/2005 | 0.26 | 200 | 20/07/2009 | 0.17 | 452 | 17/10/2011 | 1 55 |
| 120 | 22/05/2005 | 0.20 | 290 | 20/07/2006 | 0.17 | 452 | 17/10/2011 | 1.55 |
| 129 | 30/05/2005 | 0.19 | 291 | 20/07/2008 | 0.17 | 453 | 19/10/2011 | 2.72 |
| 130 | 30/05/2005 | 0.24 | 292 | 20/07/2008 | 0.30 | 454 | 1/11/2011 | 0.95 |
| 101 | 10/06/2005 | 0.10 | 202 | 20/07/2000 | 1 20 | 161 | 4/12/2011 | 0.00 |
| 131 | 10/00/2005 | 0.19 | 293 | 22/01/2000 | 1.20 | 400 | +/12/2011 | 0.10 |
| 132 | 18/06/2005 | 0.20 | 294 | 25/07/2008 | 0.17 | 456 | 15/12/2011 | 1.82 |
| 133 | 21/06/2005 | 0.29 | 295 | 26/07/2008 | 8 23 | 457 | 29/12/2011 | 0.18 |
| 104 | 22/06/2000 | 0.44 | 200 | 20/07/2000 | 0.17 | 151 | 20/10/2011 | 2 72 |
| 134 | 22/00/2005 | 0.41 | 290 | 20/01/2000 | 0.17 | 400 | 30/12/2011 | 3.13 |
| 135 | 24/06/2005 | 2.18 | 297 | 28/07/2008 | 0.17 | 459 | 7/01/2012 | 0.37 |
| 136 | 25/06/2005 | 0 17 | 298 | 28/07/2008 | 0 17 | 460 | 14/02/2012 | 0 19 |
| 107 | E/07/0005 | 6 70 | 200 | 20/07/2000 | 40.00 | 404 | 1 - 1 0 - 2 0 1 2 | 0.10 |
| 137 | 0/07/2005 | 0.70 | 299 | 29/07/2008 | 13.83 | 401 | 15/02/2012 | 0.40 |
| 138 | 9/07/2005 | 0.24 | 300 | 4/08/2008 | 0.17 | 462 | 23/02/2012 | 0.54 |
| 139 | 11/07/2005 | 0.67 | 301 | 9/08/2008 | 0 47 | 463 | 7/03/2012 | 0.22 |
| | 1,01/2000 | 0.01 | | 3, 33, 2000 | 5 | | .,00,2012 | J |

| 140 | 16/07/2005 | 4.12 | 302 | 12/08/2008 | 1.62 | 464 | 8/03/2012 | 0.17 |
|------|------------|------|-----|------------|------|------|------------|-------|
| 141 | 18/07/2005 | 0.89 | 303 | 13/08/2008 | 0.79 | 465 | 8/03/2012 | 0.24 |
| 142 | 18/07/2005 | 0.17 | 304 | 14/08/2008 | 0.51 | 466 | 11/03/2012 | 3.93 |
| 143 | 18/07/2005 | 0.18 | 305 | 15/08/2008 | 6.84 | 467 | 19/03/2012 | 5.27 |
| 144 | 19/07/2005 | 0.17 | 306 | 17/08/2008 | 0.19 | 468 | 21/03/2012 | 0.17 |
| 145 | 19/07/2005 | 0.17 | 307 | 17/08/2008 | 1.00 | 469 | 21/03/2012 | 12.74 |
| 146 | 21/07/2005 | 0.18 | 308 | 19/08/2008 | 0.23 | 470 | 25/03/2012 | 0.22 |
| 147 | 1/08/2005 | 0.34 | 309 | 19/08/2008 | 0.17 | 471 | 8/05/2012 | 0.26 |
| 148 | 24/08/2005 | 0.61 | 310 | 19/08/2008 | 0.17 | 472 | 8/05/2012 | 1.82 |
| 149* | 18/09/2005 | 2.17 | 311 | 24/08/2008 | 5.76 | 473 | 14/05/2012 | 0.36 |
| 150 | 23/09/2005 | 0.17 | 312 | 7/10/2008 | 0.67 | 474 | 15/05/2012 | 0.19 |
| 151* | 2/10/2005 | 5.13 | 313 | 23/10/2008 | 0.34 | 475 | 16/05/2012 | 0.33 |
| 152* | 6/10/2005 | 2.46 | 314 | 24/10/2008 | 1.98 | 476 | 16/05/2012 | 0.18 |
| 153 | 8/10/2005 | 0.64 | 315 | 25/11/2008 | 0.17 | 477 | 5/06/2012 | 0.18 |
| 154 | 8/10/2005 | 0.17 | 316 | 23/12/2008 | 0.50 | 478 | 5/06/2012 | 0.19 |
| 155 | 10/10/2005 | 0.83 | 317 | 20/02/2009 | 0.76 | 479 | 7/06/2012 | 0.18 |
| 156 | 13/10/2005 | 0.21 | 318 | 28/02/2009 | 1.07 | 480 | 26/06/2012 | 0.24 |
| 157 | 14/10/2005 | 1.95 | 319 | 6/03/2009 | 0.42 | 481 | 28/06/2012 | 0.26 |
| 158 | 20/10/2005 | 6.02 | 320 | 2/05/2009 | 0.17 | 482* | 3/07/2012 | 28.56 |
| 159 | 22/10/2005 | 0.17 | 321 | 10/05/2009 | 0.77 | 483* | 27/07/2012 | 45.44 |
| 160 | 22/10/2005 | 0.17 | 322 | 25/05/2009 | 0.17 | 484 | 2/11/2012 | 0.40 |
| 161 | 26/11/2005 | 0.20 | 323 | 9/06/2009 | 5.78 | 485 | 7/11/2012 | 0.44 |
| 162 | 24/01/2006 | 0.82 | 324 | 12/06/2009 | 0.77 | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

* denotes those events ISCO sampled





| Fable 17. Sediment yield | I summary for the | Vaughan catchment |
|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|

| Description | Value (unit) | |
|---|--------------------|--|
| Total sediment across all events | 1077 t | |
| Total sediment across sampled events | 133 t | |
| Total predicted sediment using rating | 944 t | |
| Error of predicted sediment yield | 33 t | |
| % total error of predicted sediment yield | 3 % | |
| % total sediment yield sampled | 12 % | |
| Length of record | 9.6 yr | |
| Catchment area | 2.3 km^2 | |
| Specific sediment yield | 48.8 t/km²/yr | |
| Yield trend | 0.3 t/day | |
| Specific yield trend | 44 t/km²/ yr | |

4.8 Wairoa

Greywacke and pasture are the dominant geology and land cover, respectively, in the 114 km² Wairoa catchment (Table 3). Dominant soil types include Granular and Ultic (Table 3) followed by pockets of Recent (26%), Brown (6%), Allophanic (3%), Gley (1%) and Organic (1%) soils. The Wairoa catchment is predominantly steep and the full slope breakdown is illustrated in Figure 13. The Wairoa site has been selected as a validation site. In historic reports, it has been reported that the Wairoa catchment size was 150 km². In the current study, the dams in the bottom of the catchment have been excluded and the catchment area has been recalculated as 114 km²whereby.

The sediment record at the Wairoa site spans from May 2010 to December 2012. Event sediment yields were calculated for 72 events occurring throughout the 2.6 year duration (Table 18 and Figure 10). The total sediment yield from storm events over the monitoring period was 14047 t, equating to a specific sediment yield of 47 t/km²/year (Tables 18 and 19).

Wairoa was one of the best sampled sites, sampling 87% of the recorded sediment yield. Event number 26 (Table 18) between 28/1/2011 and 31/1/2011 contributed about 37% of the overall yield (Figure 10) and had a 1:25 year return period in terms of flow (m³/s) (Appendix E3). It should be noted that this event wasn't sampled all the way through its recession, but the sampled yield as far as it went was used in preference to the rated yield because the sampled yield (as far as it went) was greater than the rated yield. Once another event of this magnitude is well sampled it will improve the upper end of the rating.

The SSY for the Wairoa catchment for the two physical years, 2011-12, was 51.8 t/km²/year versus 47 t/km²/year for the entire 2.6 year record. This suggests that the site was relatively uninfluenced by winter yields in 2010. Similarly to the Hoteo catchment, the Wairoa site yield was strongly influenced by the major summer storm event occurring in January 2011.

| Event | Event start | Event | Event | Event start | Event | Event | Event start | Event |
|-------|-------------|-----------|-------|-------------|-----------|-------|-------------|-----------|
| no. | date | yield (t) | no. | date | yield (t) | no. | date | yield (t) |
| 1 | 21/05/2010 | 5.76 | 25* | 25/01/2011 | 13.39 | 49 | 11/10/2011 | 40.14 |
| 2 | 24/05/2010 | 3.80 | 26 | 28/01/2011 | 5236.00 | 50 | 18/10/2011 | 242.77 |
| 3* | 25/05/2010 | 25.41 | 27* | 5/03/2011 | 156.80 | 51 | 18/12/2011 | 103.78 |
| 4 | 1/06/2010 | 390.14 | 28* | 18/03/2011 | 37.44 | 52 | 31/12/2011 | 41.64 |
| 5* | 6/06/2010 | 23.84 | 29 | 22/03/2011 | 24.40 | 53 | 8/01/2012 | 51.57 |
| 6* | 11/06/2010 | 17.35 | 30* | 17/04/2011 | 11.93 | 54* | 23/02/2012 | 14.99 |
| 7* | 20/06/2010 | 3.54 | 31 | 26/04/2011 | 157.73 | 55 | 20/03/2012 | 331.30 |
| 8* | 25/06/2010 | 773.40 | 32 | 7/05/2011 | 49.05 | 56* | 9/05/2012 | 49.65 |
| 9 | 4/07/2010 | 131.15 | 33 | 11/05/2011 | 8.43 | 57* | 15/05/2012 | 22.25 |
| 10 | 22/07/2010 | 93.11 | 34 | 26/05/2011 | 1191.01 | 58* | 7/06/2012 | 27.93 |
| 11 | 2/08/2010 | 265.80 | 35 | 10/06/2011 | 68.31 | 59 | 21/06/2012 | 135.33 |
| 12 | 14/08/2010 | 121.21 | 36 | 18/06/2011 | 91.63 | 60 | 25/06/2012 | 23.64 |
| 13 | 17/08/2010 | 22.71 | 37* | 27/06/2011 | 13.13 | 61 | 3/07/2012 | 40.18 |
| 14 | 20/08/2010 | 20.44 | 38* | 28/06/2011 | 14.97 | 62 | 15/07/2012 | 698.09 |
| 15 | 26/08/2010 | 64.99 | 39* | 8/07/2011 | 31.09 | 63 | 22/07/2012 | 254.02 |
| 16* | 30/08/2010 | 26.40 | 40* | 12/07/2011 | 42.25 | 64 | 30/07/2012 | 641.21 |
| 17 | 7/09/2010 | 61.57 | 41* | 21/07/2011 | 36.90 | 65* | 9/08/2012 | 41.16 |
| 18 | 9/09/2010 | 42.96 | 42* | 11/08/2011 | 74.31 | 66 | 12/08/2012 | 115.16 |
| 19* | 16/09/2010 | 45.23 | 43* | 15/08/2011 | 15.24 | 67* | 18/08/2012 | 16.60 |
| 20* | 21/09/2010 | 46.20 | 44* | 16/08/2011 | 21.85 | 68* | 19/08/2012 | 54.93 |
| 21* | 25/09/2010 | 12.38 | 45 | 11/09/2011 | 98.33 | 69 | 3/09/2012 | 422.28 |
| 22* | 1/10/2010 | 16.72 | 46* | 14/09/2011 | 14.94 | 70 | 16/09/2012 | 18.33 |
| 23* | 20/12/2010 | 11.80 | 47 | 18/09/2011 | 5.96 | 71 | 21/10/2012 | 69.49 |
| 24 | 23/01/2011 | 895.85 | 48* | 3/10/2011 | 30.62 | 72* | 6/12/2012 | 22.66 |

Table 18. Event sediment yields for the Wairoa catchment between 01/05/2010 and 31/12/2012.

* denotes missing events which are predicted based on the event peak flow rating.



Figure 10. Cumulative sediment yields and peak discharge (A) and rainfall (B) for the Wairoa sediment monitoring record from May 2010-December 2012. Note **X's** indicate sediment gauging events.

| Table 19. | Sediment y | rield summar | y for the W | airoa catchment. |
|-----------|------------|--------------|-------------|------------------|
| | | | J | |

| Description | Value (unit) |
|---|---------------------|
| Total sediment across all events | 14047 t |
| Total sediment across sampled events | 12279 t |
| Total predicted sediment using rating | 1767 t |
| Error of predicted sediment yield | 771 t |
| % total error of predicted sediment yield | 5 % |
| % total sediment yield sampled | 87 % |
| Length of record | 2.6 yr |
| Catchment area | 114 km ² |
| Specific sediment yield | 47 t/km²/yr |
| Yield trend | 16 t/day |
| Specific yield trend | 50 t/km²/yr |

4.9 Weiti

Mudstone and exotic forestry are the dominant geology and land cover, respectively, in the 1.7km² Weiti catchment. The majority of the land is rolling (51%), forming into strongly rolling (45%) and moderately steep (4%) terrain (Figure 13). The Weiti site has been selected as a compliance site.

Event sediment yields were calculated for 99 events occurring throughout the 4.7 year duration of sediment monitoring (Table 20 and Figure 11). The total sediment yield from storm events over the monitoring period was 257 t, equating to a specific sediment yield of 32 t/km²/year (Tables 20 and 21).

The SSY for the Weiti catchment for the four physical years, 2009-12, is 30 t/km²/year. The SSY figure above using a record spanning for 4.7 years that captures five winters and four summers therefore suggests that winter in 2008 had a relatively negligible influence on the SSY for the entire record. This is despite the largest event recorded at this site (event number 10 Table 20; 23 t) on 29/07/2008 occurring during this period (Appendix E4). This supports the concept that longer spanning records are less sensitive to the influence of major storm events and partially sampled years.

| Event no. | Event start date | Event yield (t) | Event no. | Event start date | Event yield (t) | Event no. | Event start date | Event yield (t) |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------|------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 15/04/2008 | 0.30 | 34* | 5/07/2010 | 4.20 | 67* | 1/11/2011 | 0.94 |
| 2 | 29/04/2008 | 0.16 | 35 | 21/07/2010 | 2.49 | 68 | 14/12/2011 | 2.59 |
| 3* | 1/05/2008 | 0.65 | 36* | 23/07/2010 | 1.17 | 69 | 29/12/2011 | 4.02 |
| 4 | 4/05/2008 | 0.92 | 37 | 7/08/2010 | 0.31 | 70* | 15/02/2012 | 1.89 |
| 5 | 8/06/2008 | 7.82 | 38 | 13/08/2010 | 0.34 | 71* | 11/03/2012 | 2.21 |
| 6* | 16/06/2008 | 1.13 | 39* | 7/09/2010 | 0.57 | 72* | 19/03/2012 | 10.66 |
| 7* | 22/06/2008 | 3.69 | 40* | 16/09/2010 | 0.92 | 73* | 21/03/2012 | 6.20 |
| 8* | 28/06/2008 | 0.79 | 41* | 19/12/2010 | 1.07 | 74* | 24/03/2012 | 0.16 |
| 9* | 26/07/2008 | 7.53 | 42 | 23/01/2011 | 2.32 | 75* | 25/03/2012 | 0.10 |
| 10 | 29/07/2008 | 22.70 | 43 | 28/01/2011 | 16.06 | 76 | 8/05/2012 | 0.42 |
| 11* | 12/08/2008 | 0.53 | 44* | 21/03/2011 | 6.34 | 77* | 14/05/2012 | 0.17 |
| 12* | 13/08/2008 | 1.00 | 45* | 26/03/2011 | 1.11 | 78* | 15/05/2012 | 0.14 |
| 13* | 15/08/2008 | 0.98 | 46* | 16/04/2011 | 0.56 | 79* | 16/05/2012 | 0.16 |
| 14* | 16/08/2008 | 0.86 | 47 | 25/04/2011 | 8.90 | 80 | 3/07/2012 | 12.59 |
| 15* | 24/08/2008 | 4.55 | 48 | 2/05/2011 | 7.45 | 81* | 16/07/2012 | 0.11 |
| 16* | 28/02/2009 | 0.79 | 49* | 7/05/2011 | 1.07 | 82* | 16/07/2012 | 0.10 |
| 17 | 10/05/2009 | 0.25 | 50* | 11/05/2011 | 1.78 | 83* | 16/07/2012 | 0.15 |
| 18 | 9/06/2009 | 6.10 | 51* | 26/05/2011 | 3.23 | 84* | 16/07/2012 | 0.34 |
| 19 | 12/06/2009 | 0.18 | 52* | 10/06/2011 | 1.58 | 85 | 22/07/2012 | 4.60 |
| 20 | 28/06/2009 | 7.79 | 53* | 17/06/2011 | 3.15 | 86* | 24/07/2012 | 0.10 |
| 21 | 4/07/2009 | 0.17 | 54* | 18/06/2011 | 1.08 | 87* | 26/07/2012 | 0.11 |
| 22 | 11/07/2009 | 1.71 | 55* | 25/06/2011 | 0.61 | 88 | 29/07/2012 | 11.60 |
| 23 | 14/07/2009 | 0.07 | 56* | 28/06/2011 | 0.52 | 89* | 1/08/2012 | 0.12 |
| 24 | 17/07/2009 | 1.43 | 57 | 8/07/2011 | 4.64 | 90* | 1/08/2012 | 1.08 |
| 25 | 29/09/2009 | 2.76 | 58 | 10/07/2011 | 0.66 | 91* | 7/08/2012 | 0.12 |
| 26 | 3/10/2009 | 0.44 | 59 | 11/07/2011 | 1.02 | 92* | 8/08/2012 | 0.33 |
| 27 | 15/10/2009 | 1.19 | 60 | 14/07/2011 | 1.28 | 93* | 11/08/2012 | 2.88 |
| 28 | 4/12/2009 | 6.59 | 61* | 21/07/2011 | 0.71 | 94* | 15/08/2012 | 0.46 |
| 29* | 21/05/2010 | 1.65 | 62* | 22/07/2011 | 6.34 | 95* | 18/08/2012 | 0.13 |
| 30* | 24/05/2010 | 1.39 | 63 | 10/10/2011 | 1.75 | 96 | 19/08/2012 | 1.24 |
| 31* | 28/05/2010 | 1.63 | 64* | 13/10/2011 | 0.93 | 97 | 3/09/2012 | 12.55 |
| 32* | 1/06/2010 | 3.04 | 65 | 17/10/2011 | 0.56 | 98* | 15/09/2012 | 0.42 |
| 33* | 25/06/2010 | 1.31 | 66 | 19/10/2011 | 0.79 | 99* | 6/12/2012 | 0.22 |

 Table 20. Event sediment yields for the Weiti catchment between 15/04/2008 and 31/12/2012.

* denotes missing events which are predicted based on the event peak flow rating.



Figure 11. Cumulative sediment yields and peak discharge (A) and rainfall (B) for the Weiti sediment monitoring record from April 2008-December 2012.

| Description | Value (unit) |
|---|---------------------|
| Total sediment across all events | 257 t |
| Total sediment across sampled events | 159 t |
| Total predicted sediment using rating | 98 t |
| Error of predicted sediment yield | 14 t |
| % total error of predicted sediment yield | 5 % |
| % total sediment yield sampled | 62 % |
| Length of record | 4.7 yr |
| Catchment area | 1.7 km ² |
| Specific sediment yield | 32.1 t/km²/yr |
| Yield trend | 0.14 t/day |
| Specific yield trend | 37.3 t/km²/yr |

 Table 21. Sediment yield summary for the Weiti catchment.

4.10 West Hoe

The West Hoe site was established in 2012 to act as a reference site whereby change in sediment loss is driven solely by climatic conditions in order to determine background conditions. The majority of the catchment (97%) is covered by broadleaved indigenous hardwoods and manuka/kanuka, and 100% of the catchment is Waitemata geology and Ultic soils (Table 3). The site is predominantly (74%) moderately steep with the rest (26%) being strongly rolling (Figure 13).

As stated in section 3.1.3, a TSS-turbidity relationship was created to develop a rating for this site. Although SSC is also being analysed for the site, the rating was stronger and appeared more sensible using this relationship than it was for SSC- turbidity but the SSC data will be used in time once more events are captured and the site better established.

The sediment yield for the TSS-turbidity one year record was calculated as 13.95 t, equating to a specific sediment yield of 26.3 t/km²/yr (Figure 12). A sediment yield summary will be derived for the West Hoe catchment over time.



Figure 12. Cumulative sediment yields and discharge (A) and rainfall (B) for the West Hoe sediment monitoring record from January 2012 to December 2012.

5.0 Discussion

5.1 Sediment yield comparisons between current sites and wider studies

The specific sediment yield (SSY) across the ten sites averaged 62.9 t/km²/yr and ranged from 26 to 167 t/km²/yr (Figure 14). The SSY was by far the greatest for the Mangemangeroa catchment which was almost double the SSY to the second greatest yielding site, Orewa (80 t/km²/yr). Although the surrounding land use is not fully provided for the Mangemangeroa catchment, as a result of some patchy AgriBase data for the area, the dominant land uses include lifestyle blocks, beef cattle and sheep farming (AssureQuality 2012). The event occurring in 24-26/7/12 at the Mangemangeroa catchment contributed to over one third of the annual yield recorded at this site, and such an event has a return period of about 1:10 year, in terms of flow (m³/s). Although there was a greater rainfall event in and around March 2012, generating a yield of 76 t, the July event occurred at a time of year when soil moisture was at field capacity and the storm event contributed to saturated excess runoff (Curran Cournane *et al.* 2011; Srinivasan and McDowell 2007; Srinivasan *et al.* 2007).

A call for caution is suggested when interpreting the sediment yield and SSY for the Mangemangeroa catchment because of its late establishment as a sediment monitoring site, particularly given the influence of one large event over a short monitoring record span. A longer record will allow us to determine if the site continues to record high sediment yield, indicating a highly erosive catchment, or whether reduced yields will be recorded over time. For example, Hicks et al. (2009b) calculated a SSY of 89 t/km²/yr for Mangemangeroa using data collected between November 2000 and March 2004 by Andrew Swales, NIWA Hamilton, and the then Auckland Regional Council Environmental Services. It is also worth noting that particular attention should focus on the approach used for calculating SSY. The 89 t/km²/yr calculated for Mangemangeroa in Hicks et al. (2009b) is the mean of three SSY approaches calculated for this site. The three rating approaches include: 1) a SSC vs peak discharge approach; 2) an event yield vs peak discharge approach; and 3) a Monte Carlo approach. Whichever of approaches 1 and 2 has the lowest standard error tends to be the approach opted for. The Monte Carlo approach is based on an event sediment yield rating using a probability distribution of event peak discharges. The SSY ranged from 81-94 t/km²/yr across all three approaches used for the Mangemangeroa catchment (Hicks et al. 2009b) and, hence, particular attention should note the approach used to calculate SSY.

Unsurprisingly, the West Hoe site generated the least SSY across all sites - supporting its appropriateness as a reference site. A call for caution also applies when interpreting the sediment yield and SSY for the West Hoe and Kaipara catchments because of the shorter length of the sediment record at these sites, albeit having longer flow and rainfall records (Figure 14). The sediment rating for these sites will improve over time as more storm events are sampled.



Figure 13. Comparison of land cover and slope at study catchments.

Mean SSY for the longer established sites (>1year sediment record) was 57.7 t/km²/yr, and the SSY are all clustered in the range 32-80 t/km²/yr – a tight range for sediment yields from multiple catchments (Hicks *et al.* 2009b). The majority of these catchments were predominantly pasture catchments except for Awanohi and Weiti which were predominantly indigenous vegetation and plantation forest, respectively (Figure 13). In contrast to Hicks *et al.* (2009b) who reported a SSY of 172 ± 19 t/km²/yr for pre-harvest conditions at Redwood Forest in the Mahurangi, pre-harvest SSY were recorded as 32 t/km²/yr in the current study at Weiti Forest. The Redwood Forest site was the steepest of all sites reported by Hicks *et al.* (2009b) and post-harvest activity at Redwood Forest yielded the greatest SSY across all sites.

When sediment yield from pastoral farming was compared with yield from plantation forestry over a full forest rotation (pre-, during- and post-harvest) in the Hawke's Bay, it was reported that sediment yield was likely to be less under forestry than pasture (Fahey *et al.* 2003). Over the seven year sediment monitoring period: pre-harvest yields were 7.6 t/km² and 21.2 t/km² for the forested and pasture catchments, respectively; 4.9 t/km² and 22 t/km², respectively, during the road construction phase; 84.4 t/km² and 43.8 t/km², respectively, during the logging phase; and 176.8 t/km² and 129 t/km², respectively, during the post harvesting phase (Fahey *et al.* 2003).

In the current study, Weiti Forest is undergoing harvesting activity and it will be interesting to both determine how the sediment yield will vary across the full rotation cycle and how long it takes for post-harvest yields to return to pre-harvest conditions. It is also worth noting that Hicks *et al.* (2009b) reported a SSY of $82 \pm 13 \text{ t/km}^2/\text{yr}$ at the Weiti Forest site (vs $32 \text{ t/km}^2/\text{yr}$ in the current report). The former SSY was derived using a sediment record only 0.56 years in length which has now been extended to 4.7 years and used to update the current SSY results. This example again reiterates to interpret short term records with caution and the importance of establishing long term records as they provide more meaningful results and are less sensitive to erratic storm events.

Sediment yields calculated for 23 monitored sites in the Waikato region ranged from 8 t/km²/yr to 230 t/km²/yr, with the majority of sites falling within the 40-100 t/km²/yr range (Hoyle *et al.* 2012). The site that generated the greatest yields was a pasture dominated site. For the nine auto-sampled sites in the latter report, SSYs ranged from 36 to 195 t/km²/yr, calculated using the event yield rating approach for unsampled events. The majority of these nine sites reported by Hoyle *et al.* (2012) were pasture dominated sites (n=6) and similarly, seven out of the ten sites in the current report (excluding Awanohi, Weiti and West Hoe) were predominantly pasture. The mean SSY for pastoral sites reported in the Waikato analysis using the event rating approach was 90 t/km²/yr versus 75 t/km²/yr in the current report, representing only a 17% difference in sediment yields generated from pastoral catchments between the two regions.

Although not currently being monitored for sediment, Hicks *et al.* (2009b) reported SSY (mean across the three analysis approaches) of $200 \pm 2 \text{ t/km}^2/\text{yr}$, $88 \pm 19 \text{ t/km}^2/\text{yr}$ and $40 \pm 11 \text{ t/km}^2/\text{yr}$ for Wylie Road, Mahurangi College and lower Awaruku-Long Bay, respectively, in Auckland. The former two sites were predominantly pasture sites and the latter site a predominantly urban site. These authors also calculated that for a given rainfall x slope product, sediment yields from forested areas were 2/3 of those from pasture areas, while sediment yields from urbanised areas were ¼ of those from pasture areas.





There tends to be a bias towards monitoring sediment in pastoral dominated catchments, reflecting the prevalence of this land cover in both Auckland and Waikato. Basher *et al.* (1997) reported a SSY of 49 t/km²/yr over a 3 year monitoring period for a predominantly intensive market gardening catchment in Pukekohe. The dominant soil types in South Auckland are classified as well structured Granular soils, representing about 17% of land area in Auckland (NZLRI 2010b). Interestingly, these yields recorded by Basher *et al.* (1997) were described as being very low in absolute terms compared to the amount of soil movement that was being measured within paddocks and deposited in drains close to the source. This was attributed to the relatively strong aggregated nature of the soils making them resistant to slaking and dispersion mechanisms that would otherwise break them up into primary soil particles which would be transported as suspended load in surface runoff (Basher *et al.* 1997; Basher and Ross 2002). These authors also reported that the bulk of sediment is generated in winter/early spring and that efforts to reduce sediment load and soil movement should be

concentrated during this period. It has been recommended that sediment stations are set up in and around West Auckland, Auckland city and the Manukau/Pukekohe areas (Semadeni-Davies *et al.* 2013) to provide a broader geographical representation of sediment yield data. This will also take into account broader geologies, land cover and climate, increasing the diversity of the dataset.

5.2 Sediment modelling considerations

It is timely to start considering using the sediment data reported in the current study, Hicks et al. (2009b), Hoyle et al. (2012) and Basher et al. (1997) to calibrate an empirical model for predicting sediment yield that is spatially sensitive and responsive to catchment hydrology, slope, land cover and geology. The CLUES (Catchment Land Use for Environmental Sustainability) model was recently investigated for data reported in the current study and that of Hicks et al. (2009b) (Semadeni-Davies et al. 2013). In general, the relationship between CLUES-predicted yields and observation-based sediment yield estimates was poor. The lack of agreement indicates that there is a need for local calibration of the CLUES model for Auckland and pooling the various studies highlighted above, as well as any studies in neighbouring regions such as Northland, will be a good starting point. However, the CLUES model does not taken into account hydrological variation which has been reported in the current and other studies as being highly variable. When choosing the empirical model it will be important to consider what the model will to be used for, whether it is fit for purpose and having appropriate data to validate the model. The Orewa and Wairoa catchments are looking like very promising sites for the purposes of model validation, both having sampled 87% of the recorded sediment yield, and in time the other validation, calibration and reference sites will become good candidates. It is recommended that future work explores the model options appropriate for Auckland Council's sediment monitoring requirements.

5.3 Auckland Plan target

Strategic Direction 7 in the Auckland Plan has a target to 'reduce the overall yield of suspended sediment to priority marine receiving environments from 2012 levels by 15% by 2040' (AC 2012). Specific sediment yields for 2012 for the ten catchments in the current study are illustrated in Figure 15 which demonstrates how variable SSY are across individual sites in Auckland. The numbers in parentheses (in Figure 15) illustrate whether 2012 total rainfall is above or below the long term mean rainfall for each site indicating the spatial variability of rainfall patterns from year to year that also needs to be considered. This is important because a reduction of sediment by 15% by 2040 from 2012 levels could purely be by chance depending on how wet or dry these two physical years are. That said, a wet or dry year is not the only driver contributing to high yields. One large event in a dry year (for example, the January 2011 event with a 1:25 return period for the Hoteo and Wairoa catchments) can have a greater effect than an above normal wet year on the SSY.



Figure 15. Specific yield (t/km²) and total rainfall for 2012 all sites [numbers in parentheses illustrate by how much rainfall (mm) was above (+) or below (-) the long term mean rainfall for each site].

A lot of research highlights the annual variability in sediment yield that is to be expected from year to year variability in weather e.g. Basher *et al.* (2011) and Hicks *et al.* (2011). This is illustrated in Figure 16 for the Vaughan site. It is therefore important to consider this sampling issue when determining if a SSY reduction has occurred between 2012 and 2040, as per the Auckland Plan target.



Figure 16. Specific annual sediment yields and mean SSY for the Vaughan 2003-2012 record.

- One way forward is to compare running mean yields over several years (e.g. 2010-2012, vs 2038-2040). The averaging period is not clear at present we need one wherein the standard error on the mean yield is < 15% otherwise a change within the target level won't be detected. This will become clearer as time progresses and the sediment datasets continue to extend.
- Another approach could involve the comparison of similar sized peak discharge events for years 2010-2012 vs 2038-2040. However, land use changes within catchments for similar sized peak discharge events will need to be considered when making temporal comparisons.
- It will also be important to nominate what sites will be used to determine the Auckland Plan sediment target. For example, the West Hoe reference site is the most stable of sites that is envisaged to remain so which would make a good candidate. Being a reference site whereby sediment is driven by climatic conditions, future climate change might mean that even West Hoe's yield increases or decreases. Therefore, the West Hoe sediment record could be used to normalise the yield trend, removing the effects of climate change (which should affect every catchment). This could also apply to the Awanohi catchment being 60% native bush. In contrast, if harvesting were to occur at Weiti forest or urbanisation of any of the pastoral catchments (e.g. Vaughan) in and around 2040 it would be imprudent to use such sites or caution would be warranted.

Furthermore, priority marine-receiving environments will also need to be identified for the latter to be determined.

• An alternative approach is to look at drift in the event yield vs Qpeak rating. This removes the interannual variability. So (assuming the rating slope remained constant), the approach would be to look for a 15% reduction in the rating offset.

Therefore, as well as serving SoE purposes, sediment monitoring needs to continue in order to measure if a sediment reduction has occurred, as per the Auckland Plan. The method used to measure change will be determined by the performance of individual sites which are envisaged to improve over time as more events are captured and the rating improved. It is recommended that future work concentrate on the approach used to determine the sediment target in the Auckland Plan when sediment data becomes more refined and reliable for all sites over time.

6.0 Conclusion

The main conclusions reported in this study of sediment yields from ten catchments in Auckland include:

- Specific sediment yields (SSY) ranged from 26 t/km²/yr at the West Hoe reference catchment to 167 t/km²/yr at the Mangemangeroa predominantly pastoral catchment. Both these two sites and the Kaipara catchment should be interpreted or viewed with caution owing to their short 1 year monitoring record. For example, the Mangemangeroa catchment yielded the greatest SSY of all sites but this was largely influenced by a 1:10 year return period event based on flow. A longer record will allow us to determine if the site continues to record high sediment yield, indicating a highly erosive catchment, or whether the SSY will reduce over time as the impact of this event on the time-averaged yield wanes.
- The mean SSY across all ten sites was 62.9 t/km²/yr calculated using the sampled storm events and the sediment event yield (kg) vs Qpeak (l/s) rating for missing events. Excluding sites with only a year's data, the SSY range across catchments (32-80 t/km²/yr) was relatively tight. The SSY reported for sites in the current study were similar in range, if not at the lower end, to Waikato yields which mostly fell within the 40-100 t/km²/yr range.
- Specific sediment yield was sensitive to large infrequent storm events, particularly for catchments with short spanning sediment records.
- It is recommended that future work explores an empirical model for predicting sediment yield for Auckland. Sediment yield analyses from previous studies in Auckland, Waikato and Northland can potentially be pooled together to locally calibrate the chosen model.
- Several considerations and approaches to measure the Auckland Plan target, which is to reduce sediment yields from 2012 levels by 15% by 2040, have been discussed. It is recommended that future work concentrate on the approach used to measure change when sediment data becomes more refined and reliable for all sites over time.

7.0 Acknowledgements

The Environmental Strategy and Policy team are thanked for supporting this study, particularly Roger Bannister. The Environmental Monitoring team in the Research Investigation and Monitoring Unit are thanked for their fieldwork contribution. Dr Murray Hicks from NIWA is thanked for analytical assistance and peer reviewing the report which has improved its quality. This report has also undergone an internal peer review and the peer review panel, review manager and reviewer, Nick Reid, are thanked for their valuable comments and suggestions.

8.0 References

Assure Quality (2012). Agribase Database Version 2012. Assure Quality, Wellington

AC (2012). The Auckland Plan March 2012. Auckland Council <u>http://theplan.theaucklandplan.govt.nz/</u>

Basher LR, Hicks DM, Clapp B, Hewitt T (2011). Sediment yield response to large storm events and forest harvesting, Motueka River, New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research* 45, 333-356

Basher LR, Hicks DM, Handyside B, Ross CW (1997). Erosion and sediment transport from the market gardening lands at Pukekohe, Auckland, New Zealand. *Journal of Hydrology (NZ)* 36, 73-95

Basher LR, Ross CW (2002). Soil erosion rates under intensive vegetable production on clay loam, strongly structured soils at Pukekohe, New Zealand. *Australian Journal of Soil Research* 40, 947-961.

Bilotta GS, Brazier RE (2008). Understanding the influence of suspended solids on water quality and aquatic biota. *Water Research* 42, 2849-2861

Curran-Cournane F, McDowell RW, Littlejohn RP, Condron LM (2011). Effects of cattle, sheep and deer grazing on soil physical quality and phosphorus and suspended sediment losses in surface runoff. *Agriculture Ecosystems & Environment* 140, 264-272

Fahey BD, Marden M, Phillips CJ (2003). Sediment yields from plantation forestry and pastoral farming, coastal Hawke's Bay, North Island, New Zealand. *Journal of Hydrology (NZ)* 42, 27-38

Guo Q (2006). Correlation of total suspended solids (TSS) and suspended sediment concentration (SSC) test methods. Prepared for New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Division of Science, Research, and Technology P.O. Box 409 Trenton, NJ 08625 Contract No. SR05-005 by The State University of New Jersey Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering 623 Bowser Road, NJ 08854

Haygarth PM, Bilotta GS, *et al.* (2006). Processes affecting transfer of sediment and colloids, with associated phosphorus, from intensively farmed grasslands: an overview of key issues. *Hydrological Processes* 20, 4407-4413

Hewitt AE (Ed.) (1998). New Zealand Soil Classification Manaaki Whenua Press: Lincoln, New Zealand

Hicks DM (2011). Sediment monitoring methods. An appendix to the sediment monitoring plan for the Auckland region. Prepared by NIWA for Auckland Council. Auckland Council technical report, TR2011/012

Hicks DM, Elliott S, Swales A (2009a). Sediment monitoring plan for the Auckland Region. Prepared by NIWA for Auckland Regional Council. Auckland Regional Council technical report, TR2009/125

Hicks DM, Hoyle J, Roulston H (2009b). Analysis of sediment yields within the Auckland Region. Prepared by NIWA for Auckland Regional Council. Auckland Regional Council technical report, TR 2009/064

Hicks DM, Shankar U, McKerchar AI, Basher L, Jessen MR, Lynn I, Page M (2011) Suspended sediment yields from New Zealand rivers. *Journal of Hydrology (NZ)* 50, 81-142

Hoyle J (2012). Weiti Forest sediment yields. Auckland Council technical report, TR2013/037

Hoyle J, Hicks M, Roulsten H (2012). Sampled suspended sediment yields from the Waikato Region. Prepared by NIWA for Waikato Regional Council technical report, 2012/01

Lynn I, Manderson A, Page M, Harmsworth G, Eyles G, Douglas G, Mackay A, Newsome P (2009) 'Land Use Capability Survey Handbook. A New Zealand handbook for the classification of land- 3rd edition.' (AgResearch Ltd, Hamilton; Landcare Research New Zealand Ltd, Lincoln; Institute of Geological and Nuclear Sciences Ltd, Lower Hutt)

McDowell RW, Srinivasan MS (2009). Identifying critical source areas for water quality: 2. Validating the approach for phosphorus and sediment losses in grazed headwater catchments. *Journal of Hydrology* 379, 68-80

Mills G, Williamson B, Cameron M, Vaughan M (2012). Marine sediment contaminants: Status and trends assessment 1998 to 2010. Prepared by Diffuse Sources Ltd for Auckland Council. Auckland Council technical report, TR2012/041

NZLRI (2010a). New Zealand Land Resource Inventory NZLRI. Landcare Research http://lris.scinfo.org.nz/#/layer/64-nzlri-slope/metadata/ Accessed 20/03/2013

NZLRI (2010b). New Zealand Land Resource Inventory NZLRI. Landcare Research http://lris.scinfo.org.nz/#/layer/79-fsl-new-zealand-soil-classification/ Accessed 20/03/2013

NZLRI (2010c). New Zealand Land Resource Inventory NZLRI. Landcare Research http://lris.scinfo.org.nz/#/layer/304-lcdb-v30-land-cover-database-version-3/comments/ Accessed 20/03/2013

Semadeni-Davies A, Hughes A, Elliott S (2013). Assessment of the CLUES model for the implementation of the National Policy Statement on Freshwater Management in the Auckland Region. Prepared by NIWA for Auckland Council (under external review)

Srinivasan MS, McDowell RW (2007). Hydrological approaches to the delineation of critical-source areas of runoff. *New Zealand Journal of Agricultural Research* 50, 249-265

Srinivasan MS, McDowell RW (2009). Identifying critical source areas for water quality: 1 mapping and validating transport areas in three head-water catchments in Otago, New Zealand. *Journal of Hydrology* 379, 54-67

Srinivasan MS, McDowell RW, Hunt C, Stevenson P (2007). Selecting curve numbers for predicting storm flow in Otago catchments. *Journal of Hydrology (New Zealand)* 49, 91-104

Yule CM, Boyero L, Marchant R (2010). Effects of sediment pollution on food webs in a tropical river (Bornea, Indonesia). *Marine and Freshwater Research* 61, 204-213

9.0 Appendices

Auckland Council

9.1 Appendix A: Schematic example of hydrograph



Appendix A. Schematic example of hydrograph illustrating water level trace, volume, trigger level to trigger sub sampling (composite) and bottle sampling.

Y axis is Water Level height in meters X axis is Day of the Month.

9.2 Appendix B: SSC and TSS background for individual sites

| Site | SSC and TSS relationship |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| Awanohi | All data pre 22/07/2012 = TSS |
| Hoteo | All data is TSS |
| Kaipara | SSC= 0.984*TSS |
| Kaukapakapa | SSC= 1.0064*TSS |
| Mangemangeroa | All 2012 data is SSC |
| Orewa | SSC = 0.998*TSS |
| Vaughan | All data pre 03/07/2012 is TSS |
| Wairoa | SSC = 1.077*TSS |
| Weiti | SSC= 0.8214*TSS (Hoyle 2012) |
| West Hoe | All data TSS/Turbidity relationship |

9.3 Appendix C: Gauging results including Cmean/Cpoint values for the various sites

| Site | Date and Time | Cmean | Cpoint | Ratio | Rated |
|---------------|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| | | | | | Discharge m ² /s |
| Hoteo | 20/03/2012 13:32 | 120.0 | 102.8 | 1.17 | 76.87 |
| Kaipara | 23/07/2012 10:51 | 107.8 | 105.9 | 1.02 | 29.87 |
| | 02/08/2012 10:21 | 117.5 | 132.18 | 0.89 | 47.55 |
| Kaukapakapa | 19/03/2012 15:43 | 115.85 | 206.25 | 0.56 | 15.11 |
| | 20/03/2012 09:27 | 92.17 | 120.00 | 0.77 | 22.75 |
| Mangemangeroa | 16/07/2012 10:57 | 195.75 | 210.15 | 0.93 | 0.83 |
| | 26/07/2012 12:47 | 27.54 | 35.51 | 0.78 | 0.23 |
| | 31/07/2012 18:48 | 76.66 | 75.75 | 1.01 | 0.56 |
| Orewa | 07/09/2010 11:46 | 147.82 | 229.90 | 0.64 | 1.47 |
| | 29/01/2011 06:05 | 87.73 | 100.80 | 0.87 | 5.50 |
| | 23/07/2012 11:32 | 40.48 | 56.30 | 0.72 | 1.65 |
| Wairoa | 26/05/2011 00:00 | 380.13 | 439.03 | 0.87 | 83.34 |
| | 27/05/2011 01:04 | 266.56 | 316.40 | 0.84 | 73.58 |
| | 22/03/2012 10:25 | 157.00 | 154.12 | 1.02 | 20.11 |
| | 22/03/2012 12:39 | 117.40 | 126.90 | 0.93 | 15.19 |
| | 16/07/2012 12:20:00 | 333.46 | 292.47 | 1.14 | 50.60 |
| | 16/07/2012 14:37 | 397.53 | 371.80 | 1.07 | 60.05 |
| | 22/03/2012 10:25 22/03/2012 12:39 16/07/2012 12:20:00 16/07/2012 14:37 | 157.00 117.40 333.46 397.53 | 154.12 126.90 292.47 371.80 | 1.02 0.93 1.14 1.07 | 20.11 15.19 50.60 60.05 |



9.4 Appendix D: Event sediment yield ratings for individual sites

Figure D1. Awanohi rating. The % estimate error in rating-estimated yield is 16%.



Figure D2. Hoteo rating. The % estimate error in rating-estimated yield is 26%.



Figure D3. Kaipara rating. The % estimate error in rating-estimated yield is 23%.



Figure D4. Kaukapakapa rating. The % estimate error in rating-estimated yield is 14%.



Figure D5. Mangemangeroa rating. The % estimate error in rating-estimated yield is 18.6%.



Figure D6. Orewa rating. The % estimate error in rating-estimated yield is 17.1%.



Figure D7. Vaughan rating. The % estimate error in rating-estimated yield is 10.2%.



Figure D8. Wairoa rating. The % estimate error in rating-estimated yield is 30.5%.



Figure D9. Weiti rating. The %estimate error in rating-estimated yield is 4.0%. The blue squares are rating events taken from Hoyle et al. (2012) up to March 2012 and the red squares are events used to develop the rating from March-December 2012.



9.5 Appendix E: Return period distributions

Figure E1. Return period distribution for the Hoteo catchment based on flow record.







Figure E3. Return period distribution for the Wairoa catchment based on flow record.



Figure E4. Return period distribution for the Weiti catchment based on flow record.