A submission to Tamar Estuary Management Taskforce

By Dr Ian Kidd (Estuarine Scientist)

lan.kidd@internode.on.net

0418 138 936

Problems in the estuary are:-

- Excessive siltation* caused by poor tidal flushing, low freshwater flows and redirection/infilling (Davis and Kidd, 2012)
- Excessive nutrients* from catchment runoff, treated and untreated sewage (Inappropriate siting of WWTPs especially Ti-tree Bend)
- Weeds willows and rice grass
- Exotic fish gambusia, oysters
- Sea-level rise* 2.7 m expected by 2100
- **Problems*** are interrelated and require holistic solutions
- Estuarine processes are often counter intuitive and a specialised knowledge is required when dealing with the estuarine environment. The Tamar is not a river and does not have a flood-plain. 'Launceston' is built on inter-tidal zones tidal flats and tidal marshes

Criteria to be met

- Essential criterion #1:- Act with nature for a good chance of success; act against nature for certain failure (PIANC, 2011)
- Essential criterion #2:- solutions must address the root cause of the problem
- Essential criterion #3:- Launceston is a first world city and deserves first world solutions
- Essential criterion #4:- solutions must be SLR-proof
- Other criteria:- cost, public licence, etc. etc..

Silt

- The silt issue has never been solved despite \$millions spent because the root causes have never been addressed see (Davis and Kidd, 2012; Kidd and Davis, 2015; Kidd et al., 2017). Excessive silt is a symptom of the root causes mentioned above and studies into the silt per se can never provide a solution. The silt is neither a catchment issue nor a turbidity issue (Davis and Kidd, 2012; Prandle, 2009) "The prevailing estuarine sediment regimes are a consequence of rather than the determinant of estuarine bathymetries" (Prandle, 2009). Peer reviewed solutions are discussed in Kidd et al. (2017).
- Raking arguably working with nature (using the flow) but doesn't provide a permanent solution because it acts to (re)move the symptom rather than removing the root cause of the issue. Works against nature by infilling the channel and removing natural tidal flats.

Sewage

 Combined sewerage systems are common around the globe so why has the Launceston system failed? (which implies that the combined system cannot be the root cause of the

- problem) **Answer**: it attempts to act against the natural processes of the estuary. WWTP discharge points all act against the tidal nature of the estuary (see criterion #1).
- **Problem is exacerbated by** reduced flushing caused by redirection of the South Esk and reduced tidal flows due to tidal levees (which in turn causes the excessive silt accretion)
- A tide flowing at 0.5 m/s for 6 hours travels 10.8 km, so as a basic starting point, discharge points must be at least 12 km downstream of Launceston and preferably, discharge into Bass Strait and the WWTP must be relocated out of Launceston at an elevation above 10 m AHD.
- Some piping is already laid adjacent to new sections of East Tamar Highway from the failed Gunns Pulp Mill Project??
- Effluent passes any point in the estuary at exactly the same rate as it is discharged, so.....
- **Under the 12 km scenario** dilution levels remain exactly as at present downstream of the discharge with no effluent reaching Launceston
- The sewage 'fix' lies somewhere between more appropriate discharge points and a fully separated tertiary-treatment system.
- The solution to pollution is dilution. Ti-tree Bend discharges into ~3 million m³ of tidal prism whereas 12 km downstream the tidal prism is ~30 million m³ and Bell Bay is 150 million m³. Dilution at Bell Bay is such that fish-farming is completely safe.
- TasWater's preferred solution meets neither criterion #1 nor criterion #2 and will fail. Similarly criteria #3 and #4; the centre of the city is no place for such a facility and is threatened by even a modest SLR.

Sea-level rise

- Retreat is the better part of valour:- Sea-levels have a direct correlation with CO2 concentrations in the atmosphere. With concentrations above 400 ppm SL ought to be 7-9 metres above the present and increases are inevitable whether emissions are reduced or not (negative emissions are required to prevent catastrophic SLR). To mitigate SLR and satisfy our essential criteria requires retreat and giving the estuary sufficient accommodation space. With accommodation space and sufficient sediment supply the estuary has a chance of rising with a modest SLR without drowning of the upper Tamar valley.
- In other words infrastructure plants, pumps, sewerage and waste water pipes must be of sufficient elevation to remain above SL for the life span of the asset.
- A barrage is the ultimate example of working against nature and will fail. (Kidd et al., 2016a; Kidd et al., 2016b; Kidd et al., 2017; Kidd et al., 2015)

Solutions – minimum requirements

- Tailrace waterway returning Tailrace discharge along the Trevallyn foreshore to the Yacht Basin (Kidd et al., 2017)
- Return North Esk tidal marshes to the estuary Acquisition of Glebe Farm, Glebe Gardens inter-tidal flats, Bill Grove inter-tidal flats and removal of associated tidal levees (Kidd et al., 2017)
- Reinstatement of old North Esk meander system on the Bill Grove inter-tidal (Kidd et al., 2017)

- Remove sluice gates near Henry St Bridge
- New WWTP beyond the city limits of Launceston discharging to a point at least 12 km downstream of Launceston. All sewage and storm water to be pumped to that facility.
 Elevation > 10 m AHD; treated as close as possible to (not worse than) present Ti-tree Bend standard
- Remove silt ponds and old WWTP at Ti-tree Bend and return to estuary possible urban wetland park/ tourist feature
- Reduce nutrient run-off from the catchment utilising....
- Real time monitoring system for nutrient loads in catchment areas of Esk Rivers. NRM North to coordinate.
- Discourage future development below 10 m AHD and encourage retreat from same

Outcomes

- Root causes of silt and sewage problems are addressed
- Upper estuary restored as close as possible to natural state
- Physical amenity returned to the upper estuary allowing Launceston to reach full potential
- Silt permanently reduced to acceptable levels without affecting Trevallyn Power Station
- Raking not required
- No sewage (raw or treated) discharge into the environs of Launceston
- Separation of storm water and sewerage infrastructure not immediately necessary
- SLR resilience

References (most included in attached thesis (Kidd, 2017))

Davis, J., Kidd, I., 2012. Identifying major stressors: The essential precursor to restoring cultural ecosystem services in a degraded estuary. Estuaries and Coasts 35, 1007-1017.

Kidd, I.M., 2017. Strategies for Morphological Remediation of the Tamar River Estuary and Other Similarly Degraded Estuaries, Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies. University of Tasmania, Launceston.

Kidd, I.M., Davis, J.A., 2015. 200 years of mud and misunderstanding, Tasmania 40 Degrees South. Forty South Publishing, Hobart Tasmania.

Kidd, I.M., Davis, J.A., Fischer, A., 2016a. A First-Order Morphological Response Model (FORM) for predicting hydrologically induced bathymetric change in coastal-plain estuaries. Journal of Coastal Research 33(2), 468-480.

Kidd, I.M., Davis, J.A., Fischer, A., 2016b. Total exclusion barrages as sea-level rise mitigators: The geomorphological trade-offs for new installations. Ocean and Coastal Management 143, 122-135. Kidd, I.M., Davis, J.A., Seward M., A., F., 2017. Bathymetric rejuvenation strategies for a degraded estuary. Ocean and Coastal Management 142, 98-110.

Kidd, I.M., Fischer, A., Chai, S., Davis, J.A., 2015. A senario-based approach to evaluating potential environmental impacts following a tidal barrage installation. Ocean and Coastal Management, 9-19. PIANC (2011). Working with Nature. Accessed August 2016, from

http://www.pianc.org/wwnpositionpaper.php.

Prandle, D., 2009. Estuaries: Dynamics, mixing, sedimentation and morphology. Cambridge University Press, New York.

Attachment

• Thesis; (Kidd, 2017)

