

Chowilla Icon Site – Floodplain Vegetation Monitoring 2018 Interim Report



**Jason Nicol, Kate Frahn, Josh Fredberg, Susan
Gehrig, Kelly Marsland and James Weedon**

**SARDI Publication No. F2010/000279-9
SARDI Research Report Series No. 1004**

**SARDI Aquatics Sciences
PO Box 120 Henley Beach SA 5022**

December 2018

Chowilla Icon Site – Floodplain Vegetation Monitoring 2018 Interim Report

**Jason Nicol, Kate Frahn, Josh Fredberg, Susan
Gehrig, Kelly Marsland and James Weedon**

**SARDI Publication No. F2010/000279-9
SARDI Research Report Series No. 1004**

December 2018

This publication may be cited as:

Nicol, J.M., Frahn, K.A., Fredberg, J., Gehrig, S.L., Marsland, K.B. and Weedon, J.T. (2018). Chowilla Icon Site – Floodplain Vegetation Monitoring 2018 Interim Report. South Australian Research and Development Institute (Aquatic Sciences), Adelaide. SARDI Publication No. F2010/000279-9. SARDI Research Report Series No. 1004. 70pp.

South Australian Research and Development Institute

SARDI Aquatic Sciences

2 Hamra Avenue

West Beach SA 5024

Telephone: (08) 8207 5400

Facsimile: (08) 8207 5415

www.pir.sa.gov.au/research

DISCLAIMER

The contents of this publication do not purport to represent the position of the Commonwealth of Australia or the MDBA in any way and, as appropriate, are presented for the purpose of informing and stimulating discussion for improved management of the Basin's natural resources. To the extent permitted by law, the copyright holders (including its employees and consultants) exclude all liability to any person for any consequences, including but not limited to all losses, damages, costs, expenses and any other compensation, arising directly or indirectly from using this report (in part or in whole) and any information or material contained in it. The report has been through the SARDI internal review process, and has been formally approved for release by the Research Director, Aquatic Sciences. The SARDI Report Series is an Administrative Report Series which has not reviewed outside the department and is not considered peer-reviewed literature. Material presented in these Administrative Reports may later be published in formal peer-reviewed scientific literature.

© 2018 SARDI

With the exception of the Commonwealth Coat of Arms, the Murray-Darling Basin Authority logo and photographs, all material presented in this document is provided under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licences/by/4.0/>) For the avoidance of any doubt, this licence only applies to the material set out in this document.



The details of the licence are available on the Creative Commons website (accessible using the links provided) as is the full legal code for the CC BY 4.0 licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licences/by/4.0/legalcode>).

SARDI Publication No. F2010/000279-9
SARDI Research Report Series No. 1004

Authors: Jason Nicol, Kate Frahn, Josh Fredberg, Susan Gehrig, Kelly Marsland and James Weedon

Reviewers: Chris Bice (SARDI) and Jan Whittle (DEW)

Approved by: Assoc. Prof. Qifeng Ye
Science Leader – Inland Waters & Catchment Ecology

Signed: 

Date: 7 December 2018

Distribution: MBDA, DEW, SAASC Library, Parliamentary Library, State Library and National Library

Circulation: Public Domain

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	II
LIST OF FIGURES	III
LIST OF TABLES.....	IV
LIST OF APPENDICES	IV
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	V
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1. INTRODUCTION	6
1.1. Objectives.....	7
2. METHODS.....	8
2.1. Hydrology	8
2.2. Vegetation surveying protocol.....	13
2.3. Plant identification and nomenclature.....	14
2.4. Data analysis	14
2.5. Comparison of The Living Murray targets under current and modelled natural flows	15
RESULTS	17
3.1. 2018 snapshot of plant communities.....	17
3.2. Grazing intensity	21
3.3. Change in the plant community from 2006 to 2018	24
3.4. The Living Murray targets	30
4. DISCUSSION	40
4.1. Floodplain and temporary wetland vegetation dynamics	40
4.2. The Living Murray Targets	41
4.3. Future research and monitoring	43
REFERENCES	44
APPENDICES.....	49

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: River Murray flow to South Australia from January 2000 to March 2018 (DEW 2018b).	10
Figure 2: Water level in Chowilla Creek upstream of the Chowilla Environmental Regulator from January 2007 to March 2018 (DEW 2018a).	11
Figure 3: Map of the Chowilla Floodplain showing condition monitoring sites: green dots indicate sites surveyed in 2018 and red dots indicate sites not surveyed in 2018.	12
Figure 4: Relationship between the number of cells containing flood dependent and amphibious species and species richness for floodplain sites (1 to 85) from 2006 to 2017 condition monitoring data.	16
Figure 5: Relationship between the number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months and species richness for floodplain sites (1 to 85) from 2006 to 2017 condition monitoring data.	16
Figure 6: Dendrogram showing group average clustering of vegetation survey sites from the 2018 survey. Dashed line shows division of sites into vegetation groups at 30% similarity.	18
Figure 7: Spatial distribution and plant communities of the 126 survey sites across the Chowilla Floodplain for the 2018 survey. Colours reflect the 2018 dendrogram groupings (Figure 6).	19
Figure 8: Mean frequency of scats for each site surveyed in 2018.	22
Figure 9: Mean frequency of scats for the different habitats (floodplain or temporary wetland) and plant communities identified by the dendrogram groupings (Figure 6). Colours for the plant community columns reflect the 2018 dendrogram groupings and error bars = ± 1 SE.	23
Figure 10: Changes through time in species richness (number of taxa) of the Chowilla Floodplain from 2006 to 2018. 2013(a), 2014(a), 2015(a), 2016(a) 2017(a), 2018(a) denotes floodplain only sites 1–85, 2013(b) denotes temporary wetland sites (86–118), 2014(b) denotes temporary wetland sites (86–126), 2015(b) denotes temporary wetland sites (86–129), 2016(b) denotes temporary wetland sites (86–143), 2017(b) denotes temporary wetland sites (86–143), 2018(b) denotes temporary wetland sites (86–143) 2013(c) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–118), 2014(c) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–126), 2015(c) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–129), 2016 (c) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–143), 2017(c) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–143) and 2018(c) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–143).	25
Figure 11: Changes in the percentage of observations of vegetation functional groups of the Chowilla Floodplain from 2006 to 2018. 2013(a), 2014(a), 2015(a), 2016 (a), 2017 (a) and 2018 (a) denotes floodplain sites 1–85; 2013(b) denotes floodplain and temporary wetlands sites (1–118), 2014(b) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–126), 2015(b) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–129), 2016(b), 2017(b) and 2018 (b) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–143).	28
Figure 12: NMS ordination comparing the plant communities of Chowilla Floodplain sites 1–85 from 2006 to 2018.	29
Figure 13: Percentage of cells with amphibious or flood dependent species present at floodplain sites (sites 1 to 85) between 2006 and 2018.	30
Figure 14: Species richness of amphibious and flood dependent species at floodplain sites (sites 1 to 85) between 2006 and 2018.	31
Figure 15: Percentage of cells with amphibious or flood dependent species present at temporary wetland sites (sites 86 to 143) between 2013 and 2018.	32
Figure 16: Species richness of amphibious and flood dependent species at temporary wetland sites (sites 86 to 143) between 2013 and 2018.	33
Figure 17: Percentage of cells with exotic species and <i>Xanthium strumarium</i> present at floodplain sites (sites 1 to 85) between 2006 and 2018.	34
Figure 18: Percentage of cells with exotic species and <i>Xanthium strumarium</i> present at temporary wetland sites (sites 86 to 143) between 2013 and 2018.	35
Figure 19: Percentage of cells with amphibious or flood dependent species present at floodplain sites between 2006 and 2018 and predicted percentage of cells with flood	

dependent and amphibious species present under modelled natural conditions at floodplain sites between 2006 and 2017.	38
Figure 20: Species richness of native amphibious and flood dependent species at floodplain sites between 2006 and 2018 and predicted flood dependent and amphibious species richness under modelled natural conditions at floodplain sites between 2006 and 2017 (Modelled Natural 1 = predicted using number of cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa; Modelled Natural 2 = predicted using number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months).....	39

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Success of attaining floodplain and temporary wetland native vegetation targets between 2006 and 2017.....	4
Table 2: Success of attaining floodplain and temporary wetland exotic species and <i>Xanthium strumarium</i> targets between 2006 and 2017.	5
Table 3: Indicator Species Analysis (Dufrene and Legendre 1997) based on unpooled data ($n=378$) from the 2018 vegetation survey. Max. Group indicates group in which taxon had highest indicator value. P-value derived from Monte-Carlo test of significance (permutations=10,000). Significant ($p<0.05$) taxa are highlighted (*denotes exotic taxon; **denotes proclaimed pest plant in SA).	20
Table 4: Success of attaining floodplain and temporary wetland native vegetation targets between 2006 and 2017.....	33
Table 5: Success of attaining floodplain and temporary wetland exotic species and <i>Xanthium strumarium</i> targets between 2006 and 2017.	35

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Site GPS coordinates (UTM format, map datum WGS 84), year survey site established (N/A = no longer included in analysis, I/A = inaccessible due to reasons other than inundation), site description and inundation history across survey period (W = watered, F = flooded, WF = watered + flooded that year).	49
Appendix 2: Species list, functional classification, life history strategy, conservation status (state conservation status from listings in Barker et al. 2005 (*denotes exotic species, **denotes proclaimed pest plant in South Australia, ***denotes weed of national significance, # denotes listed as rare in South Australia, ^ denotes listed as vulnerable in South Australia, ^denotes listed as endangered in South Australia).	56
Appendix 3: Modelled maximum inundation extent of the Chowilla Floodplain under modelled natural flows in a) 2005-06, b) 2006-07, c) 2007-08, d) 2008-09, e) 2009-10, f) 2010-11, g) 2011-12, h) 2012-13, i) 2013-14, j) 2014-15, k) 2015-16 and l) 2016-17 water years (green dots represent floodplain sites (1–85) and blue dots temporary wetland sites (86–143)).	59

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Todd Wallace, Rebecca Crack, Mark Hassam, Kate McNicol, Richard Watts, Mark Schultz, Erin Lenon and Terry Minge for field assistance. Matt Gibbs (DEW) and Andrew Keogh (MDBA) for providing modelled natural flows and inundation extents for the Chowilla Floodplain. Todd Wallace, Tony Herbert, Richard Watts, Brad Hollis, Nick Souter, Mark Schultz, Erin Lenon, Chris Bice, Rod Ward, Sandra Leigh, Leigh Thwaites, Philippa Wilson, Alison Stokes, Jan Whittle, Brenton Zampatti and Juan Livore are thanked for comments on early drafts of this report. This project was funded by The Living Murray initiative. The Living Murray is a joint initiative funded by the New South Wales, Victorian, South Australian, Australian Capital Territory and Commonwealth governments, coordinated by the Murray-Darling Basin Authority. This project has been managed by the Department of Environment and Water (DEW), through the Chowilla Icon Site staff.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Chowilla Floodplain is the largest remaining area of undeveloped floodplain habitat in the lower Murray-Darling Basin (MDB). Nonetheless, it has suffered ecological degradation due to reduced magnitude, duration and frequency of flooding as a result of river regulation and abstraction, rising saline ground water and grazing by domestic stock. It was designated as one of The Living Murray (TLM) initiative's icon sites and management actions are being undertaken with the aim of attaining a series of site-specific ecological objectives. These include the following vegetation-specific objectives:

- Objective 5: improve the area and diversity of grass and herblands,
- Objective 6: improve the area and diversity of flood dependent understorey vegetation,
- Objective 8: limit the extent of invasive (increaser) species, including weeds.

A series of quantitative targets were developed through the TLM Condition Monitoring Plan refinement project to be the subject of monitoring programs and aid assessment of the aforementioned objectives in temporary wetland and floodplain habitats at Chowilla. Five targets relate to assessment of Objectives 5 and 6 and take into consideration the abundance of flood dependent and amphibious species, frequency of occurrence of these species, species richness and the maximum interval between occurrences:

1. In temporary wetlands, a minimum of 40% of cells (from monitoring quadrats) either inundated or containing, native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every two years on average with maximum interval no greater than 4 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 20 .
2. In temporary wetlands, a minimum of 80% of cells either inundated or containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every four years on average with maximum interval no greater than 6 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 40 .
3. On the floodplain, a minimum of 20% of cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every three years on average with maximum interval no greater than 5 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 15 .
4. On the floodplain, a minimum of 40% of cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every five years on average with maximum interval no greater than 7 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 25 .
5. On the floodplain, a minimum of 65% of cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every seven years on average with maximum interval no greater than 10 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 40 .

Four targets were developed to aid assessment of Objective 8 and take into consideration the abundance of exotic species and the South Australian proclaimed pest plant *Xanthium strumarium* across the floodplain and in temporary wetlands:

1. In temporary wetlands, a maximum of 1% of cells containing *Xanthium strumarium* in any given survey.
2. In temporary wetlands, a maximum of 10% of cells containing exotic taxa in any given survey.

3. On the floodplain, a maximum of 1% of cells containing *Xanthium strumarium* in any given survey.
4. On the floodplain, a maximum of 5% of cells containing exotic taxa in any given survey.

The aim of this study was to monitor and assess vegetation condition at the Chowilla Icon Site against the site specific objectives and ecological targets. After discussions with icon site managers two additional aims were added in 2018: to assess grazing pressure and the attainment of the floodplain native vegetation targets predicted under modelled natural flows. The additional objectives were added to gain an indication of a non-hydrological influence (grazing) on vegetation and determine whether the floodplain native vegetation targets could be achieved under natural conditions and are realistically achievable.

Throughout this monitoring program (2006–2018), variable flow in the MDB and site specific management interventions within Chowilla, have resulted in spatio-temporally variable patterns of inundation. When monitoring sites were established in 2006 the MDB was in extended drought and overbank flows had not inundated large areas of floodplain since 1996. In spring 2006 and spring 2009, site-scale environmental watering (pumping) occurred at discrete wetlands (i.e. Coppermine Complex and Gum Flat). An extensive and prolonged overbank flow, and subsequent floodplain inundation, occurred from spring 2010 to autumn 2011 and another shorter but higher overbank flood occurred in late spring 2016. Several in-channel flow pulses were also experienced from 2011 to 2016. The Chowilla Environmental Regulator was also operated three times over this period, namely: spring 2014 (inundation height = 2.75 m above normal pool height, inundation area = 2,142 ha); spring 2015 (inundation height = 1.5 m above normal pool height, inundation area = 535); and winter-spring 2016 inundation height = 3.4 m above normal pool height, inundation area 7,653 ha.

A network of sites was established in areas of herbland and grassland in 2006 and the vegetation surveyed to provide a baseline. They have been re-surveyed on an annual basis to monitor medium-term vegetation changes and assess the aforementioned site specific ecological objectives. Between 2013 and 2018, an additional 58 sites in temporary wetlands that were part of a previous intervention monitoring program were added to the network to gain a better understanding of floodplain and temporary wetland condition at Chowilla. In addition, vertebrate grazing intensity was estimated for the first time in 2018 at each site by recording the frequency of scats.

The predicted attainment of the floodplain native vegetation targets was undertaken by comparing the number of quadrat cells containing flood dependent or amphibious species and species richness under current conditions and the potential number of cells with these species and species richness under modelled natural flows. The maximum flow across the South Australian border for each year between 2005 and 2016 was modelled using MSM BIGMOD (MDBA) for natural conditions. The inundation extent for the Chowilla Floodplain corresponding to the maximum natural flow was modelled using the MIKE FLOOD model (MDBA) model and a polygon of the modelled maximum inundation for each year was overlaid on the position of the sites to determine which sites were inundated in the 12 months prior to the survey.

Data collected between 2006 and 2017 showed that 75% of cells inundated in the previous 12 months contained native flood dependent or amphibious taxa. This relationship was used

to calculate the potential number of cells containing these for each survey under modelled natural flows. Two predictors of potential species richness under modelled natural flow were identified; the number of quadrat cells containing amphibious or flood dependent species and the number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months. The relationship between flood dependent and amphibious species richness and the number of cells containing the aforementioned species (derived from the condition monitoring data) was a positive linear relationship (Predicted species richness = $0.0188 \times$ no. cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious species: $R^2=0.73$) (Figure 4). In contrast, the relationship between flood dependent and amphibious species richness and the number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months was an exponential rise to maximum relationship (Predicted species richness = $36.3323 \times (1 - \exp(-0.0667 \times$ no. sites inundated in the previous 12 months: $R^2=0.84)$).

The 13th annual floodplain vegetation condition monitoring survey was undertaken in February 2018. A total of 30 species, from 12 families (predominantly from the Chenopodiaceae and Asteraceae) were recorded from the floodplain sites (1–85). With the inclusion of the temporary wetland sites surveyed in 2018, species richness across the Chowilla Floodplain increased to 62 species from 21 families (also predominantly from the Chenopodiaceae and Asteraceae).

The five most frequently encountered taxa were *Sclerolaena stelligera*, *Sclerolaena divaricata*, bare soil, *Sporobolus mitchellii* and *Atriplex* spp.; accounting for 46% of observations. Of the 10,086 observations, approximately 9% were found to be devoid of vegetation, which was a 340% increase in the number of bare cells recorded in 2017.

At a similarity of 30% cluster analysis identified eight distinct groups among the 126 sites surveyed in 2018 and Indicator Species Analysis produced a list of significant representative taxa for each group. Plant communities based on groupings identified from cluster analysis are listed below:

1. “*Atriplex* spp./*Disphyma*/*Sclerolaena brachyptera*/*Sclerolaena stelligera*” sites were predominantly characterised by the terrestrial taxa *Atriplex* spp., *Disphyma crassifolium*, *Sclerolaena brachyptera* and *Sclerolaena stelligera* (23.0% of sites),
2. “*Sclerolaena divaricata*/*Sporobolus*” were dominated the terrestrial species *Sclerolaena divaricata* and flood dependent *Sporobolus mitchellii* (27.7%),
3. “Bare soil” were predominantly characterised by empty cells (19.0%),
4. “Flood responders 1” were dominated by flood dependent and amphibious taxa such as *Calotis cunefolia*, *Cyperus gymnocaulos*, *Epaltes australis*, *Stemodia florulenta* and *Wahlenbergia fluminalis* (8.0%),
5. “Flood responders 2” were dominated by flood dependent and amphibious taxa such as *Lotus cruentus*, *Mimulus repens* and exotic *Heliotropium curassivicum* (2.3%),
6. “*Abutilon*” were dominated by the exotic amphibious species *Abutilon theophrati* (0.8%),
7. “Flood responders 3” flood dependent and amphibious taxa such as *Centipeda minima*, *Glinus lotoides*, *Glycyrrhiza acanthocarpa* and the exotic *Heliotropium europaeum* (15.9%),
8. “*Tecticornia pergranulata*” sites were dominated by the samphire *Tecticornia pergranulata* (3.3%).

Grazing intensity was variable with the floodplain more heavily grazed than temporary wetlands; however, Coombool Swamp and Lake Littra were grazing hot spots. Different grazing intensity was observed in the different communities identified by cluster analysis with the 'Atriplex spp./Disphyma/Sclerolaena brachyptera/Sclerolaena stelligera' and 'Sclerolaena divaricata/Sporobolus' communities having the highest scat frequencies and the Bare Soil and Flood responders 3 communities the lowest.

At floodplain sites in 2018, there was a decrease in species richness compared to 2017 due to there being less flood dependent and amphibious species present and an increase in bare soil. The plant community on the floodplain is transitioning towards a community similar to the one observed during the drought in the absence of watering. In contrast, species richness increased at the temporary wetland sites due to all sites not being inundated (as many were during the 2017 survey) and many being densely vegetated.

Current management practices (i.e. site-scale watering and regulator operation) and natural flooding have resulted in three out of the five targets for native understorey floodplain vegetation being achieved over the previous 12 years (Table 1). More than 65% of cells in sites 1 to 85 and more than 80% of cells at sites 86 to 143 contained amphibious or flood dependent taxa (or were inundated) in 2017 but because native flood dependent and amphibious species richness was below 40 for both habitats the target was not fully achieved.

Table 1: Success of attaining floodplain and temporary wetland native vegetation targets between 2006 and 2017.

Floodplain:	Minimum of 20% of cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every three years on average with maximum interval no greater than 5 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 15 .	Achieved
	Minimum of 40% of cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every five years on average with maximum interval no greater than 7 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 25 .	Achieved
	Minimum of 65% of cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every seven years on average with maximum interval no greater than 10 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 40 .	Not achieved
Temporary wetlands:	Minimum of 40% of cells either inundated or containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every two years on average with maximum interval no greater than 4 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 20 .	Achieved
	Minimum of 80% of cells either inundated or containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every four years on average with maximum interval no greater than 6 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 40 .	Not achieved

Targets for exotic species for the floodplain were achieved each year except in 2011, 2012 and 2017 (after the 2010-11 and 2016 floods) and the targets for *Xanthium strumarium* on the floodplain and in temporary wetlands were achieved every year. However, exotic species were abundant in temporary wetlands and the target in this habitat was only achieved in 2017 when most sites were inundated and thus devoid of vegetation (Table 2).

Table 2: Success of attaining floodplain and temporary wetland exotic species and *Xanthium strumarium* targets between 2006 and 2018.

Year	Target			
	Floodplain exotics	Floodplain <i>Xanthium</i>	Temporary wetland exotics	Temporary wetland <i>Xanthium</i>
2006	Achieved	Achieved	NA	NA
2007	Achieved	Achieved	NA	NA
2008	Achieved	Achieved	NA	NA
2009	Achieved	Achieved	NA	NA
2010	Achieved	Achieved	NA	NA
2011	Not achieved	Achieved	NA	NA
2012	Not achieved	Achieved	NA	NA
2013	Achieved	Achieved	Not achieved	Achieved
2014	Achieved	Achieved	Not achieved	Achieved
2015	Achieved	Achieved	Not achieved	Achieved
2016	Achieved	Achieved	Not achieved	Achieved
2017	Not achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved
2018	Achieved	Achieved	Not achieved	Achieved

Modelled natural inundation predicted that for most years more sites would be inundated compared to the current regime, except in 2006-07 and 2009-10 when Coppermine Complex and Gum Flat were watered, and 2014-15 and 2015-16 when the regulator was operated. Under modelled natural conditions between 2006 and 2017, 20% or more of quadrat cells were predicted to contain amphibious or flood dependent species on six occasions with the maximum interval four years. This also occurred on six occasions under current conditions. Amphibious or flood dependent species were present in 40% of cells three times between 2006 and 2017 with a maximum interval of five years under both natural and current conditions. However, on each of these occasions under natural conditions over 65% of cells were predicted to have flood dependent or amphibious species present.

Predicted species richness under modelled natural flows varied depending on whether the number of cells containing floodplain or amphibious species or the number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months was used as the predictor. More than 15 native flood dependent and amphibious species were recorded on seven occasions between 2006 and 2017 but on three occasions this was due to watering interventions. When the number of quadrat cells containing flood dependent or amphibious species was used as the predictor more than 15 species were predicted on five occasions and when the number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months was used more than 15 species was predicted on six occasions. However, when the number of quadrat cells containing floodplain or amphibious species was used as the predictor the flood dependent and amphibious species richness was predicted to be greater than 40 in 2011, 2012 and 2017. In contrast, the predicted flood dependent and amphibious species richness did not exceed 40 when the number of cells inundated in the previous 12 months was used.

Under modelled natural conditions based on the predicted occurrence of flood dependent or amphibious taxa and using the number of quadrat cells containing flood dependent or amphibious species as the predictor for species richness, all targets would be achieved under

natural conditions. When the number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months was used to predict flood dependent and amphibious species richness only the one-in-three and one-in-five year targets would be achieved. However, both functions used to predict amphibious and flood dependent species richness under natural conditions need to be viewed with caution and require further investigation.

The predictions of occurrence of flood dependent and amphibious species and species richness under natural conditions showed that that the targets (despite being developed largely using expert opinion) are realistic benchmarks for vegetation condition.

Keywords: Floodplain understorey, The Living Murray, Condition monitoring, Chowilla monitoring, Chowilla Floodplain.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Chowilla Floodplain, located on the lower River Murray at the borders of South Australia, New South Wales and Victoria, is the largest remaining undeveloped area of floodplain habitat in the lower Murray-Darling Basin (MDB). It is unique for its large area of contiguous floodplain habitat and wide variety of aquatic environments including fast and slow flowing anabranches, temporary billabongs and permanent backwaters (O'Malley and Sheldon 1990). The area supports a large range of species across many taxonomic groups and has been recognised as a wetland of international significance under the Ramsar convention (O'Malley and Sheldon 1990) and an Icon Site under the Murray-Darling Basin Authority's (MDBA) *The Living Murray* (TLM) initiative.

Prior to river regulation in the MDB, the lower River Murray experienced greater variability in flow (and in turn water level) and (due to small to medium sized floods, which are now generally lost from the system). Hence, the Chowilla Floodplain was historically inundated more frequently (to some extent every one to two years), for longer duration and to greater depths (Maheshwari *et al.* 1995).

Vegetation on the Chowilla Floodplain includes *Eucalyptus largiflorens* (black box) woodlands, *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* var. *camaldulensis* (river red gum) woodlands, *Atriplex* spp. (saltbush) shrublands and a range of aquatic and riparian vegetation types associated with the various temporary and permanent wetlands (O'Malley and Sheldon 1990). The majority of vegetation studies of the Chowilla Anabranch system prior to 2005 focused on the *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* and *Eucalyptus largiflorens* overstorey communities with an emphasis on the impact of groundwater depth and salinity on tree condition (e.g. Jolly *et al.* 1993; 1994; McEwan *et al.* 1995; Walker *et al.* 1996; Akeroyd *et al.* 1998; Doble *et al.* 2004; Overton and Jolly 2004). Prior to The Living Murray condition and intervention monitoring programs, there were sporadic investigations of the understorey vegetation of the system; O'Malley (1990) and Roberts and Ludwig (1990; 1991) undertook extensive surveys of the floodplain and permanently inundated wetlands, respectively, whilst there has been a series of site-specific monitoring and research investigations at Pilby Creek (e.g. Stone 2001; Siebentritt 2003).

1.1. Objectives

This monitoring program was initiated in 2006 and represents the longest continuous monitoring program of the understorey plant community on the Chowilla Floodplain and at any floodplain site in the South Australian River Murray Corridor. The monitoring program was established to assess the four understorey vegetation objectives identified in The Chowilla Floodplain Environmental Water Management Plan (Murray-Darling Basin Authority 2012), namely:

Objective 5 - “improve the area and diversity of grass and herblands”,

Objective 6 - “improve the area and diversity of flood dependent understorey vegetation”,

Objective 7 - “maintain or improve the area and diversity of grazing sensitive plant species”,

Objective 8 - “limit the extent of invasive (increaser) species, including weeds”.

A series of targets for temporary wetlands and the floodplain were developed to assess Objectives 5, 6 and 8 (Objective 7 was not assessed because it does not relate to water management). Five targets assess the combined Objectives 5 and 6, and take into consideration the abundance of flood dependent and amphibious species, the frequency of occurrence of these species, species richness and the maximum interval between occurrences:

1. In temporary wetlands a minimum of 40% of cells (from monitoring quadrats) either inundated or containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every two years on average, with maximum interval no greater than 4 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 20 .
2. In temporary wetlands a minimum of 80% of cells either inundated or containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every four years on average, with maximum interval no greater than 6 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 40 .
3. On the floodplain a minimum of 20% of cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every three years on average with maximum interval no greater than 5 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 15 .
4. On the floodplain a minimum of 40% of cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every five years on average with maximum interval no greater than 7 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 25 .
5. On the floodplain a minimum of 65% of cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every seven years on average with maximum interval no greater than 10 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 40 .

Four targets were developed to assess Objective 8 and take into consideration the abundance of exotic species and the South Australian proclaimed pest plant *Xanthium strumarium* across the floodplain and in temporary wetlands in any given survey:

1. In temporary wetlands a maximum of 1% of cells containing *Xanthium strumarium* in any given survey.

2. In temporary wetlands a maximum of 10% of cells containing exotic taxa in any given survey.
3. On the floodplain a maximum of 1% of cells containing *Xanthium strumarium* in any given survey.
4. On the floodplain a maximum of 5% of cells containing exotic taxa in any given survey.

Assessment of these objectives and targets requires both baseline data and ongoing monitoring, particularly after large flood events or management interventions.

Monitoring undertaken in 2018 builds upon data collected from 2006–2017 and provides information regarding the change in plant communities over that time. The survey period includes a period of record low inflows, targeted environmental watering, two large unregulated flow events, several smaller flow pulses and operation of the Chowilla Environmental Regulator on three occasions, at three different heights and durations. Therefore, this monitoring program has collected information regarding the change in floodplain understorey vegetation in response to different inundation histories, such as desiccation, targeted environmental watering and increased water levels and areas of inundation due to natural flooding and regulator operation. The surveys from 2013 onwards included temporary wetlands that were previously monitored under the intervention monitoring program (Nicol *et al.* 2010b; Nicol 2012).

The aim of this study was to monitor and assess vegetation condition at the Chowilla Icon Site against site specific objectives and associated ecological targets. After discussions with site managers two additional aims were added in 2018: to assess grazing pressure and compare the attainment of the floodplain native vegetation targets with those predicted under modelled natural flows. The aims were added to gain an indication of the influence grazing, which is considered major non-hydrological influence on the understorey vegetation and determine whether the floodplain native vegetation targets are attainable under natural flows and realistic for assessing management actions. This interim report describes: the methods used to establish the monitoring sites, including survey design; results from the 2018 survey; quantitative and qualitative comparisons of the changes in floristic composition between 2006 and 2018; evaluation of achievement of TLM targets; assessment of vertebrate grazing pressure; and comparison of the attainment of TLM targets under current conditions and modelled natural flows.

2. METHODS

2.1. Hydrology

From 1996 to 2010, the MDB experienced the most severe drought in recorded history (van Dijk *et al.* 2013). Below average stream flows, coupled with upstream extraction and river regulation, have resulted in reduced inflows to South Australia (van Dijk *et al.* 2013), which prior to August 2010 were insufficient to inundate the floodplain (Murray-Darling Basin Authority 2011) (Figure 1). From June 2010 to May 2011, total inflow volumes were among the highest on record and patterns of inflows were atypical compared to historical flows (Murray-Darling Basin Authority 2011) (Figure 1). Inflows from June until the end of November 2010, were the highest since 2000, but not unusual compared to historical flows. However,

inflows during summer 2010-11 were the highest on record for the southern basin (~6,700 GL); more than double the previous highest record of ~2,980 GL in the summer of 1992-93 (Murray-Darling Basin Authority 2011).

During this period, flow into South Australia peaked at 93,000 ML/day in February 2011 (Figure 1). Flows of this magnitude inundate around 70% of the Chowilla Floodplain area (Overton *et al.* 2006), with the delineation between floodplain and highland based upon the extent of the 1956 flood (Overton and Doody 2010). Large flows with maximums of ~100,000 ML/day under natural conditions typically last for around three months as unregulated events (Sharley and Huggan 1995), but the 2010-11 high flows and floodplain inundation persisted for ~11 months (Figure 1). Hence, for the first time in more than ten years, flows not only watered red gum (*Eucalyptus camaldulensis*) woodland and wetland areas, but also reached higher elevation black box (*Eucalyptus largiflorens*) woodlands (Murray-Darling Basin Authority 2011).

Flows remained high throughout winter and spring 2011 with flows of 41,000 ML/day in August 2011, and remained above 15,000 ML/day throughout the summer. Another two flow pulses peaking at 60,000 ML/day and 50,000 ML/day (flow into South Australia) occurred in April and October 2012 (Figure 1) resulting in inundation of low level floodplain. Following this, flow declined and from January to August 2013 flow into South Australia was maintained at entitlement flows (<10,000 ML/day), before a small unregulated flow peaking at 23,500 ML/day in October 2013 (Figure 1). From December 2013 to June 2014, flow to South Australia remained at entitlement (Figure 1). There was a small flow of 16,000 ML/day in July 2014, after which flows decreased to 5,000 ML/day in September 2014, before increasing again to 7,000–11,000 ML/day between October 2014 and March 2015 (due to delivery of environmental water and return flows from upstream watering interventions), and then returning to entitlement (Figure 1). These flows were confined to the channel and insufficient to inundate large areas of floodplain; nevertheless, some low lying temporary wetlands were flooded between 2012 and 2015.

For most of 2016 flows to South Australia remained <12,000 ML/day until mid-July when flow increased slowly, peaking at 95,000 ML/day on November 30th, inundating 14,358 ha of the Chowilla Floodplain, after which flow (and water level: Figure 2) decreased rapidly. By February 2017 flow was approximately 10,000 ML/day and remained around this level for the rest of the study period (Figure 1). At the peak of the late 2016 overbank flood 116 monitoring sites; 60 (80%) floodplain sites and 57 (100%) temporary wetland sites were inundated (Appendix 1). Flows were generally below 12,000 ML/day throughout 2017, except for the first half of January when flows were receding from the overbank flood and a small in-channel pulse peaking at 17,600 ML/day in mid-November (Figure 1). The resultant water level rise was insufficient to inundate significant areas of floodplain or temporary wetlands (Figure 2).

The Chowilla Environmental Regulator was operated for the first time in spring 2014. Water levels were gradually raised to 19.1 m AHD upstream of the regulator by October 2014, increasing water levels by approximately 2.75 m (Figure 2). An associated raising of Lock and Weir 6 to 19.67 m AHD (42 cm above normal pool level) was also undertaken. These actions resulted in inundation of 2,142 ha of low lying floodplain (including 12 floodplain sites) and most temporary wetlands including Werta Wert Wetland, Coppermine Complex, Lake Limbra, Twin Creeks, Punkah Depression, Punkah Floodrunner and Monoman Horseshoe (including

55 temporary wetland sites). Water levels were held at this height for two weeks before being drawn down and returning to normal levels by December 2014.

The Chowilla Regulator was operated for a second time in spring 2015 to a low level to generate a within channel increase in water levels. Water levels were gradually raised to 17.85 m AHD upstream of the regulator in November 2015, increasing water levels by 1.5 m (Figure 2). This action resulted in inundation of 535 ha of low lying floodplain (including two floodplain sites) and temporary wetlands (including five monitoring sites). Water levels were held at this height for five days before being drawn down and returning to normal levels by December 2015.

A third large scale operation of the Chowilla Regulator was undertaken in spring 2016. Water levels were raised to 19.75 m AHD (3.4 m above pool level) at the regulator and to 19.84 m AHD (59 cm above normal pool level) at Lock 6 (Figure 2). This resulted in inundation of approximately 7,650 ha of floodplain and temporary wetlands at the peak in late-September 2016. Regulator operation inundated a total of 90 monitoring sites (35 floodplain and 55 temporary wetland), all of which were inundated again by the subsequent natural flood (Appendix 1) during which water levels peaked at 19.96 m AHD in early-December (Figure 2).




Figure 1: River Murray flow to South Australia from January 2000 to March 2018 (DEW 2018b).




Figure 2: Water level in Chowilla Creek upstream of the Chowilla Environmental Regulator from January 2007 to March 2018 (DEW 2018a).




Figure 3: Map of the Chowilla Floodplain showing condition monitoring sites: green dots indicate sites surveyed in 2018 and red dots indicate sites not surveyed in 2018.

2.2. Vegetation surveying protocol

Vegetation survey methods were consistent with those used for other vegetation monitoring projects in the South Australian River Murray upstream of Wellington (e.g. Nicol 2010; Nicol *et al.* 2013; 2015a; 2015b). The maintenance of consistent methods and ongoing monitoring will facilitate comparison of data across studies to enable a greater understanding of floodplain vegetation dynamics across the lower River Murray and with broader hydrology.

In February 2006, a series of sites were established in areas of herbland and grassland across the Chowilla Floodplain (Weedon and Nicol 2006). Sites were chosen such that they:

- were located in areas that would be inundated by overbank flows
- had no tree overstorey
- were accessible by 4WD vehicle during dry conditions
- covered a range of vegetation types and grazing histories.

Sites were re-surveyed in February 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018. Due to the 2010/11 overbank flood, access to the Chowilla Floodplain was not possible until July 2011. In 2008, three additional sites on islands and the New South Wales section of the floodplain were added. Two sites established in 2006 (53 and 54) were excluded from 2009 onwards as the construction of a fence made them inaccessible (Appendix 1). In 2010, 2011, 2012, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018 sites on Punkah Island were inaccessible due to high water levels in Punkah Creek or damage to the ford and in 2011 a total of 16 sites (including the sites on Punkah Island) were inaccessible due to high river levels. In 2013, a total of 5 of the original floodplain sites were inaccessible and therefore not surveyed. In spring 2013, Gum Flat was watered with six sites inundated and thus not able to be surveyed in 2014. In 2016 a total of 17 established sites (including those on Punkah Island) were unable to be surveyed; sites 50, 96 (Punkah Depression), 98 (Punkah Flood Runner), 118 (Pipeclay Billabong) and 129 (Bandy Bottle Lagoon) were inundated and sites 84, 85, 88, 89 and 90 (Kulcurna) were inaccessible due to the key for the lock on the gate being unavailable. In 2017 a total of 48 sites were inundated in February, and devoid of vegetation but were included in the analysis. In 2018 a total of 12 sites were not surveyed including the sites on Punkah Island. Four floodplain sites and one in Woolshed Creek on the western end of the floodplain were not surveyed due to changed land tenure (see further details in Appendix 1).

In 2013, 34 additional sites were included in the network to gain a better understanding of temporary wetland (as well as floodplain) condition at Chowilla. These included sites within temporary wetlands such as Lake Littra, Werta Wert Wetland, Hancock Creek, Kulcurna (flood runners), Lake Limbra, Coombool Swamp, Punkah Depression, Punkah Flood Runner, Monoman Depression, Chowilla Oxbow and Pipeclay Billabong (Figure 3, Appendix 1). In 2014, another seven temporary wetland sites were added, in Twin Creeks, Monoman Island Horseshoe and Coppermine Waterhole (in 2013 these sites had been either wet or inaccessible) (Appendix 1). An additional three sites were added in 2015 in Brandy Bottle Lagoon and Chowilla Island Loop (having been inaccessible or inundated prior to 2014)

(Appendix 1). Another 14 sites were added in 2016 in the central and southern basins of Werta Wert Wetland and Woolshed Creek, which had been previously inundated (Appendix 1). The second site in Pipeclay Billabong was not inundated in 2018 and has now been surveyed. A total of 59 temporary wetland sites have now been included in the network since 2013; however, they may not all be surveyed each year depending on accessibility and inundation (Appendix 1). The only sites from the intervention monitoring program (Nicol *et al.* 2010b; Nicol 2012) now not included in the condition monitoring program are the two sites in Punkah Island Horseshoes (Figure 3, Appendix 1).

At each site, three 15 m x 1 m quadrats were surveyed. Quadrats were arranged in a straight line parallel to elevation contours 50 m apart. Each quadrat was divided into 15, 1 x 1 m cells. The presence of each species that had live plants rooted within each cell was recorded to give a total score out of 15 for each quadrat. Cells that were not inundated and contained no live plants were recorded as bare soil and inundated cells containing no live plants as open water. In 2018, the frequency of scats in each quadrat was also recorded in this manner to gain an indication of vertebrate grazing intensity. The types of scats were not identified but included the native animals: emus (*Dromaius novaehollandiae*), kangaroos (western grey; *Macropus fuliginosus* and red; *Macropus rufus*) and euros (*Macropus robustus*) and feral and domestic species: sheep (*Ovis aries*), goats (*Capra aegagrus hircus*), pigs (*Sus scrofa*) and rabbits (*Oryctolagus cuniculus*).

2.3. Plant identification and nomenclature

Plants were identified using keys in Jessop and Toelken (1986), Cunningham *et al.* (1992), and Jessop *et al.* (2006). In some cases, due to immature individuals or lack of floral structures, plants were identified to genus only. Nomenclature follows the Centre for Australian National Biodiversity Research and Council of Heads of Australasian Herbaria (2018). A comprehensive list of all species surveyed, their functional classification, life history strategy and conservation status are presented in Appendix 2.

2.4. Data analysis

For the 2018 survey, the plant communities present (a snapshot for that year) were compared using Group Average Clustering (McCune *et al.* 2002) performed on pooled data (species scores were averaged from the three quadrats at each site). A cut-off score of 30% similarity was used to determine the cluster groups based on species presence and their abundances. To identify the representative species for each group, Indicator Species Analysis (Dufrene and Legendre 1997) was performed on the unpooled data using the groupings of sites derived from the cluster analysis. All multivariate analyses used Bray-Curtis (1957) distances to construct the similarity matrices and were undertaken using the package PCOrd 5.12 (McCune and Mefford 2006). Finally, the locations of the quadrats were mapped to allow presentation of the spatial distribution of the vegetation groups.

Differences in scat frequency between the floodplain (sites 1–85) and wetland (sites 86–143) habitats and the different plant communities as identified by the cluster analysis were analysed using single factor univariate PERMANOVA (Anderson and Ter Braak 2003), using the package PRIMER version 7.0.12 (Clarke and Gorley 2015). Euclidean distances were used

to calculate the similarity matrices for all univariate PERMANOVA analyses and α was corrected for multiple comparisons using the Bonferroni correction.

Changes in floristic composition of floodplain sites (sites 1 to 85) from 2006 to 2018 were analysed using non-metric multi-dimensional scaling (nMDS) ordination using the package PRIMER version 7.0.12 (Clarke and Gorley 2015). In addition, plants were classified into functional groups based on the framework developed by Nicol *et al.* (2010) and the proportion of broad functional groups (terrestrial, salt tolerant, flood dependent, amphibious and bare soil) present each year were plotted.

2.5. Comparison of The Living Murray targets under current and modelled natural flows

A comparison of 1) the number of quadrat cells containing flood dependent or amphibious species; and 2) flood dependent and amphibious species richness was made between current conditions (empirical data) and that predicted under modelled natural flows for the floodplain (sites 1 to 85). The maximum flow across the South Australian border for each year between 2005 and 2016 was modelled for natural conditions (all regulating structures and water extraction removed) using MSM BIGMOD by the Murray-Darling Basin Authority (MDBA). The inundation extent for the Chowilla Floodplain corresponding to the maximum natural modelled flow was calculated using the MIKE FLOOD model (MDBA). A polygon of the modelled maximum inundation extent under natural flows for each year was overlaid on the position of the sites to determine which sites were modelled to have been inundated in the 12 months prior to the survey.

Empirical data collected between 2006 and 2017 showed that 75% of cells contained native flood dependent or amphibious taxa when inundated in the previous 12 months and this number was used to calculate the potential number of cells containing flood dependent or amphibious species for each survey under modelled natural flows.

The same data yielded two predictors of potential species richness under modelled natural flow; 1) the number of quadrat cells containing amphibious or flood dependent species; and 2) the number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months. However, these data showed very different and highly significant relationships (Figure 4, Figure 5). The relationship between flood dependent and amphibious species richness and the number of cells containing the aforementioned species was a positive linear relationship (Predicted species richness = $0.0188 \times \text{no. cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious species}$; $R^2=0.73$) (Figure 4). In contrast, the relationship between flood dependent and amphibious species richness and the number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months was an exponential rise to maximum relationship (Predicted species richness = $36.3323 \times (1-\exp(-0.0667 \times \text{no. sites inundated in the previous 12 months}))$; $R^2=0.84$) (Figure 5).




Figure 4: Relationship between the number of cells containing flood dependent and amphibious species and species richness for floodplain sites (1 to 85) from 2006 to 2017 condition monitoring data.




Figure 5: Relationship between the number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months and species richness for floodplain sites (1 to 85) from 2006 to 2017 condition monitoring data.

RESULTS

3.1. 2018 snapshot of plant communities

In 2018, 30 species, from 12 families (predominantly from the Chenopodiaceae and Asteraceae) were recorded from the floodplain sites (established in 2006). With the inclusion of the temporary wetland sites surveyed in 2018, species richness across the Chowilla Floodplain increased to 62 species from 21 families (also predominantly from the Chenopodiaceae and Asteraceae).

The five most frequently encountered taxa were *Sclerolaena stelligera*, *Sclerolaena divaricata*, bare soil, *Sporobolus mitchellii* and *Atriplex* spp.; accounting for 46% of observations. Of the 10,086 observations, approximately 9% were found to be devoid of vegetation.

At a similarity of 30% cluster analysis identified eight distinct groups (Figure 6) of the 126 sites surveyed across the Chowilla Floodplain in 2018 and Indicator Species Analysis (Table 3) produced a list of significant representative taxa for each group. Figure 7 shows the spatial distribution and plant community based on groupings identified from cluster analysis listed below:

1. “*Atriplex* spp./*Disphyma*/*Sclerolaena brachyptera*/*Sclerolaena stelligera*” sites were predominantly characterised by the terrestrial taxa *Atriplex* spp., *Disphyma crassifolium*, *Sclerolaena brachyptera* and *Sclerolaena stelligera* (23.0% of sites),
2. “*Sclerolaena divaricata*/*Sporobolus*” were dominated the terrestrial species *Sclerolaena divaricata* and flood dependent *Sporobolus mitchellii* (27.7%),
3. “Bare soil” were predominantly characterised by empty cells (19.0%),
4. “Flood responders 1” were dominated by flood dependent and amphibious taxa such as *Calotis cunefolia*, *Cyperus gymnocaulos*, *Epaltes australis*, *Stemodia florulenta* and *Wahlenbergia fluminalis* (8.0%),
5. “Flood responders 2” were dominated by flood dependent and amphibious taxa such as *Lotus cruentus*, *Mimulus repens* and exotic *Heliotropium curassivicum* (2.3%),
6. “*Abutilon*” were dominated by the exotic amphibious species *Abutilon theophrati* (0.8%),
7. “Flood responders 3” flood dependent and amphibious taxa such as *Centipeda minima*, *Glinus lotoides*, *Glycyrrhiza acanthocarpa* and the exotic *Heliotropium europaeum* (15.9%),
8. “*Tecticornia pergranulata*” sites were dominated by the samphire *Tecticornia pergranulata* (3.3%).




Figure 6: Dendrogram showing group average clustering of vegetation survey sites from the 2018 survey. Dashed line shows division of sites into vegetation groups at 30% similarity.

Table 3: Indicator Species Analysis (Dufrene and Legendre 1997) based on unpooled data ($n=378$) from the 2018 vegetation survey. Group indicates group in which taxon had highest indicator value. P-value derived from Monte-Carlo test of significance (permutations=10,000). Significant ($p<0.05$) taxa are highlighted (*denotes exotic taxon; **denotes proclaimed pest plant in SA).

Species	Group	P
<i>Abutilon theophrasti</i>	Abutilon	0.0002
<i>Acacia stenophylla</i>	Flood responder 1	0.2547
<i>Alternanthera denticulata</i>	Sclerolaena divaricata/Sporobolus	0.2388
<i>Aster subulatus*</i>	Bare Soil	0.4917
<i>Atriplex</i> spp.	Atriplex spp./Disphyma/Sclerolaena brachyptera/Sclerolaena stelligera	0.0236
<i>Atriplex suberecta</i>	Flood responder 3	0.5489
Bare soil	Bare Soil	0.0002
<i>Brachyscome basaltica</i>	Bare Soil	0.5047
<i>Calotis cuneifolia</i>	Flood responder 1	0.0034
<i>Calotis hispidula</i>	Atriplex spp./Disphyma/Sclerolaena brachyptera/Sclerolaena stelligera	0.5631
<i>Centaurium tenuiflorum</i>	Flood responder 1	0.034
<i>Centipeda minima</i>	Flood responder 3	0.001
<i>Chamaesyce drummondii</i>	Flood responder 1	0.1808
<i>Chenopodium nitrariaceum</i>	Sclerolaena divaricata/Sporobolus	0.3795
<i>Conyza bonariensis</i>	Flood responder 1	0.0906
<i>Cyperus gymnocaulos</i>	Flood responder 1	0.0042
<i>Disphyma crassifolium</i> ssp. <i>clavellatum</i>	Atriplex spp./Disphyma/Sclerolaena brachyptera/Sclerolaena stelligera	0.0002
<i>Dittrichia graveolens</i>	Flood responder 1	0.1998
<i>Duma florulenta</i>	Flood responder 1	0.5183
<i>Duma horrida</i>	Atriplex spp./Disphyma/Sclerolaena brachyptera/Sclerolaena stelligera	0.3123
<i>Dysphania pumilio</i>	Flood responder 3	0.249
<i>Einadia nutans</i>	Atriplex spp./Disphyma/Sclerolaena brachyptera/Sclerolaena stelligera	0.7117
<i>Enchylaena tomentosa</i>	Bare Soil	0.6823
<i>Epaltès australis</i>	Flood responder 1	0.0002
<i>Eragrostis australasica</i>	Atriplex spp./Disphyma/Sclerolaena brachyptera/Sclerolaena stelligera	0.7243
<i>Eragrostis dielsii</i>	Flood responder 1	0.1434
<i>Eremophila divaricata</i>	Atriplex spp./Disphyma/Sclerolaena brachyptera/Sclerolaena stelligera	0.7281
<i>Eucalyptus camaldulensis</i>	Flood responder 1	0.4761
<i>Frankenia pauciflora</i>	Tecticornia pergranulata	0.1072
<i>Glinus lotoides</i>	Flood responder 3	0.0002
<i>Glycyrrhiza acanthocarpa</i>	Flood responder 3	0.0204
<i>Goodenia gracilis</i>	Flood responder 1	0.1512
<i>Haloragis aspera</i>	Flood responder 1	0.051
<i>Helichrysum luteo-album</i>	Flood responder 1	0.0684
<i>Heliotropium amplexicaule*</i>	Flood responder 1	0.0712
<i>Heliotropium curassavicum*</i>	Flood responder 2	0.0058
<i>Heliotropium europaeum*</i>	Flood responder 3	0.0128
<i>Lotus cruentus</i>	Flood responder 2	0.0002
<i>Maireana</i> spp.	Atriplex spp./Disphyma/Sclerolaena brachyptera/Sclerolaena stelligera	0.2118
<i>Medicago</i> spp.*	Flood responder 3	0.3005
<i>Mimulus repens</i>	Flood responder 2	0.0002
<i>Osteocarpum acropterum</i>	Tecticornia pergranulata	0.0838
<i>Phyla canescens*</i>	Sclerolaena divaricata/Sporobolus	0.2354
<i>Polygonum plebeium</i>	Flood responder 3	0.0898
<i>Rhagodia spinescens</i>	Bare Soil	0.1558
<i>Rumex bidens</i>	Flood responder 3	0.1986

Species	Group	P
<i>Salsola australis</i>	Atriplex spp./Disphyma/Sclerolaena brachyptera/Sclerolaena stelligera	0.6719
<i>Scleroblitum atriplicinum</i>	Flood responder 1	0.7419
<i>Sclerolaena brachyptera</i>	Atriplex spp./Disphyma/Sclerolaena brachyptera/Sclerolaena stelligera	0.0002
<i>Sclerolaena divaricata</i>	Sclerolaena divaricata/Sporobolus	0.0002
<i>Sclerolaena stelligera</i>	Atriplex spp./Disphyma/Sclerolaena brachyptera/Sclerolaena stelligera	0.0002
<i>Senecio cunninghamii</i>	Flood responder 3	0.145
<i>Senecio runcinifolius</i>	Flood responder 3	0.6639
<i>Solanum lacunarium</i>	Sclerolaena divaricata/Sporobolus	1
<i>Spergularia marina</i> *	Bare Soil	0.4841
<i>Sporobolus mitchellii</i>	Sclerolaena divaricata/Sporobolus	0.0088
<i>Stemodia florulenta</i>	Flood responder 1	0.0002
<i>Tecticornia pergranulata</i>	Tecticornia pergranulata	0.0002
<i>Tecticornia triandra</i>	Atriplex spp./Disphyma/Sclerolaena brachyptera/Sclerolaena stelligera	0.0962
<i>Teucrium racemosum</i>	Flood responder 3	0.9614
Unknown-Coombool	Flood responder 2	0.0004
<i>Wahlenbergia fluminalis</i>	Flood responder 1	0.0372
<i>Xanthium strumarium</i> **	Flood responder 3	0.2733

3.2. Grazing intensity

Grazing intensity (as inferred by the frequency of scats) was highly variable across the Chowilla Floodplain and showed no clear spatial patterns (Figure 8). However, there were areas of high frequency of scats such Coppermine Complex (although Coppermine Waterhole had a low frequency of scats), Gum Flat, Coombool Swamp and Lake Littra (Figure 8). Despite high scat frequencies at some temporary wetlands, overall scat frequency was significantly higher at floodplain sites than wetland sites (PERMANOVA *Pseudo F*_{1,133} = 17.77; *P* = 0.001) (Figure 9).

There were significant differences in scat frequency between plant communities as defined by the cluster analysis (PERMANOVA *Pseudo F*_{7,133} = 15.09; *P* = 0.001). Sites dominated by bare soil and the flood responder 3 community had significantly lower scat frequencies than the other plant communities. Sites dominated by *Tecticornia pergranulata* had significantly higher frequencies than sites dominated by bare soil and the flood responder 3 community but significantly lower frequencies than the remaining communities and there was no significant difference between those communities (Figure 9). The rank frequency of scats between the plant communities identified by the cluster analysis is as follows: bare soil = flood responder 3 < *Tecticornia pergranulata* < Atriplex spp./Disphyma/Sclerolaena brachyptera/Sclerolaena stelligera = flood responder 1 = flood responder 2 = Sclerolaena divaricata/Sporobolus (Figure 9).




Figure 8: Mean frequency of scats for each site surveyed in 2018.




Figure 9: Mean frequency of scats for the different habitats (floodplain or temporary wetland) and plant communities identified by the dendrogram groupings (Figure 6). Colours for the plant community columns reflect the 2018 dendrogram groupings and error bars = ± 1 SE.

3.3. Change in the plant community from 2006 to 2018

Between 2006 and 2009, species richness generally declined across the Chowilla Floodplain (Figure 10) except for a rise in species richness in 2007. This peak of 48 taxa followed the first watering of Coppermine Complex and Gum Flat in spring 2006, but in subsequent years species richness steadily declined, such that by 2009, only 17 taxa were recorded (Figure 10). Re-watering of the same areas in spring 2009 resulted in higher species richness in the 2010 survey similar to the numbers recorded in the 2007 survey (42 and 48 taxa, respectively) (Figure 10). In 2011, following overbank flooding, species richness increased by more than 50% compared to 2010 (66 and 42 taxa, respectively), but by 2012 species richness had declined slightly (50 taxa) (Figure 10). In 2013, species richness declined again (30 taxa), increased to 37 taxa in 2015 in response to the regulator operation in spring 2014, but declined to 21 in 2016 (Figure 10). In 2017, there was a more than two-fold increase in species richness (57 taxa) due to the regulator operation and natural flooding; however, this was lower than following the previous overbank flood in 2011. In 2018, there was sharp decrease with species richness falling to 30. This decrease in species richness was similar to decreases recorded between 2012 and 2013 (Figure 10).

In temporary wetlands, species richness was higher than the floodplain sites, and increased between 2013 and 2016, but decreased in 2017 due to most sites being inundated (Figure 10). Temporary wetlands generally contained a higher number of amphibious and flood dependent species than the floodplain (Figure 6, Figure 7 and Table 3) due to watering interventions (pumping) undertaken at these sites and longer and more frequent inundation by regulator operations and high flows. The increase between 2013 and 2016 was primarily due to an increase in the number of sites surveyed each year and the decrease in 2017 due to most sites being inundated and devoid of vegetation. In 2018, none of the temporary wetlands were inundated and there was an increase in species richness recorded across these sites (Figure 10).

Combined species richness of the floodplain and temporary wetland sites remained relatively constant between 2013 and 2016 (the lowest being 54 species recorded in February in 2014 and the highest 58 in February 2015) but increased in 2017 due to the late 2016 overbank flood and regulator operation (Figure 10). Many of the same species were present in the floodplain sites inundated by the regulator operations in spring 2014 and 2016, and the flood in 2016 that were present in the wetland sites between 2013 and 2016. There was a decrease in combined richness in 2018; however, it was the second highest recorded (despite the decrease in floodplain sites) due to the increase in the number of species present in temporary wetlands (Figure 10).




Figure 10: Changes through time in species richness (number of taxa) of the Chowilla Floodplain from 2006 to 2018. 2013(a), 2014(a), 2015(a), 2016(a) 2017(a), 2018(a) denotes floodplain only sites 1–85, 2013(b) denotes temporary wetland sites (86–118), 2014(b) denotes temporary wetland sites (86–126), 2015(b) denotes temporary wetland sites (86–129), 2016(b) denotes temporary wetland sites (86–143), 2017(b) denotes temporary wetland sites (86–143), 2018(b) denotes temporary wetland sites (86–143) 2013(c) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–118), 2014(c) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–126), 2015(c) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–129), 2016 (c) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–143), 2017(c) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–143) and 2018(c) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–143).

In 2006, the floodplain understorey was mostly comprised of taxa from salt tolerant and terrestrial functional groups; however, following the first site-specific watering of Coppermine Complex and Gum Flat (spring 2006) there was an increase in amphibious and flood dependent taxa and a concomitant decrease in terrestrial taxa and bare soil recorded during the 2007 survey (Figure 11). In 2008, the number of observations of bare soil and salt tolerant taxa increased, while flood dependent and terrestrial taxa decreased and amphibious taxa were not recorded (Figure 11). Similarly in 2009, the observations of salt tolerant taxa increased further, terrestrial and bare soil remained consistent and both flood dependent and amphibious taxa were not observed (Figure 11). Re-watering of the Coppermine Complex and Gum Flat (spring 2009) resulted in an increase in flood dependent and amphibious taxa in 2010 (Figure 11). Overbank flooding in 2010/11 resulted in a further decline in bare soil, terrestrial and salt tolerant taxa, a moderate increase in amphibious taxa and a large increase of flood dependent taxa (Figure 11). In 2012, the number of observations of terrestrial and salt tolerant taxa and bare soil increased, while the observations of amphibious and flood dependent taxa decreased compared to the previous year (Figure 11). In 2013, if a comparison is made between the original floodplain sites (sites 1–85); the proportion of bare soil increased, while terrestrial and salt tolerant species remained consistent and flood dependent and amphibious taxa all decreased. However, with the inclusion of the additional temporary wetland sites (sites 1–118), the proportion of bare soil and flood dependent taxa increased, amphibious species remained consistent, while terrestrial and salt tolerant species decreased (Figure 11).

In 2014, for the floodplain sites (1–85), there was an increase in the proportion of salt tolerant species and a decrease in all other functional groups, except for bare soil which remained in similar proportions to 2013 (Figure 11). The proportions of functional groups in the floodplain sites (1–85) were similar to the proportions observed in the 2008 surveys (Figure 11). With the inclusion of the temporary wetlands sites (1–126), there was a marked decrease in amphibious and flood dependent species, while the proportion of terrestrial species remained the same and the bare soil and salt tolerant taxa increased, compared to 2013 (Figure 11).

In 2015, following the first regulator operation in spring 2014 there was a decrease in bare soil and an increase in flood dependent species at all sites (1–129) and sites one to 85 compared to 2014 (Figure 11). The proportion of flood dependent species was higher when temporary wetland sites were included compared to just the floodplain sites (1–85) in 2014 and 2015 (Figure 11). Nevertheless, salt tolerant and terrestrial taxa were the dominant groups in 2015 (Figure 11) given that the regulator operation in spring 2014 was only a low-mid level, short duration (2 weeks at peak) event resulting in 2,142 ha (approximately 12%) of low elevation floodplain being inundated. The survey was also undertaken in February 2015 and it is acknowledged that the regulator operation was followed by intense grazing pressure from kangaroos (*Macropus* spp.) and feral goats (*Capra aegagrus hircus*), which along with the hot dry conditions muted the vegetation response detected at the time of the survey.

In 2016, there was a decrease in the proportion of observations of bare soil at sites one to 85 despite it being the most abundant taxon recorded (Figure 11). The proportion of salt tolerant and terrestrial taxa was similar to 2015, but there was an increase in flood dependent species (Figure 11). Across all sites in 2016, there was an increase in the proportion of amphibious and flood dependent species, and decrease in all other functional groups compared to 2015 (Figure 11). This was due to an increase in the number of temporary wetland sites surveyed in 2016, most of which remained inundated during the 2015 survey following the regulator operation in spring 2014.

At sites one to 85 in 2017, there was an increase in flood dependent and amphibious taxa and corresponding decrease in bare soil and salt tolerant taxa compared to the 2016 survey due regulator operation in spring 2016 and subsequent natural flooding inundating 59 sites (Figure 11). There was a similar pattern across all sites with a higher proportion of amphibious taxa and lower proportion of salt tolerant taxa present when the temporary wetland sites were included (Figure 11). In 2018, there was a decrease in flood dependent and amphibious taxa and corresponding increase in bare soil and terrestrial and salt tolerant taxa at sites one to 85. When the temporary wetland sites were added there were still increases in bare soil and salt tolerant and terrestrial taxa compared to 2017; however, there were higher proportions of amphibious and flood dependent species compared to the floodplain sites (Figure 11).




Figure 11: Changes in the percentage of observations of vegetation functional groups of the Chowilla Floodplain from 2006 to 2018. 2013(a), 2014(a), 2015(a), 2016 (a), 2017 (a) and 2018 (a) denotes floodplain sites 1–85; 2013(b) denotes floodplain and temporary wetlands sites (1–118), 2014(b) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–126), 2015(b) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–129), 2016(b), 2017(b) and 2018 (b) denotes floodplain and temporary wetland sites (1–143).

NMS ordination (Figure 12) shows the trajectory for plant communities at floodplain sites (sites 1–85) from 2006 to 2018. The largest changes in floristic composition occurred between 2010 and 2011, and 2016 and 2017 following natural flooding (and a preceding regulator operation in 2016). Without further flooding or interventions, the plant community became more similar to the communities present in 2008 and 2009, and in 2015 it was more similar to the community present in 2008 and 2009 compared to after the flood or watering. Although the regulator was operated in spring 2014 the event was of a moderate scale that resulted in inundation of 2,142 hectares (approximately 12%) of the floodplain with peak water levels maintained for only two weeks. However, this intervention inundated 12 sites compared to eight and ten inundated by the watering interventions in spring 2006 and 2009 respectively.

In 2016, the plant community was similar to the community present during the Millennium Drought in years when no large scale watering interventions were undertaken (Figure 12). The regulator operation undertaken in spring 2015 was a low level in-channel rise (17.85 m AHD) that raised water levels within the creeks by 1.5 m. This resulted in the inundation of 535 ha along riparian zones and two floodplain sites, one of which was still inundated in February 2016 and not surveyed. The large change between 2016 and 2017 was due to regulator operation and subsequent overbank flood in spring 2016; however, the floristic composition was different compared to 2011 (Figure 12), primarily due to lower species richness in 2017. In 2018, there was also a large change in the plant community that was transitioning towards one similar to those observed at the end of the Millennium drought and 2016 (Figure 10).




Figure 12: NMS ordination comparing the plant communities of Chowilla Floodplain sites 1–85 from 2006 to 2018.

3.4. The Living Murray targets

Native taxa - floodplain sites

At the floodplain sites (1–85) between 2006 and 2018, 20% or more of the cells contained amphibious or flood dependent species on seven occasions: 2007, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2015, 2017 and 2018 with the maximum interval two years (Figure 13). In 2007 and 2010, Gum Flat and Coppermine Complex were watered, 2011, 2012 and 2017 followed overbank flooding, the 2015 survey followed regulator operation in spring 2014 and in 2018 flood dependent species that recruited after the regulator operation and subsequent overbank flow in 2016 persisted at some sites. Amphibious or flood dependent species were present in 40% or more of cells three times between the period 2006 to 2018, in 2011, 2012 and 2017 (following overbank flooding) with a maximum interval of five years (Figure 13). In 2017 68% of cells contained flood dependent or amphibious species (Figure 13); however, the target was not met because species richness of native flood dependent and amphibious species did not exceed 40 (Figure 14, Table 4).




Figure 13: Percentage of cells with amphibious or flood dependent species present at floodplain sites (sites 1 to 85) between 2006 and 2018.

Figure 14 shows species richness of native flood dependent and amphibious species between 2006 and 2018. Six out of the seven occasions when the percentage of cells containing flood dependent or amphibious taxa exceeded 20% (2007, 2010, 2011, 2012, 2015 and 2017) (Figure 13) the native flood dependent and amphibious species

richness >15; therefore, the target was met (Figure 14, Table 4). Similarly, when more than 40% of cells from floodplain sites contained amphibious or flood dependent species (2011, 2012 and 2017), >25 native flood dependent and amphibious species were recorded; hence, the target was achieved (Figure 14, Table 4). Native amphibious and flood dependent species richness has never exceeded 40; therefore, the one-in-seven year target has never been achieved during the years surveyed (Figure 14, Table 4).




Figure 14: Species richness of amphibious and flood dependent species at floodplain sites (sites 1 to 85) between 2006 and 2018.

Native taxa - temporary wetland sites

Over 40% of quadrat cells at temporary wetland sites (86 to 143) were inundated or contained amphibious or flood dependent species between 2013 and 2018 and in 2015 (after the first operation of the regulator) and 2017 (after regulator operation and overbank flooding) over 80% were inundated or contained amphibious or flood dependent taxa (Figure 15).




Figure 15: Percentage of cells with amphibious or flood dependent species present at temporary wetland sites (sites 86 to 143) between 2013 and 2018.

Over 20 native flood dependent and amphibious species were present in temporary wetland sites each year between 2013 and 2018 (Figure 16), which means that the one-in-two-year target has been achieved (Table 4). Despite over 80% of cells being inundated or containing floodplain or amphibious species in 2015 and 2017 (twice in the previous six years) (Figure 15), there were less than 40 species present (Figure 16). Therefore, the one-in-four-year target for temporary wetlands has not been achieved (Table 4).




Figure 16: Species richness of amphibious and flood dependent species at temporary wetland sites (sites 86 to 143) between 2013 and 2018.

Table 4: Success of attaining floodplain and temporary wetland native vegetation targets between 2006 and 2018.

Floodplain:	Minimum of 20% of cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every three years on average with maximum interval no greater than 5 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 15 .	Achieved
	Minimum of 40% of cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every five years on average with maximum interval no greater than 7 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 25 .	Achieved
	Minimum of 65% of cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every seven years on average with maximum interval no greater than 10 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 40 .	Not achieved
Temporary wetlands:	Minimum of 40% of cells either inundated or containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every two years on average with maximum interval no greater than 4 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 20 .	Achieved
	Minimum of 80% of cells either inundated or containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa once every four years on average with maximum interval no greater than 6 years. Native flood dependent and amphibious species richness ≥ 40 .	Not achieved

Exotic taxa - floodplain sites

With the exception of 2011, 2012 and 2017, < 5% of cells from floodplain sites (usually <1%) have contained exotic species (Figure 17). Therefore, the exotic species target was met every year except in 2011, 2012 and 2017 after overbank flooding (Figure 17, Table 5). *Xanthium strumarium* was uncommon on the floodplain and the number of cells with this species present never exceeded 1%; hence, this target was achieved every year between 2006 and 2018 (Figure 17, Table 5).




Figure 17: Percentage of cells with exotic species and *Xanthium strumarium* present at floodplain sites (sites 1 to 85) between 2006 and 2018.

Exotic taxa – temporary wetland sites

In temporary wetlands, the number of cells containing exotic species was >10% every year between 2013 and 2018, except in 2017 (due to most sites being inundated); hence, the target has only been achieved once (Figure 18, Table 5). *Xanthium strumarium* was uncommon and the number of cells where this species was present never exceeded 1% between 2013 and 2018; hence, this target was achieved every year (Figure 18, Table 5).




Figure 18: Percentage of cells with exotic species and *Xanthium strumarium* present at temporary wetland sites (sites 86 to 143) between 2013 and 2018.

Table 5: Success of attaining floodplain and temporary wetland exotic species and *Xanthium strumarium* targets between 2006 and 2018.

Year	Target			
	Floodplain exotics	Floodplain <i>Xanthium</i>	Temporary wetland exotics	Temporary wetland <i>Xanthium</i>
2006	Achieved	Achieved	NA	NA
2007	Achieved	Achieved	NA	NA
2008	Achieved	Achieved	NA	NA
2009	Achieved	Achieved	NA	NA
2010	Achieved	Achieved	NA	NA
2011	Not achieved	Achieved	NA	NA
2012	Not achieved	Achieved	NA	NA
2013	Achieved	Achieved	Not achieved	Achieved
2014	Achieved	Achieved	Not achieved	Achieved
2015	Achieved	Achieved	Not achieved	Achieved
2016	Achieved	Achieved	Not achieved	Achieved
2017	Not achieved	Achieved	Achieved	Achieved
2018	Achieved	Achieved	Not achieved	Achieved

Native taxa - floodplain sites: comparison of modelled natural and current conditions

The maximum flow into South Australia under modelled natural conditions, unsurprisingly, was always higher than the maximum flow under current conditions (Table 6). Therefore, in most years a larger number of sites would have been inundated

under natural conditions. However, there were some exceptions, in 2006-07 and 2009-10 Coppermine Complex and Gum Flat were watered by pumping, which inundated eight and ten sites respectively, compared to modelled natural flow that was insufficient to inundate any sites. In 2014-15, 14 sites were inundated by regulator operation compared to five indicated as inundated under modelled natural conditions and in 2015-16 regulator operation inundated two sites compared to no sites under natural conditions (Table 6, Appendix 1, Appendix 3).

Under modelled natural conditions between 2006 and 2017, 20% or more of the cells were predicted to contain amphibious or flood dependent species on six occasions: 2006, 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2016 with the maximum interval four years (Figure 19). This also occurred on six occasions under current conditions (Figure 13), which on three occasions (2007, 2010 and 2015) was due to watering interventions (pumping and regulator operation). Amphibious or flood dependent species were present in 40% of cells three times between 2006 and 2017 (2011, 2012 and 2017) with a maximum interval of five years under both modelled natural and current conditions (Figure 19). However, on each of these occasions under modelled natural conditions 70%, 70% and 73% of cells in 2011, 2012 and 2017 respectively were predicted to have flood dependent or amphibious species present (Figure 19).

Predicted species richness under modelled natural flows varied considerably depending on whether the number of cells containing floodplain or amphibious species or the number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months was used as the predictor (Figure 20). More than 15 native flood dependent and amphibious species were recorded on seven occasions between 2006 and 2017 (Figure 14), which on three occasions (2007, 2010 and 2015) was due to watering interventions (pumping and regulator operation). When the number of quadrat cells containing flood dependent or amphibious species is used as the predictor, more than 15 species were predicted on five occasions, compared to six occasions when the number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months was used as the predictor (Figure 20). However, when the number of quadrat cells containing floodplain or amphibious species was used as the predictor the flood dependent and amphibious species richness was predicted to be greater than 40 in 2011, 2012 and 2017. In contrast, the predicted flood dependent and amphibious species richness did not exceed 40 when the number of cells inundated in the previous 12 months was used (Figure 20).

Under modelled natural conditions based on the predicted occurrence of flood dependent or amphibious taxa and using the number of quadrat cells containing flood dependent or amphibious species as the predictor for species richness, all targets would be achieved under natural conditions. However, if the number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months was used to predict flood dependent and amphibious species richness only the one-in-three and one-in-five year targets would be achieved (Figure 19, Figure 20).

Table 6: Comparison of modelled natural and current peak daily flow in the River Murray into South Australia from the 2005-06 to 2016-17 water years and the number and percentage of sites inundated (*denotes sites were watered by pumping; # denotes sites were inundated by regulator operation). Maps of modelled maximum extent for each year and monitoring sites are presented in Appendix 3.

Water Year	Modelled Natural				Current			
	Date of Peak Flow	Peak Flow (MI day ⁻¹)	No. sites inundated	% sites inundated	Date of Peak Flow	Peak Flow (MI day ⁻¹)	No. sites inundated	% sites inundated
2005-06	8/11/2005	69,219	25	32	12/11/2005	15100	0	0
2006-07	1/01/2006	36,882	0	0	27/04/2006	8443	8*	10*
2007-08	13/08/2007	34,925	0	0	15/02/2007	7169	0	0
2008-09	26/10/2008	26,250	0	0	18/06/2008	9423	0	0
2009-10	14/11/2009	29,425	0	0	31/12/2009	6048	10*	13*
2010-11	31/10/2010	99,368	70	93	18/12/2010	67218	46	61
2011-12	8/02/2011	95,060	70	93	13/02/2011	93872	46	61
2012-13	2/05/2012	78,859	32	43	3/04/2012	60070	17	23
2013-14	14/10/2013	61,644	17	23	12/10/2013	25841	5*	7*
2014-15	31/08/2014	45,401	4	5	6/08/2014	18062	14#	19#
2015-16	24/09/2015	27,875	0	0	29/10/2015	11752	2#	3#
2016-17	23/11/2016	163,230	68	97	30/11/2016	94246	56	80




Figure 19: Percentage of cells with amphibious or flood dependent species present at floodplain sites between 2006 and 2018 and predicted percentage of cells with flood dependent and amphibious species present under modelled natural conditions at floodplain sites between 2006 and 2017.




Figure 20: Species richness of native amphibious and flood dependent species at floodplain sites between 2006 and 2018 and predicted flood dependent and amphibious species richness under modelled natural conditions at floodplain sites between 2006 and 2017 (Modelled Natural 1 = predicted using number of cells containing native flood dependent or amphibious taxa; Modelled Natural 2 = predicted using number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months).

4. DISCUSSION

4.1. Floodplain and temporary wetland vegetation dynamics

The floodplain vegetation condition monitoring program for the Chowilla Icon Site has provided comprehensive spatial coverage of open habitats across the floodplain with a broad range of flood and/or managed inundation frequencies (Figure 3). Initial sampling in 2006 provided baseline data whilst follow up surveys have provided information regarding medium-term vegetation dynamics and the impacts of watering, natural flooding and regulator operation, and valuable information to support management.

To gain a better understanding of floodplain and temporary wetland condition in Chowilla a further 58 sites previously surveyed as part of an intervention monitoring program (Nicol *et al.* 2010b; Nicol 2012) are now included in the condition monitoring network. This has greatly improved spatial coverage and capacity to accurately detect spatio-temporal change in plant communities. In order to monitor medium to long-term vegetation changes all sites should continue to be re-surveyed on an annual basis, if accessible.

Analysis of data collected from floodplain sites since 2006 showed that in 2018, the plant community changed from one dominated by flood dependent and amphibious species in 2017 (typical after extensive overbank flooding) to one dominated by terrestrial and salt tolerant taxa. This result was expected as many of the flood dependent taxa are short-lived annuals that have completed their life cycle and replenished the seed bank, and a similar pattern was observed in 2012 one year after the last overbank flow. In the absence of further inundation the plant community is expected to transition to a community similar to that observed during the Millennium drought.

Since 2012, temporary wetland sites have been inundated more often than floodplain sites, either via regulator operations, site-specific pumping or natural flooding. In contrast to 2017, when 52 of the 58 temporary wetland sites were inundated, no sites were inundated and all were surveyed in 2018. As expected within 12 months of inundation, temporary wetlands were dominated by amphibious and flood dependent taxa and species richness was the equal highest recorded since 2012. Similar to the floodplain sites, it is expected that the abundance of bare soil, terrestrial and salt tolerant species will increase in the absence of inundation.

Grazing intensity was measured semi-quantitatively in 2018 during the vegetation survey by recording the frequency of scats in each quadrat, which gave an indication of the combined grazing pressure by kangaroos, euros, sheep, goats, pigs and emus. However, the provenance (i.e. species identification) and age of scats was not determined, and thus, it was not possible to differentiate the impacts of different grazers or whether the grazing was recent. Ideally, scats within each quadrat would be identified, separated based on species and weighed to give a more quantitative estimate. Furthermore, moisture content of scats could be determined to give an

indication scat age and used to infer recent grazing pressure. Nevertheless, recording the frequency of scats provided a rapid and repeatable assessment of grazing intensity appropriate for the current investigation.

Scat frequency showed that grazing pressure was probably higher on the floodplain than in temporary wetlands; however, some temporary wetlands such as Lake Littra and Coombool Swamp may be grazing hot spots. These wetlands at the time of the survey were densely vegetated, with large numbers of kangaroos and emus present (J. Nicol *pers. obs.*). Scat frequency was lower in Werta Wert Wetland quadrats, despite availability of abundant vegetation, and very low across the remaining temporary wetlands (most of which were sparsely vegetated).

4.2. The Living Murray Targets

The TLM condition monitoring plan refinement project developed quantitative targets that can be assessed against data collected through the condition monitoring program. The one-in-three year target for the floodplain was able to be achieved by watering, regulator operation and the 2010-11 and 2016 floods. The one-in-five year target was achieved in 2011, 2012 and 2017, supported the spring 2016 regulator operation and subsequent overbank flooding; however, it may have been achieved by regulator operation alone in 2017 because the spring 2016 operation inundated 48% of sites (Appendix 1). The one-in-seven year target has not been achieved between 2006 and 2017, despite >65% of cells containing flood dependent or amphibious taxa in 2017, because native floodplain and amphibious species richness was below the target of 40.

The 2016 regulator operation showed that the one-in-three and one-in-five year targets for the floodplain could be achieved in the future by mid to high-level regulator operation; however, the one-in-seven year target appears to require large natural floods (Overton *et al.* 2006). Nevertheless, the two overbank floods over the monitoring program did not result in the one-in-seven year target being met and suggests this target may need refinement, in particular the metrics relating to native floodplain and amphibious species richness. The target of 40 native floodplain or amphibious species may be unrealistic for the seven year target given the design of the monitoring program, which was to maximise statistical power to detect changes in vegetation through time and in response to management. The relatively small total area surveyed using this method, in comparison with studies designed to catalogue biodiversity (e.g. O'Malley 1990), would result in rare species not being recorded. For example, *Pseudoraphis spinescens* was observed in Coppermine complex and Werta Wert Wetland in 2014 and 2017, and in Punkah Creek Depression in 2015, but not detected in any condition monitoring surveys. Furthermore, the condition monitoring program focusses on open areas and does not include woodlands that may result in species not being recorded. Nevertheless, 137 native flood dependent and amphibious species have been recorded on the Chowilla Floodplain since 1989 (Nicol *et al.* 2010a). Recording all species present in a fixed area around sites may give a more accurate indication of species richness and should be trialed in future surveys to determine if it is a suitable method for reporting species richness for targets.

The 2018 condition monitoring survey resulted in the sixth year of annual monitoring data being collected for temporary wetland sites. Over 40% of cells were either inundated or contained native amphibious or flood dependent species with a species richness >20 in each year. The achievement of the one-in-two year target was due to watering interventions, flooding and regulator operations. However, these interventions have not resulted in the one-in-four year target being achieved (due to the native flood dependent and amphibious species richness being <40) despite over 80% of cells being either inundated or containing amphibious or flood dependent taxa in 2015 and 2017. Similar to the one-in-seven year target for the floodplain, this target may require further refinement with respect to species richness and recording all species present in a fixed area around sites is also recommended for temporary wetlands.

Exotic taxa are uncommon on the floodplain, with the target for the floodplain being achieved every year except in 2011, 2012 and 2017. The increased recruitment of exotic species was probably due to natural flooding in 2010/11 and 2016, which provided conditions suitable for the recruitment of many pest plant species in areas that were inundated (Nicol 2007). Furthermore, it is likely that pest plant propagules were transported to the Chowilla Floodplain in floodwater (e.g. Nilsson *et al.* 1991). There is little in regards to management actions that can be done to control weeds due to the size of the Chowilla Floodplain and proximity to a watercourse preventing the use of herbicides.

Despite flooding facilitating the recruitment of exotic plants, the benefits of natural flooding to the riverine ecosystem (e.g. Holland *et al.* 2013; Bice *et al.* 2014) outweigh any negative impacts from pest plants. Pest plants are more abundant in temporary wetlands with exotic species being present in more than 10% of cells each year except 2017 (when most sites were inundated and devoid of live plants). This has resulted in this target being achieved only in 2017 and there is not yet sufficient data to determine medium to long-term trends in pest plant abundances. As with the floodplain there is little that can be done with regards to management. Despite the high abundances of other exotic species, the proclaimed pest plant *Xanthium strumarium* was generally absent from floodplain and temporary wetland sites with this species recorded in less than 1% of cells during each survey.

The attainment of The Living Murray targets has been determined for the floodplain since 2006 and temporary wetlands since 2013 and whilst data collected for the condition and intervention monitoring programs was examined, the targets were formulated largely by expert opinion. Nevertheless, analysis of modelled natural inundation, the number of quadrat cells predicted to contain flood dependent or amphibious species, and predicted species richness, showed that it is likely the floodplain native vegetation targets would be achieved under natural conditions. Whilst it is unlikely that management interventions and environmental flows will result in all native vegetation targets being achieved (in particular the one-in-seven year target) the modelled predictions further supported the legitimacy of the targets.

The calculations used to predict the number of cells containing flood dependent or amphibious taxa and species richness under modelled natural flow, whilst based on

data from the Chowilla Floodplain, were simple and (as with all models) should not be viewed as completely accurate. It is likely that the predicted number of cells containing flood dependent or amphibious species under natural conditions is an underestimate, as more frequent inundation would probably result in more than 75% of inundated cells containing these species. Furthermore, it assumes that there are no flood dependent or amphibious species present if the quadrat cell was not inundated in the previous 12 months, which is not always the case as reflected in the 2018 survey results that followed such a dry period.

The two different functions proposed to predict native flood dependent and amphibious species richness under natural flows, whilst both being highly significant relationships as determined by regression analysis, need to be viewed with caution. The simple linear relationship between the number of quadrat cells containing flood dependent or amphibious species and species richness, when using the predicted number of quadrat cells containing these species under natural flows, results in species richness being zero when no sites were inundated in the previous 12 months. It will also predict that species richness will increase as the number cells containing these species increases, which may reflect the data collected from the Chowilla Floodplain over the past 13 years, does not recognise there is a finite number of flood dependent and amphibious species. The exponential relationship between the number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months and native flood dependent and amphibious species richness resembles a typical species area relationship and assumes there is a finite number of flood dependent and amphibious species. The relationship derived from the previous 13 years' data suggests that the maximum number of flood dependent and amphibious species that will be present is around 37, which is just over one quarter of the total number of these species recorded on the Chowilla Floodplain since 1989 (Nicol 2010a). Therefore, it is likely that the linear relationship between native flood dependent and amphibious species richness and the number of quadrat cells underestimates species richness during dry periods and the exponential relationship between the number of sites inundated in the previous 12 months underestimates species richness after floods. Collecting species richness data over a larger area than the quadrats over time may provide a better function to model flood dependent and amphibious species richness under natural conditions.

4.3. Management recommendations and future research and monitoring

Observational and monitoring data shows that regulator operation and pumping improves understorey vegetation condition and increase the abundance and species richness of native flood dependent and amphibious species. In recent years, these interventions in conjunction with overbank flooding and flow pulses have resulted in most targets understorey being achieved. A high-level regulator operation in 2018 is not necessary to achieve targets; however, should not be ruled out if there is sufficient flow as the opportunity may not arise in following years.

Seed bank investigations in similar systems (e.g. Nicol 2004) and a comparison of the response to flooding between the Pike (unwatered) and Chowilla (watered) floodplains showed that the understorey vegetation is resilient and probably does not require

interventions for long-term survival (Holland *et al.* 2013). However, this does not mean interventions such as regulator operations; weir pool raisings and pumping are not required. Interventions are required to improve the condition of woody floodplain vegetation and provide a source of feed for native grazers often not available on the adjacent uplands (an ecosystem service the floodplain probably provided before river regulation).

The Living Murray Chowilla Floodplain condition monitoring program has produced an excellent mid to long-term dataset that has documented the changes in floristic composition through time and in response to flooding and interventions. Datasets of this nature are valuable to evaluate interventions and inform managers when to undertake interventions to slow or arrest decline in condition. Other monitoring and research is required to better understand the underlying biological processes and physicochemical factors that drive changes or the function the vegetation plays in the landscape. Future research and monitoring activities to inform management of the site include:

- Continuation of the condition monitoring program to gain further information regarding the medium to long-term floodplain and temporary wetland vegetation dynamics and report on TLM targets;
- Refinement of the monitoring methods such as recording all species present in a fixed area around sites to gain a better estimate of species richness;
- Continuation of recording scat frequency within quadrats to estimate grazing intensity, which could be coupled with enclosure experiments to gain a better understanding of the impacts of native and exotic vertebrate herbivores;
- Continuation of comparing target achievement under current and modelled natural flows;
- Investigate relationships between vegetation and soil properties (e.g. salinity, soil moisture, water potential, texture);
- Investigate short-term longevity of understorey watering/flooding response to determine optimal interval between watering and vegetation surveys; and
- Determine which species propagules' will survive passage through the gut of different grazers.

REFERENCES

- Akeroyd, M.D., Tyerman, S.D., Walker, G.R. and Jolly, I.D. (1998). Impact of flooding on the water use of semi-arid riparian eucalypts. *Journal of Hydrology* **206**: 104-117.
- Anderson, M.J. and Ter Braak, C.J.F. (2003). Permutation tests for multi-factorial analysis of variance. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation* **73**: 85-113.
- Bice, C.M., Gehrig, S.L., Zampatti, B.P., Nicol, J.M., Wilson, P., Leigh, S.L. and Marsland, K. (2014). Flow-induced alterations to fish assemblages, habitat and fish–habitat associations in a regulated lowland river. *Hydrobiologia* **722**: 205-222.

Bray, J.R. and Curtis, J.T. (1957). An ordination of the upland forest communities of southern Wisconsin. *Ecological Monographs* **27**: 325-349.

Centre for Australian National Biodiversity Research and Council of Heads of Australasian Herbaria (2018). Australian Plant Census, IBIS database, <http://www.chah.gov.au/apc/index.html>.

Clarke, K.R. and Gorley, R.N. (2015). PRIMER Version 7.0.12: User Manual/Tutorial. (PRIMER-E, Plymouth).

Cunningham, G.M., Mulham, W.E., Milthorpe, P.L. and Leigh, J.H. (1992). 'Plants of Western New South Wales.' (CSIRO Publishing: Collingwood).

DEW (2018a). Chowilla Creek downstream of Monoman Creek water level. <https://www.waterconnect.sa.gov.au>.

DEW (2018b). River Murray flow to South Australia. <https://www.waterconnect.sa.gov.au>.

Doble, R., Simmons, C., Jolly, I. and Walker, G. (2004). Spatial modelling of groundwater discharge patterns to predict floodplain salinisation and impacts on vegetation health. CSIRO Land and Water 1/04, Adelaide.

Dufrene, M. and Legendre, P. (1997). Species assemblages and indicator species: the need for a flexible asymmetrical approach. *Ecological Monographs* **67**: 345-366.

Holland, K.L., Turnadge, C.J., Nicol, J.M., Gehrig, S.L. and Strawbridge, A.D. (2013). Floodplain response and recovery: comparison between natural and artificial floods. Goyder Institute for Water Research, Technical Report Series No. 13/5, Adelaide, South Australia.

Jessop, J., Dashorst, G.R.M. and James, F.R. (2006). 'Grasses of South Australia. An illustrated guide to the native and naturalised species.' (Wakefield Press: Adelaide).

Jessop, J.P. and Toelken, H.R. (1986). 'The Flora of South Australia.' (Government of South Australia Printer: Adelaide).

Jolly, I.D., Walker, G.R. and Narayan, K.A. (1994). Floodwater recharge processes in the Chowilla anabranch system, South Australia. *Australian Journal of Soil Research* **32**: 417-435.

Jolly, I.D., Walker, G.R. and Thorburn, P.J. (1993). Salt accumulation in semi-arid floodplain soils with implications for forest health. *Journal of Hydrology* **150**: 589-614.

Maheshwari, B.L., Walker, K.F. and McMahon, T.A. (1995). Effects of regulation on the flow regime of the River Murray, Australia. *Regulated Rivers Research and Management* **10**: 15-38.

McCune, B., Grace, J.B. and Urban, D.L. (2002). 'Analysis of Ecological Communities.' (MjM Software Design: Gleneden Beach, Oregon).

McCune, B. and Mefford, M.J. (2006). PC-ORD. Multivariate Analysis of Ecological Data, Version 5.12. In. (MjM Software Design: Glenden Beach, Oregon, USA).

McEwan, K.L., Richter, M. and Jolly, I.D. (1995). Compilation of soil, groundwater, and transpiration measurements of *Eucalyptus largiflorens* on the Chowilla Floodplain around the 1993/94 flood. Australia Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organization Institute of Natural Resources and Environment Division of Water Resources, Canberra.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority (2011). The Living Murray Annual Environmental Watering Plan 2011-2012. Murray-Darling Basin Authority, MDBA publication no. 170/11, Canberra.

Murray-Darling Basin Authority (2012). Chowilla Floodplain Environmental Water Management Plan. Murray-Darling Basin Authority, MDBA Publication No. 220/11, Canberra.

Nicol, J. (2007). Risk of pest plant recruitment as a result of the operation of Chowilla environmental regulator. South Australian Research and Development Institute (Aquatic Sciences), SARDI Publication Number F2007/000253-1, Adelaide.

Nicol, J.M. (2004). Vegetation dynamics of the Menindee Lakes with reference to the seed bank. Ph.D. Thesis, the University of Adelaide.

Nicol, J.M. (2010). Vegetation monitoring of River Murray Wetlands downstream of Lock 1. South Australian Research and Development Institute (Aquatic Sciences), F2009/000416-1, Adelaide.

Nicol, J.M. (2012). Understorey vegetation monitoring of Chowilla environmental watering Sites 2008-12. South Australian Research and Development Institute (Aquatic Sciences), F2010/000632-2 Adelaide.

Nicol, J., Doody, T. and Overton, I. (2010a). An evaluation of the Chowilla Creek environmental regulator on floodplain understorey vegetation. South Australian Research and Development Institute (Aquatic Sciences), SARDI Publication Number F2010/000317-1, Adelaide.

Nicol, J.M., Gehrig, S.L., Frahn, K.A. and Fredberg, J.F. (2015a). Katarapko Floodplain vegetation condition monitoring 2015 report. South Australian Research and Development Institute (Aquatic Sciences), SARDI Publication No. F2015/000582-1, Adelaide.

Nicol, J.M., Gehrig, S.L., Frahn, K.A. and Fredberg, J.F. (2015b). Pike Floodplain vegetation condition monitoring 2015 report. South Australian Research and Development Institute (Aquatic Sciences), SARDI Publication No. F2015/000583-1, Adelaide.

Nicol, J.M., Gehrig, S.L., Frahn, K.A. and Strawbridge, A.D. (2013). Resilience and resistance of aquatic plant communities downstream of Lock 1 in the Murray River.

Goyder Institute for Water Research, Technical Report Series No. 13/5, Adelaide, South Australia.

Nicol, J.M., Marsland, K.B. and Weedon, J.T. (2010b). Understorey vegetation monitoring of Chowilla environmental watering sites 2004-08. South Australian Research and Development Institute, SARDI Publication Number F2010/000632-1, Adelaide.

Nicol, J., Muston, S., D'Santos, P., McCarthy, B. and Zukowski, S. (2007). The impact of sheep grazing on the soil seed bank of a managed ephemeral wetland: implications for management. *Australian Journal of Botany* **55**: 103-109.

Nilsson, C., Gardfjell, M. and Grelsson, G. (1991). Importance of hydrochory in structuring plant communities along rivers. *Canadian Journal of Botany* **69**: 2631-2633.

O'Malley, C. (1990). Floodplain Vegetation. In 'Chowilla Floodplain Biological Study'. (Eds O'Malley, C. and Sheldon, F.) pp. 7-53. (Nature Conservation Society of South Australia: Adelaide).

O'Malley, C. and Sheldon, F. (1990). Chowilla Floodplain biological study. Nature Conservation Society of South Australia, Adelaide.

Overton, I. and Doody, T. (2010). Ecosystem response modelling in the Chowilla Floodplain, Lindsay and Wallpolla Islands icon site. In 'Ecosystem Response Modelling in the Murray Darling Basin'. (Eds Saintilan, N. and Overton, I.) pp. 357-372. (CSIRO Publishing: Collingwood, Victoria).

Overton, I. and Jolly, I. (2004). Integrated studies of floodplain vegetation health, saline groundwater and flooding on the Chowilla Floodplain, South Australia. CSIRO Land and Water, 20/04, Adelaide.

Overton, I.C., McEwan, K., Gabrovsek, C. and Sherrah, J.R. (2006). The River Murray Floodplain Inundation Model (RiM-FIM)-Hume Dam to Wellington. CSIRO Water for a Healthy Country Technical Report 2006. CSIRO Canberra.

Roberts, J. and Ludwig, J. (1990). Aquatic macrophyte communities. In 'Chowilla Floodplain Biological Study'. (Eds O'Malley, C. and Sheldon, F.) pp. 137-142. (Nature Conservation Society of South Australia Inc.: Adelaide).

Roberts, J. and Ludwig, J.A. (1991). Riparian vegetation along current-exposure gradients in floodplain wetlands of the River Murray, Australia. *Journal of Ecology* **79**: 117-127.

Sharley, T. and Huggan, C. (1995). Chowilla Resource Management Plan. Murray Darling Basin Commission, Canberra.

Siebentritt, M.A. (2003). The influence of water regime on the floristic composition of Lower River Murray wetlands. PhD thesis, The University of Adelaide.

Stone, M.G. (2001). The effect of water regime on seed bank dynamics of three lower River Murray wetlands. Honours thesis, The University of Adelaide.

van Dijk, A.I.J.M., Beck, H.E., Crosbie, R.S., de Jeu, R.A.M., Liu, Y.Y., Podger, G.M., Timbal, B. and Viney, N.R. (2013). The Millennium Drought in southeast Australia (2001–2009): natural and human causes and implications for water resources, ecosystems, economy, and society. *Water Resources Research* **49**: 1040-1057.

Walker, G.R., Jolly, I.D. and Jarwal, S.D. (1996). Salt and water movement in the Chowilla Floodplain. CSIRO Division of Water Resources, 15, Canberra.

Weedon, J.T. and Nicol, J.M. (2006). Chowilla Significant Ecological Asset – floodplain vegetation monitoring interim report. South Australian Research and Development Institute (Aquatic Sciences), RD06/0334, Adelaide.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Site GPS coordinates (UTM format, map datum WGS 84), year survey site established (N/A = no longer included in analysis, I/A = inaccessible due to reasons other than inundation), site description and inundation history across survey period (W = watered, F = flooded, WF = watered + flooded that year).

Site #	Easting	Northing	Year Established	Description	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
1	485198	6240345	2006	Floodplain						F						WF	
2	484523	6241019	2006	Floodplain		W			W	F				W	W	WF	
3	483784	6240912	2006	Floodplain						F						WF	
4	483645	6239006	2006	Floodplain													
5	483016	6239192	2006	Floodplain													I/A
6	484742	6236011	2006	Floodplain													I/A
7	484859	6236000	2006	Floodplain													I/A
8	485543	6236491	2006	Floodplain													I/A
9	483624	6239042	2006	Floodplain													
10	483764	6239169	2006	Floodplain						F						WF	
11	484087	6238477	2006	Floodplain													
13	486211	6237577	2006	Floodplain						F				W		WF	
14	486064	6237665	2006	Floodplain						F						WF	
15	485487	6237975	2006	Floodplain												WF	
16	485298	6237971	2006	Floodplain												WF	
17	485021	6238331	2006	Floodplain					W	F				W		WF	
18	484572	6238585	2006	Floodplain					W	F				W		WF	
19	484438	6238618	2006	Floodplain		W			W	F				W		WF	
20	485169	6237680	2006	Floodplain						F						WF	
21	485459	6238026	2006	Floodplain												WF	

Site #	Easting	Northing	Year Established	Description	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
22	485513	6238180	2006	Floodplain		W			W	F				W		WF	
23	486597	6237792	2006	Floodplain		W			W	F				W		WF	
24	486698	6237764	2006	Floodplain										W		WF	
25	486805	6238779	2006	Floodplain												WF	
26	486896	6239849	2006	Floodplain												WF	
27	488116	6242678	2006	Floodplain						F						WF	
28	488241	6242818	2006	Floodplain						F						WF	
29	488551	6243371	2006	Floodplain						F						WF	
30	489071	6244832	2006	Floodplain						F						F	
31	489052	6244608	2006	Floodplain						F						WF	
32	489693	6244265	2006	Floodplain						F						F	
33	488193	6241105	2006	Floodplain						F						F	
34	487778	6240977	2006	Floodplain						F						F	
36	488897	6242699	2006	Floodplain						F						F	
37	489238	6242844	2006	Floodplain												F	
38	489017	6242097	2006	Floodplain													
39	489350	6239512	2006	Floodplain						F						WF	
40	488303	6242207	2006	Floodplain						F				W		WF	
41	488438	6242575	2006	Floodplain						F				W		WF	
42	489973	6245851	2006	Floodplain												F	
43	490075	6245613	2006	Floodplain													
44	490242	6245188	2006	Floodplain						F						F	
45	490345	6245049	2006	Floodplain													
46	489458	6244864	2006	Floodplain						F						F	
47	489351	6244956	2006	Floodplain						F						F	
48	490503	6243645	2006	Floodplain						F						F	

Site #	Easting	Northing	Year Established	Description	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
49	491017	6244303	2006	Floodplain						F						F	
50	491442	6244363	2006	Floodplain						F					W	WF	
51	490966	6244592	2006	Floodplain						F						WF	
52	491223	6244572	2006	Floodplain												WF	
55	495612	6247657	2006	Floodplain						F				W		WF	
56	494893	6246522	2006	Floodplain						F						F	
57	494499	6246028	2006	Floodplain												F	
58	492860	6247105	2006	Floodplain													
59	493830	6245882	2006	Floodplain						F						F	
60	493910	6245725	2006	Floodplain						F						F	
61	494310	6244810	2006	Floodplain						F						WF	
62	497206	6246599	2006	Floodplain		W			W	F			W	W		WF	
63	497618	6246464	2006	Floodplain		W			W	F			W			WF	
64	498069	6246375	2006	Floodplain		W			W	F			W			WF	
65	498376	6246311	2006	Floodplain		W			W	F			W			WF	
66	498394	6246168	2006	Floodplain					W	F			W			WF	
67	497154	6241724	2006	Floodplain					I/A	I/A	I/A			I/A	I/A	I/A	I/A
68	496397	6243263	2006	Floodplain					I/A	I/A	I/A			I/A	I/A	I/A	I/A
69	496572	6242971	2006	Floodplain					I/A	I/A	I/A			I/A	I/A	I/A	I/A
70	497243	6243954	2006	Floodplain					I/A	I/A	I/A			I/A	I/A	I/A	I/A
71	497342	6245017	2006	Floodplain					I/A	I/A	I/A			I/A	I/A	I/A	I/A
72	496523	6245423	2006	Floodplain					I/A	I/A	I/A			I/A	I/A	I/A	I/A
74	489083	6238916	2006	Floodplain													
75	488969	6239062	2006	Floodplain						F						F	
76	488205	6238287	2006	Floodplain												F	
77	488122	6237666	2006	Floodplain										W		F	

Site #	Easting	Northing	Year Established	Description	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
78	488692	6237147	2006	Floodplain													
79	488209	6240070	2006	Floodplain						F				W		F	
80	488942	6239515	2006	Floodplain												F	
82	491300	6242057	2006	Floodplain						F						F	
83	498893	6236615	2008	Floodplain						F						I/A	I/A
84	503870	6235576	2008	Floodplain											I/A	F	
85	504385	6235609	2008	Floodplain						F					I/A	F	
86	503659	6233903	2013	Kulcurna Black Box 1	W					F						F	
87	503689	6234181	2013	Kulcurna Black Box 2	W					F						F	
88	504119	6234315	2013	Kulcurna Red Gum 1	W			W	W	WF					I/A	F	
89	504251	6234648	2013	Kulcurna Red Gum 2	W			W	W	WF					I/A	F	
90	503690	6235129	2013	Kulcurna Red Gum 3	W			W	W	WF					I/A	WF	
91	500102	6245461	2013	Littra Edge 1	W		W		W	WF			W			WF	
92	500083	6245421	2013	Littra Middle 1	W		W		W	WF			W			WF	
93	500246	6245118	2013	Littra Edge 2	W		W		W	WF			W			WF	
94	500085	6245221	2013	Littra Middle 2	W		W		W	WF			W			WF	
95	498520	6245504	2013	Punkah Floodrunner 1	W			W		WF						WF	
96	495966	6245906	2013	Punkah Depression 1	W			W		WF					W	WF	
97	495966	6245919	2013	Punkah Depression 2	W			W		WF						WF	

Site #	Easting	Northing	Year Established	Description	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
98	488042	6245182	2013	Werta Wert North Middle 1	W		W		W	WF						WF	
99	488124	6245143	2013	Werta Wert North Edge 2	W		W		W	WF			W	W		WF	
100	488041	6245317	2013	Werta Wert North Edge 6	W		W		W	WF			W	W		WF	
101	488193	6245206	2013	Werta Wert North Middle 2	W		W		W	WF			W	W		WF	
102	488205	6245395	2013	Werta Wert North Edge 1	W		W		W	WF			W	W		WF	
103	488289	6245341	2013	Werta Wert North Middle 3	W		W		W	WF			W	W		WF	
104	489573	6247193	2013	Coombool Edge 1					W	WF	W					WF	
105	489491	6247218	2013	Coombool Middle 1					W	WF	W					WF	
106	488999	6247637	2013	Coombool Edge 2					W	WF	W					WF	
107	489213	6247649	2013	Coombool Middle 2					W	WF	W					WF	
108	489355	6248928	2013	Coombool Middle 3					W	WF	W					WF	
109	489467	6249484	2013	Coombool Edge 3					W	WF	W					WF	
110	489870	6249043	2013	Coombool Middle 4					W	WF	W					WF	
111	491123	6248539	2013	Coombool Edge 4					W	WF	W					WF	
112	487726	6239416	2013	Chowilla Oxbow 1	W			W		WF						WF	
113	487804	6238952	2013	Chowilla Oxbow 2	W			W		WF						WF	

Site #	Easting	Northing	Year Established	Description	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
114	495334	6248147	2013	Limbra 1					W	WF						WF	
115	495397	6248559	2013	Limbra 2					W	WF						WF	
116	495413	6248992	2013	Limbra 3					W	WF						WF	
117	492857	6246312	2013	Hancock Creek 2						F						WF	
118	493241	6242604	2013	Pipeclay Backwater 1				W		WF					W	WF	
119	488091	6240839	2013	Monoman Depression 1	W			W		WF						WF	
120	485268	6240209	2014	Coppermine 1				W		WF						WF	
121	485568	6240091	2014	Coppermine 2				W		WF						WF	
122	488420	6241325	2014	Monoman Island 1	W		W			WF						WF	
123	489759	6243272	2014	Twin Creek 1			W			WF						WF	
124	489596	6243373	2014	Twin Creek 2			W			WF						WF	
125	489076	6243250	2014	Twin Creek 3			W			WF						WF	
126	488868	6241674	2014	Monoman Island 2	W		W			WF						WF	
127	487240	6236425	2015	Chowilla Island Loop 1	W			W		WF						WF	
128	487464	6236797	2015	Chowilla Island Loop 2	W			W		WF						WF	
129	490728	6244838	2015	Brandy Bottle Lagoon	W			W		F					W	WF	
130	485587	6236197	2016	Woolshed Creek 1				W		WF	W	W	W	W		WF	I/A
131	485919	6237151	2016	Woolshed Creek 2				W		WF	W	W	W	W		WF	

Site #	Easting	Northing	Year Established	Description	2005-06	2006-07	2007-08	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
132	487496	6244391	2016	Werta Werta South Edge 6	W		W		W	WF	W	W	W	W		WF	
133	487634	6244017	2016	Werta Werta South Edge 7	W		W		W	WF	W	W	W	W		WF	
134	487611	6243827	2016	Werta Werta South Middle 1	W		W		W	WF	W	W	W	W		WF	
135	487698	6243755	2016	Werta Werta South Middle 2	W		W		W	WF	W	W	W	W		WF	
136	487905	6243689	2016	Werta Werta South Middle 3	W		W		W	WF	W	W	W	W		WF	
137	487743	6244165	2016	Werta Werta South Edge 2	W		W		W	WF	W	W	W	W		WF	
138	487621	6244818	2016	Werta Werta Centre Edge 2	W		W		W	WF	W	W	W	W		WF	
139	487627	6244854	2016	Werta Werta Centre Middle 3	W		W		W	WF	W	W	W	W		WF	
140	487722	6244850	2016	Werta Werta Centre Middle 1	W		W		W	WF	W	W	W	W		WF	
141	487754	6244899	2016	Werta Werta Centre Edge 5	W		W		W	WF	W	W	W	W		WF	
142	487709	6244930	2016	Werta Werta Centre Middle 2	W		W		W	WF	W	W	W	W		WF	
143	487669	6245078	2016	Werta Werta Centre Edge 8	W		W		W	WF	W	W	W	W		WF	


Appendix 2: Species list, functional classification, life history strategy, conservation status (state conservation status from listings in Barker et al. 2005 (*denotes exotic species, **denotes proclaimed pest plant in South Australia, ***denotes weed of national significance, # denotes listed as rare in South Australia, ^ denotes listed as vulnerable in South Australia, ^^denotes listed as endangered in South Australia).

Species	Common Name	Family	Status	Life history strategy	Functional group
<i>Abutilon theophrasti</i> *	Velvetleaf, China Jute, Buttonweed, Pie-Marker, Indian mallow	Malvaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual herb	Amphibious
<i>Alternanthera denticulata</i>	lesser joyweed	Amaranthaceae	Native	Annual herb	Flood dependent
<i>Ammannia multiflora</i>	jerry-jerry	Lythraceae	Native	Annual herb	Amphibious
<i>Asphodelus fistulosus</i> **	onion weed	Liliaceae	Exotic, Proclaimed SA Plant	Annual/Perennial	Terrestrial
<i>Aster subulatus</i> *	Wild aster, bushy starwort	Asteraceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual herb	Amphibious
<i>Atriplex</i> spp.	saltbush	Chenopodiaceae	Native	Perennial	Terrestrial
<i>Atriplex suberecta</i>	lagoon saltbush	Chenopodiaceae	Native	Perennial	Flood dependent
<i>Brachyscome basaltica</i> #	swamp daisy	Asteraceae	Native, Rare in South Australia	Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Brachyscome dentata</i>	swamp daisy	Asteraceae	Native	Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Calotis cuneifolia</i>	purple (or blue) burr-daisy	Asteraceae	Native	Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Calotis hispidula</i>	bogan flea, hairy burr-daisy, bindyi	Asteraceae	Native	Annual herb	Flood dependent
<i>Calotis scapigera</i> #	tufted burr-daisy	Asteraceae	Native, Rare in South Australia	Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Centaurium tenuiflorum</i> *	branched centaury	Gentianaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual	Terrestrial
<i>Disphyma crassifolium</i> ssp. <i>clavellatum</i>	round pigface	Aizoaceae	Native	Perennial	Salt tolerant
<i>Centipeda minima</i> ssp. <i>minima</i>	spreading sneezeweed	Asteraceae	Native	Annual herb	Flood dependent
<i>Chamaesyce drummondii</i>	caustic weed	Euphorbiaceae	Native	Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Chenopodium nitariaceum</i>	nitre goosefoot	Chenopodiaceae	Exotic	Annual	Terrestrial
<i>Dysphania pumilio</i>	clammy goosefoot, small crumbweed	Chenopodiaceae	Native	Annual/Perennial	Flood dependent
<i>Citrullus lanatus</i> *	bitter melon, wild (or camel) melon	Cucurbitaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual herb	Terrestrial
<i>Conyza bonariensis</i> *	flaxleaf fleabane, tall fleabane	Asteraceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual herb	Terrestrial
<i>Cotula australis</i>	common cotula	Asteraceae	Native	Annual/Perennial herb	Amphibious
<i>Craspedia chrysantha</i>	bachelors buttons, common billybuttons	Asteraceae	Native	Annual herb, sometimes Biennial	Terrestrial
<i>Crassula helmsii</i>	swamp crassula	Crassulaceae	Native	Annual	Amphibious
<i>Crassula sieberana</i> ^^	Australian stonecrop	Crassulaceae	Native, Endangered in South Australia	Annual/Perennial	Amphibious
<i>Cyperus difformis</i>	variable flat-sedge, dirty Dora	Cyperaceae	Native	Annual	Amphibious
<i>Cyperus gymnocaulos</i>	spiny flat-sedge, spiny sedge	Cyperaceae	Native	Perennial	Amphibious
<i>Dittrichia graveolens</i> *	stinkwort, stink-weed	Compositae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual herb	Flood dependent
<i>Duma florulenta</i>	lignum	Polygonaceae	Native	Perennial shrub	Amphibious
<i>Duma horrida</i> #	spiny lignum	Polygonaceae	Native, Rare in South Australia	Perennial shrub	Amphibious
<i>Eleocharis acuta</i>	common spike-rush	Cyperaceae	Native	Perennial	Amphibious
<i>Enchylaena tomentosa</i> var. <i>tomentosa</i>	ruby saltbush, barrier saltbush	Chenopodiaceae	Native	Perennial shrub	Terrestrial
<i>Enneapogon nigricans</i>	black-heads, niggerheads	Poaceae	Native	Perennial	Flood dependent
<i>Epaltes australis</i>	spreading nut-heads	Compositae	Native	Annual/Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Eragrostis australasica</i>	cane-grass, bamboo-grass	Poaceae	Native	Perennial	Amphibious


Species	Common Name	Family	Status	Life history strategy	Functional group
<i>Eragrostis dielsii</i>	Mallee lovegrass	Poaceae	Native	Perennial	Flood dependent
<i>Eremophila divaricata</i>	spreading emubush	Scrophulariaceae	Native	Perennial shrub	Terrestrial
<i>Eremophila scoparia</i>	broom emubush, silver emubush, scotia bush	Scrophulariaceae	Native	Perennial shrub	Terrestrial
<i>Erodium cicutrium</i> *	common storks bill	Geraniaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual/Biennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Eucalyptus camaldulensis</i> var. <i>camaldulensis</i>	red gum, river red gum	Myrtaceae	Native	Tree	Amphibious
<i>Frankenia pauciflora</i> var. <i>gunnii</i>	common (or southern) sea-heath	Frankeniaceae	Native	Perennial herb	Salt tolerant
<i>Glinus lotoides</i>	hairy carpet-weed	Aizoaceae	Native	Annual/Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Glycyrrhiza acanthocarpa</i>	liquorice	Fabaceae	Native	Annual herb	Flood dependent
<i>Goodenia gracilis</i> ^	slender goodenia	Goodeniaceae	Native, Vulnerable in South Australia	Annual/Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Gunniopsis septifraga</i>	green pigface	Aizoaceae	Native	Annual	Flood dependent
<i>Haloragis aspera</i>	rough raspwort	Haloragaceae	Native	Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Haloragis glauca</i>	grey raspweed, grey raspwort	Haloragaceae	Native	Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Helichrysum luteoalbum</i>	jersey cudweed	Asteraceae	Native	Annual	Flood dependent
<i>Heliotropium amplexicaule</i> *	blue heliotrope	Boraginaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Heliotropium curassavicum</i> *	smooth heliotrope	Boraginaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual/Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Heliotropium europaeum</i> *	potato weed, heliotrope, common heliotrope	Boraginaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual herb	Flood dependent
<i>Helminthotheca echioides</i> *	ox-tongue	Asteraceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual/Biennial herb	Terrestrial
<i>Hypochoeris glabra</i> *	smooth catsear, glabrous catsear	Asteraceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual herb	Terrestrial
<i>Isoetopsis graminifolia</i>	grass cushions, grass buttons	Asteraceae	Native	Annual herb	Flood dependent
<i>Isolepis hookeriana</i>		Cyperaceae	Native	Annual herb	Amphibious
<i>Lachnagrostis filiformis</i>	blown grass, fairy grass	Gramineae	Native	Perennial	Flood dependent
<i>Leiocarpa brevicompta</i>	flat Billy-buttons	Asteraceae	Native	Annual herb	Terrestrial
<i>Limosella australis</i>	Australian mudwort, austral mudwort	Scrophulariaceae	Native	Perennial herb	Amphibious
<i>Ludwigia peploides</i>	Water primrose, clove-strip	Onagraceae	Exotic, Naturalised		Amphibious
<i>Lycium ferocissimum</i> ***	African box thorn	Solanaceae	Exotic, Weed of National Significance	Perennial shrub	Terrestrial
<i>Maireana</i> spp.	bluebush	Chenopodiaceae	Native	Perennial shrub	Terrestrial
<i>Malva parviflora</i> *	small flowered marshmallow	Malvaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual/Perennial herb	Terrestrial
<i>Marsilea costulifera</i>	nardoo	Marsileaceae	Native	Annual	Amphibious
<i>Medicago</i> spp.*	burr-medic	Fabaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual herb	Terrestrial
<i>Mentha australis</i>	slender mint	Lamiaceae	Native	Perennial herb	Amphibious
<i>Mesembryanthemum crystallinum</i> *	Common iceplant	Aizoaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual/biennial herb	Terrestrial
<i>Mimulus repens</i>	creeping monkey flower, Maori musk	Scrophulariaceae	Native	Perennial herb	Amphibious
<i>Mollugo cerviana</i>	Wire-stem chickweed	Aizoaceae	Native	Ephemeral/Annual herb	Flood dependent
<i>Myosurus australis</i>	mousetail	Ranunculaceae	Native	Annual herb	Flood dependent
<i>Nothoscordum borbonicum</i> *	onion weed	Liliaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual	Flood dependent
<i>Osteocarpum acropterum</i>	water weed, babbagia	Chenopodiaceae	Native	Perennial herb	Salt tolerantz
<i>Persicaria lapathifolia</i>	pale (or pink) knotweed	Polygonaceae	Native	Annual	Amphibious

Species	Common Name	Family	Status	Life history strategy	Functional group
<i>Phyla canescens</i> *	lippia, fog fruit	Verbenaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Perennial herb	Terrestrial
<i>Phyllanthus lacunaris</i>	lagoon spurge, Caraweena clover	Euphorbiaceae	Native	Annual/Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Plantago cunninghamii</i>	sago weed	Plantaginaceae	Native	Annual herb	Flood dependent
<i>Plantago turrifera</i>	small sago weed	Plantaginaceae	Native	Annual herb	Flood dependent
<i>Polygonum aviculare</i> *	wireweed, hogweed, (prostrate) knotweed.	Polygonaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual	Terrestrial
<i>Polygonum plebium</i>	small knotweed	Polygonaceae	Native	Annual	Flood dependent
<i>Polypogon monspeliensis</i> *	annual beard-grass, beard-grass.	Poaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual	Amphibious
<i>Rhagodia spinescens</i>	spiny saltbush, berry saltbush	Chenopodiaceae	Native	Perennial shrub	Terrestrial
<i>Rorippa palustris</i> *	yellow cress, marsh watercress	Brassicaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual/Biennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Rumex bidens</i>	mud dock	Polygonaceae	Native	Perennial	Amphibious
<i>Salsola australis</i>	buckbush, rolypoly, soft roly-poly, prickly saltwort	Chenopodiaceae	Native	Annual	Salt tolerant
<i>Scleroblitum atriplicinum</i>	purple (or starry or purple-leaved) goosefoot,	Chenopodiaceae	Native	Annual	Flood dependent
<i>Sclerolaena brachyptera</i>	short-winged copperburr, hairy bassia,	Chenopodiaceae	Native	Annual	Salt tolerant
<i>Sclerolaena divaricata</i>	tangled copperburr, pale poverty bush	Chenopodiaceae	Native	Perennial	Terrestrial
<i>Sclerolaena stelligera</i>	star-fruit bassia, star copperburr, starred bluebush	Chenopodiaceae	Native	Perennial	Salt tolerant
<i>Senecio cunninghamii</i>	bushy groundsel	Asteraceae	Native	Perennial shrub	Flood dependent
<i>Senecio runcinifolius</i>	tall groundsel	Asteraceae	Native	Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Sida ammophila</i>	sand sida	Malvaceae	Native	Perennial shrub	Terrestrial
<i>Solanum lacunarium</i>	lagoon Nightshade	Solanaceae	Native	Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Solanum nigrum</i> *	black-berry nightshade, black nightshade	Solanaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Perennial shrub	Terrestrial
<i>Spergularia marina</i> *	salt sand-spurrey	Caryophyllaceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Annual/Biennial/Perennial herb	Salt tolerant
<i>Sporobolus mitchellii</i>	rats-tail couch, short rats-tail grass	Poaceae	Native	Perennial	Flood dependent
<i>Stemodia floribunda</i>	blue-rod	Scrophulariaceae	Native	Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Taraxacum officinale</i> *	dandelion	Asteraceae	Exotic, Naturalised	Perennial herb	Terrestrial
<i>Tecticornia pergranulata</i>	N/A	Chenopodiaceae	Native	Perennial herb/shrub	Amphibious
<i>Tecticornia triandra</i>	desert glasswort	Chenopodiaceae	Native	Perennial shrub	Salt tolerant
<i>Tetragonia tetragonioides</i>	New Zealand spinach, Warragul cabbage	Aizoaceae	Native	Annual/Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Teucrium racemosum</i>	grey germander	Lamiaceae	Native	Perennial herb	Flood dependent
<i>Trachymene cyanopetala</i>	purple trachymene, purple parsnip	Apiaceae	Native	Annual herb	Flood dependent
<i>Typha domingensis</i>	narrow-leaved Cumbungi	Typhaceae	Native	Perennial	Amphibious
<i>Wahlenbergia fluminalis</i>	river bluebell	Campanulaceae	Native	Perennial	Flood dependent
<i>Xanthium strumarium</i> **	Noogoora burr, cockleburr	Asteraceae	Exotic, Proclaimed SA Pest Plant	Annual herb	Flood dependent


b)




c)




d)




e)



f)



g)



j)

