

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**AN INVESTIGATION INTO REPELLENCY-INDUCED RUNOFF
AND ITS CONSEQUENCES IN A NEW ZEALAND HILL COUNTRY
PASTURE SYSTEM**

**A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in Soil Science**

Massey University



Michael Robert Bretherton

2012

ABSTRACT

Soil water repellency affects a wide range of soils within diverse environments. In agricultural systems, it has the potential to reduce infiltration of water into the soil and enhance surface runoff processes. Accordingly, soil water repellency may have significant consequences in hill country. In these landscapes, repellency-induced runoff has the potential to result in a marked reduction in the quantity of water available to pasture in summer and autumn, and to increase the impact of summer storm events on stream flow.

The objective of this thesis is to examine repellency-induced runoff and to study its consequences in New Zealand hill country pasture systems, with a particular focus on the East Coast of the North Island as represented by the research area at Alfredton and a catchment near Waipawa.

Detailed meteorological data, surface runoff measurements from small plots (1.0 x 2.0 m), and soil moisture values gathered over two years at the Alfredton catchment were used to determine the effect of soil water repellency on the infiltration rate of the soil and surface runoff, and to assess its importance as a hydrological process in that catchment. The persistence of repellency was further investigated on soil slabs in the laboratory. A soil water balance model, which incorporates the observed throttling effect of repellency in the top 50 mm of soil, was developed to help assess when this phenomenon was most likely to occur. Output from the model using 8 years of rainfall and stream flow data from the Waipawa catchment was used to help gauge the effect of repellency-induced runoff on peak stream flow and total stream flow. The effect of repellency on pasture production was also measured at the Alfredton site.

The Alfredton soils had high intrinsic infiltrability (at least 2 mm min^{-1}), but this property was compromised by water repellency under dry soil conditions. However, analysis of detailed meteorological, soil moisture, and surface runoff data at the Alfredton catchment indicated that plot-scale repellency-induced runoff events occurred less than 10 times a year and that over two years these events equated to less than 5 % of the mean annual rainfall of 1517 mm. Observations and modelling showed that repellency-induced runoff occurred whenever

both the rainfall intensity exceeded 0.1 mm min^{-1} and the soil water content in the 0-50 mm topsoil was less than $0.28 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$. Although repellency reduced the infiltration rate of the Alfredton soils by a factor of 10, it disappeared less than 44 hours after significant rainfall, and only reappeared once the soils had again become sufficiently dry. The rapid disappearance of water repellency was confirmed by the laboratory study using large soil slabs. The implication is that repellency-induced runoff is not a significant hydrological process.

The soil water balance model was used to predict repellency-induced runoff over 8 years in the Waipawa catchment. It predicted on average about 50 mm yr^{-1} of repellency-induced runoff from both the North catchment and South catchments over the 8 years, during which time the catchments received an average rainfall of 793 mm yr^{-1} . This suggests that even in this drier climate, repellency-induced runoff plays a relatively minor role in the soil water balance of these hill country catchments.

Examination of Waipawa stream flow data on those days when more than 10 mm of repellency-induced runoff was predicted, revealed a maximum stream flow of 1.1 mm and an average flow that was only 3.3 % of the modelled repellency-induced runoff. Additionally, on those days, peak stream flow was less than 3 % of peak rainfall intensity. These values suggest that at least 95 % of repellency-induced runoff infiltrated the soil before reaching the stream and thus contributed very little to both peak and total stream flow at Waipawa over the 8 years.

Repellency-induced runoff appears to have had little effect on pasture production at the Alfredton site. Employment of the refined soil water balance model in combination with a pasture production model suggested that repellency-induced runoff would be responsible for less than 1 % reduction in pasture production per annum. Statistical analysis of production data over the 2010 and 2011 years showed that shallower (20°) slopes significantly out-produced steeper (30°) slopes by 2.7 t ha yr^{-1} , with North and South aspect production being similar.

In summary, repellency-induced runoff does not appear to play a major role in the soil water balance of the study catchment at Alfredton. Furthermore, repellency-induced runoff does not seem to have a marked impact on stream flow under the drier Waipawa climate.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The course of this PhD thesis has been a significant journey and, as with most significant journeys, I've been very fortunate to have received considerable help from many people along the way.

First and foremost, I would like to thank both Dave Horne and Dave Scotter for their patience, enthusiasm, and understanding in guiding me through the process of PhD study. Contrary to any impression I may have given at the time, I enjoyed the many meetings we had and found them both constructive and entertaining. Dave Scotter's considerable knowledge of soil physics as well as a planned and measured approach to the thesis gelled beautifully with Dave Horne's enthusiasm and complete disregard of deadlines. I thank them both for an enjoyable and instructive apprenticeship.

Mike Hedley and James Hanly have my sincere thanks for encouraging me to embark on a course of PhD study. I am indebted to them for nudging me out of my comfort zone and allowing me to explore new areas of creativity. Special thanks to Mike Hedley for his ready willingness to accept me as a PhD candidate.

The process of field work was made much easier and more enjoyable with enthusiastic help from several people from the INR Soil and Earth Science Group. In particular I would like to thank Ian Furkert, Bob Toes, Anja Möbis, Ross Wallace, and Michael Killick for their assistance at Alfredton, sometimes under unpleasant weather conditions. I hope that the stop at the Eketahuna café on the way home helped to compensate somewhat for their efforts. On a personal note, I would like to thank Bob Toes for keeping me focussed on the primary reason for the completion of my PhD – the promise of a return to fishing New Zealand's spectacular coastal waters.

A number of other people have helped with the field work at Alfredton on occasion, and in this regard I would like to thank Manual Bermudez, Michael Walker, Richard French, Peter Bishop, and Reid Christianson who saved me considerable time and effort in fine-tuning the runoff plots.

The availability of the research area at Alfredton in the northern Wairarapa was generously provided by Clem and Joy Smith of Pori Station. Their welcoming attitude and willingness to accommodate all manner of visitors from Massey University is much appreciated - this project would not have been possible without their generosity. I would also like to thank Jennifer and William Forbes who took over Pori Station after Clem and Joy's retirement and kindly allowed the project to continue.

Part time PhD study requires a certain skill in time management, something I could never quite get the hang of. I would like to thank Lance Currie for arranging my workloads so that I could complete the PhD course as efficiently as possible, particularly during the final stages, when I was able to spend appreciable periods of time writing the thesis.

I have been privileged to have had specialist help and advice from a number of individuals who have been very generous with their time. In this regard I would like to thank Dr. Sumanasena for his substantial assistance and long hours spent analysing soil samples using the ROMA apparatus located at Plant and Food Research at Palmerston North. Thanks also to Dr. Jeyakumar for his help on the use of this equipment. Dr. Alan Palmer's extensive pedological knowledge was invaluable in describing and quantifying the soil profiles at Alfredton – his help is greatly appreciated. Anne West's assistance as well as her patient and very clear explanations regarding the statistical analysis of pasture samples were invaluable in differentiating production differences between slope classes at Alfredton.

Analysis of the effects of repellency on stream flow would not have been possible without the generous provision of Waipawa catchment data from NIWA.

Thanks to Glenys Wallace and Liza Haarhoff – warm smiles, encouragement, and a sense of humour are always appreciated.

And for those who appreciate a mention in the 'Acknowledgements Section'

Hello Christine.

Finally, my gratitude and love go to my parents, Clare and Fred – and to my kids – Frances, Alice, and Matthew. Thanks for your patience and understanding, and for putting up with the change in routine over the last few years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	x
List of Plates	xvi
List of Figures	xviii
List of Tables	xxii

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1	Introduction	1
-----	--------------------	---

Chapter 2

Literature review

2.1	Introduction	5
2.2	New Zealand hill country pastoral farming	5
	2.2.1 Geology, geography, and climate.....	5
	2.2.2 Soils.....	7
	2.2.3 Pasture.....	8
	2.2.4 Land management and environmental issues	9
2.3	Soil water repellency.....	10
	2.3.1 Surface runoff	10
	2.3.2 Repellency-induced surface runoff	11
	2.3.3 The chemistry of water repellency	12

2.3.4	Water repellent compounds in soils	13
2.3.5	Measurement of soil water repellency	15
2.3.6	Spatial and temporal variations in soil water repellency.....	17
2.3.7	Distribution of soil water repellency in New Zealand	19
2.3.8	Impacts of soil water repellency in New Zealand hill country pastures	20
2.4	Conclusions	23

Chapter 3

Site details and instrumentation

3.1	The research area	25
3.2	Soils	28
3.3	Pasture	36
3.4	Instrumentation and sampling	36
3.4.1	General	36
3.4.2	Runoff plots and the measurement of runoff volumes	40
3.4.3	Rainfall	46
3.4.4	Soil moisture	46
3.4.5	Bulk density	47
3.4.6	Water repellency	49
3.4.7	Solar radiation	51
3.4.8	Air temperature and relative humidity	52
3.4.9	Wind.....	54

Chapter 4

Soil water availability in hill country

4.1	Introduction	57
4.2	Towards an improved understanding of the soil water balance of sloping land under pasture	58
4.3	Methodology.....	60
4.4	Results.....	62
	4.4.1 A modified model	64
	4.4.2 Model outputs and discussion.....	72
4.5	Conclusions	76
4.6	Acknowledgements.....	77
4.7	References	77
4.8	Summary	77

Chapter 5

Measurement of repellency-induced runoff in hill country

5.1	Introduction	79
5.2	Results.....	83
	5.2.1 Rainfall	83
	5.2.2 Runoff and volumetric soil water content	85
5.3	Discussion.....	95
	5.3.1 2010	95
	5.3.2 2011	97
	5.3.3 General Discussion	100
	5.3.4 Infiltration Rates	108
5.4	Conclusions	113

Chapter 6

A laboratory study of runoff and water repellency using a hill country soil

6.1	Introduction	115
6.2	Methodology.....	116
6.3	Results and discussion	120
	6.3.1 General	120
	6.3.2 Soil moistures	125
	6.3.3 Runoff and drainage	125
6.4	Conclusions	127

Chapter 7

Stream flow and water repellency in paired hill country catchments

7.1	Introduction	129
7.2	The Waipawa site.....	130
7.3	The refined model.....	130
7.4	Evaluating the model's parameters	133
7.5	Comparison of model outputs with Alfredton data	136
7.6	Application of the model to the Waipawa site.....	142
7.6	Conclusions	155

Chapter 8

The effect of repellency-induced runoff on pasture production in hill country

8.1	Introduction	157
8.2	Methodology.....	161
8.3	Results and discussion	165
8.3.1	Pasture production - data.....	165
8.3.2	Cumulative pasture production – effect of slope	169
8.3.3	Cumulative pasture production – effect of aspect.....	171
8.3.4	Cumulative pasture production – general.....	171
8.3.5	Individual harvests – effect of slope.....	171
8.3.6	Individual harvests – effect of aspect.....	172
8.3.7	Daily pasture growth rates	172
8.3.8	Soil water repellency and pasture production	175
8.4	Conclusions	179

Chapter 9

Conclusions

9.1	Summary	181
9.2	Suggestions for further work	185
	References	187
	Appendices.....	199
	Statements of contribution.....	199

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 3.1	The primary catchment area – looking WNW.	26
Plate 3.2	The soil profile at the C1North aspect (scale units are in cm).....	32
Plate 3.3	The soil profile at the C1South aspect (scale units are in cm).....	33
Plate 3.4	One of the C1 30 N plots showing the split PVC pipe and collection bin.	41
Plate 3.5	Custom designed and manufactured runoff tipping bucket housed inside a chilly bin.	42
Plate 3.6	Surface runoff measurement system installed in the field.	43
Plate 4.1	Aerial photograph (sourced from Terralink NZ Limited) showing the location of the runoff plots. Each point represents a replicate pair of plots and the dotted line denotes the main catchment boundary. The top of the photograph is true North. Inset shows the 30°N (left) and 30°N (right) runoff plots.....	61
Plate 6.1	Collection of a soil slab from a point close to one of the C1North shallow slope runoff plots.	117
Plate 6.2	Side view of the ROMA apparatus. Foam is applied to prevent edge flow at the sides of the slab, and water (or 30 % ethanol) is delivered at a constant rate via eight hypodermic needles set in a line across the width of the slab at the top of the slope. The angle of the slope was fixed at 22 degrees.....	118
Plate 8.1	Location of the stock exclusion cages at the research area.	164

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3.1	Location of the research area.	26
Figure 3.2	Location of the research sites at Alfredton. The primary catchment boundary is shown by the black dotted line; yellow dotted lines denote contours at 20 m intervals.	27
Figure 3.3	The setup for the collection of surface runoff.	41
Figure 3.4	Tip volume as a function of tip rate. Calibration plots for runoff tipping buckets C1 20 N L (A), C1 20 N R (B), C1 30 N L (C), C1 30 N R (D), C1 20 S L (E), and C1 20 S R (F). Data points are the means of 3 replicates; solid lines are least squares fitted curves.	44
Figure 3.5	Tip volume as a function of tip rate. Calibration plots for runoff tipping buckets C1 30 S L (A), C1 30 S R (B), C1 30 E L (C), C1 30 E R (D), C2 30 E L (E), and C2 30 E R (F). Data points are the means of 3 replicates; solid lines are least squares fitted curves.	45
Figure 3.6	Calibration plot for 300 mm depth TDR probes; the red line is a least squares fitted linear curve.	47
Figure 3.7	Incoming daily short wave solar radiation measured on a horizontal surface at the C2East site.	52
Figure 3.8	Mean daily maximum and minimum relative humidity values for the research sites.	53
Figure 3.9	Mean daily maximum and minimum air temperature values for the research sites.	54
Figure 3.10	High and low wind run datasets for the research sites.	55
Figure 4.1	Driest (◆) and wettest (■) water content profiles measured at (a) 30°S and (b) 20°N locations.	63
Figure 4.2	Modelled (×) and measured (◆) available water in the top 350 mm of soil at locations (a) 30°N (30° slope N aspect site), (b) 20°N (c) 30°S, (d) 20°S and (e) 30°E (◆ for sub-catchment I and ■ for sub-catchment II) on various sampling dates.	66

Figure 4.3 Modelled (×) and measured (◆) water content in the top 50 mm of soil at locations (a) 30°N (30° slope N aspect site), (b) 20°N (c) 30°S, (d) 20°S and (e) 30°E (◆ for sub-catchment I and ■ for sub-catchment II) on various sampling dates.	68
Figure 4.4 Modelled drainage (+), repellency-induced runoff (×) and measured surface runoff (◆ for left- and ■ for right-paired plots) for (a) 30°N (30° slope N aspect site), (b) 20°N (c) 30°S, (d) 20°S and (e) 30°E (◆ and ■ for sub-catchment I; ▲ and ● for sub-catchment II) on various sampling dates.....	70
Figure 5.1a Cumulative rainfall for all rainfall gauges during the period February 2009 through to June 2009.....	84
Figure 5.1b Cumulative rainfall for all rainfall gauges during the period December 2009 through to March 2010.....	84
Figure 5.2 Cumulative runoff and rainfall intensity (a) and daily rainfall and volumetric water contents (b) for the C1North site during 2010. Solid lines in (b) denote VWC for 0-300 mm soil depth.....	86
Figure 5.3 Cumulative runoff and rainfall intensity (a) and daily rainfall and volumetric water contents (b) for the C1North site during 2011. Solid lines in (b) denote VWC for 0-300 mm soil depth.....	87
Figure 5.4 Cumulative runoff and rainfall intensity (a) and daily rainfall and volumetric water contents (b) for the C1South site during 2010. Solid lines in (b) denote VWC for 0-300 mm soil depth.....	88
Figure 5.5 Cumulative runoff and rainfall intensity (a) and daily rainfall and volumetric water contents (b) for the C1South site during 2011. Solid lines in (b) denote VWC for 0-300 mm soil depth.....	89
Figure 5.6 Cumulative runoff and rainfall intensity (a) and daily rainfall and volumetric water contents (b) for the C1East site during 2010.....	90
Figure 5.7 Cumulative runoff and rainfall intensity (a) and daily rainfall and volumetric water contents (b) for the C1East site during 2011.....	91
Figure 5.8 Cumulative runoff and rainfall intensity (a) and daily rainfall and volumetric water contents (b) for the C2East site during 2010.....	92
Figure 5.9 Cumulative runoff and rainfall intensity (a) and daily rainfall and volumetric water contents (b) for the C2East site during 2011.....	93

Figure 5.10 Cumulative runoff and rainfall intensity associated with runoff event 1 in 2010 for the C1North site.	109
Figure 5.11 Cumulative runoff and rainfall intensity associated with runoff event 1 in 2010 for the C1South site.	109
Figure 5.12 Cumulative runoff and rainfall intensity associated with runoff event 1 in 2010 for the C2East site.	110
Figure 5.13 Cumulative runoff and rainfall associated with runoff event 1 on 20-01-2010 for the C1North, C1South, and C2East sites. Solid lines are fitted quadratic functions.	111
Figure 5.14 Infiltration rates associated with runoff event 1 on 20-01-2010.	112
Figure 6.1 Runoff and drainage fractions relative to input for (a) water applied to the C1North shallow site (b) ethanol applied to the C1North shallow site, (c) water applied to the C1North steep site (d) ethanol applied to the C1North steep site. R1, R2, and R3 are replicate analyses.....	123
Figure 6.2 Runoff and drainage fractions relative to input for (a) water applied to the C1South shallow site (b) ethanol applied to the C1South shallow site, (c) water applied to the C1South steep site (d) ethanol applied to the C1South steep site. R1, R2, and R3 are replicate analyses.....	124
Figure 7.1 Modelled and measured volumetric water contents in the top 50 mm of soil at locations (a) 30°N (30° slope N aspect site), (b) 20°N (c) 30°S, (d) 20°S and (e) 30°E on various sampling dates (Chapter 5).	135
Figure 7.2 Modelled available water contents in the root zone at locations (a) 30°N (30° slope N aspect site) and (b) 20°N. Measured values were calculated using data from 300 mm deep TDR probes.....	138
Figure 7.3 Cumulative runoff for left and right plots and modelled cumulative runoff for the North steep site in (a) 2010 and (b) 2011.....	140
Figure 7.4 Rainfall intensity (15 minute periods) and stream flow data (5 minute periods) for the North Waipawa catchment for key dates in 1999, 2000, and 2001 when the model simulated more than 10 mm day ⁻¹ of repellency-induced runoff.....	147
Figure 7.5 Rainfall intensity (15 minute periods) and stream flow data (5 minute periods) for the North Waipawa catchment for key dates in 2001, 2004,	

2006, and 2007 when the model simulated more than 10 mm day ⁻¹ of repellency-induced runoff.	148
Figure 7.6 Rainfall intensity (15 minute periods) and stream flow data (5 minute periods) for the North Waipawa catchment for the key date in 2008 when the model simulated more than 10 mm day ⁻¹ of repellency-induced runoff.....	149
Figure 7.7 Rainfall intensity (15 minute periods) and stream flow data (5 minute periods) for the North Waipawa catchment when the 8 year maximum daily stream flow was observed.	154
Figure 8.1 Cumulative pasture production for North sites (a), South sites (b), and East sites (c). Vertical lines represent seasonal boundaries.....	168
Figure 8.2 Daily pasture production for North sites (a), South sites (b), and East sites (c). Vertical lines represent seasonal boundaries.....	173
Figure 8.3 Modelled versus actual pasture production for the years 2010 and 2011 for the C1North aspect. Details are given in the text.....	177

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1	Summary of site layout at the research area.....	28
Table 3.2	Soil profile descriptions for the C1North aspect (Plate 3.2) and the C1South aspect (Plate 3.3).	29
Table 3.3	Nutrient status of the soils for all sites on 23-11-2006 (first row) and 12-06-2012 (second row). The additional C2, C3, C4 and C5 sites (which have only one analysis on 12-06-2012) are associated with pasture sampling sites that are described in detail in Chapter 8.....	34
Table 3.4	Summary of the logger and sensor inventory for each of the weather stations.....	38
Table 3.5	Installation dates of surface runoff tipping buckets for the research plots.....	43
Table 3.6	Bulk density statistics for each of the research sites.....	48
Table 3.7	Potential degree and persistence of water repellency for 0-40 mm top soils at each of the research sites on 16-11-2010.	50
Table 4.1	Summary of model output for all aspect and slope combinations for the year 31/10/2006 to 30/10/2007 when total rainfall was 840 mm. All numbers are mm.....	75
Table 5.1	Summary rainfall and runoff statistics for all logger sites for the years 2010 and 2011.	94
Table 5.2	Rainfall and runoff data for the major repellency-induced runoff events.	102
Table 5.3	Rainfall and initial 0-300 mm depth VWC values for the major repellency-induced runoff events at the C1North site.	104
Table 5.4	Table giving fitted quadratic equation parameters for the cumulative rainfall and runoff curves in Figure 5.13.....	111
Table 6.1	Volumetric water contents (VWC) of 0-50 mm depth at field sampling and immediately prior to ROMA analysis.	120
Table 6.2	Peak water runoff and steady-state runoff values and timings for the ROMA samples.	122
Table 7.1.	Measured (mean and standard deviation) and modelled Alfredton runoff (mm) from all plots on key days (see Chapter 5).....	142

Table 7.2	Modelled repellency-induced runoff, rainfall, and North and South catchment stream flow for the 13 key days where simulated daily repellency-induced runoff exceeded 10 mm. Flow values are spread over the whole catchment.	150
Table 7.3	Maximum 15 minute rainfall intensity and maximum 5 minute North catchment stream flow for the 13 key days where simulated daily repellency-induced runoff exceeded 10 mm. Maximum stream flow values are spread over the whole catchment.	152
Table 8.1	Summary of replication pattern for stock exclusion cages at the research site.	162
Table 8.2	Summary of aerial topdressing events at the research site.	162
Table 8.3	Individual dry matter yields for all harvests after 04-12-2009 at each of the sites. Values given are the means of the paired cages at each site.	165
Table 8.4	Summary of statistical processing of pasture data between steep and shallow slopes and for North and South aspects only. Values listed are the probability that there is no difference within the slope and aspect categories.	170
Table 8.5	Actual and modelled pasture production data for the C1North site at Alfredton over the period 04-12-2009 to 12-01-2012.	178