

# Response of micro-algae in the Kromme Estuary to managed freshwater inputs

Snow GC and Adams JB\*

Botany Department, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, PO Box 77000, Port Elizabeth 6031, South Africa

## Abstract

The Kromme is a permanently open estuary that receives little freshwater input because the capacity of the dams is equivalent to the mean annual runoff from the catchment. The estuary is marine dominated and phytoplankton chlorophyll *a* is low because of the low freshwater pulses that introduce nutrient-rich freshwater. Water released ( $2 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ ) from the Mpofo Dam in 1998 produced little micro-algal response in the estuary. The study reported here addresses further runoff scenarios to see which might be beneficial in stimulating microalgal production. Recent surveys together with past research were used to describe the present state and reference condition of the estuary. Average intertidal chlorophyll *a* was  $12.9 \pm 2.5 \mu\text{g}\cdot\text{g}^{-1}$  of sediment and  $4.9 \pm 0.4 \mu\text{g}\cdot\text{g}^{-1}$  of sediment during November 2003 and July 2004. These concentrations are relatively low but comparable to those found in intertidal sediments in other South African estuaries and might indicate that intertidal microalgal biomass is not severely limited by low freshwater inputs. Average water column chlorophyll *a* concentrations have ranged from  $0.6 \pm 0.1$  to  $5.6 \pm 0.3 \mu\text{g}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ . Present state conditions can thus be described as those where water column chlorophyll *a* seldom exceeds  $5 \mu\text{g}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$  and small flagellates ( $3.5 \mu\text{m} \times 2.8 \mu\text{m}$ ) dominate the phytoplankton. The diatoms introduced via freshwater have been lost. Under reference conditions before the Mpofo Dam was built, baseflow would have been greater than  $1 \text{ m}^3\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  for approximately 8 months of the year. The flocculation of fine particles associated with the mixing of fresh and saline waters would have resulted in phytoplankton peaks ( $\text{chl } a > 10 \mu\text{g}\cdot\text{L}^{-1}$ ) in the middle reaches of the estuary. A more suitable habitat might also have been present for the epipelagic (mud associated) benthic microalgae. An assessment of the future runoff scenarios indicated that the most beneficial for the microalgae would be a flow release from the Mpofo Dam of  $5 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$  in October and then again in January. This would stimulate a 25 to 33% increase in phytoplankton chlorophyll *a* and a doubling in intertidal benthic chlorophyll *a* for a period of two months following the releases.

**Keywords:** phytoplankton, microphytobenthos, freshwater inflow, salinity, present state, dam releases

## Introduction

The Kromme Estuary is located in the Eastern Cape Province, 80 km west of Port Elizabeth. The estuary is relatively narrow with an average width of approximately 80 m, and extends for 14 km from the permanently open mouth to a rocky sill that forms the tidal head of the estuary. Its major tributary is the Geelhoutboom River which enters 8 km from the mouth. The catchment area and length of the Kromme River are approximately 1 000 km<sup>2</sup> and 100 km respectively. The rainfall in the catchment occurs throughout the year, with bimodal maxima in autumn and spring. January and February tend to have the lowest rainfall (Bickerton and Pierce, 1988).

There are two dams above the estuary and their combined holding capacity (Mpofo Dam  $107 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$  and the Churchill Dam  $33.3 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ ) exceeds the mean annual runoff (MAR) of the Kromme River (estimated to be in excess of  $105 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ ) (Reddering, 1988). This has resulted in the water becoming saline towards the head of the estuary. In addition to reduced river flow, the dams have also affected the frequency and magnitude of flood events, and the availability of riverine material replenishing the estuarine nutrient pool (Scharler et al., 1997). A release policy, which provides  $2 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{a}$  (EMATEK (CSIR) 1994), was proposed to account for the evaporative loss of the estuary (Jezewski and Roberts, 1986). However, flow

records and personal communications with the Mpofo Dam managers indicate that very few or no releases have been made for a number of years (2002 to 2005). The construction of farm dams and abstraction of water for agriculture have significantly reduced the flow of water from the Geelhoutboom River.

A freshwater release study in 1998 (Bate and Adams 2000; Snow et al., 2000a) indicated that a release of  $2 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$  had little beneficial effect on the estuary and that a consistent baseflow was probably necessary to maintain water column production. The results reported in this study were a component of a Department of Water Affairs and Forestry comprehensive Ecological Reserve study on the Kromme Estuary. The response of the micro-algae to different runoff scenarios was investigated to compare which would be most beneficial to micro-algal production.

The aims of this study were to document the present state of micro-algae (phytoplankton and microphytobenthos) in the Kromme Estuary, determine how this has changed from the reference condition (before anthropogenic influences) and then to predict changes in response to varying freshwater inflow scenarios. The present status assessment was based on two recent surveys and past research results. The freshwater inflow scenarios considered were:

- $5 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$  release from the Mpofo Dam during November
- $5 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$  release during November and another in January
- Maintain present flow in the Kromme but increase flow in the Geelhoutboom Tributary
- $5 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$  release during November and increased flow from the Geelhoutboom Tributary
- $7.5 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$  release over a two-month period (October–November).

\* To whom all correspondence should be addressed.

☎ +2741 5042429; fax: +2741 5832317;

e-mail: [janine.adams@nmmu.ac.za](mailto:janine.adams@nmmu.ac.za)

Received 21 July 2005; accepted in revised form 17 November 2005.