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Response:
The comments from Referee #2 greatly improved the quality and transparency of the study proposed in this manuscript.

Comment:
The statistical analysis is a lot more transparent, and I would urge the authors to refer to the model as a 'statistical model' throughout the paper so as to distinguish it from a model based on physics.
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p. 11906, l. 12

Replaced: “...to build a multiple linear model...”
by: “...to build a statistical model with multiple linear regression...”

p. 11910, l. 3
Replaced: “...via multivariate linear modelling...”
by: “...via statistical multivariate linear modelling...”

p. 11914, l. 2
Replaced: “Model development...”
by: “Statistical model development”

l. 4
Replaced: “build a calibration dataset for hydrological modelling...”
by: “build a calibration dataset for statistical modelling of hydrologic change...”

l. 12
Replaced: “...generate a predictive model to reconstruct monthly $F_\alpha$”
by: “...generate a predictive statistical model to reconstruct monthly $\Delta F_\alpha$”
Comment:
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p. 11906, l. 16
Included: “(Table A5; Fig. A3)” after “56 km2”

p. 11915, l. 20
Included: “(Table A4)” after “variation”.

p. 11916, l. 14
Replaced “Table A3” by “Table A6”

p. 11916
Replaced (in revised text): “minor changes in the fit, slope and intercept.” by: “minor changes in the fit, slope and intercept (Fig. A4).”

p. 11934
Replaced “Table A3” by “Table A6”
Included:

"Table A4: Sensitivity analysis of the four variables included in the statistical model”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>-18.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R_d</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( R \) = total rainfall-month\(^{-1}\) on the upper Fortescue (mm); \( R_d \) = number of days with > 0 mm of rain-month\(^{-1}\) (days); \( F_{A-1} \) = flood area of the previous month (km\(^2\)); \( Int \) = the time interval between observations (days); Std Error = Standard error; \( p \) = significance level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R^2_{adj}$</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{bias}$</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_{rmse}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driver</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
<td>Std Error</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_d$</td>
<td>-18.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>-17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{A_{t-1}}$</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** $R = \text{total rainfall·month}^{-1}$ on the upper Fortescue (mm); $R_d = \text{number of days with > 0 mm of rain-month}^{-1}$ (days); $F_{A_{t-1}} = \text{flood area of the previous month (km}^2\text{)}$; Int = the time interval between observations (days); Std Error = Standard error; $p$ = significance level
"Figure A3: Surface water extent ($F_A$) at the Fortescue Marsh reconstructed using the final model based on the full 1988-2012 calibration period (black line) and the subsets for the 1998-2012 (red line) 1988-1997; 2005-2012 (green line), 1988-2004 (purple line) periods; $F_A \leq 0$ km$^2$ = no surface water evident on the Marsh (shaded)."

"Figure A4: Collinearity between $R$ and $R_d$ over the last century (1912-1937; 1938-1962; 1963-1987) compared to the calibration months (1988-2012)."
Comment:
The increased information contained in the response (not available during the initial review) does raise more questions. Specifically, the large negative departure of the predicted time series of FA area when FA-1 is not included in the model (Figure 1b in the response). Regardless of the R2 value, this does raise some issues. The first is that if FA-1 acts as an autoregressive variable, then an autoregressive model is usually adopted to formally account for this.

Response:
It is probably incorrect to designate the FA-1 as an autoregressive variable of the model as we did in our latest response because it is not strictly speaking autoregressive (and the model does not have to be for our purpose). In fact, the statistical model provided here is reconstructing the change in inundated area (i.e., ΔFA) rather than FA, (significantly influenced by the amount of surface water already present). However, the building of the reconstruction over 100 years (continuous changes) is affected when FA-1 is not included in the statistical model because the wetland has a limit as to how ‘negative’ or how dry it can be. Hence, FA-1 is included primarily as a weighting variable to account for the size-dependent range of possible values of change in FA. The FA values are not just correlated with FA-1, they are unevenly limited (i.e., biased) within a certain range when (FA<0) dependent on FA-1. This bias would not be accounted for by using an autoregressive model. In other words, because the sign of the FA-1 coefficient is negative in the model (see sensitivity analysis table in the response and Table 1 in the original manuscript), a “negative FA-1” status changes the sign of the influence of FA-1 to positive, thus maintaining the reconstruction within the “limits” of the system. Physical modelling using recent observational information would likely enlighten the processes of which the results have been statistically reconstructed here.

p. 11918
l. 1
Replaced: “The sequence of events, or...”
by: “The sequence of events (i.e., FA_{At-1}), or...”

Included after “despite a lack of rain in both cases.” (revised version):
“Because of the negative value of the FA_{At-1} coefficient, this variable was not only significant in predicting ΔFA (Table 1), but also enabled the reconstruction of continuous values for FA over the last 100 years from ΔFA by accounting for the “maximum drying capacity” of the system, where FA became otherwise progressively more negative with time. The FA values are not just correlated with FA_{At-1}, they are unevenly limited (i.e., biased) within a certain range when (FA<0) dependent on FA_{At-1}. FA_{At-1} hence acts as a weighting variable to account for the size-dependent range of possible values of change in FA.”
Comment:
The second, and somewhat perplexing issue, is how the authors actually know what the variable FA-1 is if they are using it to predict FA for the following month? I understand that this is one of four variables used to predict dFA in the calibration period (i.e. when they are able to measure this from the remote sensing data), but the extrapolation of this series back to 1912 implies they have data for all these independent variables going back that far (such as it appears for total rain and rain days). From what I can see the authors have data for two of the variables going back to 1912, but use a model with 4 variables for prediction, but there doesn’t appear to be actual data for the latter 2 (FA-1 and Int). If this the case, and if so, what numbers do they use in the model in their place? Or have I missed something here? If I’ve got this totally wrong I think the authors need to at least clarify this last step.

Response:
As pointed out by the reviewer, this important step has been detailed in Section 2.4.2 of the original version of the manuscript (p. XX):

“We used the modelled ΔFA to reconstruct the total area flooded (FA) from the earliest available instrumental data in the region, i.e., from March 1910 to December 2012. However, the value of FA in March 1910 being unknown, the observed FA minimum, average and maximum of the calibration period (1988–2012) were used as starting points and long-term statistics for the hydrological regime were calculated from the meeting point of the three time series, i.e., January 1912.”

The Interval (Int) variable being the number of days per month, this value can be obtained for any given month in time (28, 29, 30 or 31 days). Having R, RDays and Int since 1910, we used the average, minimum and maximum observed FA values from the calibration period from 1910 for FAt-1, and, though as the referee pointed out we do not know what FAt-1 might have been initially, the three reconstructions met in 1912 at the same value. We believe the information already provided offers sufficient explanation of this step as per above extract.
Comment:
Finally, the Cross-Validation Error should be plotted with the final predicted time series as error bounds to show the values are not a precisely known line, and give a visual sense of this error, not just one contained within the table (otherwise the figure is at risk of being misleading).

Response:
We consider the $E_{RMSP}$ a better estimator of the error (i.e., the error for values independently reconstructed over 1/3 of the dataset period from the remaining 2/3 of the dataset period as opposed to only 16 occurrences for the cross-validation) and have included this in the plot as per the referee’s suggestion.
Comment:
I also appreciate the authors have modified the interpretation of the negative FA values in the MS, and this seems reasonable. However, negative values are presented as a continuous series in the time series figure giving the impression that these are representative of an actual physical process. Positive values are obviously an accurate estimate of the actual water area on the marsh itself, but negative values are not an accurate estimate of anything (i.e. they certainly can't be expected to match the time series of the vadose zone water content or the groundwater elevation), so we are left with these precise looking wiggly lines below 0 whose values doesn't actually mean anything (other than they are less than 0 and an unsaturated zone is developing). One option is to highlight this in the figure, or at the very least provide this explanation in the text within the relevant section.

Response:
We agree with the referee that negative FA values are unrealistic and thus as per the referees’ suggestion, we included shading to the figure for values below zero and inserted explicit reference to the negative values in the figure caption for clarity.

p. 11937, Figure caption
Replaced: “1912–2012 c) flood area reconstruction (solid black line) with the observation dataset plotted for the 1988-2012 period (dashed red line) for comparison and d)” by: “1912–2012 c) flood area reconstruction (solid black line), monthly $E_{\text{RMSp}}$ of $\Delta F_A = \pm 56$ km$^2$ (solid grey lines) and observation dataset plotted for the 1988-2012 period (dashed red line) for comparison and d)”

Replaced: “12 consecutive months.” by: “12 consecutive months. c) & d) $F_A \leq 0$ km$^2$ = no surface water evident on the Marsh (shaded).”

Comment:
With these comments to be addressed, the paper looks good for publication.

Response:
We thank the referee for promptly providing these helpful revisions.
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Abstract

Globally, there has been much recent effort to improve understanding of climate change-related shifts in rainfall patterns, variability and extremes. Comparatively little work has focused on how such shifts might be altering hydrological regimes within arid regional basins, where impacts are expected to be most significant. Long-term hydrological records provide crucial reference baselines of natural variability that can be used to evaluate potential changes in hydrological regimes and their impacts. However, there is a dearth of studies of the hydrological regimes for tropical drylands where intraseasonal and interannual variability in magnitude and frequency of precipitation are extreme. Here, we sought to identify the main hydroclimatic determinants of the strongly episodic flood regime of a large catchment in the semi-arid, subtropical northwest of Australia and to establish the background of hydrologic variability for the region over the last century. We used a monthly sequence of satellite images to quantify surface water expression on the Fortescue Marsh, the largest water feature of inland northwest Australia, from 1988 to 2012. We used this sequence together with instrumental rainfall data to build a statistical model with multiple linear regression and reconstruct monthly history of floods and droughts since 1912. We found that severe and intense regional rainfall events, as well as the sequence of recharge events both within and between years, determine surface water expression on the floodplain (i.e., total rainfall, number of rain days and carried-over inundated area; $R^2_{adj} = 0.79$; $p$ value < 0.001, $E_{RMSP} = 56$ km$^2$). The most severe inundation (~1000 km$^2$) over the last century was recorded in 2000. The most severe reconstructed inundation over the last century was in March 2000 (1000 km$^2$), which is less than the 1300 km$^2$ area required to overflow to the adjacent catchment. The Fortescue Marsh was completely dry for 32% of all years, for periods of up to four consecutive years. Extremely wet years (seven of the 100 years) caused the Marsh to remain inundated for up to 12 months; only 25% of years (9% of all months) had floods of greater than 300 km$^2$. Duration, severity and frequency of inundations between 1999 and 2006 were above average and unprecedented when compared to the last century. The prolonged, severe and consecutive yearly inundations between 1999 and 2006 were unprecedented compared to the last century. While there is high inter-annual variability in the system, changes to the flooding regime over the last 20 years suggest that the wetland will become more persistent in response to increased frequency and intensity of extreme rainfall events for the region. While there is high inter-annual variability in the system, if the...
frequency and intensity of extreme rainfall events for the region were to increase (or be similar to 1999-2006), surface water on the Marsh will become more persistent, in turn impacting its structure and functioning as a wetland.
1 Introduction

Extreme climatic events such as tropical cyclones, heavy rainfall and severe drought are projected to become more intense and less frequent globally over the next hundred years in response to anthropogenic-driven climate change (Coumou and Rahmstorf, 2012). Tropical cyclones (TC) have been increasing in intensity in the semi-arid northwest of Australia since the 1970's, although trends in both their occurrence and the distribution of associated rainfall remain unclear (Hassim and Walsh, 2008; Goebbert and Leslie, 2010; Emanuel, 2013; Wang et al., 2013). Instrumental data and modeling suggest that the subtropical region has also experienced an increase in summertime rainfall since 1950 and overall wetting (Shi et al., 2008; Taschetto and England, 2009; Fierro and Leslie, 2013). Rainfall anomalies over the 1919–1999 period retrieved from tree ring records provide further evidence of a post-1955 wetting trend in northwest Australia (Cullen and Grierson, 2007). This wetting, since at least the 1980’s, has been attributed to increased occurrence of monsoonal lows and TCs (Berry et al., 2011; Lavender and Abbs, 2013) and is also consistent with increases in extreme wet and hot conditions during the summer monsoon period in the Australian tropics over recent decades (Gallant and Karoly, 2010).

However, resultant impacts of shifts in hydroclimate on catchment hydrology are still poorly understood. Quantifying the “hydroclimatic expression” of regional events remains challenging for not only the Australian northwest but for arid environments more generally; quantifying the hydrological response to changes in the rainfall patterns remains challenging in arid environments, especially for remote tropical and minimally gauged drylands such as the Pilbara region of northwest Australia. Tropical drylands are often characterised by extreme hydroclimatic conditions, where rainfall is highly heterogeneous in its distribution and the majority of streams and rivers are ephemeral but highly responsive to intense rainfall events. For example, peak surface flow rates generated from ephemeral rivers and creeks in the Pilbara region of northwest Australia can reach thousands of cubic metres per second after such events (WA Department of Water, 2014). These factors contribute to high spatial and temporal heterogeneity of recharge-discharge mechanisms across any one catchment, which in turn presents considerable challenges for prediction of consequences of changes in intensity and frequency of extremes resultant impacts of hydroclimate change on catchment hydrology. Several lines of evidence suggest the Pilbara has been particularly wet during the late 20th century (e.g., Cullen and...
and that the frequency of extreme precipitation events may be increasing (e.g., Gallant and Karoly, 2010). However, there is no consensus on whether the observed higher summer rainfall can be attributed to an overall ‘wettening trend’ or whether the recent ‘wet’ period may be a feature within the range of natural ‘extreme’ variability characteristic of this region. The consequences of intensification and shifts in frequency of the hydrological cycle as well as greater variability of precipitation patterns have already been documented in other parts of the world, including alterations in the seasonality and extent of floods or drought (Harms et al., 2010; Feng et al., 2013).

Ecological disturbances such as flood and drought cycles are usually described by their extent, spatial distribution, frequency (or return interval), predictability and magnitude (i.e., severity, intensity and duration) (White and Pickett, 1985). Determining how altered hydrologic regimes (floods and droughts) may in turn impact vulnerable ecosystems, including wetlands, requires detailed understanding of the links between the distribution of precipitation and flows across multiple spatial and temporal scales (e.g., Kiem et al., 2003; Kiem et al. 2004; Verdon-Kidd and Kiem, 2010; Ishak et al. 2013). The Pilbara region of northwest Australia, in common with other hot arid regions of the world including the Indian Thar, Namib-Kalahari and Somali deserts, is characterised by some of the most variable annual and inter-annual rainfall patterns on the planet (van Etten, 2009). In the case of the Pilbara, TCs in the Pilbara, tropical cyclones and other low-pressure systems forming off the west Australian coast in the tropical Indian Ocean often result in extreme severe flooding events (WA Department of Water, 2014). These events punctuate years of prolonged drought, which together define the “boom-bust” nature of productivity in highly variable desert ecosystems (McGrath et al., 2012). Surface water availability or persistence of water features, physical disturbances and hydrological connectivity resulting from this highly dynamic regime in turn play a central role in shaping aquatic and terrestrial ecosystem processes, species life history strategies and interactions and population dynamics (Box et al., 2008; Leigh et al., 2010; Pinder et al., 2010; Sponseller et al., 2013). Changes in hydroclimatic patterns and extremes that might alter the natural disturbance regime would thus have profound consequences for the structure and functioning of often highly specialised and adapted arid ecosystems (Newman, 2006; Leigh et al., 2010). However, while the ecological response to extreme flood or drought has been documented...
Remote sensing has proven to be the most suitable and often only tool for investigating spatial and temporal variability of arid zone remote wetlands in the arid zone (e.g., McCarthy et al., 2003; Bai et al., 2011; Thomas et al., 2011), as well as and improved understanding of ecophysiological processes at the regional scale particularly (Gardelle et al., 2010; Haas et al., 2011; McGrath et al., 2012). As interannual variability of rainfall is high in arid regions, long temporal series are essential to capture the background variability of systems at appropriate temporal scales (Mori, 2011). High temporal resolution is also needed to accurately characterise the seasonal cycles and mechanisms generating the complex spatial and temporal patterning of floods at basin and regional scale and to effectively address the consequences of changes in disturbance regimes for different ecosystems. For example, satellite imagery has recently been successfully combined with hydrological modelling to extend wetland flood regime records from tropical Australia (e.g., Karim et al., 2012) and to investigate mechanisms such as connectivity among floodplains (e.g., Trigg et al., 2013). Similar approaches have also been used to understand the evolution of daily flood and dynamics of floodplain vegetation on the east coast of Australia (Powell et al., 2008). Remote sensing techniques have also been utilised to calibrate hydraulic models of dynamic flow processes during floods, albeit over relatively short time periods (e.g., Bates, 2012; Neal et al., 2012; Wen et al., 2013). However, flood regime analyses based solely on remotely-sensed data do not adequately capture the lengthy temporal scales of flood and drought cycles in many arid and semi-arid regions, which require calibration periods that encompass variability at interannual, decadal and multidecadal scales, especially to elucidate relationships with climatic drivers and geomorphological processes (Roshier et al., 2001; Mori, 2011; Ishak et al. 2013; Kiem and Verdon-Kidd 2013).

Here, we sought to identify the main hydroclimatic determinants of flooding regimes at the catchment scale and to establish the background of variability of surface water expression over the last century in the semi-arid northwest of Australia. First, we identified the main rainfall variables influencing surface water expression on the Fortescue Marsh, the largest
internally draining wetland in the Pilbara region (Fig. 1), by combining monthly remote sensing imagery from the Landsat archive to instrumental data from 1988–2012 via statistical multivariate linear modelling. Second, we used the model to extend the flooding regime record of the Marsh to the 1912–2012 period based on instrumental records of rainfall. The development of this high-resolution temporal series allowed us to explore and better understand the factors governing surface water expression in a semi-arid landscape at multiple temporal scales, and particularly the significance of extreme events. These larger temporal windows are needed to better understand long-term functioning of arid zone wetlands such as the Marsh but more broadly to establish improved context for more informed water management strategies in these sensitive regions.

2 Methods

2.1 Study site – the Fortescue Marsh

The Fortescue Marsh (hereon referred to as the Marsh; Fig. 1) is an ephemeral wetland of some 1300 km², which is comprised of a complex network of riverine floodplains and freshwater and floodplain lakes. The Marsh is the largest wetland of inland northwest Australia and formally recognised as nationally significant for its ecological and hydrologic values (Environment Australia, 2001; McKenzie et al., 2009; Pinder et al., 2010). Vegetation across the Marsh is dominated by salt-tolerant chenopod (Tecticornia) shrublands, with eucalypt and Acacia woodlands growing adjacent to the most permanent water features (Beard, 1975). As the largest freshwater feature for hundreds of kilometres, the Marsh (Martuythatha) is also of considerable heritage significance including as a key focus for aboriginal communities for more than 40 000 years and since the late 1800’s for early European pastoralists (Slack et al., 2009; Law et al., 2010; Barber and Jackson, 2011).

The Marsh acts as an internally draining basin for the 31 000 km² upper Fortescue River catchment (21–23°S; 119–121°E; Fig. 1), which is physiographically separated from the Lower Fortescue River catchment by the Goodiarrie Hills (> 410 m a.s.l.; www.water.wa.gov.au). The flood level required for the Marsh to overflow to the Lower
Fortescue catchment is not formally established but digital elevation models (Geosciences Australia, 2011) suggest water could flow if inundations reached >410 m a.s.l. The upper Fortescue River is the main drainage of the catchment, flowing north to northwest into the wetland system. However, numerous ephemeral creeks on the southern and northern flanks of the Fortescue Valley (Fig. 1) discharge to the marsh directly (www.water.wa.gov.au; Table A1). Flow in the Fortescue River is characterised as "variable, summer-dominated and extremely intermittent" (Kennard et al., 2010), where very large volumes of runoff are generated following heavy rainfall, which is in contrast and only very large rainfall events generate continuous flow, which contrasts with the normally dry stream empty beds of the dry season (WA Department of Water, 2014). Only one official daily stream gauging station is currently operational on the river (>100 km upstream of the Marsh). The other stations were only installed along the main creeks in two of the 13 sub-catchments of the Upper Fortescue River catchment (Fig. 1), and records did not overlap consistently in time (Table A1). Recently, sub-daily gauging stations were installed along Coondiner Creek and sections of Weeli Wolli Creek with pluviographs and used to implement stable isotope water balance models for these sub-catchments over relatively short (i.e., < 6 years) time periods (Dogramaci et al., 2015). The Ophthalmia Dam, constructed on the Fortescue River at Newman in 1981 to provide the town with drinking water, has a 32 GL capacity and receives from a relatively small and low lying fraction of the catchment (14.5%) with minimal observed impact on the riverine ecosystem at the mouth of the Marsh (Fig. 1; Payne and Mitchell, 1999). 

The Fortescue River Valley paleodrainage, eroded from the Hamersley Basin sedimentary rocks, lies between the Hamersley Range in the south and the Chichester Range in the north, constituting the main topographical features of the Eastern Pilbara (Dogramaci et al., 2012). The Fortescue Marsh consists of colluvial and alluvial sedimentary deposits up to ~50m developed on the top of the Oakover Formation, a sequence of younger Tertiary lacustrine carbonate, silcrete and mudstone rocks deposited in the Fortescue River Valley (Clout, 2011). The Oakover Formation is underlain by fractured dolomite and shale of the Wittenoom Formation (Clout, 2011). The recent sediments consist mainly of detrital clays, iron oxides and gypsum. The alluvial and colluvial aquifers of the Fortescue Marsh are frequently confined by impermeable consolidated massive clays and calcrete and silcrete layers. The residence time of water in the upper sections of the catchment is short: surface
runoff is high via the steep gradients of creeks and gorges. Surface runoff is high via the steep gradients of creeks and gorges; recent tracer studies from the Weeli Wolli Creek and Coondiner Creek (Fig. 1) showed that residence time of water in the upper sections of the catchment was short (days to weeks) (Dogramaci et al., 2015). The groundwater under the Marsh is highly saline and likely developed by evaporation of floodwater and consequent recharge to underlying aquifers (Skrzypek et al., 2013). The most reported permanent water feature on the Marsh is 14 Mile Pool, located at the mouth of the upper Fortescue River; this pool does not retain water significantly diluted nor flushed by groundwater, which contrasts to other small through-flow pools in upper parts of the secondary tributaries of the catchment (Fellman et al., 2011; Skrzypek et al., 2013).

2.2 Climate and rainfall patterns

Rainfall in the Pilbara comes from troughs, monsoonal depressions, and onshore circulations (Leroy and Wheeler 2008; Risbey et al 2009). Over the 1912–2012 historical period, the upper Fortescue River catchment received on average 290 mm yr⁻¹, of which 75% fell during the monsoonal summer (November–April) (Fig. 2a; Australian Bureau of Meteorology, www.bom.gov.au/cgi-bin/silo/cli_var/area_timeseries.pl). "Meteorologically dry" years received less than 200 mm rainfall, while "wet" years received over 300mm (Fig. 2a), as defined by the left-skewed mode of the yearly rainfall frequency distribution (35% of all years). Scattered, small-scale storms cause daily rainfall to be highly variable among the 17 weather stations (Fig. 1a, Appendix A, Table 1) of the upper Fortescue River catchment (www.bom.gov.au/climate/data/). Evaporation is highest during the summer and generally exceeds rainfall (Skrzypek et al., 2013); average temperatures in summer range between 30–40 °C, and in winter months between 24–35 °C (www.bom.gov.au/climate/data/).

Heavy summer storms and tropical cyclones often generate large floods in the major river systems of the Pilbara, particularly on the coast, while winter rainfall is typically not sufficient to generate surface flows (Fig. 2; WA Department of Water, 2014). Tropical cyclones and other closed lows accounted for most of the extreme rainfall events in the northwest of Australia over the 1989–2009 period (Lavender and Abbs, 2013). Numerous historical tracks of cyclones have been recorded in the upper Fortescue River catchment.
during the last century (www.bom.gov.au/cyclone/history/). When TC tracks were recorded within a 500 km radius of the Marsh, total monthly rainfall in the catchment was significantly greater ($p$ value < 0.01) than the 1912–2012 monthly averages for no-TC months (Fig. 2b). Rain intensity during TC months was also higher (17–22 mm monthly rain $d^{-1}$; 22 mm of rain per rain day) than in no-TC months (8–10 mm monthly rain $d^{-1}$; 10 mm of rain per rain day). Not surprisingly, extremes in the rainfall record (defined here as exceeding the 95th and 99th percentile of all monthly total rainfall occurrences, or $Ex_{95}$ and $Ex_{99}$, respectively) are linked to the occurrence of tropical cyclones. In fact, half of the months falling in the $Ex_{95}$ (i.e., > 104 mm rainfall/month) recorded at least one TC (30 out of 60 months). Further, at least one TC occurrence was recorded for nine out of 12 months falling in the $Ex_{99}$, i.e., months recording 190–258 mm of rainfall.

2.3 Mapping flood history based on the Landsat archive (1988–2012)

We mapped the flood history (i.e., surface water expression) of the Marsh floodplain area (~1300 km$^2$; Fig. 1) between 1988 and 2012 from high-resolution (i.e., ca. two-week intervals) Landsat images that captured patterns of surface water expression (see Appendix A, Sect. A2 for details). The Marsh floodplain area is defined here as elevations below 410 m.a.s.l. and within the upper Fortescue River catchment (Fig. 1). Surface water features were extracted from Landsat images using an automated thresholding method in ArcGIS v. 9.2 and flood areas ($FA$) were calculated using Fragstats v. 4.1 (see Appendix A, Sect. A2 for details). We calculated potential errors associated with using the pixel resolution (30 m) of Landsat images and the thresholding approach to classify surface water features (see Appendix A, Sect. A2 for details). Based on these potential errors, estimated monthly change in flood area ($\Delta FA$) of less than 6 km$^2$ should be considered with caution. However, given the scale of variation in $FA$ on the Marsh (ca. 0–1000 km$^2$, Fig. 3) this error is relatively small.

To provide further confidence in our dataset within the estimated errors we used two 40 cm resolution digital ortho-images produced from aerial photographs taken in July 2010, April 2012 (Fortescue Metals Group Limited, Perth, Australia) and one 5 m resolution image taken in August 2004 (Landgate, Government of Western Australia), to confirm that our
flood areas mapped from Landsat images taken on similar dates (i.e., within one week of the ortho-image dates) were within 1 pixel (30m) of the flood area visible in the ortho-images (Fig. A1a). A groundtruthing expedition in the dry season (November 2012; Fig. A1b, c) that noted boundaries by GPS route tracking while walking along the water edge (~1-2 m distance from standing water) of the Moorimoordinia Native Well and a delineation of the inundation plume in the wet season (February 2012; Fig. A1 d) by GPS route tracking during low altitude helicopter survey along the water plume were also conducted and confirm that our thresholding method captured standing water on the Marsh (Appendix A2).

2.4 Modelling floodplain wetting and drying events

2.4.1 Statistical model development and selection

Of the 493 Landsat images processed, only 208 images (TM & ETM) were used to build a calibration dataset for hydrological modeling between the 1988–2012 period (Fig. 3). Following selection of the latest observation for each month (or of the first observation of the next month if within the first week; n = 265), only ΔFA between two consecutive months (n = 232) that were above the estimated errors were included. As a result, 160 ΔFA values were used in the final calibration dataset. Most (70 %) ΔFA values were calculated over a ca. month-long interval (i.e., 30±7 d), but this interval ranged from 16 to 48 days for the full calibration dataset.

We used a multiple linear regression (in R v. 2.11.1) to identify the main climatic drivers of ΔFA on the Marsh and generate a predictive statistical model to reconstruct monthly ΔFA for the last century (1912–2012). Climatic variables tested as predictors in the model included: monthly total rainfall, number of rain days, mean temperature and potential evapo-transpiration calculated from weather station records and monthly gridded datasets (see Appendix B, Table A3 for details). To account for the potential effect of system memory, we included FA in the previous 1 to 12 months as predictors in the model. Variables that were significant in explaining the variation in FA, provided the best fit as per the adjusted coefficient of variation (R² adj) for the number of variables and the smallest root mean square error (\( \varepsilon_{\text{RMSE}} \)) were used in the final model. Initially, the sensitivity of each
predictor was tested and only the hydroclimatic variables that were significant in explaining the variation in $F_A$ were used in the model. The model that provided the best fit between the predicted and observed values in the calibration set as per the coefficient of variation ($R^2_{adj}$) adjusted for the number of variables and the smallest root mean square error $E_{RMS}$ was selected.

2.4.2 Validation of model and 1912–2012 reconstruction

The model’s predictive accuracy was tested by both cross-validation and calculation of the $E_{RMS}$ of prediction ($E_{RMSP}$). A random ten-fold cross-validation (CV) was computed using the CVlm function of the DAAG R package v. 1.16 (Maindonald and Braun, 2013). The $E_{RMSP}$, which indicates how well the model fits an independent subset of the data, was obtained by removing block subsets representing a third of the calibration occurrences (i.e., 1988–1997; 1998–2004; 2005–2012).

We used the modelled $\Delta F_A$ to reconstruct the total area flooded ($F_A$) from the earliest available instrumental data in the region, i.e., from March 1910 to December 2012. However, the value of $F_A$ in March 1910 being unknown, the observed $F_A$ minimum, average and maximum of the calibration period (1988–2012) were used as starting points and long-term statistics for the hydrological regime were calculated from the meeting point of the three time series, i.e., January 1912. Yearly statistics were calculated for the rain year, i.e., November–October. We used comparisons with an aerial photographic survey from 1957 (Edward de Courcy Clarke Earth Science Museum, UWA), early MSS Landsat imagery (1972–1988) and droughts/flood events reported by early surveyors and pastoralists to local newspapers (www.trove.nla.gov.au) to provide historical anchors to our 1912–2012 time series (see references in-text).

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Hydroclimatic determinants of floods and droughts

Total rainfall in the upper Fortescue River catchment ($R$), number of rain days ($R_d$) and
carried-over inundated area ($F_{A,t-1}$) were the strongest hydroclimatic determinants of the monthly flooding and drying ($\Delta F_A$) regime at the Fortescue Marsh ($p$ value < 0.001; Table 1). The high $R^2_{adj}$ (0.79, $p$ value < 0.001) indicates that the final model included the most important contributors to $\Delta F_A$ variation. $R$ alone tested independently of the other variable explained 64% of the variance ($p < 0.001$), and including $R_d$, improved variance explained by only 8% ($p < 0.001$). Although there is some collinearity between $R$ and $R_d$ (Table A4), we considered it important to include both hydroclimatic variables ($R$ and $R_d$) from a mechanistic point of view, precisely because of the highly variable nature of our system. For example, in our study system, while it is common that 200 mm may fall over just two days, at other times 200 mm may fall over 28 days (www.bom.com.au). These very contrasting monthly distributions of rainfall demonstrate vastly different intensities and in turn generate quite different run-off; the dynamics of rainfall in such a highly heterogeneous climate are thus best captured by inclusion of both variables, where more $R_d$ modulates negatively the impact of $R$. In addition, the inclusion of $R$ and $R_d$ may account to some extent for the recorded changing rainfall intensity over the century (Shi et al., 2008; Taschetto and England, 2009; Gallant and Karoly, 2010; Fierro and Leslie, 2013). The model's predictive accuracy was similar for both tests performed, i.e., the $E_{RMSECV}$ and the best $E_{RMSEP} = 56$ km$^2$ (Table A5, Fig. A3). However, the subset model used to calculate $E_{RMSEP}$, which excluded the particularly wet and variable 1998–2004 period from the calibration period, performed the worst at reconstructing $\Delta F_A$ for the 1998–2004 verification period ($R^2_{adj} = 0.64$; $E_{RMSEP} = 86$ km$^2$), indicating this period constituted an important range for the calibration of the model. Both other calibration models (excluding the 1988–1997 or the 2005–2012 periods) were more accurate ($E_{RMSEP} = 58$ and 56 km$^2$, respectively), and the overall variance explained improved to 81 and 82% when either of these dry, less variable periods was removed from the model.

The enhanced performance of the subset models built without as many “dry” periods highlights an important limitation of the observation dataset. Because it was not possible to calculate $\Delta F_A$ from the calibration set when the surface water at the Marsh was dry, water loss, i.e., soil water storage depletion, was therefore underestimated during these periods. Concurrently, however, the reconstruction of monthly $F_A$ values below 0 km$^2$ reflects the ability of our model to provide quantitative information on soil water storage, or the unsaturated zone of the Marsh where rapid infiltration of rainwater was observed following
-heavy rainfall at the Marsh (Skrzypek et al., 2013). This zone between water table and ground surface likely acts as a buffer to net surface water gain or loss. A lack of surface water is returned by the model as areas ≤ 0 km². The negative values (≤ 0 km²) for ‘area’ can conceptually be explained as the depletion of the groundwater resources and lowering of the water table below the ground level. While our calibration period captures an exceptional range of intraseasonal and interannual variability in this extreme system, changes in the collinearity structure between highly collinear variables may occur over time and thus affect the relative contribution of the predictors and the reliability of the reconstructed estimates (Dormann et al., 2013). However, the relationship between $R$ and $R_d$ variables appears to have remained strongly linear between equivalent time periods over the reconstructed period, with only minor changes in the fit, slope and intercept (Fig. A4). Nevertheless, the coefficients of these variables should not be used outside the scope of this study. Mechanistically, we do not expect the mutual influence of $R$ and $R_d$ on surface flow, where for the same volume of rain more water flushes through the river network if it occurs over fewer rain days, to have changed drastically in the semi-arid region over the last 100 years, or at least not beyond the reported error of the model. Hence, this reconstruction should be used to examine long-term patterns of change in hydrological status and meteorological determinants as opposed to fine-grained catchment processes of recharge provided by higher spatio-temporally resolved hydrological models.

For further details on the modelling statistics, refer to the Pearson correlation matrix for the modelled variables (Appendix A, Table A6) and the distribution of observed against reconstructed $\Delta F_A$ values (Appendix A, Fig. A2).

The goodness-of-fit and relatively small errors of the model provide confidence in the reconstruction starting in the early 1900’s. While our calibration period captures an exceptional range of intraseasonal and interannual variability in this extreme system, changes in the collinearity structure between highly collinear variables may occur over time and thus affect the relative contribution of the predictors and the reliability of the reconstructed estimates (Dormann et al., 2013). However, the relationship between $R$ and $R_d$ variables appears to have remained strongly linear between equivalent time periods over the reconstructed period, with only minor changes in the fit, slope and intercept. Nevertheless, the coefficients of these variables should not be used outside the scope of this study. Mechanistically, we do not expect the mutual influence of $R$ and $R_d$ on surface flow.
flow to have changed drastically in the semi-arid region over the last 100 years, where for the same volume of rain more water flushes through the river network if it occurs over fewer rain days, or at least not beyond the reported error of the model. Hence, this reconstruction should be used to examine long-term patterns of change in hydrological status and meteorological determinants as opposed to fine-grained catchment processes of recharge provided by higher spatio-temporally resolved hydrological models. In particular, the inclusion of $R_d$ in addition to $R$ makes the model and reconstruction robust against the recorded changing rainfall intensity over the century (Shi et al., 2008; Taschetto and England, 2009; Gallant and Karoly, 2010; Fierro and Leslie, 2013).

However, the model tended to underestimate $\Delta F_a$ following very intense rainfall events (large rainfall over 1–3 days), which might be partly attributed to the monthly resolution (Appendix A, Fig. A2). Reconstructed values of $\Delta F_a$ for any given month are calculated for the last day of the month and as such do not account for the timing of intense events during that month. A large rainfall event occurring early in the month would thus result in smaller $\Delta F_a$. The underestimation of $\Delta F_a$ values during intense events might also be due to the high spatial heterogeneity of rainfall in the catchment, which was readily apparent when events were much larger closer to the Marsh (e.g., Marillana Station, Fig. 1b; www.bom.gov.au/climate/data/). Consequently, our time series mostly reflects regional-scale events rather than more localised events. The use of weighted contributions of the different meteorological stations or sub-catchments within the upper Fortescue River catchment might improve the downscaling of this model. However, the instrumental records in this region are both temporally and spatially patchy, and using higher resolution gridded data would not necessarily truly improve the resolution of the data evenly for the last century (Fig. 1; www.bom.gov.au/climate/data/).

Severe and intense rainfall events (i.e., high $R$ and low $R_d$) clearly drive the hydrologic regime of this system over the last century. Total rainfall contributed most ($R_0 = 145$ km$^2$; $p$ value $< 0.001$) to monthly flooding of the Marsh (…$F_A$). More than 75 mm rain/month in the catchment systematically caused a net wettening (increase in $F_A$) of the Marsh’s floodplains while $< 30$ mm rain month$^{-1}$ was generally insufficient to impact on $F_A$ (Fig. 4). However, more intense rainfall events resulted in much larger flooding episodes. Conversely, for the same total rainfall, more rain days in the month strongly dampened the extent of floods ($R_{dp} = -63$ km$^2$; $p$ value $< 0.001$). These “flash floods” drive the current
hydrological regime of the Marsh but are also consistent with the hydrochemical evolution
and modern recharge of shallow groundwater under the Marsh (Skrzypek et al., 2013). By
washing down of surface salts deposited on the Marsh during previous evacuation
episodes, large floods not only recharge the system, but also deliver freshwater that
becomes available at surface for extended periods of time. This heavy rainfall (as opposed
to groundwater) driven system is rather unusual in the arid zone, where many wetlands
are groundwater-dominated, playa-like ecosystems (Bourne and Twidale, 2010; Tweed et
al., 2011). In arid zone playas, the hypersaline groundwaters from the deep aquifer are
connected to surface processes and result in saline waters being exposed (Bourne and
Twidale, 2010; Cendon et al., 2010). In contrast, our results support that the Fortescue
Marsh is rather a paleosaline lake where vegetation can grow and surface water is largely
fresh, but then eventually becomes brackish due to the concentration of solutes with time
owing to evaporative losses.

The sequence of events (i.e., $F_{At-1}$), or the “system memory”, was also an important
determinant of surface water availability on the Marsh. When still inundated from the
previous month ($F_{At-1} > 0$ km$^2$), decrease of the total area flooded was significantly larger
($F_{At-1} = 29$ km$^2$; $p$ value $< 0.001$). For example, although the largest inundated area was
recorded in 2000, the 1942 net $\Delta F_A$ was larger but resulted in slightly less inundated area
at the Marsh owing to the drier conditions than in 1999 in the previous month. Water loss (-
$\Delta F_A$) on the Marsh from one month to the next was larger over a months after higher
inundation extent ($F_{At-1} > 0$ km$^2$). For example, after large 560 km$^2$ inundation in August
1942, the water extent decreased by 100 km$^2$ over the first month. In contrast, an extent of
200 km$^2$ in May 1912 decreased by 50 km$^2$ over the first month, despite a lack of rain in
both cases. Because of the negative value of the $F_{At-1}$ coefficient, this variable was not only
significant in predicting $\Delta F_A$ (Table 1), but also enabled the reconstruction of continuous
values for $F_A$ over the last 100 years from $\Delta F_A$ by accounting for the “maximum drying
capacity” of the system, where $F_A$ became otherwise progressively more negative with
time. The $F_A$ values are not just correlated with $F_{At-1}$, they are unevenly limited (i.e., biased)
within a certain range when ($F_A<0$) dependent on $F_{At-1}$. $F_{At-1}$ hence acts as a weighting
variable to account for the size-dependent range of possible values of change in $F_A$.

Intervals (Int) between observations (number of days over which the change was
observed) did not significantly improve the fit of the model ($\text{Int}_p = -8$ km$^2$; $p$ value $< 0.07$).
This variable (Int) thus rather acted as a constant that contributed to the decrease of surface water every month. Intervals (Int) between observations (number of days over which the change was observed) did not significantly improve the fit of the model (Int\(_0\) = −8 km\(^2\); \(p\) value = 0.07). This variable (Int) was nevertheless included in the model to account for Δ\(F_A\) values being calculated over slightly different time intervals (i.e., 30±7 d) in the calibration period and because months of the year include 28 to 31 days. This, Int acted as a constant that contributed to explaining the decrease of surface water every month.

Monthly loss of surface water on the Marsh through evaporation and transpiration was reconstructed to be up to 150 km\(^2\) (i.e., lowest Δ\(F_A\)). The most severe water losses occurred during especially dry April, May and June (i.e. <3.5 mm rainfall; Fig. 4) following very wet summers. Unsurprisingly, cumulative severe floods resulted in the longest inundation periods recorded on the Marsh, and often contributed to the following year’s hydrological status. Over the 1912–2012, 32% of years had up to 400 km\(^2\) (40% fullness) surface water expression carried over to the next year (i.e., winter to summer). In contrast, 68% of years ended with no surface water and depleted aquifers in October (Fig. 5b).

Our findings indicate that the reconstructed total area flooded at the Marsh represents an integrated ecohydrological catchment response to rainfall, which is expected from such terminal basins (Haas et al., 2011). We observed that the impact of rainfall on inundations and droughts is at least in part modulated by the high local evaporation rate (five to ten-fold greater than rainfall), which acts as a constant drying force on the surface water even though temperature or potential evapotranspiration (PET) did not significantly improve the fit of the model. In addition, vegetation in drylands typically shows a rapid increase in productivity in the few months following a large rainfall event (e.g., Veenendaal et al., 1996; McGrath et al., 2012); thus, runoff from subsequent events might be dampened through enhanced physiological (plant water) use, which is in turn consistent with the negative effect of \(F_{Ai-1}\) on flood area change (Table 1). We suggest that expected seasonal and interannual variation in temperature and/or PET were thus largely accounted for through the use of \(F_{Ai-1}\) and the constant Interval variables.

### 3.2 Spatial and temporal patterns of inundations

Our monthly reconstruction reveals that the floodplains of the Fortescue Marsh have had...
extremely variable interannual severity of total flooded area ($F_{Amax}$) that in turn determined
the duration of inundations for the last century (Fig. 3). Of the last 100 years (1912–2012),
aftermath were large flood years, i.e., years for which the maximum flood area ($F_{Amax}$)
was over 300 km$^2$ (Fig. 3b). Large inundations typically occurred as a result of one to
three-month long flood pulses in the austral summer (February–April). As described
earlier, these flood pulses were mainly associated with regional hydroclimatic events such
as TC occurring in the austral summer (January–March), and are major drivers of surface
water expression at the Marsh for the last century. Following large floods, some level of
inundation could be maintained for over 12 months in 7% of years (Figs. 6 and 7). Further,
only large flood years generated substantial $>0.5$m depth of surface water (Fig. 8a), which
would also have the potential to completely submerge the vast chenopod community on
the Marsh (Beard, 1975). These large flood years, their consequent supra-seasonal
sustained inundations and their connectivity to the western sections (downstream) have
been relatively frequent over the last century and reflect the natural variability in the
hydroclimatic regime. On the other hand, $>800$ km$^2$ flood years (only two in the past 100
yr, 1942 and 2000) are considered extreme, infrequent disturbances bringing exceptional
volumes of freshwater to the system (Fig. 8b). The most striking effect of the interannual
system memory was observed between 1999 and 2006, the period during which
inundations extent and duration on the Marsh were above average and unprecedented for
the last century. The longest period in the last 100 years that surface water was
consistently present on the Marsh (i.e., $F_A > 0$ km$^2$) was from 1998 to 2002, including the
largest yearly inundation for the entire century in March 2000 of $\sim 1000$ km$^2$ (Fig. 3c).

In addition to the large flooding events described above, the majority of years (70–79 %)
experienced at least one month of inundation resulting from smaller floods ($F_{Amax} < 40–48$
km$^2$) (Figs. 6 and 7) that in turn also influenced the distribution and connectivity of surface
water within the different sections of the Marsh (Fig. 6). During large or severe inundation
years, the entire floodplain became initially one (Fig. 6). Following such an event in 1934,
pastoralists experienced the “Marsh becoming a [400 km$^2$] large lake” (Fig. 6; Aitchison,
2006). Going into the winter months, evaporation and the lack of significant input from
rainfall events typically resulted in drying and progressive formation of disconnected pools
mainly along the northern shore and eastern end of the Marsh (Fig. 6). Based on our 25 yr
calibration period, similarly severe years resulted in spatially consistent patterns of
interannual inundation during both wetting and drying phases (Fig. 6). While quite frequent, large flood years do not occur at regular intervals, conferring a poor predictability to surface water in the system. The lowest recurrence was prior to 1960, with up to 14 years between two events; post 1960, large events have occurred at intervals of seven years or less, which in turn has resulted in more severe and prolonged inundations e.g., between 1999 and 2006.

The increased flood severity and duration over recent decades relative to the previous 80 or so years observed in our flooding record is consistent with the increasing trend in heavier summer rainfall events recorded in the region for the same period (Shi et al., 2008; Taschetto and England, 2009; Gallant and Karoly, 2010; Fierro and Leslie, 2013). A simple linear regression between time and yearly duration of floods ($F_{Amax}$) further demonstrates slightly increased inundation length since the beginning of the century ($p$ value = 0.046). However, the significance of this finding should be treated with some caution given the non-independence of the $F_{Amax}$ (especially between two consecutive years) and the limited number of observations included ($n$ = 25 flooding events). The near yearly recurrence of severe and prolonged inundations over the 1999-2006 period in our record is unprecedented relative to the previous 80 or so years and consistent with the heavier summer rainfall events observed in the region over the recent decades (e.g. Shi et al., 2008; Taschetto and England, 2009; Gallant and Karoly, 2010; Fierro and Leslie, 2013). The appraisal of multi-decadal trends in the hydrological regime could be improved by exploring the impact of cyclicity of known larger scale climatic drivers of (summer) rainfall in the northwest of Australia such as the El Niño–Southern Oscillation (ENSO), the Indian Ocean Dipole (IOD) and the Madden–Julian oscillation (MJO) – phasing of these different modes (Risbey et al., 2009). However, rigorous analysis of periodicities would be required for the appraisal of potential multi-decadal trends in the hydrological regime against such a high background of variability (e.g., Kiem et al., 2003; Kiem et al. 2004; Verdon-Kidd and Kiem, 2010; Ishak et al. 2013). In fact, future investigations and risk analyses in the region should strive to assess the potential influence of known larger scale climatic drivers and their interaction of intraseasonal and interannual hydroclimate variability in the northwest of Australia (e.g., Kiem and Frank, 2004; Pui et al., 2011; Kiem and Verdon-Kidd, 2013), such as El Niño-Southern Oscillation, the Indian Ocean dipole, the Madden Julian oscillation and the southern annular mode (Risbey et al., 2009; Fierro...
The development and application of high-resolution proxy indicators of past hydroclimatic changes for the arid zone could also provide more robust insights on multi-decadal trends and ecosystem vulnerability to these changes (e.g., Cullen and Grierson, 2007).

3.3 Significance of predictability and persistence of drought

Our reconstruction shows that the Fortescue Marsh floodplains have more often been dry (i.e., where no surface water is evident on the Marsh, or $F_A \leq 0 \text{ km}^2$) than wet over the last century (Fig. 3c). Hydrological droughts (i.e., series of consecutive months where $F_A \leq 0 \text{ km}^2$) of at least one year were frequent (21%) between 1912–2012 (Figs. 3c, d, and 7). The most recent drought that persisted for more than 2 years occurred between 1990 and 1993 (3.2 years). In contrast, particularly extended drought periods (where no surface water is evident on the Marsh) were more frequent between the late 1930’s and early 1960’s, with the longest supraseasonal drought on record lasting 4.3 years (between 1961 and 1965). In such water-restricted and remote environments, early pastoralists would have been the first to notice changes in the distribution and availability of freshwater. Reports of “bad drought” on Roy Hill Station in early 1939 and winter of 1940, where “no feed” for cattle was available (Aitchison, 2006) corroborate our reconstruction. Dramatic vegetation changes were also documented on the Marsh’s floodplain during this dry period (1938–1940), which coincided shortly after with Marillana Station shifting from cattle to sheep farming (Aitchison, 2006). In our time series, this documented drought corresponded to largely dry conditions; minimal surface water ($F_{A\text{max}} < 150 \text{ km}^2$) at the Marsh due to the occurrence of only minor flood events over these years (Fig. 3c). A 20-month period between 1918 and 1919 where $F_A$ at the Marsh was reconstructed as less than 0 km$^2$ in our analysis also corresponds to a report by the Roy Hill Pastoral Company, one of the main pastoralist in the upper Fortescue River catchment, as a “severe drought” causing the installation of “10 new wells” in 1919 (Dept Land and Survey, 1919) (Fig. 3c).

Overall, the eastern section of the Marsh experienced the least interannual variability by holding the most reliably inundated freshwater areas (Fig. 6), consistent with the presence of long-lived trees at 14 Mile Pool and Moorimooordinia Native Well (Beard, 1975). The September 1957 aerial photograph also shows these pools partially filled even though
there was little summer rain that year, also corroborating our reconstruction of a dry period
at that time. These more permanent, shallow water features were restricted to the
floodplains at the mouth of the upper Fortescue River and other smaller tributaries draining
the steeper slopes of the Chichester Range to the north (Fig. 6). These sections have thus
been under a more localised and “high” inundation frequency regime from smaller events
(Thomas et al., 2011; Fig. 6). These sequential, smaller events potentially maintain refugia
for aquatic populations, which may facilitate recolonisation of other parts of the Marsh
following the larger, less frequent flood disturbances that in turn effectively “reset” arid
zone ecosystems (Leigh et al., 2010; Stendera et al., 2012). With such spatial variation in
floods frequency, we can also expect vegetation communities on the Marsh to form
mosaics tightly linked to their different water requirements and tolerances, as has been
seen on other floodplains such as those of the Macquarie Marshes in central-eastern
Australia (Thomas et al., 2011).

4 Conclusions

We developed a robust reliable model to predict and characterize the surface water
response of a major regional wetland to hydroclimatic variability over the last century. Our
approach is readily applicable to extend the temporal record to other ephemeral water
bodies. Through greater understanding of system responsiveness to regional rainfall
patterns, we also now have improved capacity to assess the long-term ecohydrological
functioning of arid floodplains. For example, if current rainfall trends are sustained,
increased flooding of the Fortescue Marsh will prolong the inundation period in the year,
the connectivity between the different parts of the Marsh and the river network and
increase the carry-over for the following year. The resulting enhanced persistence may in
turn affect long-term hydrochemical and ecological processes of the system, e.g., by an
increase in surface water salinity.
Appendix A: Mapping the flood history

A1 Landsat archive/image selection

The flood history of the Fortescue Marsh was reconstructed using standard terrain corrected scenes for systematic radiometric and geometric accuracy (Level 1T) from the USGS EarthExplorer Landsat archive (http://earthexplorer.usgs.gov/). The Landsat archive has seasonal to monthly coverage of the Fortescue Marsh from 1972–1988 and fortnightly coverage from 1988–2012. We quantified water coverage, or total flooded area (FA) from a subset of 493 satellite images with the analysis of wavelengths sensitive to water reflectance (Xu, 2006), specifically the short wave (SWIR) or mid infra red (MIR) radiation bands 5 (TM, ETM) and 3 (MSS). All image processing was conducted using ArcGIS v.9.2 and ERDAS Imagine 2011. Pixel resolution was 30m x 30m (900m²) for the observation period (1988–2012).

A2 Flood area delineation and error

Water features were relatively straightforward to extract using a simple automated thresholding method (Xu, 2006), owing to their very high contrast to the surrounding arid landscape. FA could not be estimated using our automated method when partial cloud cover was present in the satellite imagery, or for the ETM-SLC off series of Landsat 7 (169 images from a total of 493). Therefore, FA was estimated in these years by calculating the midpoint between the most recent “before and after” FA estimates. This approach also allowed us to capture the largest FA estimates as they were often partly obstructed by clouds.

To account for registration error across the temporal and satellite series, the FA estimate and its associated error (estimation errors) were obtained from three water features extracted for every image using a lower, mid and upper threshold of reflectance values. The three consecutive threshold values (either 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, or 60 value of reflectance) were selected to include the highest frequency distribution of water pixels while providing the smallest FA estimate error. We also calculated resolution errors in extracting FA to account for the use of 30m x 30m pixels values. Here, we applied a 15m
buffer inside and outside the water-only polygon for all thresholds. Thus, estimation and resolution errors were largest when $F_A$ was small owing to an increase in the “edge length” to 5 size ratio, and differences in $F_A$ less than 6 km$^2$ should be considered with caution. A simple linear regression obtained between the automated $F_A$ and its buffer was used to calculate the resolution error for these shapes. The resolution error for shape-estimated $F_A$ was calculated using linear regression formulas obtained between $F_A$ and inside buffer ($R^2 = 0.99, p \text{ value} < 0.001$) and outside buffer ($R^2 = 0.99, p \text{ value} < 0.001$). Strong congruency between elevation contours and the shape of flooded area estimates on the Fortescue Marsh indicate that our thresholding methodology accurately detected standing water.

Neither estimation nor resolution errors were found to follow a seasonal or overall temporal trend. However, we cannot discount that areas of waterlogged ground also contributed to the estimates of flooded area (Castaneda et al., 2005).

Appendix B: Climate variables

While 17 meteorological stations have been intermittently recording daily rainfall data in the upper Fortescue River catchment, only six are currently still in operation, forming a too sparse and temporally inconsistent network for direct use in this study (Fig. 1; Table A2). Explanatory hydroclimatic variables were thus generated using monthly gridded datasets resolved at either 0.5 or 1" cell size weighted for their relative contribution to the upper Fortescue River catchment (Table A3). Total rainfall and mean temperature were obtained from the Australian Bureau of Meteorology (www.bom.gov.au/cgi-bin/silo/cli_var/area_timeseries.pl), the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) and the Global Precipitation Climatology Centre (GPCC) via the Koninklijk Nederlands Meteorologisch Instituut (KNMI) Climate Explorer (climexp.knmi.nl). Potential evapotranspiration (PET), calculated using Penman–Monteith parameterization and based on the actual vegetation cover, was from van der Schrier et al. (2013). The mean number of rain days/month ($R_d$) was calculated from daily rainfall records obtained from the four meteorological stations still in operation, located within or closest the upper Fortescue River catchment, relatively well spread in the vast geographic area and with the longest records (i.e., Noreena Downs, Bulloo Downs, Marillana and Mulga Downs) (Fig. 1; Table A2).
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Table 1: Model parameter estimates and standardized statistics for the final linear model to reconstruct historical flood area on the Fortescue Marsh, NW Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>β (km$^2$)</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>144.729</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R_d$</td>
<td>−62.950</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{At-1}$</td>
<td>−29.157</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>−7.650</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>−8.040</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: β = Weighted contribution; Effect = gain (+) or loss (−) effect of each variable on change in flood area (ΔFA); $R$ = total rainfall/month on the upper Fortescue; $R_d$ = number of days with > 0 mm of rain/month; $F_{At-1}$ = flood area of the previous month; Int = the time interval between observations; Intercept = equation intercept.
Table A1: Temporal coverage of all official stream gauging stations in the Upper Fortescue River catchment and maximum recorded daily discharge

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site number</th>
<th>Stream Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Operational date</th>
<th>Last measurement</th>
<th>Max discharge (m³ sec⁻¹)</th>
<th>Total discharge (GL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>708001</td>
<td>Marillana Ck</td>
<td>Flat Rocks</td>
<td>15/08/1967</td>
<td>23/02/1983</td>
<td>1327</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708006</td>
<td>Fortescue River</td>
<td>Goodalame Crossing</td>
<td>01/12/1972</td>
<td>07/10/1986</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708008</td>
<td>Fortescue River</td>
<td>Roy Hill</td>
<td>01/08/1973</td>
<td>20/09/1986</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708011</td>
<td>Fortescue River</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>09/01/1986</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708013</td>
<td>Weeli Wolli Ck</td>
<td>Waterloo Bore</td>
<td>30/11/1984</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>4157</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708014</td>
<td>Weeli Wolli Ck</td>
<td>Tarina</td>
<td>10/05/1985</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>7600</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>708016</td>
<td>Weeli Wolli Ck</td>
<td>Weeli Wolli Springs</td>
<td>06/10/1997</td>
<td>13/07/2007</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Only daily stage height available; location of stations marked on Fig. 1.
**Table A2**: Australian Bureau of Meteorology (BoM) rainfall stations (www.bom.gov.au/climate/data/) located within and nearby the upper Fortescue River catchment, NW Australia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Station name</th>
<th>BoM number</th>
<th>Lat ('N)</th>
<th>Long ('E)</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Year open</th>
<th>Year closed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mulga Downs</td>
<td>5015</td>
<td>-22.10</td>
<td>118.47</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bulloo Downs</td>
<td>7019</td>
<td>-24.00</td>
<td>119.57</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maritana</td>
<td>5009</td>
<td>-22.63</td>
<td>119.41</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Noreena Downs</td>
<td>4026</td>
<td>-22.20</td>
<td>120.18</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Balfour Downs</td>
<td>4003</td>
<td>-22.80</td>
<td>120.86</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Wittenoom</td>
<td>5026</td>
<td>-22.34</td>
<td>118.34</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Auski Munjina Roadhouse</td>
<td>5093</td>
<td>-22.38</td>
<td>118.69</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kerdiadary</td>
<td>5047</td>
<td>-22.25</td>
<td>119.10</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Warrie</td>
<td>5025</td>
<td>-22.40</td>
<td>119.53</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bonney Downs</td>
<td>4006</td>
<td>-22.18</td>
<td>119.94</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Poondawindie</td>
<td>4063</td>
<td>-22.20</td>
<td>120.20</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Roy Hill</td>
<td>5023</td>
<td>-22.62</td>
<td>119.96</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ethel Creek</td>
<td>5003</td>
<td>-22.90</td>
<td>120.17</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Packsaddle Camp</td>
<td>5089</td>
<td>-22.90</td>
<td>118.70</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Rhodes Ridge</td>
<td>7169</td>
<td>-23.10</td>
<td>119.37</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Rpf 672 Mie</td>
<td>4065</td>
<td>-22.70</td>
<td>121.10</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Billmooka</td>
<td>13029</td>
<td>-23.03</td>
<td>120.90</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Jigalong</td>
<td>13003</td>
<td>-23.36</td>
<td>120.78</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Minderoo</td>
<td>7172</td>
<td>-23.40</td>
<td>119.78</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Capricorn Roadhouse</td>
<td>7191</td>
<td>-23.45</td>
<td>119.80</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Murrumunda</td>
<td>7102</td>
<td>-23.50</td>
<td>120.50</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Prairie Downs</td>
<td>7153</td>
<td>-23.55</td>
<td>119.15</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Turee Creek</td>
<td>7083</td>
<td>-23.62</td>
<td>118.66</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mundwindi</td>
<td>7062</td>
<td>-23.79</td>
<td>120.24</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Newman</td>
<td>7151</td>
<td>-23.37</td>
<td>119.73</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table A3**: Climate variables used in the development of a linear model to reconstruct historical flood area on the Fortescue Marsh, NW Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interval</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Res.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1˚ UF</td>
<td>1900-2012</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bom.gov.au/cgi-bin/silo/cli_var/area_timeseriespl">www.bom.gov.au/cgi-bin/silo/cli_var/area_timeseriespl</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.5˚ UF</td>
<td>1901-2012</td>
<td>GPCC V6 rain gauge precipitation dataset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.5˚ UF</td>
<td>1901-2009</td>
<td>CRU time-series (TS) version 3.10.01 (land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>1˚ UF</td>
<td>1910-2012</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bom.gov.au/cgi-bin/silo/cli_var/area_timeseriespl">www.bom.gov.au/cgi-bin/silo/cli_var/area_timeseriespl</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.5˚ UF</td>
<td>1901-2009</td>
<td>CRU TS 3.10 (land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>PET</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.5˚ UF</td>
<td>1901-2009</td>
<td>(Schrier et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Res. stands for the resolution of gridded data, d is daily weather station rainfall data, m is monthly gridded climate data, R is total rainfall (mm), T is mean temperature (°C) and PET is Penman-Monteith potential evapotranspiration index. UF is the upper Fortescue River catchment (31,000 km²).
Table A4: Sensitivity analysis of the four variables included in the statistical model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rd</td>
<td>-18.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FAt</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Int</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.070</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: R = total rainfall·month\(^{-1}\) on the upper Fortescue (mm); Rd = number of days with > 0 mm of rain·month\(^{-1}\) (days); FAt = flood area of the previous month (km\(^2\)); Int = the time interval between observations (days); Std Error = Standard error; p = significance level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R² adj</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERMS</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERMSP</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Driver</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Std Error</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.177</td>
<td>0.195</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>0.264</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>-3.7</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>-3.74</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>0.875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**: R = total rainfall·month⁻¹ on the upper Fortescue (mm); RD = number of days with > 0 mm of rain·month⁻¹ (days); FA = flood area of the previous month (km²); Int = the time interval between observations (days); Std Error = Standard error; p = significance level.

Note: For the table, please ensure that the formatting is correctly aligned and the text is legible and clear. The table should be centered and properly formatted in a readable manner.
Table A6: Pearson correlation matrix of the variables included in the final linear model to reconstruct historical flood area on the Fortescue Marsh, NW Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Rd</th>
<th>FA\textsubscript{t-1}</th>
<th>Int</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rd</td>
<td>0.8518</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( FA\textsubscript{t-1} )</td>
<td>0.0361</td>
<td>-0.0313</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Int</td>
<td>0.0703</td>
<td>0.0089</td>
<td>-0.0162</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: \( R \) = total rainfall-month\(^{-1}\) on the upper Fortescue (mm); \( Rd \) = number of days with > 0 mm of rain-month\(^{-1}\) (days); \( FA\textsubscript{t-1} \) = flood area of the previous month (km\(^2\)); Int = the time interval between observations (days)
Figure 1: The a) Pilbara region in northwest Australia, b) Upper Fortescue River catchment and river network (blue lines; DoW, 2014), including the Fortescue Marsh’s floodplain area used in this study (black hatched section; < 410 m a.s.l. extracted from a 1 sec DEM-H, Geoscience Australia, 2011), stream gauging stations (blue circles, see full list in Appendix A, Table A1: WIN, 2014) and meteorological stations (green circles, see full list in Appendix A, Table A2; www.bom.gov.au/climate/data/) and c) elevation of the study area (0.1 m vertical accuracy (RMS) LiDAR Survey DEM; Fortescue Metals Group Ltd, 2010) with roads and place name (black lines and circles; Geoscience Australia, 2001). Generated in ArcMap v. 9.2.
Figure 2: The upper Fortescue River catchment 1912-2012 hydroclimate with (a) frequency distribution of total yearly rainfall and (b) average monthly rainfall for months recording at least one tropical cyclone (TC) within 500 km radius of the upper Fortescue River catchment (blue line) and without TC recorded (black line), with the number of years (frequency) where TC occurrence was recorded for each month of the water year (blue columns); only one occurrence of TC was recorded in Nov and May for the last century and thus rainfall averages for these months were not included. Source: www.bom.gov.au/cgi-bin/silo/cli_var/area_timeseriespl & www.bom.gov.au/cyclone/history.
Figure 3: 1988-2012 a) flood area observation and calibration dataset (solid black line with dots for each observation) and its b) timing of seasonal change over the rain year ($n = 24$ yr); 1912-2012 c) flood area reconstruction (solid black line), monthly $E_{RMSP}$ of $\Delta F_A = \pm 56$ km$^2$ (solid grey line) and observation dataset plotted for the 1988-2012 period (solid grey line) for comparison and d) monthly mean, minimum (min), maximum (max) and 1 and 2 $\sigma$ ranges of variation over the rain year for the reconstructed period ($n = 100$ yr). Overlaid on a) and c) time-series are the supraseasonal dry and wet periods, where $F_A$ was either $< 0$ km$^2$ or $> 0$ km$^2$ for over 12 consecutive months. c) & d) $F_A \leq 0$ km$^2$ = no surface water evident on the Marsh (shaded).
Figure 4: Total monthly rainfall in the upper Fortescue River catchment (Total rainfall) causing an increase in surface water area measured as the proportion of months with net change in flood area or $\Delta F_A > 0 \text{ km}^2$ (black columns) at the Fortescue Marsh (1912-2012).
Figure 5: 1912-2012 frequency distributions of yearly a) net change in flood area ($\Delta F_A$), b) end-of-the-year flood area ($Oct \ F_A$) and c) yearly maximum flood area ($F_{A_{\max}}$; km$^2$), $n = 100$ yr.
**Figure 6**: Maps of the Fortescue Marsh floodplain including flood duration isohyets over the rain year (Nov-Oct) representing examples of the main connectivity thresholds: wettest year observed in 2000 ($F_{A_{max}} \sim 1000 \text{ km}^2$); a very large flood year in 2004 ($F_{A_{max}} \sim 300 \text{ km}^2$); the long-term mean flood year in 1990 ($F_{A_{max}} \sim 40 \text{ km}^2$) and a dry year in 2010 ($F_{A_{max}} < 6 \text{ km}^2$) and the 1988-2012 average.
**Figure 7**: Frequency distribution of drought duration per annum (i.e. consecutive month with $F_A < 0 \text{ km}^2$), with error bars representing the variation in the distribution when threshold for drought duration is defined as $F_A < \pm 56 \text{ km}^2$ for the last century ($n = 100$ yr).
Figure 8: Total flood area at the Fortescue Marsh and a) its proportion occupied by water depth shallower than 0.5 m (light grey), between 0.5 and 2 m (dark grey) and deeper than 2 m (black) and b) the volume of surface water (black line) with century frequencies (% yr) at which different thresholds (grey shading) were attained.
Figure A1: Validation and groundtruthing of standing water on the Fortescue Marsh, including: a) standing water on the 14 Mile Pool extracted from Level 1T Landsat image (Jul 2010; solid white line = threshold pixel value ≤ 40; LT5; USGS) and close up against a 40-cm resolution ortho-photo (Jul 2010); delineation by GPS route tracking while walking along the water edge (1-2 m distance from standing water; solid white line) and close up against b) a Level 1T Landsat image of Moorimoordinia Native Well (Nov 2012; blue fill = threshold pixel value ≤ 40; LE7-SLC-off, USGS) and c) a RGB image showing the extent of the dry channel bed (Dec 2006; SPOT-5); d) delineation of standing water by GPS route tracking during a low altitude helicopter survey.
along the water plume of the Fortescue Marsh (2012 Feb 12; solid red line) and close up against standing water extracted from Level 1T Landsat image (2012 Feb 14; blue fill = threshold pixel value ≤ 40; corrected LE7-SLC-off; USGS), overlain on a 2.5 m resolution RGB image taken during dry season (Dec 2006; SPOT-5).
Figure A2: Observed against reconstructed monthly $\Delta F_A$ values ($n = 160$) for the 1988-2012 calibration period ($R^2_{adj} = 0.79; p$-value < 0.001).
Figure A3: Surface water extent ($F_A$) at the Fortescue Marsh reconstructed using the final model based on the full 1988-2012 calibration period (black line) and the subsets for the 1998-2012 (red line), 1988-1997, 2005-2012 (green line), 1988-2004 (purple line) periods; $F_A \leq 0 \text{ km}^2$ = no surface water evident on the Marsh (shaded).
Figure A4: Collinearity between $R$ and $R_d$ over the last century (1912-1937; 1938-1962; 1963-1987) compared to the calibration months (1988-2012).