

The Evaluation of Hydrological Environment for Wetlands - Application of Hydrogeomorphic Approach

柳孟宏、陳宜清

E-mail: 9607718@mail.dyu.edu.tw

ABSTRACT

The wetland classification and assessment are bases of proper management. The hydrogeomorphic (HGM) approach was developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in 1995. This approach to functional assessment estimates the change in functioning induced by alteration of a wetland, either positive or negative. Functions normally fall into one of three major categories, i.e. hydrologic, biogeochemical and physical habitat. The HGM Approach is based on three fundamental factors that influence how wetlands function, i.e. geomorphic setting, hydrology and hydrodynamics. The assessment model results in a functional capacity index, which estimates the capacity of a wetland to perform a function relative to other wetlands from the same regional subclass in the reference domain. In this study the Guandu riverine wetland was applied to evaluate and analyze its functional performance through HGM approach. There were 13 model variables and 8 functions assessed. Due to lack of detail data only 11 variables were scored except factors of " frequency of subsurface flooding " and " decomposition of organic matter ". Also, there were 7 functional capacity index evaluated except function of " nutrient cycling " and the results showed that the function display in Guandu was ranked in common class and was partial to descend. The influence was mainly induced by flood blocking of dike. Nevertheless, proper operation of gates and main channel can actually conduct river water into wetland to maintain the flooding capacity. Besides, the vegetation community was approaching monotonous state with herbage only. Diversity was apparently inadequate.

Keywords : Wetlands ; hydrogeomorphic (HGM) approach ; functional capacity index (FCI) ; riverine wetlands ; Guandu wetland

Table of Contents

封面內頁 簽名頁 授權書.....	iii	中文摘要.....	iv
iv 英文摘要.....	v	致謝.....	vi
.....	vii	圖目錄.....	ix
.....	ix	表目錄.....	x
.....	xi	第一章 緒論 1.1研究緣起.....	1
.....	1	1.2評價溼地與水文地貌環境 關聯之背景說明.....	5
.....	5	1.2.1溼地定義.....	5
.....	5	1.2.2溼地與水文環境之關聯.....	8
.....	8	1.2.3溼地與地貌之關聯.....	11
.....	11	1.3研究流程.....	15
.....	15	第二章 文獻回顧 2.1溼地功能評價.....	17
.....	17	2.2國內相關溼地評價之研究.....	24
.....	24	2.3溼地分類系統.....	33
.....	33	2.4水文環境與溼地復育.....	43
.....	43	2.4.1溼地 之水文環境因子.....	43
.....	43	2.4.2水收支平衡分析.....	46
.....	46	2.4.3溼地復育.....	48
.....	48	2.4.4溼地復育的相關法規、策略、 監測與評估.....	53
.....	53	第三章 水文地貌法簡介 3.1內容...	59
.....	59	3.1.1概述.....	59
.....	59	3.1.2溼地之水文地貌環 境.....	61
.....	61	3.2評價程序之簡介.....	73
.....	73	3.2.1溼地功能與價值.....	73
.....	73	3.2.2功能涵容值之建立.....	75
.....	75	3.2.3評價程序.....	80
.....	80	第四章 研究方法 4.1河岸濕地評價之 功能及因子概述.....	84
.....	84	4.2評價因子.....	86
.....	86	4.3功能計算.....	102
.....	102	第五章 案例分析 5.1關渡溼地之 簡介.....	110
.....	110	5.2溼地功能評價.....	115
.....	115	5.3結果與討論.....	125
.....	125	第六章 結論與建議 6.1結論.....	128
.....	128	6.2建議與未來展望.....	130
.....	130	參考文獻.....	132

REFERENCES

1. 王鑫 (1998), 地景生態與地形分區, 環境科學技術教育專刊, 第14期, 頁1-8.
2. 台北市野鳥學會、地靈國際工程顧問公司 (1996a), 「關渡自然公園環境重要因子影響說明書」, 台北市政府委託辦理。
3. 台北市野鳥學會、地靈國際工程顧問公司 (1996b), 「關渡自然公園檢討修正計畫」, 台北市政府委託辦理。
4. 申銳莉, 鮑征宇, 顏萍 (2005), 美國溼地功能評價方法, 環境污染與防治 (網路版), 第8期, 湖北, 中國。
5. 邱文彥 (2001), 「人工溼地應用規劃與法治課題」, 台灣溼地, 第23期。
6. 邱文彥、張揚祺、楊磊 (2002), 「陽明山竹子湖溼地水文水質之調查研究」, 國家公園學報, 第十二卷, 第一期, 頁1-20。
7. 林裕彬、柳文成、郭瓊瑩

(1999),「環境復育之生態規劃初探」,師範大學環境教育季刊,第40卷,第III期,頁24-32。8.邵廣昭等(2000),「關渡自然保留區及關渡自然公園環境監測與研究(第二期)期末報告」,台北市政府建設局委託辦理。9.高榮彬(2005),台灣農地轉變為人工溼地之復育成效評估架構研究,大葉大學環境工程學所碩士論文。10.陳宜清、呂育勳、龔誠山(1998),「溼地維持之水文分析及水理模擬-以關渡自然公園為例」,中興工程,第60期,頁65-79。11.陳宜清(2003),溼地之恢復、創造與重建,台灣溼地,第41期。12.陳宜清(2005),「香港溼地公園參訪記」,台灣溼地,第56期,第4-9頁。13.陳治勳、蔡欣恬、丁澈士、張祥仁、簡新洋(2005),「溼地水文之研究-以屏東科技大學靜思湖為例」,第二屆資源工程研討會論文集,台南,頁111-118。14.郭一羽(2001),水域生態工程,六合書局出版,台中,409頁。15.莊雅軒(2004),淡水草澤溼地水文對生態環境影響之初步研究-以屏東科技大學為例,屏東科技大學土木工程系碩士論文,屏東縣。16.陸國先、方偉達、沈立(2002),台灣環境復育之新方向,國政研究報告-永續(研)091-014號,國家政策研究基金會,台北市。17.張文亮、唐瑞霖、陳慈徽、邱文雅(1996),「以水文與水質觀點評估關渡水田溼地之生態規劃」,八十五年農業工程研討會,頁333-342。18.張文亮、邱文雅(1998),「溼地環境與水文」,八十七年度水資源管理研討會論文集,頁157-197。19.張文賢(2005),建立人工溼地設置與操作作業程序及技術之研究報告,行政院公共工程委員會委託辦理。20.曾秋莉(2001),台灣環境信託研習坊第二階段計劃報告,台灣環境資訊協會、台大全球變遷中心。21.廖學誠(2001),生態水文研究之展望,林業研究專訊,第40期,行政院農業委員會林業試驗所。22.鄭啟仲、王亞男(1998),溼地生態系及其養分循環,台大實驗林研究報告,第12卷,第2期,頁129-137。23.鄭蕙燕、闕雅文(1997),「鰲鼓海岸溼地遊憩經濟價值評估」,戶外遊憩研究,第10卷,第4期,頁7-18。24.蔡正偉(1999),水文律動溼地生態系魚群動態模擬,國立臺灣大學農業工程學研究所碩士論文,台北市。25.蔡欣恬、簡新洋、張祥仁、陳治勳、丁澈士、蘇惠珍(2005),「溼地儲水量與水質參數動態調查之探討-以高屏溪左岸實驗性溼地為例」,第二屆資源工程研討會論文集,台南,頁477-484。26.羅炳和、鄭蕙燕(2000),「以野生動物區之非使用價值檢驗條件評估法之次序偏誤」,2000年環境資源經濟、管理暨系統分析學研討會。27.謝蕙蓮(2001),「台灣西海岸溼地保育軸的規劃與願景」,台灣溼地,第29期。28. Bartoldus, C.C. (1999). A Comprehensive Review of Wetland Assessment Procedures: A Guide for Wetland Practitioners, Environmental Concern Inc., MD. 29. Brinson, M. M. (1993). A Hydrogeomorphic Classification for Wetlands, Technical Report WRP-DE-4, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS. 30. Brinson, M.M. (1995). The HGM Approach Explained. National Wetlands Newsletter, Vol.17, No.6, pp.7-13. 31. Brinson, M.M. (1996). Assessing Wetland Functions Using HGM. National Wetlands Newsletter, Vol.18, No.1, pp.10-16. 32. Brinson, M.M. and R.D. Rheinhardt. (1996). The role of reference wetlands in functional assessment and mitigation. Ecological Applications, No.16, pp.69-76. 33. Cowardin, L.M., Carter, V., Golet, F.C. and LaRoe, E.T. (1979). Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC. 34. Fredrickson, L.H. and Reid, F.A. (1990). Impacts of hydrologic alteration on management of freshwater wetlands, in J.M. Sweeney, ed. Management of Dynamic Ecosystems, North Central Section, 296-306. The Wildlife Society, West Lafayette, Indiana. 35. Hauer, F. R., Cook, B. J., Gilbert, M. C., Clairain, Jr. E. J., and Smith, R. D. (2002). A Regional Guidebook for Applying the Hydrogeomorphic Approach to Assessing Wetland Functions of Riverine Floodplains in the Northern Rocky Mountains, ERDC/EL TR-02-21, U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS. 36. Hraby, T. (1997). Continuing the discussion: Scientific and technical issues regarding the hydrogeomorphic approach to function assessment of wetlands. Society of Wetland Scientists Bulletin, Vol.3, No.3, pp.23-24. 37. Hraby, T. (1998). The HGM dialogue: What is science and what is belief? Society of Wetland Scientists Bulletin, Vol.15, No.2, pp.:6-8. 38. Karr, J. R., Fausch, K. D., Angermeier, P. L., Yant, P. R., and Schlosser, I. J. (1986). Assessing biological integrity in running waters a method and its rationale, Illinois Natural History Survey Special Publication 5, Champaign, IL. 39. Kushlan, J.A. (1989). Avian use of fluctuating wetlands. in R.R. Sharitz and J.W. Gibbons, eds. DOE Symposium Series no. 61, 593-604. USDOE Office of Scientific and Technical Information: Oak Ridge, Tennessee. 40. Lugo, A.E. and S.C. Snedaker (1974). The ecology of mangroves. Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst., No. 5, pp39-64. 41. Mark, S. D. and Schmid, J. A. (1997). "Wetland Mitigation: Mitigation Banking and Other Strategies for Development and Compliance", Government Institutes Publisher, Rockville, MD. 42. McNamara, J.P. (1992). Hydrogeologic controls on peatland development in the Malloryville wetlands, New York. Journal of Hydrology, 4: 279 ~ 296. 43. Mitsch, W. J. and Gosselink, J. G. (1993). Wetlands[濕地]. (章盛傑, 邱文雅 譯), 地景出版社, 1998. 44. Moore, P. D. and Bellamy, D. J. (1974) Peatlands, London: Elek Science, 221 pp. 45. National Research Council. (1992). Restoration of Aquatic Ecosystems: Science, Technology and Public Policy. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C. 46. Rheinhardt, R.D., M.M Brinson, and P.M. Farley. (1997). Applying Wetland Reference Data to Functional Assessment, Mitigation, and Restoration. Wetlands, Vol.17, No.2, pp.195-215. 47. Rheinhardt R.D., M.C. Rheinhardt, and M.M. Brinson (2002). A Regional Guidebook for Applying the Hydrogeomorphic Approach to Assessing Wetland Functions of Wet Pine Flats on Mineral Soils in the Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain, Report ERDC/EL TR-02-9, Wetlands Research Program, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, DC. 48. Semlitsch, R. D. and J. R. Bodie (1998). Are small, isolated wetlands expendable? Conservation Biology, No.12, pp.1129-1133. 49. Shaw, S.P. and Fredine, C.G.. (1956). Wetlands of the United States- Their extent and their value to waterfowl and other wildlife. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Circ., 39, 67 pp. 50. Smith, D. R., A. Ammann, C. Bartoldus, and M. M. Brinson (1995). An Approach for Assessing Wetland Functions Using Hydrogeomorphic Classification, Reference Wetlands, and Functional Indices, Technical Report WRP-DE-9, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS. 51. Stanford J.A., Ward J.V., Liss W.J., Frissell C.A., Williams R.N., Lichatowich J.A. & Coutant C.C. (1996). A general protocol for restoration of regulated rivers. Regulated Rivers, Research and Management, No.12, pp.391 - 413. 52. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. (1980). Ecological Services Manual (101-104ESM), Division of Ecological Services, USDI Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC. 53. USEPA (2000). Principles for the Ecological Restoration of Aquatic Resources. EPA841-F-00-003. Office of Water (4501F), US Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC. 54. Whigham, D.F., M.B. Dickinson, and N.V.T. Brokaw (1999).

Tropical forest treefalls and windstorms. Pp. 223-252. In: L. Walker (ed). *Ecosystems of Disturbed Ground*. Elsevier, Amsterdam. 55. Whisenant, S. G. (1999). *Repairing Damaged Wildlands: A Process-Oriented, Landscape-Scale Approach*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 56. Wyant, J. G., R. A. Meganck, and S. H. Ham, (1995). A planning and decision-making framework for ecological restoration. *Environmental Management*, No.19, pp. 789-796.