

Water Quality Targets for Seagrass Restoration in Pensacola and Perdido Bays Comprehensive Description

Overall Description:

The estuaries of the western panhandle of Florida have lost approximately 95 percent of their seagrass coverage between 1950 and 1980. Of the reduced amount of seagrass left in Pensacola Bay, a further 43 percent loss occurred between 1992 and 2003. Seagrasses in Perdido Bay have diminished 80% in area between 1987 and 2002. Recent assessments of the health of Pensacola Bay have concluded that water clarity should be sufficient to allow seagrass to grow in those areas that had lost their extensive seagrass meadows. However, seagrass beds are not recovering to their historic coverage. Lack of recovery may be due to an under estimate of local seagrass light requirements or other water quality problems. The development of locally-derived water clarity requirements for seagrass meadows would be, by itself, insufficient information to guide resource management actions in Pensacola and Perdido Bays. Should it be determined that water clarity is inadequate for supporting seagrass reestablishment, the appropriate management response would require knowledge of what factor(s) should be acted upon to improve water clarity. This proposal would determine: current and historic offshore extents and depth limits of seagrass meadows, the minimum light requirements of existing seagrass meadows; the light environment in areas that historically supported seagrass, but which are currently devoid of coverage; influence of phytoplankton, tannins and suspended sediments on water clarity. Results will be disseminated for local peer review and public input. A final report will include recommendations for the restoration of seagrass coverage in Pensacola Bay and Perdido Bay.

Justification:

Need: restoration of seagrass beds; Goal: water quality target for area seagrasses; Metric: quarterly progress reports, final report. Seagrass beds are an extremely valuable natural resource. Approximately 2.2 million acres of seagrass have been mapped in Florida; providing ecological services worth \$20 billion annually. Economically important fish and shellfish species depend on seagrass beds. Seagrasses also play a role in the global carbon cycle, nutrient cycles, sediment stabilization, and maintenance of coastal biodiversity. Seagrasses provide food and shelter for endangered species. The estuaries of the western panhandle of Florida have lost approximately 95 % of their seagrass coverage between 1950 - 1980. Of the reduced amount of seagrass left in Pensacola Bay, a further 43 % loss occurred between 1992 - 2003. Seagrasses in Perdido Bay have diminished 80% in area between 1987 and 2002. The loss of seagrass has been attributed to impacts from point source discharges and impacts from dredge and fills operations. Although the point source discharges to Pensacola Bay have been substantially reduced or eliminated, there is no evidence of seagrass recovery, as opposed to the seagrass increases for Clearwater Harbor, Hillsborough Bay, and Sarasota Bay, where similar reductions in point source discharges have been achieved. Recent assessments of the health of Pensacola Bay have concluded that water clarity should be sufficient to allow seagrass to grow in areas that have lost their seagrass meadows (Attachment 1). However, these assessments were based on model assumptions that a light level of 20 % of light was sufficient to support seagrass growth. Research in Sarasota Bay and Hillsborough Bay indicate that a higher level of light is found at the offshore edge of seagrass meadows (30 and 40 % respectively). Light requirement values from studies conducted world-wide, found that shallow water seagrass meadows, require 30 to 40 % light levels to maintain themselves. Consequently, water clarity in Pensacola Bay may be insufficient to support seagrass meadows. Data from Santa Rosa Sound suggests that a light level of 38 % might be needed to support those seagrasses (Attachment 1). Florida and the US EPA developed numeric nutrient criteria and TMDLS for the Pensacola and Perdido Bays. These criteria and TMDLS are to be protective and assist in restoration of healthy seagrass communities. However, the models used to develop these criteria and TMDLS used 20 % surface light at the seagrass bed edge as the target. If 20 % surface light is insufficient, nutrient criteria and associated TMDLS may not be protective nor promote recovery of lost seagrass meadows. If Pensacola and Perdido Bay are ever to see seagrass meadows recover, accurate and appropriate water quality targets must be established. This project will identify whether the 20 % surface light recommendation is appropriate for seagrass beds in the Pensacola and Perdido Bay system. Water chemistry results will be used to determine the cause(s) of reduced clarity. Should it be determined that water clarity is inadequate for supporting seagrass reestablishment, recommendations will be made regarding strategies to improve surface water clarity.

Budget:

The complete estimated cost of this project is \$420,000. A breakdown of the budget is: planning/design (\$12,000); quarterly/final report preparation and public stakeholder meetings (\$31,000); chemical analyses for approximately 700 samples (\$107,000); equipment and supplies (\$55,000); project implementation (\$215,000).

Timing:

This project can be completed in 24 months. Three months of planning and preparation. Eighteen months of water quality data collection. Data collection will be implemented to capture two "wetseasons", June through September. Three months of data analysis and report preparation.

Public Interest:

Economics: Florida seagrass beds are an extremely valuable natural resource. Approximately 2.2 million acres of seagrass have been mapped in estuarine and near shore Florida waters, and they provide ecological services worth more than \$20 billion a year. Seagrass health and acreage is directly proportional to the health and status of many commercially and recreationally important fish and shellfish species. Since most of Florida's fishery species (approximately 70%) spend at least part of their life cycle within seagrass communities, seagrasses are vital to the survival of these fishing industries. Resiliency and Stabilization: Healthy seagrass beds also play an important role in shoreline resiliency and sediment stabilization. Areas with seagrass losses have experienced increased rates of erosion, while areas that have experienced increased coverage have exhibited decreased rates of

coastal erosion. With no seagrasses to diminish the force of the currents along the bottom, Florida's beaches, businesses, and homes are less resilient and can be subject to greater damage from storms. Water Quality: Seagrasses help trap fine sediments and particles that are suspended in the water column, which increases water clarity. When a sea floor area lacks seagrass communities, the sediments are more frequently stirred by wind and waves, decreasing water clarity, affecting marine animal behavior, and generally decreasing the recreational quality of coastal areas. Seagrasses also work to filter nutrients that come from land-based industrial discharge and stormwater runoff before these nutrients are washed out to sea and to other sensitive habitats such as coral reefs.

Monitoring:

This project will be successful if a peer reviewed water quality target is developed for seagrass beds in the Pensacola and Perdido Bay systems. This target would establish minimum light requirements for seagrasses in these bay systems. The project will also determine the specific water quality parameters that most influence water clarity (color, suspended solids, algae blooms, etc.). Recommendations will be made to appropriate regulatory agencies concerning effective strategies to achieve the water quality targets, thereby promoting area seagrass bed restoration. Ideally, the target will be reflected in regulatory documents (permits, Basin Management Action Plans, etc.) for the Pensacola and Perdido Bay systems. Monitoring this project's success will be achieved by quarterly interim progress reports and the peer reviewed final report.

Habitat Restoration and Conservation:

The heart of this project is promoting restoration of area seagrass beds. Despite apparent significant gains in water quality from point source elimination and stormwater treatment efforts, seagrass beds that have suffered previous losses are not recovering. Other estuaries such as Hillsborough and Sarasota Bays where similar water quality improvements have been made have seen significant recovery of lost seagrass acres. The lack of seagrass bed recovery in Pensacola and Perdido Bays may be due to a lack of understanding of minimum light and water quality requirements for seagrasses in these estuaries. The proposed study will improve our knowledge regarding minimum light and water quality requirements for seagrasses in the Pensacola and Perdido Bay systems. This deficiency may have resulted in the establishment of Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) and water quality criteria that are not protective of critical seagrass habitat. Once these requirements are better understood, water quality criteria, TMDLs and pollutant load reductions can be revised if necessary. Until these steps are taken, seagrass beds may continue to decline and restoration efforts may be ineffective. Seagrass restoration may be achieved naturally as existing seagrass beds spread back into areas where seagrasses formerly thrived, by transplanting artificially propagated seagrasses or by transplanting appropriate seagrass species from a donor site. Areas of Pensacola and Perdido Bays that once supported healthy seagrass communities are now typically bare sand or mud bottoms affording little substrate or habitat for a thriving and diverse estuarine community. While stabilizing the seafloor with their roots the seagrass blades provide tremendous surface area and structure for a variety of colonizing species. The seagrass blades also provide important refuge and foraging areas for countless commercially and recreationally important species of finfish and shellfish. Since most of Florida's fishery species (approximately 70%) spend at least part of their life cycle within seagrass communities restoring this habitat is critical to Florida's fisheries. The loss of seagrass habitat adversely affects a wide range of aquatic life forms. Affected species range from benthic invertebrate communities including polychaete worms, small crustaceans all the way to Florida manatees and sea turtles.

This project is directed at understanding why seagrass bed habitats are continuing to decline in the Pensacola and Perdido Bay systems despite improvements to water quality. The final nutrient Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) prepared by the state and US EPA states that chlorophyll levels and thereby nutrient levels are appropriate for seagrasses in many areas of lower Escambia Bay, Pensacola Bay and East Bay. Still recent reports indicate that these bays are continuing to lose seagrass beds. In order for conservation and preservation efforts to be successful, agencies responsible for the stewardship of these resources must understand what the specific light and water quality requirements are for area seagrasses. Arguably the limiting factor seagrass bed health is adequate light. Light is affected by biotic (algae blooms from excessive nutrient levels) and abiotic factors (turbidity from runoff). Once these minimum requirements are determined effective and appropriate conservation and preservation measures can be implemented. Successfully implemented measures will improve seagrass health and acreage which is directly proportional to the health and status of many commercially and recreationally important fish and shellfish species. Species include: shrimp, crabs, scallops, redfish, speckled trout, and mullet. Since most of Florida's fishery species (approximately 70%) spend at least part of their life cycle within seagrass communities, seagrasses are vital to the survival of these fishing industries.

Water Quality:

Healthy seagrass beds directly improve water quality through shoreline stabilization and filtration of particulates in the water column. Shoreline stabilization results in less erosion and resuspension of bottom sediments. The seagrass blades themselves actually filter particulates from the water column. Combined these attributes will: reduce turbidity, improve water clarity and minimize contaminant transport through re-suspension of potentially contaminated sediments. It is an accepted fact that seagrass beds perform several important ecological functions. These functions include: providing critical habitat, fin and shellfish refuge from predators, carbon and nutrient cycling, direct forage for endangered species, substrate stabilization and water column filtration. Due to the fact that submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) such as seagrasses are such an important component of healthy estuarine and marine ecosystems many water quality improvement efforts are designed to preserve and protect valuable SAV communities. However, it is imperative to understand what water quality improvements need to be made to protect and promote recovery of seagrass beds. First an understanding of minimum light requirements for healthy seagrass beds must be agreed upon. If subsurface light levels are no longer adequate in areas that once supported seagrass beds, an evaluation of what is adversely influencing water clarity and subsurface light levels in those areas must be undertaken. If it is determined that nutrients (directly measured and phytoplankton measured by chlorophyll levels) are not interfering with water clarity then seagrasses provide no reason for increased nutrient reductions. However, the reverse is also true; if chlorophyll levels (phytoplankton) constitute a significant interference to light levels and water clarity then measures to reduce nutrient levels must be implemented if we are to

restore seagrass beds to earlier acreages. If it is determined that turbidity and suspended solids are contributing to insufficient light levels then measures must be recommended and implemented to mitigate the sources of turbidity. Research has shown that resource management strategies must take into account system-specific factors; not all strategies will result in similar results in different systems. Water quality target and strategies to meet them that are developed in south Florida are quite likely not be appropriate to promote seagrass restoration in northwest Florida (Attachment 2). Water quality improvements are achieved only through personal awareness resulting in changed behavior and extremely costly capital improvement projects. These projects must be tied to a measurable and real goal. The goal is not just "cleaner water" but a restored diverse and healthy ecosystem. Seagrasses are an important metric for a healthy coastal ecosystem and we must better understand what makes them "tick" if we are to make appropriate and cost effective recommendations that will result in restored seagrass communities.

Natural Systems Resiliency:

Healthy seagrass meadows stabilize bottom substrate, help minimize shoreline erosion, provide natural wave attenuation and filter particulates from the water column. These attributes make seagrass communities a natural way to improve resiliency and protect Florida's valuable coastline resources. Areas with seagrass losses have experienced increased rates of erosion, while areas that have experienced increased seagrass coverage have exhibited decreased rates of coastal erosion. With no seagrasses to diminish the force of the currents along the bottom, Florida's beaches, businesses, and homes are less resilient and can be subject to greater damage from storms. The added benefit is of course the many other ecological functions that seagrass communities perform. These functions include: providing critical habitat, fin and shellfish refuge from predators, carbon and nutrient cycling, direct forage for endangered species. Seagrass health and acreage is directly proportional to the health and status of many commercially and recreationally important fish and shellfish species. Species include: shrimp, crabs, scallops, redfish, speckled trout, and mullet. Since most of Florida's fishery species (approximately 70%) spend at least part of their life cycle within seagrass communities, seagrasses are vital to the survival of these fishing industries. Healthy seagrass meadows are an important part in achieving natural systems resiliency in Florida while providing significant benefits listed above.

Tourism and Tourism Opportunities:

Florida is the "Fishing Capital of the World" with more world record fish catches than any other state or country. From an economic perspective, Florida also leads all states in economic impacts for its marine recreational fisheries and has one of the top producing commercial fisheries in the country. From a recreational perspective Florida is #1 in the nation in saltwater anglers as compiled by a 2011 USFWS survey. 1,612,102 recreational saltwater licenses were sold (resident and nonresident) in fiscal year 2013/14. This generated \$29,073,573 in revenues from license sales. The economic impact of recreational saltwater fishing as measured by the National Marine Fisheries Service in a 2014 report was \$7.6 billion and supported 109,341 jobs. Since most of Florida's fishery species (approximately 70%) spend at least part of their life cycle within seagrass communities, seagrasses are vital to the survival of these fishing industries and tourism opportunities. Therefore healthy seagrass communities play an important role in gulf coast tourism and tourism activities.

Recreational Fishing and Local Seafood

From a recreational perspective Florida is #1 in the nation in saltwater anglers as compiled by a 2011 USFWS survey. 1,612,102 recreational saltwater licenses were sold (resident and nonresident) in fiscal year 2013/14. This generated \$29,073,573 in revenues from license sales. The economic impact of recreational saltwater fishing in Florida as measured by the National Marine Fisheries Service in a 2014 report was \$7.6 billion and supported 109,341 jobs. Since most of Florida's fishery species (approximately 70%) spend at least part of their life cycle within seagrass communities, seagrasses are vital to the survival of these fishing industries and tourism opportunities. Therefore healthy seagrass communities play an important role in gulf coast tourism and tourism activities. This project by increasing our understanding of the requirements for healthy seagrass communities in the Pensacola and Perdido Bay systems is increasing our opportunities for enhanced recreational fishing and local seafood. If this project is successful in providing a catalyst for seagrass bed restoration by improved water quality, it will constitute a significant environmental success story generating a justified improved public perception. This success story could play an important role in increased eco-tourism and fishing related activities.

Job Creation:

The economic impact of recreational saltwater fishing in Florida as measured by the National Marine Fisheries Service in a 2014 report was \$7.6 billion and supported 109,341 jobs. Since most of Florida's fishery species (approximately 70%) spend at least part of their life cycle within seagrass communities, seagrasses are vital to the survival of these fishing industry related jobs. Using a 2000 ecological services value of \$20,500 per acre of seagrass bed and 1960 and 2003 seagrass acreages for the Pensacola Bay system the annual dollar values are estimated at \$ 88,396,000 and \$51,537,000 respectively. If a restoration target for the Pensacola Bay system alone was to restore back to the 1960 acreage of 4312 acres from the 2003 acreage of 2514 acres, an increase of 1798 acres, the annual economic increase in 2000 dollars would be an estimated \$36,859,000 per year (Attachment-3). Similarly, the 1940 annual dollar value for Perdido Bay seagrasses would be estimated at \$28,821,000. The 2002 annual value would be estimated at \$5,678,500. If a restoration target for the Perdido Bay was to restore back to the 1940 acreage of 1162 acres from the 2002 acreage of 277, an increase of 885 acres, the annual economic increase in 2000 dollars would be an estimated \$18,142,500 per year (Attachment-3). If these restoration targets are combined and only 50% realized the regional annual economic benefit would be estimated at \$27,600,000. That type of economic increase will add jobs and grow business.

Industry and Business Growth:

Using a 2000 ecological services value of \$20,500 per acre of seagrass bed and 1960 and 2003 seagrass acreages for the Pensacola Bay system the annual dollar values are estimated at \$88,396,000 and \$51,537,000 respectively. If a restoration target for the Pensacola Bay system alone was to restore back to the 1960 acreage of 4312 acres from the 2003 acreage of 2514 acres, an increase of 1798 acres, the annual economic increase in 2000 dollars would be an estimated \$ 36,859,000 per year (Attachment-3). Similarly, the 1940 annual dollar value for Perdido Bay seagrasses would be estimated at \$28,821,000. The 2002 annual value would be estimated at \$5,678,500. If a restoration target for the Perdido Bay was to restore back to the 1940 acreage of 1162 acres from the 2002 acreage of 277, an increase of 885 acres, the annual economic increase in 2000 dollars would be an estimated \$18,142,500 per year (Attachment-3). If these restoration targets are combined and only 50% realized the regional annual economic benefit would be estimated at \$27,600,000. That type of economic increase will add jobs and grow business.

Workforce Development:

Escambia County will provide internships for local university students majoring in environmental studies, natural resource conservation, or related fields. Internships will provide hands-on training in ecosystem management, surface water sampling, geographical information systems, and other related activities. Due to the fact that this is proposal is an applied research project with important "real-world" application, interns will have the opportunity to learn and gain experience in all of the STEM fields.

Transportation Network Improvements:

Florida has created the very successful Florida Paddling Trails Association. This network of "Blueways" covers the entire state of Florida including the Pensacola and Perdido Bay systems. Outdoor enthusiasts that are enjoying this recreational opportunity will have an enhanced experience with improved water clarity and fishing provided by healthy seagrass meadows. The diverse flora and fauna (in and above the water) associated with seagrass ecosystems will greatly enrich the paddler's experience. Seagrass beds help reduce shoreline erosion and sediment transport by stabilizing the bottom sediments and physically filtering sediment from the water column. These attributes may well protect adequate depths in maintained waterways in the area. Frequency of maintenance dredging activities may be lessened with healthy seagrasses in nearby littoral areas.

Flooding Improvements:

Healthy seagrass meadows stabilize bottom substrate, help minimize shoreline erosion, provide natural wave attenuation and filter particulates from the water column. These attributes make seagrass communities a natural way to improve resiliency and protect Florida's valuable coastline resources. Areas with seagrass losses have experienced increased rates of erosion, while areas that have experienced increased seagrass coverage have exhibited decreased rates of coastal erosion. With no seagrasses to diminish the force of the currents along the bottom, Florida's beaches, businesses, and homes are less resilient and can be subject to greater damage from storms. Coastal and shoreline flooding will be reduced with healthy seagrass beds to protect shorelines from erosion. A stable shoreline is one less prone to flooding.

Community Resiliency:

Healthy seagrass beds play an important role in shoreline and sediment stabilization. Areas with seagrass losses have experienced increased rates of erosion, while areas that have experienced increased coverage have exhibited decreased rates of coastal erosion and infrastructure damage. With no seagrasses to diminish the force of the currents along the bottom, Florida's beaches, businesses, and homes can be subject to greater damage from storms.

Benefits Traditionally Underserved Persons or Areas:

Many traditionally underserved persons rely on fishing in local waters to provide an important and inexpensive healthy part of their diet. Often some of these same people may actually be sustenance fishermen. Since most of Florida's fishery species (approximately 70%) spend at least part of their life cycle within seagrass communities, seagrasses play an indirect, though important part in the role of providing an ongoing source for fishing opportunities.

Community Health:

Providing inexpensive and healthy options for diet are critically important to community health. Fishing in local waters can provide an important and inexpensive part of a healthy diet. Since most of Florida's fishery species (approximately 70%) spend at least part of their life cycle within seagrass communities, seagrasses play an indirect, though important part in the role of providing an ongoing source for fishing opportunities. Healthy seagrass communities influence public use of recreational opportunities including fishing, kayaking, boating, snorkeling as well as bird watching. Seagrass beds contribute to shoreline protection, coastal resiliency during storm events and protection of property along the coast.

Neighborhood Benefits:

Waterfront neighborhoods benefit from healthy seagrass beds through the role they play in shoreline and sediment stabilization. Areas with seagrass losses have experienced increased rates of erosion, while areas that have experienced increased coverage have exhibited decreased rates of coastal erosion and infrastructure damage. With no seagrasses to diminish the force of the currents along the bottom, Florida's beaches, businesses, and homes can be subject to greater damage from storms. Healthy seagrass communities also benefit neighborhoods by increasing recreational opportunities including fishing, kayaking, boating, snorkeling as well as bird watching.

Education and Awareness:

Escambia County will provide internships for local university students majoring in environmental studies, natural resource conservation, or related fields. Internships will provide hands-on training in ecosystem management, surface water sampling, geographical information systems, and other related activities.

Environmental Outreach:

Results of this project will be presented to area elected officials to improve their understanding of the value of healthy seagrass communities, and promote responsible resource management decisions. Public stake holders will also be invited to attend presentations of the results of this study. An informed and educated public will be essential to implementing water quality improvement strategies should they be determined to be necessary.

Cultural and Historic Resources:

Many of Florida's cultural and historic resources are on the shoreline or actually underwater (ship wrecks). Locally, the University of West Florida has a respected underwater archaeology program. Healthy seagrass beds directly improve water quality through shoreline stabilization and filtration of particulates in the water column. Shoreline stabilization results in less erosion and re-suspension of bottom sediments. The seagrass blades themselves actually filter particulates from the water column. Combined these attributes will: reduce turbidity, improve water clarity and minimize contaminant transport through re-suspension of potentially contaminated sediments. All of these functions of seagrass beds will assist in the protection (covering or silting in) of and exploration (improved water clarity and quality) of coastal and submerged cultural and historic resources.

Consistency with Local Plans:

In 1997 and 2011 Surface Water Improvement and Management (SWIM) Plans for the Pensacola Bay System and Perdido River and Bay Watershed (respectively) were developed by the Northwest Florida Water Management District in cooperation with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Restoration and preservation of seagrass habitat was identified as one of the most important issues. The 2001 Seagrass Management Plan for Big Lagoon and Santa Rosa Sound prepared by FDEP stated goal number one is to gain a better understanding of natural and anthropogenic impacts on the seagrass ecosystem through research in an effort to maintain seagrasses as a valuable resource. FDEP has developed a numerical nutrient criteria and Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for Escambia Bay based largely on the goal of protection and restoration seagrass beds. Though specific basin management action plans have not been developed, these documents coupled together identify nutrient load reductions that will be required if seagrass communities are to be restored and protected. However, these criteria and TMDLs may in fact not be protective of nor assist in the restoration of seagrass beds. These documents were based on models that were programmed assuming that 20% sub-surface irradiance is adequate for healthy seagrass beds. In fact FDEP conducted a local study of seagrasses in Big Lagoon and found that light levels less than 22% sub-surface irradiance were insufficient for long-term survival and health of those seagrass beds. This highlights the need to clarify minimum criteria for area seagrass communities.

Green Design:

Waterfront neighborhoods benefit from healthy seagrass beds through the role they play in shoreline and sediment stabilization. Areas with seagrass losses have experienced increased rates of erosion, while areas that have experienced increased coverage have exhibited decreased rates of coastal erosion and infrastructure damage. With no seagrasses to diminish the force of the currents along the bottom, Florida's beaches, businesses, and homes can be subject to greater damage from storms. With waterfront shorelines stabilized by healthy seagrass beds the need and use of bulkheads is greatly reduced. Bulkheads are costly, aesthetically unattractive and provide no habitat for aquatic flora and fauna. Seagrasses are definitely the "green" and environmentally friendly alternative for shoreline protection and stabilization.

Leverages funds:

Funding for this project to develop water quality targets for the protection and restoration of seagrass resources in Pensacola and Perdido Bays will be used to leverage funds from other grant opportunities sources such as: the US EPA's Gulf of Mexico Program, the Florida Department of Environmental Protection's EPA Section 319(h) grant program, the US Fish and Wildlife Service Habitat Conservation Planning Assistance grants program and RESTORE. Awarded grants may be used to expand the study or assist in implementation of recommended water quality improvement strategies.

Sustainability and Efficiency:

The development of water quality targets for the protection and restoration of seagrass resources in Pensacola and Perdido Bays is ultimately a project about ensuring effective and efficient restoration and preservation of these systems seagrass resources. Accurate water quality targets will enable efficient measures to be developed and implemented that will result in a sustainable and even increasing seagrass community. Knowledge gained from a successfully implemented project will add critical information to the body of knowledge required to responsibly manage these valuable natural resources for years into the future. For a relatively small budget to fund this project knowledge gained will allow optimized projects to be developed and implemented with the potential to preserve and restore valuable seagrass bed acreage to the Pensacola and Perdido Bay systems. The fruit of these efforts will be an improved marine fishery, reduced shoreline erosion and increased recreational opportunities.

Planning and Partnerships:

The development of water quality targets for the protection and restoration of seagrass resources in Pensacola and Perdido Bays is ultimately a project about ensuring effective and efficient restoration and preservation of these seagrass resources. Accurate water quality targets will enable efficient measures be developed and implemented that will result in a sustainable and even increasing seagrass community. Knowledge gained from a successfully implemented project will add critical information to the body of knowledge required to responsibly manage these valuable natural resources for years into the future. Area seagrass resources cross jurisdictional boundaries of numerous political boundaries (Florida, Alabama, Escambia County, City of Pensacola and Santa Rosa County). Once water quality targets are better understood, the most effective and efficient implementation of water quality improvement strategies will be through planning and partnerships. Water quality targets and recommended strategies to meet these targets will be provided to political bodies and stakeholders that have the authority to implement recommended strategies. Escambia County will work closely with natural resource management agencies to ensure that where necessary, water quality targets are revised to protect seagrasses and appropriate strategies put into place which will promote in seagrass restoration and protection.

Enhanced Tourism Opportunities

Winter birding for aquatic birds is an extremely popular tourist activity. The annual Audubon Christmas bird count draws birding enthusiasts every year to Florida's coastal habitats to participate in this event. Protected and restored seagrass beds will increase wildlife use of these resources, thereby increasing tourist opportunities to enjoy wildlife using these resources in the off season. Fishing in Florida is a year round activity. Since most of Florida's fishery species (approximately 70%) spend at least part of their life cycle within seagrass communities, seagrasses play an indirect, though important part in the role of providing an ongoing source for fishing opportunities.

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

Division of Environmental Assessment and Restoration, Bureau of Watershed Restoration

NORTHWEST DISTRICT • PENSACOLA BASIN

Final REPORT

Nutrient TMDLs

North Escambia Bay (WBID 548AA)

Judges Bayou (WBID 493B)

Bayou Chico (WBIDs 846C and 846)

Dissolved Oxygen TMDL

Judges Bayou (WBID 493A)

Douglas Gilbert



June 7, 2013

with anthropogenic activities (urban, agriculture, transportation, barren lands, and rangeland) were converted to upland forests or forested wetlands based on the current ratio of forest and wetland land uses in the model.

The purpose of the natural condition scenario was to determine whether water quality standards could be achieved under natural conditions and to ensure that the TMDL would not attempt to abate the naturally occurring loads from the watershed.

Appendix E, Section 6, Tables E.6.1 through E.6.3 and Figures E.6.1 through E.6.4, present the results for the nonanthropogenic model runs. The Department version of the model predicts a background concentration of TN (as a WBID average) of 0.24 mg/L, for TP 0.014 mg/L, and for CChla 4.53 µg/L.

North Escambia Bay Nutrient TMDL

As discussed previously, Murrell *et al.* (2007) found that nitrogen limitation can occur during low-flow conditions, but that phosphorus limitation occurred in the bay under normal flow conditions. The TMDL is for long-term average conditions, and under these conditions the bay is predominantly phosphorus limited. Therefore, considering that the WASP model is well calibrated for both PO₄-P and CChla, it was determined suitable for use in the determination of the TMDL.

Once the PO₄-P and CChla calibrations in WBID 548AA were determined to be acceptable, both the EPA and Department versions were tested to determine how they would respond to increases in TN and TP. Two runs were made for each version: one with a 10% increase in TN and a separate run with a 10% increase in TP. Increases were only made to concentrations from the Escambia River (Reach 20002) and sources along the eastern side of Escambia Bay (Reaches 20055 and 20059). The results, summarized in **Appendix E, Section 7, Table E.7.1**, show that both versions of the model were sensitive to increases in TP. The EPA model predicted a 32% increase in CChla with a 10% increase in TP, and the Department model predicted a 6% increase in CChla. The EPA version predicted only a 6% increase in CChla after applying a 10% increase in TN, with the Department version predicting a 0% increase.

TMDL Target Development

The TMDL target is based on restoring healthy, well-balanced natural populations of flora and fauna by reducing anthropogenic nutrient enrichment. As reported by the Department (2012) seagrasses are one of the most nutrient-sensitive biological endpoints in the bay. Therefore, the TMDL target for restoration focuses on determining the nutrient concentrations needed to achieve a chlorophyll-based target that will allow for healthy seagrass beds and otherwise result in meeting all nutrient-related water quality standards. In an estuary such as Pensacola Bay that is dominated by a large, alluvial river (the Escambia River), it is important to recognize that the oligohaline zone (the lower salinity portion of the estuary where river water first enters the estuary) has very different ecological characteristics than the higher salinity areas in the lower reaches of the estuary that are more influenced by Gulf of Mexico waters. Because of their distinct ecological characteristics, there should be different expectations for nutrients, turbidity, chlorophyll, and biological productivity in these oligohaline areas.

The Department report (2012) notes that during the past 27 years, the annual geometric mean Chla (based on a minimum of 4 values per station per year) in Santa Rosa Sound, where healthy seagrass beds prevail, has ranged from 0.8 to 7.95 µg/L. **Except for slightly higher**

values in certain bayous (Chico, Grande, and Texar), most of Pensacola Bay (Lower Escambia Bay, East Bay, and Main Pensacola Bay) also had Chla values in this range, suggesting that current nutrient and Chla conditions are appropriate for seagrass protection in these areas.

In establishing the target for the TMDL, it is important to consider that low-salinity areas (i.e., areas where freshwater rivers initially mix with more saline estuarine waters) may be expected to exhibit higher nutrient and Chla levels than higher salinity, open water areas. For this reason, the Department believes that a CChla target in the upper end of the range (0.8 to 7.95 µg/L) is appropriate for the oligohaline waters of North Escambia Bay. Because chlorophyll a annual average concentrations less than 7.95 µg/L are not expected to interfere with the ability of submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) to photosynthesize, targeting nutrient concentrations that result in a long-term annual average CChla concentration below this level will result in a level of production that represents a healthy system. The target for the TMDL is to reduce the long-term (2002–09) annual average CChla in WBID 548AA in the Department version of WASP from the current level of 10.07 µg/L in the calibrated model to a long-term annual average concentration of less than 7.95 µg/L, and to provide for a margin of safety (MOS).

TMDL Results

Numerous model runs were made, reducing first TN, then TP, and then TN and TP together. While these preliminary model results indicated that increases in either TN or TP would result in increases in CChla, reducing TN either alone or in combination with TP did not result in any measurable difference over reducing just TP. Model runs were made to assess the response of CChla in North Escambia Bay based on where reductions were made in the overall Pensacola Bay system. If all reductions were made in the Escambia River, TP would be lowered to below the natural condition. Similarly, if reductions were only made to TP from the Escambia River (Reach 20002) and the two terminal reaches coming into Escambia Bay from Bayou Mulatto (Reach 20055) and Indian Bayou (Reach 20059), the resulting concentration in these reaches would be below the natural condition. Given that all of the watersheds draining to Pensacola Bay have experienced increases in TP loading over the natural condition (**Table 5.12**) ranging from 20.9% to 74.5%, the Department approach to the TMDL is a percent reduction applied to all sources.

Additional model runs were made to determine what level of reductions would be required if all 12 terminal reaches were reduced equally. A 35% reduction in TP was initiated at all 12 reaches, and the resulting WBID-wide average CChla concentration was reduced to 7.43 µg/L. This meets the restoration target of a long-term annual average CChla concentration of less than 7.95 µg/L, provides for an MOS, and is the basis for the TMDL. Additionally, as discussed in the section for EBTC/EPA model results below, all other nutrient-related water quality standards will be achieved if the target TMDL CChla condition is achieved.

Figures 5.5 through 5.7 present the TN, TP, and CChla long-term (2002–09) WBID-wide annual average results from the TMDL run, together with the Department calibration and natural condition results. **Table 5.14** provides TMDL summary information for TN and TP in Pensacola Bay.

LSPC modeling of the watershed indicates that the current condition for TN loads is 49% higher than the natural condition load. The modeling results for TN indicate that additional increases in TN alone will result in measurable increases in CChla.

Table 5.14. Pensacola Bay TMDL Summary Table (WBID 548AA)

¹ The TMDL in Chapter 6 includes the TN and TP WLA wastewater loads.

Average Load	Calibration (lbs/yr)	TMDL (LA) (lbs/yr) ¹	% Reduction
TN	16,669,238	16,669,238	0%
TP	906,914	589,494	35%

EBTC/EPA Model Results and Downstream Waters

The Department must ensure that the reductions required to restore the impaired waters in North Escambia Bay will be sufficient to protect all downstream waters. For North Escambia Bay, this involves all of the other waters in the Pensacola Bay system.

The modeling results submitted to the Department by the EBTC indicate that during 2003 (a high-flow year) PO₄-P concentrations increased in North Escambia Bay. The results indicate that high flows during the summer will result in lower CChla predictions, due to decreased residence time, resulting in less PO₄-P uptake in the upper bay. Under these same high-flow conditions, the model predicts lower DO concentrations and higher PO₄-P fluxes from the sediments. Model predictions resulted in higher NH₄-N during the summer and lower concentrations in the winter. Of particular interest, the EBTC model predicts higher NO₃-N concentrations in the upper bay, a finding consistent with the measured data.

The model results indicate that CChla is higher in North Escambia Bay during low-flow years and the peak concentrations occur farther to the south as flow increases, with higher concentrations in Lower Escambia Bay during average flow years and farther south in Upper Pensacola Bay during high-flow years.

All documents and copies of the models provided to the Department by the EBTC are available on request.

North Escambia Bay/Pensacola Bay System

The Department and EPA approaches to the development of numeric nutrient criteria that ensure water quality standards are met and designated uses protected have similar endpoints, as follows:

- *Balanced faunal communities;*
- *Healthy seagrass communities; and*
- *Balanced phytoplankton biomass and production.*

Department staff met with EPA Headquarters' modeling consultants from Tetra Tech in Atlanta, Georgia, in February 2012. The purpose of the meeting was to go over modeling results and evaluation criteria, and to obtain copies of the LSPC, EFDC, and WASP models that the EPA used to assess both the current condition (EPA-calibrated model) and a background (natural) condition, as described above. Based on the information provided by Tetra Tech, it is the Department's understanding that the EPA is using a multiple-line-of-evidence approach to

determine if Pensacola Bay meets the state of Florida narrative criteria for nutrients. Central to the methodology is the establishment of a series of nine “zones” based on salinity gradients in the Pensacola Bay system. These zones are depicted in **Appendix E, Figure E.1.2**.

The multiple lines of evidence considered include the following:

- *Balanced faunal communities:*
 - Ensure that within each zone, a daily average DO of 5.0 mg/L (as a water column average) is obtained 90% of the time over the 2002 to 2009 simulation period.
 - Ensure that within each zone, a minimum DO of 4.0 mg/L (as a water column average) is obtained 90% of the time over the 2002 to 2009 simulation period.
 - Ensure that within each zone, the 3-hour average DO does not fall below 1.5 mg/L (as an average of the bottom 2 layers in WASP and the bottom 4 layers of RCA) over the 2002 to 2009 simulation period.
- *Healthy seagrass communities:*
 - Relate colonization depth targets to CChla limits.
 - Determine where the growing season average bottom light equals or exceeds 20% of the surface light for both current and natural conditions.
 - Compare the areas where the bottom light is 20% of surface light or greater with historical seagrass coverages (for both current and natural conditions).
 - Compare areas where the growing season average 20% light depth on the bottom is achieved against the zone depth targets developed by the EPA.
- *Balanced phytoplankton biomass and production:*
 - Use CChla as an indicator of balanced phytoplankton biomass and production.
 - Develop TN and TP criteria based on the relationships between TN and/or TP and CChla.
 - Ensure that CChla over the 2002 to 2009 simulation period does not exceed 20.0 µg/L more than 10% of the time in any zone. This is intended to prevent CChla from reaching levels that may result in harmful algal blooms.

The EPA’s final reports and findings have not yet been released. Information provided by EPA consultants (Tetra Tech) during February and May 2012 should be considered preliminary, as refinements in both the model calibration and the evaluation metrics may have continued. It is the Department’s understanding, based on the preliminary model results provided by Tetra Tech during a teleconference on May 3, 2012, that all of the zones in the bay system either meet these evaluation metrics, or the current and background conditions were nearly identical. In those cases where the background and current condition DO were the same, the results imply

that reducing nutrients would result in no improvement in the current condition for DO, and reductions in nutrients were not warranted.

The EBTC modeling results provided to the Department that considered the same evaluation metrics and zones (July 13, 2012) indicate that with the exception of DO in the Upper Pensacola Zone, where the 90% DO concentration was 4.91 mg/L under the current condition and 4.92 mg/L in the natural condition, all metrics were met in all zones. The current and natural condition DO were within 0.01 mg/L, indicating that current levels of nutrients and CChla concentrations were not adversely affecting daily average DO.

The EBTC results for the North Escambia Bay Zone indicate that (for the 14-year simulation period), the range in annual average concentrations of CChla, TN, and TP that would result in meeting all targets for seagrasses, light penetration, CChla, and DO were CChla annual average concentrations ranging from 3.5 to 8.4 µg/L, TN from 0.37 to 0.56 mg/L, and TP from 0.022 to 0.041 mg/L. The EBTC found that reducing nutrients to natural conditions resulted in lower TN, TP, and CChla but did not result in significant changes to DO and available light.

Based on these results, the TMDL for North Escambia Bay (WBID 548AA) will be fully protective of all downstream waters.


5.4 Critical Conditions/Seasonality

The critical condition for chla in a given watershed depends on many factors, including the presence of point sources and the land use pattern in the watershed. Typically, the critical condition for nonpoint sources is an extended dry period followed by a rainfall runoff event. During the wet weather period, rainfall washes off nutrients that have built up on the land surface under dry conditions. However, significant nonpoint source contributions can also appear under dry conditions without any major surface runoff event. This may happen when nonpoint sources contaminate the surficial aquifer, and nutrients are brought into the receiving waters through baseflow. In addition, sediments that have accumulated for months may provide a flux of nutrients to the water column under certain weather or DO conditions. The critical condition for point source loading typically occurs during periods of low stream flow, when dilution is minimized.



Seagrass Management Plan for Big Lagoon and Santa Rosa Sound

Dec 2001



Algal blooms and excessive turbidity in the water column can reduce the amount of sunlight available to seagrass for photosynthesis. One indication of increased algae due to excessive nutrients is an increase in both chl-a and color. However, when turbidity has increased, while chl-a and color remain low, stormwater runoff, or some other stirring mechanism (i.e. boating), may be the cause of light attenuation. Results of water quality monitoring for the parameters of chl-a, color and turbidity suggest an increased eutrofication over the past 2 years (Figure 3-10). The summer months of July and August normally show seasonal trends of increased Chl-a and color compared to other months of the same year. Not only is this trend evident in the data, but those seasonal highs have also increased over the last two years.

		Jan-99	Feb-99	Mar-99	Apr-99	May-99	Jun-99	Jul-99	Aug-99	Sep-99	13Oct99	Nov-99	Dec-99
		no data				und	und	und	und		und	und	und
1999	Chl-a (ug/L)					und	und	und	und		und	und	und
	Color (Pt-Co)					5.0	5.0	10.0	10.0		5.0	10.0	5.0
	Turb (NTU)					1.0	0.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	2.0	0.0
		Jan-00	Feb-00	Mar-00	Apr-00	May-00	Jun-00	Jul-00	Aug-00	Sep-00	Oct-00	Nov-00	Dec-00
		und	und	und	und	und	und	und	8.0	8.5	und	und	und
2000	Chl-a (ug/L)	und	und	und	und	und	und	und	8.0	8.5	und	und	und
	Color (Pt-Co)	5.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	30.0	5.0	5.0	10.0
	Turb (NTU)	2.0	4.0	1.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
		Jan-01	Feb-01	Mar-01	Apr-01	May-01	Jun-01	Jul-01	Aug-01	Sep-01	Oct-01	Nov-01	Dec-01
		und	und	6.7	und	und	und	5.9	9.6	und	und	und	
2001	Chl-a (ug/L)	und	und	6.7	und	und	und	5.9	9.6	und	und	und	
	Color (Pt-Co)	5.0	5.0	30.0	20.0	10.0	20.0	20.0	30.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	
	Turb (NTU)	1.0	0.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	7.0	2.0	4.0	7.0	5.0	4.0	
* und = undetectable													

Figure 3-10. Water quality monitoring results for the parameters of chl-a, color, and turbidity. While there currently are no set standards for chl-a, color, and turbidity for the state of Florida, current monitoring results are compared to the proposed Impaired Waters Rule (Chapter 62-303, F.A.C).

Light Attenuation Monitoring: Photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) is the part of the spectrum, between 400 and 700 nanometers (nm) that plants use for energy. Seagrass requires about 25% of surface PAR for photosynthetic production. For example, if the PAR is 9.5 Moles per square meter (M/m²) just below the surface of the water, then the seagrass requires 2.4 M/m² of PAR for optimal survival. Underwater vegetation is less likely to receive sufficient sunlight (PAR) to sustain growth when light reaching the plants is reduced due to water turbidity and algae blooms.

The current light attenuation study suggests that immediately after a heavy rainfall, stormwater input inhibits the amount of PAR available to the seagrass. Figure 3-7 illustrates light attenuation at the deep edge of a grass bed in 4.5 feet of water. Although the storm event lasted only one day, the inhibited PAR persisted for several days after the rainfall due to increased turbidity and nutrient enrichment from stormwater runoff.




Figure 3-11 A sufficient amount of PAR was diminished for several days while turbidity settled after a storm event. Dates are listed YYMMDD HHMM.

October 19th indicates a normal day with surface PAR around 9.6 M/m² and underwater PAR (grass blade depth) around 3.7 M/m². Available PAR to the grass bed is about 38% of surface PAR.

October 20th indicates a storm event with decreased surface and underwater PAR due to clouds and rain. Following the storm event, surface PAR returned to normal while underwater PAR remained inhibited for days due to increased turbidity from stormwater runoff. Available PAR has decreased to insufficient levels of around 22%, and persisted for four days before returning to normal.

Spatial and temporal variation in seagrass coverage in Southwest Florida: assessing the relative effects of anthropogenic nutrient load reductions and rainfall in four contiguous estuaries

D.A. Tomasko ^{a,*}, C.A. Corbett ^b, H.S. Greening ^c, G.E. Raulerson ^d

^a Southwest Florida Water Management District, 2379 Broad Street, Brooksville, FL 34604, United States

^b Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program, 4980 Bayline Drive, Fourth Floor, North Fort Myers, FL 33917, United States

^c Tampa Bay Estuary Program, 100 Eighth Avenue, S.E., St. Petersburg, FL 33701, United States

^d Sarasota Bay National Estuary Program, 111 South Orange Avenue, Suite 200 W, Sarasota, FL 34236, United States

Abstract

The estuaries of Tampa Bay, Sarasota Bay, Lemon Bay, and Upper Charlotte Harbor are contiguous waterbodies located within the subtropical environment of Southwest Florida. Based on an examination of rainfall data over the period of record (1916–2001) within the watersheds of these estuaries, there is no evidence for spatial differences (at the watershed level) or monotonic trends in annual rainfall. During the 1980s, nitrogen loads into Tampa Bay and Sarasota Bay (generated primarily by domestic wastewater treatment facilities) were reduced by 57% and 46%, respectively. In response, both Tampa Bay and Sarasota Bay have lower phytoplankton concentrations, greater water clarity and more extensive seagrass coverage in 2002 than in the early 1980s. As there is no evidence of a concurrent trend in rainfall during the period of 1982–2001, it is unlikely that variation in rainfall can account for the observed increase in seagrass coverage in these two bays. In contrast, seagrass coverage has remained relatively constant since the mid 1980s in Lemon Bay and Charlotte Harbor. Domestic wastewater treatment facilities are minor sources of nitrogen to Lemon Bay, and water clarity in Charlotte Harbor varies mostly as a function of dissolved organic matter and non-chlorophyll associated turbidity, not phytoplankton levels. Even in estuaries that share boundaries and are within 100 km of each other, varied responses to anthropogenic changes and natural phenomena were observed in water quality and associated seagrass extent. **Resource management strategies must take into account system-specific factors—not all strategies will result in similar results in different systems.** © 2005 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Seagrass; Water quality; Eutrophication; Florida; Estuaries

1. Introduction

Between 1950 and 2000, Florida's population increased from approximately 2.7 million to nearly 16 million residents, with 3 million new residents moving to the state during the 1990s alone (Letson, 2002). More

than 70% of Floridians live in coastal counties, which is where most of the state's building permits are issued, as well (Florida Department of Community Affairs [FDCA] 1996). Waterborne trade, beach-related tourism, and land development are much larger contributors to the economy of Florida's coastal counties than commercial fishing, with annualized net worths of \$47 billion, \$15 billion, \$11 billion, and \$202 million, respectively (FDCA, 1996). With an estimated economic impact of just under \$3 billion a year (Letson, 2002),

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 352 796 7211; fax: +1 352 797 5806.
E-mail address: dave.tomasko@swfwmd.state.fl.us (D.A. Tomasko).

even the value of recreational fishing activities (both residents and visitors) pales beside that of more intensive uses of Florida's natural resources. As the intrinsic value of a clean environment is difficult to quantify (Pearce, 1993), successful management and protection of Florida's natural resources is often done despite, rather than because of, the economic pressures of continued development. Tools that can be used to track the effectiveness of efforts to restore and/or protect water quality have tremendous value, given this scenario.

In Southwest Florida, a substantial amount of research has focused on the relationships between human population, land use patterns, pollutant loads, estuarine water quality, and seagrass health. In Tampa Bay, historical losses of seagrass coverage have been linked to both direct and indirect impacts (i.e., Lewis et al., 1985; Lewis, 1989; Haddad, 1989). In contrast, recent (1982–1996) increases in seagrass coverage in Tampa Bay have been linked to improved water quality in the bay (i.e., Johansson, 1991; Johansson and Ries, 1997; Lewis et al., 1998; Johansson and Greening, 1999). Improvements in the early 1980s in the treatment and disposal of wastewater discharges by the Cities of Tampa, St. Petersburg and Clearwater have been identified as major causes of improved water quality in Tampa Bay (Johansson and Greening, 1999). A similar situation exists in Sarasota Bay, where recent (1988–1996) increases in seagrass coverage are most likely related to reductions in anthropogenic nitrogen loads to the bay by the City of Sarasota and Manatee and Sarasota Counties (Kurz et al., 1999). However, significant non-point sources of nitrogen loads still exist, especially urban stormwater runoff and septic tank systems.

In contrast to Tampa and Sarasota Bays, neither Lemon Bay nor Upper Charlotte Harbor (i.e., waters north of 26°40' N latitude) seem to have experienced any substantial changes in seagrass coverage during the period of 1982–1996 (Kurz et al., 1999; Tomasko et al., 2001). The relatively stable seagrass coverage in Upper Charlotte Harbor in recent years could be related to the comparatively minor importance of phytoplankton populations to overall light attenuation in the Harbor (McPherson and Miller, 1987). That is, the relationship between pollutant loads and seagrass meadows may not be as recognizable in Upper Charlotte Harbor as in Tampa Bay (Tomasko and Hall, 1999).

This paper will review some of the information available relating to pollutant loads and water quality for contiguous Southwest Florida estuaries, to determine the relationships (if any) between anthropogenic versus natural phenomena and temporal variation in seagrass coverage. Also, this paper updates a previous summary of the status and trends in seagrass coverage in Southwest Florida (Kurz et al., 1999) by including data from two additional mapping events, in 1999 and 2002.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. General description of locations

For purposes of this paper, the following estuaries will be considered: 1) Tampa Bay, 2) Sarasota Bay, 3) Lemon Bay, and 4) Upper Charlotte Harbor (Fig. 1). The region “Upper Charlotte Harbor” will include only those areas north of 26°40' N latitude. The climate in this portion of Southwest Florida is subtropical, with warm, wet summers and mild, dry winters. Annual average temperatures range between 21 and 24 °C, depending upon distance from the coast and latitude (Southwest Florida Water Management District [SWFWMD] 1999). Mean annual rainfall usually ranges between 136 and 144 cm year⁻¹, with more than half that amount occurring during the typical wet season of June to September (SWFWMD, 1999).

The different estuaries vary in terms of both the size of the open waters of each system, as well as the size of each system's watershed (Table 1). With a watershed:open water ratio of 24.3:1, Upper Charlotte Harbor experiences a much greater influence of freshwater inflow than Sarasota Bay (ratio of 2.9:1). Tampa Bay and Lemon Bay have similar watershed:open water ratios (6.2:1 and 4.9:1, respectively); values that are intermediate between those for Sarasota Bay and Upper Charlotte Harbor.

2.2. Pollutant loading models

Manipulative studies in Upper Charlotte Harbor have shown nitrogen to be the principal nutrient limiting primary production (Montgomery et al., 1991). In addition, strong empirical evidence points to the importance of nitrogen in controlling phytoplankton biomass in Tampa Bay (e.g., Johansson, 1991; Wang et al., 1999). In Lemon Bay, nitrogen loads appear to be related to water column chlorophyll *a* values (Tomasko et al., 2001). Consequently, pollutant loading models for these four estuaries focus on nitrogen as the primary nutrient of concern.

Nitrogen loading estimates for Tampa Bay, Sarasota Bay, Lemon Bay, and Upper Charlotte Harbor combine both measured nitrogen loads and estimated loads from difficult to quantify sources. For Tampa Bay, approximately 57% of the watershed is gaged for both flow and water quality, allowing for direct estimates of loads. However, much of the developed portions of these same watersheds drain directly to the bay, downstream of any gages. In situations such as this, loads from stormwater runoff are estimated using predictions based on rainfall, land use, soils, and seasonal land-use-specific water quality concentrations (Greening and Janicki, unpublished data; Pribble et al., 2001). In Upper Charlotte Harbor, 87% of the Peace River's watershed is gaged,




Fig. 1. Location of Tampa Bay, Sarasota Bay, Lemon Bay, and Upper Charlotte Harbor within Southwest Florida. Note that the term “Upper Charlotte Harbor” refers to those areas north of 26°40' N latitude.

Table 1

Estimates of watershed size (km²), open water (km²), and the watershed to open water ratio by estuary

Estuary	Watershed (km ²)	Open water (km ²)	Watershed:open water ratio
Tampa Bay	5896	959	6.2
Sarasota Bay	389	135	2.9
Lemon Bay	154	31	4.9
Charlotte Harbor	8549	337	24.3

Data for Tampa Bay are from Pribble et al. (2001). Data for Sarasota Bay are from Tomasko et al. (1996). Data for Lemon Bay are from Tomasko et al. (2001). Data for Charlotte Harbor are from Squires et al. (1998), with open water estimate from Tomasko (unpublished data).

and approximately 50% of the Myakka River's watershed is gaged (Squires et al., 1998). Consequently, the majority of nitrogen loads to Upper Charlotte

Harbor from stormwater runoff are measured, not modeled. In contrast, the entirety of stormwater-related nitrogen load estimates for Sarasota Bay and Lemon Bay are from models of non-point source loads associated with various land use types (e.g., Tomasko et al., 1996; Tomasko et al., 2001, respectively).

In addition to stormwater runoff, other pollutant sources included in these models are point sources (both industrial sites and domestic wastewater treatment plants), atmospheric deposition of nitrogen onto open water, baseflow (i.e., uncontaminated groundwater), septic tanks, and, in the case of Tampa Bay, material losses from the substantial fertilizer processing and transport facilities along the shoreline.

For point source load estimates, values for individual facilities are calculated from measurements of discharge rates and constituent levels required for maintaining

permit compliance (Greening and Janicki, unpublished data; Pribble et al., 2001; Squires et al., 1998). These loads are then summed for all point sources for each estuary.

In Tampa Bay, atmospheric deposition of nitrogen to the open waters of the bay were calculated by multiplying the volume of precipitation onto the bay by nitrogen concentrations in rainfall. Recent estimates include direct measurements of both wet and dry deposition (Poor et al., 2001). In Upper Charlotte Harbor, wet deposition load calculations were multiplied by a correction factor to account for dry deposition (Squires et al., 1998). In both Sarasota and Lemon Bays, estimates are for wet deposition only (Tomasko et al., 1996; Tomasko et al., 2001, respectively).

Baseflow (uncontaminated groundwater contributions) and septic tank system loads were estimated using various algorithms to quantify their impacts (e.g., Squires et al., 1998; Tomasko et al., 2001). These techniques all require significant extrapolation to derive watershed-level estimates of these diffuse sources of nutrient loads.

For Tampa Bay, nitrogen load estimates exist for the years 1938, 1976, a 1992–1994 average, and a 1995–1998 average (Pribble et al., 2001). 1938 is considered a relatively unimpacted or “baseline” condition, while 1976 is considered to be indicative of the most degraded condition of the bay (Johansson and Greening, 1999; Greening and Janicki, unpublished data). For Sarasota Bay, nitrogen load estimates are for the year 1990. Additional load estimates have been derived for the years 1890 and 1988. Estimates for 1890 are for a mostly undeveloped watershed, while 1988 is considered to be indicative of the most degraded condition in Sarasota Bay (Kurz et al., 1999). Nitrogen load estimates for Lemon Bay are for the years 1850 and 1995 (Tomasko et al., 2001), while estimates for Upper Charlotte Harbor are for the year 1992 (Squires et al., 1998).

2.3. Rainfall data

The SWFWMD collects and/or compiles rainfall data from 370 rainfall gage sites throughout its approximately 28,000 km² jurisdictional area. Data are available for various periods of record, although most regions have one or more rainfall gage sites that date back to at least the 1910s. For purposes of this paper, rainfall data were combined for all stations throughout the entirety of the particular estuary's watershed. For Sarasota and Lemon Bays, rainfall data were combined, as the individual watersheds are relatively small, compared to Tampa Bay and Upper Charlotte Harbor. For Upper Charlotte Harbor, rainfall data were combined from throughout the Peace River watershed, which is the largest (≈6000 km²) source of freshwater inflow into the Harbor.

2.4. Seagrass mapping efforts

Seagrass maps are produced through a multiple step process. First, aerial photography is obtained, usually in the late fall to early winter. This time of year is typically associated with both good water clarity (i.e., Dixon, 1999; Tomasko and Hall, 1999) and relatively high seagrass biomass (i.e., Tomasko et al., 1996; Dixon, 1999). Flights are not flown unless Secchi disk depths meet or exceed 2 m at sampled locations for each estuary, on the day that photography is shot. In addition, wind speed on the day photography is shot must be at or below 10 knots, and wave heights must be less than 60 cm.

Second, photointerpretation efforts are conducted in the field, to allow for the successful evaluation of distinct photographic signatures. Seagrass signatures are divided into two classes (continuous and patchy coverage), with a minimum mapping unit of 0.2 ha. Continuous and patchy polygons are delimited based on the interpretation of aerial photographs, with continuous polygons characterized as having less than 25% of the delimited polygon visible as unvegetated areas. Patchy polygons have between 25% and 75% of the delimited polygon visible as unvegetated areas.

Third, polygons are integrated into an ARC/Info program. For past efforts (i.e., 1988, 1990, 1992, 1994, and 1996), individual polygons were delineated on Mylar overlays, cartographically transferred using a Zoom Transfer Scope to USGS quadrangles, and then digitally transferred to an ARC/Info database for further characterization. For 1999 and 2002 seagrass maps, analytical stereo plotters were used for photointerpretation, as opposed to stereoscopes. This technique allows for the production of a georeferenced digital file of the photointerpreted images, without the need for additional photo-to-map transfer.

Fourth, hard copy plots are made of photointerpreted seagrass coverage, and randomly chosen points are identified for a post-map-production classification accuracy assessment. A hand-held Global Positioning System unit is used, along with the draft seagrass map and the latitude and longitude of the randomly located stations, to develop an unbiased determination of the map's classification accuracy. A 90% classification accuracy standard is required for these efforts, and 94% accuracy was achieved for 2002 efforts (i.e., 64 of 68 stations that could be visited were accurately described).

Historical (i.e., 1950 and 1982) estimates of seagrass coverage had been developed by the Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council (1986) using 1:24,000 scale true color aerial photographs. A similar approach was used for Sarasota Bay for 1950 coverage estimates.

As an assessment of the “repeatability” of seagrass polygon delineations, an exercise to quantify mapping errors was introduced for the 2002 effort. Each photoin-

terpreter was given five separate aerial photos, and asked to delimit seagrass coverage for each photo three separate times. All photos were interpreted at random before an individual photo was re-interpreted, then this procedure was repeated again. Seagrass coverage per photo varied from approximately 2 ha to >900 ha. Means and standard deviations of coverage were derived for each of the five photos ($n = 3$), for each of two photointerpreters used, and the coefficient of variation was calculated for each of 10 trials (2 photointerpreters $\times$ 5 photos). Pooling for all photo and photointerpreter combinations, the mean coefficient of variation was 1.9%.

2.5. Statistical analyses

Rainfall data were tested for potential differences between watersheds and trends over time using annual averages for pooled data by watershed. When testing for differences between watersheds, pooled data from the period of record (1916–2001) were compared using ANOVA, with significance set at $p < 0.05$. Data were tested for normality and homogeneity of variance, prior to using parametric statistical analysis. For testing for potential trends over time, data were analyzed for three time intervals: (1) period of record (1916–2001), (2) 1950–2001, and (3) 1982–2001. The time period of 1950–2001 encompasses the period of rapid population growth in Southwest Florida (Letson, 2002), while the time period of 1982–2001 encompasses the time period associated with significant improvements in water clarity, at least for Tampa Bay and Sarasota Bay (Johansson and Greening, 1999; Kurz et al., 1999, respectively). Data were tested for monotonic trends over time with a linear regression model of annual rainfall vs. years, with significance set at $p < 0.05$.

For seagrass coverage, data from individual estuaries were plotted versus years, and a variety of regression techniques were tested to determine if coverage varied over time in any predictable manner. Regression equations tested included the following: (1) linear, (2) power, (3) exponential, (4) second-order polynomial, and (5) third-order polynomial. Lines of best fit, when present, represent the regression equation between seagrass coverage and date with the highest r^2 value, with statistical significance set a priori at $p < 0.05$.

3. Results

3.1. Nitrogen loads

Estimated nitrogen loads into Tampa Bay and Sarasota Bay show evidence for both substantial increases over “baseline” conditions, as well as significant reductions over the past 20 years (Table 2). For Tampa

Table 2

Estimated nitrogen loads by estuary for different time periods

Estuary	Year(s)	Nitrogen load (kg TN year ⁻¹)
Tampa Bay	1938	1,737,288
	1976	7,984,909
	1992–1994	3,447,360
	1995–1998	4,653,858
Sarasota Bay	1890	191,419
	1988	905,386
	1990	488,981
Lemon Bay	1850	81,345
	1995	129,713
Charlotte Harbor	1992	1,632,960

Data are summarized from existing nitrogen loading models. Data for Tampa Bay are from Pribble et al. (2001). Data for Sarasota Bay are from Tomasko et al. (1996). Data for Lemon Bay are from Tomasko et al. (2001). Data for Charlotte Harbor are from Squires et al. (1998). See Materials and Methods for details.

Bay, nitrogen loads are estimated to have increased more than fivefold between 1938 and 1976, while loads into Sarasota Bay increased by nearly fivefold between 1890 and 1988. Between 1976 and 1992–1994, annual average nitrogen loads into Tampa Bay were reduced by approximately 57%. Subsequent increases to 1995–1998 annual average nitrogen load levels are associated with high rainfall amounts and resulting stormwater-related nitrogen load increases during the 1997–1998 El Niño event. Nitrogen loads into Sarasota Bay decreased by 46% between 1988 and 1990. Lemon Bay also shows evidence of substantial increases in nitrogen loads over historical levels (1850–1995), although the magnitude of the increase (59%) is much less than increases in Tampa Bay and Sarasota Bay. Load estimates for Upper Charlotte Harbor are for the year 1992 only.

The substantial nitrogen load reductions for Tampa Bay between 1976 and the early 1990s, and Sarasota Bay between 1988 and 1990, are mostly due to significant improvements in the treatment of domestic wastewater discharges (Johansson and Greening, 1999; Kurz et al., 1999). As a result of these large-scale reductions in point source nitrogen loads, other nitrogen load sources have become proportionally more important (Fig. 2). In 1976, point source nitrogen loads were approximately 67% of the total load into Tampa Bay. By the mid to late 1990s, point sources had declined such that they were only approximately 12–13% of the bay-wide load. For Sarasota Bay, point source nitrogen loads were approximately 51% of the total load into the bay in 1988. By 1990, point sources contributed only approximately 10% of the nitrogen load into Sarasota Bay.

3.2. Rainfall

Annual rainfall amounts for pooled data over the period of record varied between 83.7 and 216.2 cm.




Fig. 2. Sources of nitrogen loads (kg TN year⁻¹) for Tampa Bay in 1976 and the 1995–1998 annual average, and for Sarasota Bay in 1988 and 1990. “Point Sources” includes both industrial sites and domestic wastewater treatment plants. “Stormwater Runoff” includes both gaged and ungaged surface flows. “Other” includes atmospheric deposition, baseflow, septic tank systems, etc. (see materials and methods for details). Data are summarized from Pribble et al. (2001) for Tampa Bay, and summarized from Tomasko et al. (1996) for Sarasota Bay.

Mean annual rainfall over the period of record for the Tampa Bay watershed was 131.4 cm. For the Sarasota Bay and Lemon Bay watershed, mean annual rainfall was 133.4, while the mean annual rainfall for the Upper Charlotte Harbor watershed was 133.0 cm. ANOVA did not detect a difference in mean annual rainfall between the Tampa Bay, Sarasota Bay plus Lemon Bay, and Upper Charlotte Harbor watersheds, when comparing data over the period of record ($p = 0.81$, 2 d.f.; see Fig. 3). In addition, no monotonic trends were found (using linear regression) for any watershed for any of the three chosen time intervals: (1) period of record (1916–2001), (2) 1950–2001, and (3) 1982–2001. Overall,




Fig. 3. Annual rainfall (cm year⁻¹) for pooled data from gages within the watersheds of Tampa Bay, Sarasota Bay plus Lemon Bay, and Upper Charlotte Harbor from 1916 to 2001. Data from SWFWMD.

the data suggest no spatial differences or long-term monotonic trends exist for annual rainfall in the watersheds of Tampa Bay, Sarasota and Lemon Bays, and Upper Charlotte Harbor. Using the best-fit forecasting tool for pooled data over the period of record (based on linear regression of the reciprocal of annual rainfall vs. years), the 95% prediction limit for forecasted rainfall ranges between 99 and 187 cm year⁻¹.

3.3. Seagrass coverage

Seagrass coverage varies both spatially and temporally in Southwest Florida. Combined coverage for all estuaries in 2002 was 22,689 ha. Tampa Bay contained 46% of the total mapped seagrass coverage in 2002, followed by Upper Charlotte Harbor, Sarasota Bay and Lemon Bay (33%, 16%, and 5%, respectively). Seagrass coverage in the combined estuaries expanded by 1262 ha between 1988 and 2002, an increase of 6%. The pattern of seagrass coverage over time varied between the different estuaries (see Fig. 4a–d). Additionally, from 1988 through 2002, the “continuous” cover category for all estuaries combined increased by approximately 4212 ha, indicating some areas previously mapped as “patchy” had converted to meadows with a denser photographic signature. Implications of this increased continuous coverage are currently under study.

In Tampa Bay (Fig. 4a), a third-order polynomial regression suggests a pattern of seagrass loss (1950–1970s), followed by recovery (1970s–1990s), followed by a period of little additional change over time (1990s to present). In greater detail, coverage in Tampa Bay decreased by 46% between 1950 and 1982, followed by a




Fig. 4. Seagrass coverage estimates for (a) Tampa Bay, (b) Sarasota Bay, (c) Lemon Bay, and (d) Charlotte Harbor. Note different scales on axes. Lines represent statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) relationships between year and coverage (ha) based on third-order polynomial regression.

24% increase between 1982 and 1996. Between 1996 and 1999, coverage decreased by 8%, followed by a 5% increase between 1999 and 2002. Bay-wide, seagrass coverage in Tampa Bay in 2002 is 65% of 1950 coverage, but 20% higher than in 1982.

In Sarasota Bay (Fig. 4b), a third-order polynomial regression suggests a pattern of seagrass loss (1950–1970s) followed by a period of increased coverage (1970s–1990s), followed by a period of either stable or slightly declining coverage (1990s to present). In greater detail, seagrass coverage decreased by 28% between 1950 and 1988, followed by a 19% increase between 1988 and 1996. Between 1996 and 2002, coverage decreased by 11%. However, seagrass coverage increased by 214 ha between 1988 and 2002, a 6% improvement. In Lemon Bay (Fig. 4c), seagrass coverage in 2002 (1049 ha) is essentially unchanged from coverage in 1988 (1044 ha), and is probably within the margin of error for these mapping efforts (see Materials and Methods). No trends over time were detected for seagrass coverage.

In Upper Charlotte Harbor (Fig. 4d), seagrass coverage varied between a low value of 7216 ha in 1992 and peak coverage of 7781 ha in 1996. Seagrass coverage in 2002 (7381 ha) is essentially unchanged from coverage in 1982 (7369 ha), and also (as in Lemon Bay) is probably within the margin of error for these mapping efforts. As in Lemon Bay, no trends over time were detected for seagrass coverage.

4. Discussion

The estuaries of Tampa Bay, Sarasota Bay, Lemon Bay, and Upper Charlotte Harbor are all located in

the subtropical environment of Southwest Florida. In this region, rainfall averages 132 cm year^{-1} , with approximately 60% of rainfall associated with convective storms, which are common phenomena in the afternoon hours of the typical June to September wet season (SWFWMD, 1999). Despite similar rainfall patterns in the watersheds of these four contiguous estuaries, seagrass coverage patterns and trends vary considerably.

In both Tampa and Sarasota Bays, recent increases in seagrass coverage have been linked to sustained improvements in water quality, which in turn have been related to significant reductions in anthropogenic nitrogen loads (e.g., Johansson, 1991; Johansson and Ries, 1997; Johansson and Greening, 1999; Kurz et al., 1999). Although estimated nitrogen loads into Tampa Bay and Sarasota Bay have decreased by 57 and 46%, respectively, in recent years, loads are still substantially higher than estimated values for “baseline” conditions (see Table 2). Most of the reductions in nitrogen loads have been due to improved management of effluent discharged from domestic wastewater treatment plants (Johansson and Greening, 1999; Kurz et al., 1999). In general, load reductions have accompanied the state-mandated effluent limitation requirements of the Grizzle-Figg Act (Section 403.086, Florida Statutes). This legislation, promulgated in 1980, requires effluent discharges from wastewater treatment plants in Southwest Florida to be below the levels of 5, 5, 3 and 1 (mg l^{-1}) for total suspended solids, biological oxygen demand, total nitrogen and total phosphorus, respectively (although Tampa Bay received a waiver for total phosphorus levels). Wastewater treatment plants have achieved the required reductions in effluent nitrogen

concentrations through the use of linked nitrification and denitrification processes (Doug Taylor, City of Sarasota, personal communication).

As a result of these point source nitrogen load reductions, phytoplankton levels have decreased, and water clarity has increased, in both Tampa and Sarasota Bays in recent years (e.g., Johansson and Greening, 1999; Kurz et al., 1999, respectively). As there is no evidence for a trend in rainfall during the 1982–2001 time period, improvements in water clarity in these two estuaries do not appear to be due to reductions in nutrient loads due to changes in freshwater inflow. Previously, Johansson (1991) also found that variation in rainfall could not account for the observed positive trends in water clarity in Tampa Bay during the period of 1968–1990.

Increased water clarity in Tampa and Sarasota Bays in recent years has resulted in increased seagrass coverage since the 1980s (Fig. 4a and b). In contrast to Tampa and Sarasota Bays, seagrass coverage in Lemon Bay and Upper Charlotte Harbor appears to be non-trending since the 1980s (Fig. 4c and d). In Lemon Bay, the relatively stable pattern of seagrass coverage since the 1980s may be at risk, if pollutant loads increase and water quality declines in the future, as in a scenario outlined in Tomasko et al. (2001). In Upper Charlotte Harbor, water clarity varies mostly as a function of variation in the levels of dissolved organic matter and non-chlorophyll associated turbidity in the water column (McPherson and Miller, 1987). Seasonal variation in rainfall amounts and streamflow results in considerable spatial and temporal variation in water clarity in Charlotte Harbor, with subsequent impacts on biomass and productivity of the Harbor's seagrass meadows (Tomasko and Hall, 1999). The results presented here (Fig. 4d) suggest that there is no underlying trend of loss or gain of seagrass coverage in Charlotte Harbor, despite the above-mentioned spatial and temporal variability in water clarity.

Phenomena such as the 1997–1998 El Niño event can result in dramatic increases in freshwater inflow into these systems, as has been documented for Tampa Bay (Schmidt and Luther, 2002). Elevated freshwater inflows associated with El Niño events can cause substantial increases in nutrient loads and chlorophyll *a* concentrations, at least in Tampa Bay (Greening and Janicki, unpublished data). In Upper Charlotte Harbor, increased freshwater inflows are also associated with reduced water clarity, mostly due to increases in dissolved organic matter (Tomasko and Hall, 1999). Decreased water clarity associated with high inflows of stormwater runoff during the 1997–1998 El Niño event is a likely cause of the decrease in seagrass coverage seen between 1996 and 1999 in Tampa Bay, Sarasota Bay, and Upper Charlotte Harbor.

Associated with the reductions in point-source nitrogen loads into Tampa and Sarasota Bays in recent years,

stormwater runoff has become the largest single source of nutrient loads into these two systems (see Fig. 2). With stormwater runoff as the primary source of nutrient loads, year-to-year variation in nitrogen loads will be strongly associated with year-to-year variation in rainfall. A complicating factor for resource management and assessment purposes is the highly variable annual rainfall in Southwest Florida (see Fig. 3). While future rainfall amounts can be forecasted, the 95% prediction limit ranges between 99 and 187 cm year⁻¹. As water clarity is moderately to strongly related to phytoplankton abundance in Southwest Florida's estuaries (with the exception of Upper Charlotte Harbor), and phytoplankton abundance is linked to nitrogen loads, year to year variation in seagrass coverage needs to be examined in context with variation in rainfall amounts.

Rainfall patterns in the watersheds of these four contiguous subtropical estuaries result in different water quality and seagrass coverage responses in each system, depending on both anthropogenic and natural phenomena. The same resource management strategy (i.e., nutrient reduction) therefore should not be expected to increase seagrass coverage similarly in all systems. Resource managers are typically tasked with documenting the water quality and natural resource benefits (if any) of costly pollution reduction strategies. Consequently, the potential exists in Southwest Florida for both inappropriate pessimism (during times of above-average rainfall) and inappropriate optimism (during times of below-average rainfall). Detecting the effects of anthropogenic pollution load reduction strategies, given highly variable rainfall and the response of water clarity to nutrient reduction, requires careful examination of all relevant data sets and an understanding of the factors driving seagrass growth and expansion.

Acknowledgments

This paper represents an analysis of results made possible only through the dedicated work of numerous individuals. For Avineon, Inc., fieldwork, photointerpretation and GIS-based analysis of seagrass coverage was performed by Bob Finck, Phil Still and Lesley Ward. The project manager for Avineon, Inc. was Keith Patterson. Previous project managers for the District's seagrass mapping efforts are Tom Ries and Ray Kurz. Analysis of results was greatly aided by discussions with Walt Avery, Roger Johansson, and Robin Lewis. Post-map-production classification analysis was performed with the aid of Chris Anastasiou, Darren Bishop, Diana Burdick, Lizanne Garcia, and Tammy Plazak. Diana Burdick and Frank Sargent provide exceptional GIS support.

References

- Dixon, L.K., 1999. Establishing light requirements for the seagrass *Thalassia testudinum*: an example for Tampa Bay, Florida. In: Bortone, S.A. (Ed.), *Seagrasses: Monitoring, Ecology, Physiology and Management*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, pp. 9–31.
- Doug, T., Deputy Director of Utilities, City of Sarasota. 1565 First Street, Sarasota, FL 34236, USA, unpublished.
- Florida Department of Community Affairs, 1996. State of the Coast Report: Preparing a Sustainable Future. Prepared by the Florida Center for Public Management, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.
- Greening, H.S., Janicki, A., In review. Reversal of eutrophic conditions in a subtropical estuary: water quality and seagrass response to nitrogen loading reductions in Tampa Bay, Florida, USA, unpublished.
- Haddad, K.D., 1989. Habitat trends and fisheries in Tampa and Sarasota Bays. In: Estevez, E. (Ed.), *Tampa and Sarasota Bays: Issues, Resources, Status, and Management*, NOAA Estuary-of-the-month Seminar Series No. 11. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Washington, DC, pp. 113–128.
- Johansson, J.O.R., 1991. Long-term trends in nitrogen loading, water quality and biological indicators in Hillsborough Bay, Florida. In: Treat, S.F., Clark, P.A. (Eds.), *Proceedings, Tampa Bay Area Scientific Information Symposium 2*. Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, St. Petersburg, Florida, pp. 157–176.
- Johansson, J., Ries, T., 1997. Seagrass in Tampa Bay: historic trends and future expectations. In: Treat, S. (Ed.), *Proceedings, Tampa Bay Area Scientific Information Symposium 3*. Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, St. Petersburg, Florida, pp. 139–150.
- Johansson, J.O.R., Greening, H., 1999. Seagrass restoration in Tampa Bay: a resource-based approach to estuarine management. In: Bortone, S. (Ed.), *Subtropical and Tropical Seagrass Management Ecology*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, pp. 279–293.
- Kurz, R.C., Tomasko, D.A., Burdick, D., Ries, T.F., Patterson, K., Finck, R., 1999. Recent trends in seagrass distribution in Southwest Florida coastal waters. In: Bortone, S. (Ed.), *Subtropical and Tropical Seagrass Management Ecology*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, pp. 157–166.
- Letson, D., 2002. Economic value and environmental quality: Florida's coastal resources. In: Letson, D., Milon, J.W. (Eds.), *Florida Coastal Environmental Resources—A Guide to Economic Valuation and Impact Analysis*. Florida Sea Grant College Program, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL, pp. 1–6.
- Lewis III, R.R., 1989. Biology and eutrophication of Tampa Bay. In: Estevez, E. (Ed.), *Tampa and Sarasota Bays: Issues, Resources, Status, and Management*, NOAA Estuary-of-the-month Seminar Series No. 11. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Washington, DC, pp. 89–112.
- Lewis, R.R., Durako, M.J., Moffler, M.D., Phillips, R.C., 1985. Seagrass meadows of Tampa Bay—a review. In: Treat, S.F., Simon, J.L., Lewis, R.R., Whitman, R.L. (Eds.), *Proceedings, Tampa Bay Area Scientific Information Symposium*. Florida Sea Grant Publication 65, Burgess, Minneapolis, pp. 210–246.
- Lewis III, R.R., Clark, P.A., Fehring, W.K., Greening, H.S., Johanson, R.O., Paul, R.T., 1998. The rehabilitation of the Tampa Bay Estuary, Florida, USA, as an example of successful integrated coastal management. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 37 (8), 468–473.
- McPherson, B.F., Miller, R.L., 1987. The vertical attenuation of light in Charlotte Harbor, a shallow subtropical estuary, southwestern Florida. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 25, 721–737.
- Montgomery, R.T., McPherson, B.F., Emmons, E.E., 1991. Effects of Nitrogen and Phosphorus Additions on Phytoplankton Productivity and Chlorophyll A in a Subtropical Estuary, Charlotte Harbor, Florida. US Geological Survey, Water Resources Investigations Report, 91-4077, Tampa, FL.
- Pearce, D., 1993. *Economic Values and the Natural World*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Poor, N., Pribble, R., Greening, H., 2001. Direct wet and dry deposition of ammonia, nitric acid, ammonium and nitrate to the Tampa Bay Estuary, FL, USA. *Atmospheric Environment* 35, 3947–3955.
- Pribble, R., Janicki, A., Zarbock, H., Janicki, S., Winowitch, M., 2001. Estimates of total nitrogen, total phosphorus, total suspended solids, and biochemical oxygen demand loadings to Tampa Bay, Florida. Technical Report #05-01 of the Tampa Bay Estuary Program, St. Petersburg, FL.
- Schmidt, N., Luther, M.E., 2002. ENSO impacts on salinity in Tampa Bay, Florida. *Estuaries* 25, 976–984.
- Southwest Florida Water Management District, 1999. Southern Coastal Watershed Comprehensive Watershed Management Plan. Southwest Florida Water Management District, Brooksville, FL.
- Squires, A.P., Zarbock, H., Janicki, S., 1998. Loadings of total nitrogen, total phosphorus and total suspended solids to Charlotte Harbor. In: Treat, S.F. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Charlotte Harbor Public Conference and Technical Symposium*; 1997 March 15–16. Charlotte Harbor National Estuary Program Technical Report No. 98-02. South Florida Water Management District Publication, West Palm Beach, FL, pp. 187–200.
- Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council, 1986. *Habitat Restoration Study for the Tampa Bay Region*. Tampa Bay Regional Planning Council. St. Petersburg, FL.
- Tomasko, D.A., Hall, M.O., 1999. Productivity and biomass of the seagrass *Thalassia testudinum* along a gradient of freshwater influence in Charlotte Harbor, Florida. *Estuaries* 22, 592–602.
- Tomasko, D.A., Dawes, C.J., Hall, M.O., 1996. The effects of anthropogenic nutrient enrichment on turtle grass (*Thalassia testudinum*) in Sarasota Bay, Florida. *Estuaries* 19, 448–456.
- Tomasko, D.A., Bristol, D.L., Ott, J.A., 2001. Assessment of present and future nitrogen loads, water quality, and seagrass (*Thalassia testudinum*) depth distribution in Lemon Bay, Florida. *Estuaries* 24, 926–938.
- Wang, P.F., Martin, J., Morrison, G., 1999. Water quality and Eutrophication in Tampa Bay, Florida. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 49, 1–20.

An Estimate of the Economic Value of Pensacola and Perdido Bay Seagrasses

The value of seagrasses:

Economically, Florida's 2.7 million acres of seagrass supports both commercial and recreational fisheries that provide a wealth of benefits to the state's economy. Florida's Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) reported that in 2000, Florida's seagrass communities supported commercial harvests of fish and shellfish valued at over 124 billion dollars. Adding the economic value of the nutrient cycling function of seagrasses, and the value of recreational fisheries to this number, FDEP has estimated that each acre of seagrass in Florida has an economic value of approximately \$20,500 per year, which translates into a statewide economic benefit of 55.4 billion dollars annually.

Taken from the Smithsonian Marine Station at Fort Pierce website:

http://www.sms.si.edu/irlspec/Seagrass_Habitat.htm

	Acres of Seagrass		Acres lost
	1960 (a)	2003 (b)	
Escambia Bay	259	111	148
East Bay	1175	27	1148
Pensacola Bay	918	373	545
Total Pensacola Bay System	4312	2514	1798

Note:

(a): U.S. Department of the Interior. U.S. Geological Survey. Scientific Investigations Report 2006-5287. Gulf of Mexico Program. **Seagrass** Status and **Trends** in the Northern Gulf of Mexico. Pensacola Bay By Lisa Schwenning FDEP, Traci Bruce FDEP, Lawrence R. Handley USGS.

(b): Seagrass Integrated Mapping and Monitoring for the State of Florida Mapping and Monitoring Report No. 1. Edited by Laura A. Yarbrow and Paul R. Carlson Jr. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Fish and Wildlife Research Institute St. Petersburg, Florida March 2011

Using the above referenced data the 1960 annual dollar value of Pensacola Bay seagrasses would be estimated at \$ 88,396,000. The 2003 annual dollar value would be estimated at \$51,537,000. If a restoration target for the Pensacola Bay system alone was to restore back to the 1960 acreage of 4312 acres, an increase of 1798 acres, the annual economic increase in 2000 dollars would be an estimated \$ 36,859,000 per year.

Similarly, the 1940 annual dollar value for Perdido Bay seagrasses would be estimated at \$28,821,000. The 2002 annual value would be estimated at \$5,678,500. If a restoration target for the Perdido Bay was to restore back to the 1940 acreage of 1162 acres from the 2002 acreage of 277, an increase of 885 acres, the annual economic increase in 2000 dollars would be an estimated \$18,142,500 per year.

	Acres of Seagrass		
	1940 (a)	2002 (a)	Acres lost
Perdido Bay	1162	277	885

Note:

(a): U.S. Department of the Interior. U.S. Geological Survey. Scientific Investigations Report 2006-5287. Gulf of Mexico Program. **Seagrass** Status and **Trends** in the Northern Gulf of Mexico. Perdido Bay By Taylor (Chips) Kirschenfeld, Senior Water Quality Scientist, Escambia County, Fla.; Robert Turpin, Chief, Marine Resources Division, Escambia County, Fla.; Lawrence R. Handley USGS.