



# Florida Department of Environmental Protection

Marjory Stoneman Douglas Building  
3900 Commonwealth Boulevard  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3000

Charlie Crist  
Governor

Jeff Kottkamp  
Lt. Governor

Michael W. Sole  
Secretary

September 4, 2009

Dr. Thomas Armitage  
Designated Federal Officer  
EPA Scientific Advisory Board (1400F)  
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency  
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C., 20460

Dear Dr. Armitage:

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) thanks you for the opportunity to provide comments and statements to the Science Advisory Board (SAB); Ecological Processes and Effects Committee on the draft guidance document, Empirical Approaches for Nutrient Criteria Derivation. The state of Florida has made a considerable resource investment to develop scientifically defensible and protective numeric nutrient criteria. We applaud EPA's efforts to provide additional guidance on empirical stressor-response based approaches. Our own experience has led us to believe that such approaches are the most defensible means by which to develop scientifically valid numeric nutrient criteria. Empirical approaches are far preferable over simple distributional approaches with little or no linkage to valuable ecological attributes or ecologically significant thresholds. We submit the following comments in light of our own experience:


1. When evaluating and selecting data, it is extremely important that:
  - a. Sites are selected in a manner that avoids the influence of confounding factors that also impact the biological response. For example, an adverse biological response may be evident at sites characterized by habitat and hydrological modification. If these same sites have elevated nutrients, one may incorrectly attribute the nutrients, rather than the habitat and hydrology, as the causative factor. This concept was discussed for post hoc analysis in the propensity analysis, but EPA should stress that these issues be considered as part of study design.
  - b. Any response attributed to nutrients must be well grounded in ecological

theory. For example, if a stream has elevated TP and low DO, but no evidence of excess biomass (phytoplankton, periphyton, or aquatic vegetation), it would not be correct to say that the TP caused the low DO. To be grounded in ecological theory, one must establish a reasonable series of events that link the nutrients to the response. In this example, one should show that excess biomass led to increased ecosystem respiration and decomposition, ultimately resulting in the low DO. Low DO in many areas in Florida can be due to natural phenomena.

2. The guidance completely lacks discussion of a critically important topic – the statistical strength necessary to establish scientifically defensible numeric nutrient criteria. When analyzing data, there should be a robust and consistent pattern linking dose to response, characterized by acceptable statistical rigor. The guidance should address how much of the variability in the response (dependent) variable needs to be explained by stressor (independent) variable. Our experience in Florida streams has shown that the relationships are typically too weak (*e.g.*, DEP Figure 1, DEP Table 1) to establish meaningful thresholds. The guidance document provides several examples on pages 22 through 25 where the  $R^2$  values range from 0.61 to 0.05. Relationships with low explanatory power (*e.g.*,  $R^2 < 0.5$ ) do not provide an adequate basis to set defensible criteria. The examples provided in Figures 13 and 14 of the guidance document illustrate cases in which the relationships are insufficient to develop thresholds. The fact that these prediction intervals are unusable (do not intercept the response thresholds) is indicative of the lack of explanatory power attributable to nutrients. Weak statistical relationships do not provide protective criteria or form the basis for good public policy. Sound environmental public policy is built on a foundation of science, and must directly link management action to demonstrated benefit; otherwise, there is a high risk that limited resources will be expended for little or no environmental improvement.

**DEP Table 1. Summary of multiple-linear regression analyses conducted for the panhandle nutrient region.**

Panhandle Nutrient Region										
	Response Variable									
	PollSens	PollTol	%Tol low DO	% Oligosap	VD TSI	TP Sens Dia	TIN Sens Dia	N Metab	pH Optima	SDI
Data Transformation	None	SQRT	arcsin(sqrt(x))	arcsin(sqrt(x))	None	None	None	Recip	Recip	arcsin(sqrt(x))
1	pH	pH	pH	pH	pH	CondL	pH	pH	pH	pH
2	ColorL	ColorL	TNL	TNL	CondL	pH		TNL		
3	TNL	TNL			TINL	TPL				
4	TPL	TPL			TPL	TINL				
5					ColorL					
Adjusted r <sup>2</sup> =	0.25	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.27	0.20	0.18	0.11	0.13	0.12
Yellow shading = Pr < 0.05										



**DEP Figure 1. Example of results from quantile regression analyses showing highly significant relationships between the Stream Diatom Index and both total phosphorus and conductivity levels.**

3. We support the use of prediction intervals and other statistical methods to account for uncertainty in and variability around empirical models. Setting appropriate criteria requires a major step beyond simple consideration of the average relationship. Florida has used these same types of empirical methods to draft its proposed lakes criteria. However, we offer an alternative approach to the interpretation of these relationships, which provides a performance based methodology that accounts for the range of uncertainty inherent in the empirical relationship. The DEP concluded that a simple application of an average response was not adequately protective and did not control for Type I and II statistical errors, and that a more complex application was needed to account for

uncertainty in the dose-response relationship:

- a. Uncertainty can be managed by considering nutrient concentrations in a range between a level that is unlikely (*e.g.*, 25% probability) to elicit a given threshold of response and a level that that is likely to elicit a response (*e.g.*, 75% probability). Regression prediction intervals provide a range above and below the regression line that incorporate the unexplained variability of the independent variable, as well as the uncertainty in the model parameters (slope and intercept). Within this range of nutrient concentrations (between the upper and lower prediction interval), there is less certainty that a response (exceedance of the chlorophyll target) will or will not occur. This represents a range of conditions in which nutrients may be managed while considering the potential for Type I (incorrectly identifying a waterbody as impaired) and Type II (failing to identify an impaired waterbody) errors.
- b. Nutrient concentrations less than or equal to the lower end (upper prediction interval) are unlikely to elicit the response threshold and therefore can be used as the basis for protective criteria, with a low probability of Type II statistical error but a high potential for Type I error. Conversely, a high likelihood of an undesirable response occurs when the nutrient concentration exceeds the upper end of the range (lower prediction interval). The probabilities of statistical errors at the upper end of the nutrient range are inverted compared with those at the lower end; that is, there is a low probability of Type I error and a higher probability for Type II error.
- c. Because algal response is influenced by factors other than nutrients (grazing, macrophyte nutrient uptake, water retention time), the most scientifically defensible strategy for managing nutrients within the range of uncertainty is to verify a biological response prior to taking management action. If data demonstrate that a given lake is biologically healthy and does not experience excess algal growth (*e.g.*, < 20 µg chlorophyll *a*/L in a colored lake) despite having nutrient concentrations within the range of uncertainty, then no nutrient reductions are needed. However, if the lake exhibits excess algal growth or biological impairment within this band of uncertainty, corrective action is warranted. In the absence of chlorophyll *a* data (or other biological response data), decisions should be made with an abundance of caution and assume an impaired condition if nutrients exceed the lower threshold. If chlorophyll *a* data subsequently indicate that the designated use is indeed maintained at nutrient levels within the upper and lower prediction interval, then those



existing levels should be deemed acceptable.

- d. As an example of this “performance based approach” DEP developed criteria ranges based on the 50% prediction intervals depicted in DEP Figures 2 and 3 and using annual average chlorophyll *a* values of 20 µg/L for colored lakes and higher alkalinity clear lakes, and 9 µg/L for clear, low alkalinity Florida lakes, respectively,. The resultant lower and upper thresholds for clear/low conductivity lakes, clear/higher conductivity lakes, and colored lakes, are provided in DEP Table 2.



**DEP Table 2. Total phosphorus and total nitrogen criteria ranges for clear (≤40 PCU) and colored Florida lakes (>40 PCU). The lower and upper thresholds were based on the intersection of chlorophyll *a* response concentrations with the 50% predictions intervals shown in DEP Figures 2 and 3.**

Lake Type	Response (Chl-a µg/L)	Stressor	Lower Threshold	Upper Threshold
Clear and Low Alkalinity (≤ 40 PCU and ≤ 50 mg CaCO <sub>3</sub> /L)	9	TP (mg/L)	0.015	0.043
	9	TN (mg/L)	0.85	1.14
Clear but High Conductivity (≤40 PCU and > 50 mg CaCO <sub>3</sub> /L)	20	TP (mg/L)	0.030	0.087
	20	TN (mg/L)	1.0	1.81
Colored (>40 PCU)	20	TP (mg/L)	0.05	0.157
	20	TN (mg/L)	1.23	2.25

- 4. Figure 6 implicates TP as the causative agent in reducing invertebrate richness, but later, data are presented to show that grazing pressure and % fine sediments appear to be more strongly associated with the decline in taxa. As such, attributing the response to TP would be incorrect (see comment 1a above).
- 5. Using expert opinion (as described on page 18) as the main method to establish criteria is subject to the criticism that panelists were selected to ensure a predestined outcome, and the criteria deemed arbitrary and capricious.



**DEP Figure 2. Regression analyses annual geometric mean chlorophyll a concentrations and annual geometric mean (A) TP and (B) TN concentrations in clear Florida lakes. Note that x-axis and y-axis are both expressed on a log-scale.**



1. **DEP Figure 3. Regression analyses annual geometric mean chlorophyll a concentrations and annual geometric mean (A) TP and (B) TN concentrations in moderately colored (>40-140 PCU) Florida lakes. Note that the x-axis and y-axis are both expressed on a log-scale**

6. Change point analyses can be useful as a line of evidence in a weight of evidence approach or when used to identify potential thresholds for further experimental investigation. However, change point analysis only identifies a change or inflection point in a relationship. It cannot be automatically concluded that these change points equate to a level of designated use impairment or similarly ecologically significant thresholds. Change point analysis does not rule out the possibility that the loss of valued ecological attributes linked to use support actually may occur at lower or higher nutrient levels. Threshold values must be well grounded in ecological theory and clearly linked to attainment of designated use. Any small change detected in an ecosystem should NOT automatically be labeled as an adverse change that interferes with the designated use. The change described by the analysis must also be shown independently to interfere with designated use. For example, in Figure 24, is the change seen at 55 µg/L TP associated with chlorophyll values that interfere with designated use?
7. A discussion on the evaluation of the level of variance explained by a change point (step function) needs to be added, including a consideration of minimal level of explanatory power. In the example presented in Figure 25, the range of the 90<sup>th</sup> percent confidence interval spans an order of magnitude (0.250 to 2.2 mg/L TN). It is unlikely that a relationship exhibiting this level of explanatory power will be useful for the development of protective criteria. It does not provide a clear indication of a level of TN required to maintain an acceptable of species richness.
8. In Figure 13, no demonstration is apparent that TN is the causative agent (see comment 4).
9. A diatom based Trophic State Index must be calibrated against objective measures of human disturbance, and it must be demonstrated that the metrics are linked to designated use. In the example discussed on page 27, the assumption is made that human enrichment of TP was solely responsible for changes in the diatom TSI. In Florida, we have found that diatom metrics more strongly correlate to natural variations in specific conductance and pH than to nutrients. Where there is a wide range of natural variation in nutrients, specific conductance and pH, one would incorrectly attribute changes in the diatom TSI to human disturbance. Also, there is a degree of circular logic in creation of many diatom metrics. For example, diatoms that are more abundant in low nutrient waters are deemed to be "sensitive", and then loss of these "sensitive" diatoms is automatically equated to "impairment". An alternate hypothesis is that the diatoms are simply measuring nutrients, and that nutrients vary naturally. A demonstration should be made that human disturbance has resulted in impaired ecosystem function because of changes in diatoms.

10. In Figures 19, 21, and 25, what is the ecological underpinning that increases in TN or TP results in reduced taxa richness? Just because percent fine sediments and substrate suitability scores co-vary with TN and TP does not mean that nutrients are the causative agents (physical disruption of the habitat is a better explanation). The lack of ecological explanation raises questions concerning the utility of these analyses for developing nutrient criteria.
11. Unless the response shown in Figure 22 was related to the EPA Biological Condition Gradient model (*e.g.*, less than a BCG of 4), developing criteria using this method could be described as arbitrary. EPA should clearly inform States what condition is expected on the BCG model to satisfy the interim and ultimate goals of the Clean Water Act to ensure logic and consistency in criteria development.
12. In Figure 34, the observed versus predicted probability of impairment presupposes that TN is the causative factor, which has not been demonstrated, making these types of analysis unsuitable for criteria development.
13. We agree that both conditional probability and logistic regression analyses can be very useful techniques provided there is a well-defined threshold of use impairment. However, the analysis requires two prior decisions. The first decision requires selection of a threshold that represents use impairment. Secondly, a decision regarding the probability of impairment must be selected. Both these decisions can be regarded as subjective or even arbitrary. Substantially more thought needs to be given to these important decisions, and EPA needs to provide states with additional guidance related to EPA's expectations. This guidance should include a discussion of the required linkage demonstration between biological thresholds (*e.g.*, chlorophyll *a* >20 µg/L) and use support. Our experience suggests that states will face a substantial challenge demonstrating to EPA's satisfaction that a given threshold represents use protection.

We are submitting, as an attachment, a copy of our numeric nutrient criterion technical support document for lakes and streams. This document and its associated appendices are also available at our website (<http://www.dep.state.fl.us/water/wqssp/nutrients>).

Dr. Thomas Armitage

Page 10

September 4, 2009

This technical support document summarizes our use of empirical approaches similar to those described in EPA's draft guidance. We request that the SAB review Florida's Numeric Nutrient Criteria Development Technical Support Document as part of its deliberative process. This document (including the appendices) serves as a practical example in applying many concepts described in "Empirical Approaches for Nutrient Criteria Derivation".

Sincerely,

Daryll Joyner  
Bureau Chief,  
Bureau of Environmental Assessment and Restoration

DJ/kcw

Attachment

**DRAFT**

**Technical Support Document:  
Development of Numeric Nutrient Criteria  
for Florida Lakes and Streams**



Prepared by:

Florida Department of Environmental Protection  
Standards and Assessment Section

June 2009

DRAFT

# Technical Support Document

## Development of Numeric Nutrient Criteria for Florida Lakes and Streams

### Contents

1	Introduction to Nutrient Criteria Development.....	1 -
1.1	Background .....	1 -
1.2	The Need for Nutrient Criteria .....	1 -
1.3	Scope of the Criteria.....	2 -
2	The Science of Stream and Lake Eutrophication.....	3 -
2.1	Eutrophication, Nitrogen and Phosphorus .....	3 -
2.2	Lake Eutrophication .....	4 -
2.3	Stream Eutrophication.....	5 -
2.4	The Influence of Other Environmental Factors on Eutrophication.....	7 -
2.5	References .....	8 -
3	Setting Aquatic Life Use Support Thresholds for the Stream Condition Index and Lake Vegetation Index, with Discussion of the Stream Diatom Index.....	11 -
3.1	Introduction .....	11 -
3.2	Background .....	11 -
3.3	Development of the Stream Condition Index and the Lake Vegetation Index .....	14 -
3.4	Establishing Expectations for Aquatic Life Use – Stream Condition Index:.....	16 -
3.4.1	Application of the Reference Site Approach .....	16 -
3.4.2	Biological Condition Gradient Approach .....	17 -
3.4.3	Evaluation of the Reference Site Approach Coupled with BCG .....	20 -
3.4.4	Setting an SCI Impairment Threshold .....	21 -
3.4.5	Additional Analysis of Rigorously Verified Benchmark Site SCI Data.....	24 -
3.4.6	Evaluation of Benchmark Site Replicate Data: SCI .....	26 -
3.5	Establishing Expectations for Aquatic Life Use – Lake Vegetation Index: .....	29 -

---

3.5.1	LVI Benchmark Site Approach .....	29 -
3.5.2	Evaluation of Replicate Data: LVI .....	30 -
3.5.3	LVI Biological Condition Gradient Approach .....	31 -
3.5.4	Setting a LVI Impairment Threshold .....	33 -
3.5.5	Differences in the Variability in SCI and LVI Scores .....	34 -
3.6	SCI and LVI Conclusions .....	36 -
3.7	Stream Diatom Index Development .....	36 -
3.7.1	Stream Diatom Index Calibration .....	38 -
3.8	References: .....	40 -
4	Derivation of the Numeric Criteria for Nitrate – Nitrite in Florida Clear Streams .....	42 -
4.1	Introduction .....	42 -
4.2	Recent Changes to Spring Ecosystems .....	43 -
4.3	Why Nitrate-Nitrite Criteria? .....	48 -
4.4	Criteria Development Methods .....	51 -
4.5	Laboratory Studies .....	51 -
4.6	Field Surveys .....	52 -
4.7	TMDL Development Activities .....	53 -
4.8	Analysis of Nutrient Gradient Study Rapid Periphyton Data .....	60 -
4.9	Summary and Conclusions .....	60 -
4.10	References .....	61 -
5	Regionalization of Florida’s Numeric Nutrient Criteria for Streams .....	67 -
5.1	Purpose of Developing a Regionalization Scheme .....	67 -
5.2	Development of Ecoregional and Biological Regionalization Schemes for Florida ..	67 -
5.3	Refinement of Regionalization for Nutrient Criteria Development .....	70 -
5.1	References .....	79 -
6	Stressor-Response Analyses for Florida Streams .....	82 -

---

---

6.1	Introduction .....	82 -
6.2	Macroinvertebrate Exploratory Analysis .....	84 -
6.3	Exploratory Analysis of Periphyton Response to Nutrients.....	85 -
6.4	Quantile Regression Analysis of Periphyton Response to Nutrients .....	88 -
6.5	Analysis of Rapid Periphyton Survey Data.....	90 -
6.6	Conclusions .....	96 -
6.7	References .....	96 -
7	Florida’s Nutrient Benchmark Site Distributional Approach for Rivers and Streams .....	98 -
7.1	Introduction .....	98 -
7.2	Extensive Verification Process for Selection of Benchmark Sites .....	99 -
7.2.1	Landscape Development Intensity Index (LDI) score of $\leq 2$ .....	99 -
7.2.2	Screening against the 303(d) List of Impaired Waters .....	104 -
7.2.3	Screening Against the 0.35 mg/L Proposed Nitrate-nitrite Threshold .....	104 -
7.2.4	Verification of Surrounding Land-use by Examining High Resolution Aerial Photographs.....	104 -
7.2.5	Obtaining Input from DEP District Biologists.....	105 -
7.2.6	Field Evaluation Process, Including Watershed Assessment and Biological Appraisal of Benchmark Sites.....	105 -
7.3	Results of Benchmark Screening Process .....	107 -
7.4	Analysis of Nutrient Benchmark Sites Biological Data.....	107 -
7.5	Conclusions for Use of the Benchmark Distribution to Establish Nutrient Criteria-	111 -
7.6	Calculation of Benchmark Derived Nutrient Criteria .....	112 -
7.6.1	Data Handling .....	112 -
7.6.2	Final Dataset Statistics .....	115 -
7.7	References .....	119 -
8	Nutrient Longitudinal Study: Downstream Effects of Nutrients in Selected Florida Rivers/Estuaries .....	120 -
8.1	Introduction .....	120 -

---

---

8.1.1	Project Objectives .....	- 120 -
8.1.2	Project Description.....	- 120 -
8.1.3	Sampling Sites .....	- 121 -
8.2	Sampling Results.....	- 125 -
8.2.1	Water Quality.....	- 125 -
8.2.2	Historical Trends in Nutrient Concentrations .....	- 132 -
8.2.3	Freshwater Biological Sampling Results .....	- 136 -
8.2.4	Biological Health in the Steinhatchee and Waccasassa Estuaries .....	- 139 -
8.3	Conclusions .....	- 144 -
8.4	References .....	- 144 -
9	Basis for the Proposed Lake Chlorophyll <i>a</i> Thresholds in Florida’s Numeric Nutrient Criteria Development.....	- 146 -
9.1	Introduction .....	- 146 -
9.2	History of the Trophic State Index.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
9.3	Other Efforts to Establish Chlorophyll <i>a</i> Thresholds .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
9.3.1	Paleolimnological Studies.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
9.3.2	Expert Opinion.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
9.3.3	Biological Responses .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
9.3.4	User Perceptions .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
9.3.5	Maintaining Existing Conditions .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
9.3.6	Reference Approach.....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
9.4	Investigating Relationships between Cyanobacteria Abundance and Chlorophyll <i>a</i> <b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>	
9.5	Conclusions .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
9.6	References .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
10	Stressor-Response Analyses of Florida Lakes .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
10.1	Introduction .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
10.2	Macrophyte Analyses .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>
10.3	Chlorophyll <i>a</i> Analyses .....	<b>Error! Bookmark not defined.</b>

---

10.3.1 Clear Lakes .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**  
10.3.2 Colored Lakes .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**  
10.4 Criteria Derivation .....**Error! Bookmark not defined.**

DRAFT

## List of Appendices

- 3-A: Summary of development of the Stream Condition Index (SCI)
- 3-B: Summary of development of the Lake Vegetation Index (LVI)
- 3-C: Memo from Leska Fore regarding interval and equivalence tests for the SCI
- 3-D: Site information and taxa lists for stream Benchmark site samples
- 3-E: Site information and taxa lists for SCI BCG workshop samples
- 3-F: Memo from Lester Yaun describing the proportional odds analyses for the SCI and LVI BCG workshops
- 3-G: Site information and taxa lists for lake Benchmark site samples
- 3-H: Benchmark Lake Summaries
- 3-I: Memo from Leska Fore regarding interval and equivalence tests for the LVI
- 3-J: Site information and taxa lists for LVI BCG workshop samples
- 3-K: Site information and taxa lists for Stream Diatom Index BCG workshop samples
- 6-A: Multiple regression analyses of SCI data and nutrient concentrations, by Xufeng Niu
- 6-B: Multiple regression analyses of stream periphyton data and nutrient concentrations, Panhandle Region, by Xufeng Niu
- 6-C: Multiple regression analyses of stream periphyton data and nutrient concentrations, Peninsula Region, by Xufeng Niu
- 6-D: Change Point analysis of stream periphyton data and nutrient concentrations, by Xufeng Niu
- 6-E: Quantile regression analysis of stream periphyton data and nutrient concentrations, Panhandle region, by Xufeng Niu
- 6-F: Quantile regression analysis of stream periphyton data and nutrient concentrations, Peninsula region, by Xufeng Niu
- 6-G: Analysis of rapid periphyton survey data, by Tetra Tech.
- 7-A: Stream Benchmark Summaries
- 7-B: Comparison of LDI methods, by Tetra Tech.
- 8-A: Longitudinal study site photos
- 9-A: Literature review of protective thresholds for Chlorophyll *a*

## Abbreviations Used in this Document

BCG = Biological Condition Gradient	SCI = Stream Condition Index
BPJ = best professional judgment	SDI = Stream Diatom Index
EPA = United States Environmental Protection Agency	SOP = Standard Operating Procedures
F.A.C. = Florida Administrative Code	SSAC = site specific alternative criteria
DEP = (Florida) Department of Environmental Protection	TAC = Technical Advisory Committee
FSI = Florida Springs Initiative	TKN = total Kjeldahl nitrogen
HA = Habitat Assessment	TMDL = Total Maximum Daily Load
HAB =Harmful Algal Bloom	TN = total nitrogen
HDG = Human Disturbance Gradient	TP = total phosphorus
IWR = Impaired Waters Rule	TSI = Trophic State Index
LDI = Landscape Development Intensity Index	USGS = United States Geological Survey
LVI = Lake Vegetation Index	WBID = Water Body Identifier
MDL = method detection limit	WHO = World Health Organization
NO <sub>x</sub> = nitrate+nitrite	
NPDES = National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System	
PCU = platinum cobalt units	
ppb = parts per billion	
RPS = Rapid Periphyton Survey	
SAV = submerged aquatic vegetation	

DRAFT

# 1 Introduction to Nutrient Criteria Development

## 1.1 Background

In response to reports provided by States that nutrients are the leading cause of impairment in lakes and coastal waters and the second leading cause of impairment to rivers and streams, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) published the *National Strategy for Development of Nutrient Criteria* in 1998. That document described the approach that EPA would follow for developing nutrient information and working with States and Tribes to adopt numeric nutrient criteria as part of State water quality standards. Since that time, the State of Florida has conducted an extensive effort to gather and assess the necessary scientific information to develop and adopt numeric nutrient criteria.

This document sets forth the scientific and technical basis for Florida's recommended numeric nutrient criteria. It is envisioned that these criteria, in combination with the related bioassessment tools, will facilitate the assessment of designated use attainment for its waters and to provide a better means to protect state waters from the adverse effects of nutrient over-enrichment.

## 1.2 The Need for Nutrient Criteria

The addition of excess nutrients, often associated with human alterations to watersheds, can negatively impact water body health and interfere with designated uses of waters. Excess nutrients can lead to algal blooms (which in turn may produce noxious tastes and odors in surface water drinking supplies), nuisance aquatic weeds (which can impact recreational activities like swimming and boating), and alteration of the natural community of flora and fauna.

Consistent with Florida's Numeric Nutrient Criteria Development Plan, the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) has developed numeric criteria for causal variables (phosphorus, nitrogen, and nitrate/nitrite) and/or response variables (Stream Condition Index, Lake Vegetation Index, and Chlorophyll *a*). The criteria take into account the hydrologic variability (water body type) and spatial variability (location within Florida) of the nutrient levels that naturally occur in the state's waters, and the variability in ecosystem response to those nutrient concentrations. DEP has performed extensive research and monitoring to evaluate cause/effect relationships between nutrients and valued ecological attributes, and to establish nutrient criteria that ensure that the designated uses of Florida's waters are maintained.

Florida currently uses a narrative nutrient standard to guide the management and protection of its waters. Chapter 62-302.530, Florida Administrative Code (FAC), states that "in no case shall nutrient concentrations of body of water be altered so as to cause an imbalance in natural populations of flora or fauna." The narrative criteria also states that (for all waters of the state) "the discharge of nutrients shall continue to be limited as needed to prevent violations of other standards contained in this chapter [Chapter 62-302, FAC]. Man-induced nutrient enrichment

(total nitrogen or total phosphorus) shall be considered degradation in relation to the provisions of Sections 62-302.300, 62-302.700, and 62-4.242, F.A.C.”

DEP has relied on this narrative for many years because nutrients are unlike any other “pollutant” regulated by the federal Clean Water Act (CWA). Most water quality criteria are based on a toxicity threshold, evidenced by a dose-response relationship, where higher concentrations can be demonstrated to be harmful, and acceptable concentrations can be established at a level below which adverse responses are elicited (usually in laboratory toxicity tests). In contrast, nutrients are not only present naturally in aquatic systems, they are absolutely necessary for the proper functioning of biological communities, and are typically moderated in their expression by many natural factors.

The DEP has been actively working with EPA on the development of numeric nutrient criteria for several years. DEP submitted its initial [DRAFT Numeric Nutrient Criteria Development Plan](#) to EPA Region IV in May 2002, and received [mutual agreement](#) on the Numeric Nutrient Criteria Development Plan from EPA on July 7, 2004. The DEP revised its [plan](#) in September 2007 to more accurately reflect its evolved strategy and technical approach, and DEP received [mutual agreement](#) on the 2007 revisions from EPA on September 28, 2007. On January 14, 2009, EPA formally determined that numeric nutrient criteria should be established on an expedited schedule. On March 3, 2009 DEP submitted its [Current Numeric Nutrient Criteria Development Plan](#) to EPA Region IV. This revised plan reflects DEP approaches and expedited schedule to establish numeric nutrient criteria.

To ensure that Florida’s numeric nutrient criteria are scientifically sound, Florida has been guided throughout the process of establishing them by recommendations from a [Technical Advisory Committee](#) (TAC) composed of technical experts from throughout the state. The TAC has reviewed all technical information collected during the process of establishing the State’s nutrient criteria.

### **1.3 Scope of the Criteria**

There are two types of proposed numeric nutrient criteria set forth in this document – criteria applying to Class I and III freshwater streams and criteria applying to Class I and III freshwater lakes. The stream criteria apply to free-flowing, predominantly fresh surface waters within a defined channel, including rivers, creeks, branches, canals, freshwater sloughs, spring runs, and other similar water bodies.

For the purpose of the proposed Class I and III freshwater lake criteria, a lake shall mean a freshwater water body that is not a stream or other watercourse, which has a minimum of two acres of contiguous open water that is free from emergent vegetation. Aquatic or floating vegetation may be present in these two acres of open water.

## 2 The Science of Stream and Lake Eutrophication

### 2.1 *Eutrophication, Nitrogen and Phosphorus*

Nutrients are fundamentally different from most pollutants in that they are essential to aquatic life and are not inherently harmful or toxic at natural concentrations (Freeman *et al.* 2009). In fact, aquatic organisms cannot build the proteins and nucleic acids of their cellular structure or carry out their basic metabolic processes without the proper concentrations of nitrogen and phosphorus. In contrast, some toxicants, such as pesticides or metals, can be toxic to aquatic life even in barely detectable concentrations (Supplee *et al.* 2008).

Aquatic systems can be classified as either oligotrophic (low in nutrients and productivity), mesotrophic (intermediate in nutrients and productivity), or eutrophic (high in nutrients and productivity). Biologically, oligotrophic systems are generally characterized by low amounts of biomass and high species diversity, while eutrophic systems are generally characterized by high amounts of biomass and lower species diversity. In oligotrophic and mesotrophic systems, macroalgal growth is in balance with grazer biota, and water clarity and dissolved oxygen levels are high and support natural populations of fish, shellfish, and invertebrates (Bricker *et al.* 2007).

Some aquatic ecosystems (particularly lakes and estuaries) may follow a progression, called *natural eutrophication*, in which they evolve from oligotrophic to eutrophic systems, even in the absence of human intervention, generally over a long period of time (i.e., centuries). Nutrients derived from natural inputs, such as leaf litter or soils, stimulate aquatic productivity (algal and aquatic plant growth) over time, and the resulting biological matter can accumulate in sediments. Native bacterial populations decompose the accumulated organic matter in the sediments, which releases the nutrients back into the water column while consuming dissolved oxygen, thus lowering ambient oxygen levels in the aquatic system. Aquatic systems that are following the progression from oligotrophy to eutrophy are generally referred to as mesotrophic (Smith 1977; Wetzel 2001). Underlying geology, the character and size of the watershed, and other natural factors can also determine the trophic status of a water body.

The anthropogenic introduction of additional nutrients and particulate matter from atmospheric deposition, point source discharges, and agricultural and urban nonpoint sources essentially speeds up this natural process. The excess nutrients may cause significant increases in the growth of macrophytes, macroalgae, and/or phytoplankton. The increased plant growth may exceed the capacity of grazer control, resulting in decreased water clarity and dissolved oxygen levels, with associated adverse impacts to natural populations of fish, shellfish and invertebrates (Bricker *et al.* 2007). This accelerated process is generally referred to as *cultural eutrophication*.

Major nutrients required by aquatic organisms include carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen and phosphorus (Wetzel 2001). There has been a significant amount of scientific research concerning which nutrients most often affect the primary productivity in freshwaters, and there is a general consensus that it is typically either nitrogen and/or phosphorus (Supplee *et al.* 2008). Since a particular balance of these nutrients is needed by plants and algae, one nutrient is typically in excess and the other is considered to be limiting. There has been a great deal of

recent scientific debate as to whether the emphasis on nutrient control should be on nitrogen, phosphorus or both (Schindler *et al.* 2008). The emphasis on controlling eutrophication in freshwater lakes has been focused heavily on decreasing inputs of phosphorus, although many studies in lakes and estuaries still conclude that nitrogen must be controlled as well as, or instead of, phosphorus to reduce eutrophication (Schindler *et al.* 2008; Howarth and Marino 2006). However, recent research has indicated that nitrogen may be of equal importance to phosphorus in streams, where nitrogen and phosphorus co-limitation appears to be common (Francoeur 2001) and that controls on both nutrients are necessary for long-term management of eutrophication along the continuum from freshwater to saltwater systems (Pearl 2009).

There are many sources of nitrogen and phosphorus to aquatic systems. Nitrogen is naturally introduced into the atmosphere via the nitrogen cycle, but the global rate at which reactive nitrogen is introduced into the atmosphere by anthropogenic use of fossil fuels and fertilizer production has nearly doubled when compared with the contributions of natural sources alone (Holland *et al.* 2005). Point source discharges (*e.g.*, wastewater treatment facilities) have generally been considered to be conspicuous sources of nutrients, but for most water bodies, nonpoint sources (storm water runoff) of nutrients are now typically of relatively greater importance. This is a result of both improved point source treatment and control (particularly for P) and because of increases in the total magnitude of nonpoint sources (particularly for N) over the past three decades (Howarth *et al.* 2002, FDEP 2008). Nonpoint sources result from agricultural practices (*e.g.*, excess nutrients from fertilization), soil and stream bank erosion, urban development and the associated runoff, loss of wetlands, and the subsequent oxidation of the organic soils (Supplee *et al.* 2008).

## 2.2 **Lake Eutrophication**

The increased productivity resulting from the introduction of excessive levels of nutrients to lake ecosystems can lead to increased growth of phytoplankton, including blue-green algae (cyanobacteria) and nuisance aquatic weeds. Eutrophication is recognized to be one of the important factors contributing to the geographic and temporal expansion of some Harmful Algal Bloom (HAB) species (Gilbert *et al.* 2005). Increased phytoplankton growth increases chlorophyll *a* concentrations, potentially resulting in heavy growths of blue-green algae at the water surface (Pitois *et al.* 2001). This results in the organic content of lake sediments to increase, and the increased microbial degradation of this organic material leads to lowered dissolved oxygen levels, especially in proximity to the lake bottom (Smith 1977; Wetzel 2001). Other effects may include decreased water transparency, changes in water color and odor, shifts in aquatic macrophyte vegetation, and pH increases (Xavier *et al.* 2007; Dokulil and Teubner 2003; Vitousek *et al.* 1997).

In some cases, high concentrations of cyanobacteria may produce substances that are highly toxic to fish, birds and mammals. Dense, harmful blooms of algae can cause human health problems, fish kills, problems for water treatment plants, and generally impair the aesthetics of lake waters.

Subsequently, these changes may result in decreased diversity in benthic macroinvertebrate communities to a community more tolerant of the degraded conditions. Increased phytoplankton

production can also alter the zooplankton community, which in turn can alter the availability of forage fish and thus the health of predatory fish (Carpenter and Kitchell 1988).



Figure 2-1. An oligotrophic lake in Florida.



Figure 2-2. A hyper-eutrophic lake in Florida.

### 2.3 Stream Eutrophication

The first uses of macroinvertebrates as indicators of organic pollution were in streams and rivers in Europe (Kolkwitz and Marsson 1908, 1909). The concept that certain species have differing levels of tolerance to nutrient pollution has been revisited and revised numerous times over the years (Richardson 1929; Cairns and Dickson 1971; Guhl 1987). Concurrent with the developments in flowing systems, Thienemann (1925) made similar observations in lakes, and benthic macroinvertebrates were used as indicators of changes associated with the oligotrophic/eutrophic gradient (Brinkhurst 1974).

As in lakes, the introduction of intermediate levels of nutrients often leads to increases in productivity and an associated increases in certain functional groups (*e.g.*, deposit feeders); however, with continued enrichment there is the eventual disappearance of taxa that are sensitive to organic pollution (Hynes 1960). Figures 2-3 through 2-5 illustrate the transition of a typical freshwater benthic macroinvertebrate community representative of oligotrophic conditions to one typical of mesotrophic conditions, and finally to a depauperate community typical of eutrophic conditions. Recent studies in New York, Wisconsin, and Indiana (Smith *et al.* 2007; Wang *et al.* 2007, Gillespie *et al.* 2008) have refined the linkages between nutrients and macroinvertebrate communities. Smith *et al.* (2007) developed TP and NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> thresholds for oligotrophic, mesotrophic, and eutrophic conditions and established optimal nutrient regimes for 164 macroinvertebrate taxa. Wang *et al.* (2007) found significant correlations between nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations and percent and number of Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, and Trichoptera (EPT), the Hilsenhoff biotic index, and mean tolerance values.

Results of eutrophication can also include an increase in dominance by benthic filamentous algae (*i.e.*, algae attached to the stream bottom substrates, objects sitting on the stream bottom, or detached as floating algal mats). Eutrophication can also increase the magnitude of daily dissolved oxygen and pH oscillations due to the elevated productivity of phytoplankton, benthic algae, aquatic plants. As in lakes, these changes may result in decreased diversity in benthic

macroinvertebrate communities, resulting in communities more tolerant of the degraded conditions. Excessive nutrients can also result in cyanobacteria blooms in streams, which will cause the same array of problems as described in Section 2.2 for lakes.




Figure 2-3. The photo on the left illustrates a diverse array of taxa sensitive to increases in nutrient enrichment (e.g. stoneflies, mayflies, and caddisflies). A typical oligotrophic stream is seen on the right.




Figure 2-4. The photo on the left shows an increase in abundance of taxa typical of intermediate levels of nutrients, typical of a mesotrophic conditions. The photo on the right shows evidence of habitat smothering, qualities often associated with increased runoff and nutrient enrichment.




Figure 2-5. The photo on the left illustrates a depauperate benthic community characteristic of eutrophic conditions. A typical site representing these conditions is seen on the right.

#### 2.4 ***The Influence of Other Environmental Factors on Eutrophication***

Other environmental factors can influence the manifestation of eutrophication in lakes and streams, including, climate, geochemistry, flow rates, hydraulic retention times, water color, presence of herbivores and grazers, and shading. For instance, within the Florida peninsula, variability of lake primary productivity decreases from north to south corresponding to latitudinal gradients in climatic regimes (Beaver and Crisman 1991). In addition, geochemistry factors such as exposure of the limerock to surface waters can lead to naturally-enriched levels of calcium carbonate and increased buffering capacity (Griffith *et al.* 1994). In flowing waters, nutrients will exert more effect under stagnant conditions than during periods when there is significant stream flow. Similarly, in lakes and estuaries, nutrients will exert more effect in systems with a long hydraulic retention time versus systems with a short hydraulic retention time. Finally, the expression of productivity by nutrients can be repressed by an increase in water color or shading due to canopy cover, both of which inhibit light penetration of the water.

Because these factors moderate the expression of nutrients, regional or statewide numeric nutrient criteria must be designed to account for site specific conditions and allow for alternative criteria where warranted (*i.e.*, allow for levels which still fully protect aquatic life).

## 2.5 References

- Carpenter, S.F. and J.F. Kitchell. 1988. Consumer control of lake productivity. *BioScience* 38:764-769.
- Beaver, J. R. and T. L. Crisman. 1991. Temporal variability in algal biomass and primary productivity in Florida lakes relative to latitudinal gradients, organic color and trophic state. *Hydrobiologia*, V. 224, P. 89-97
- Bricker, S., B. Longstaff, W. Dennison, A. Jones, K. Boicourt, C. wicks, and J. Woerner. 2007. Effects of Nutrient Enrichment in the Nation's Estuaries: A Decade of Change. NOAA Coastal Ocean Program Decision Analysis Series No. 26. National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science, Silver Spring, MD.
- Brinkhurst, R.O. 1974. The benthos of lakes. St. Martin's Press, New York.
- Cairns, J., Jr. K.L. Dickson. 1971. A simple method for the biological assessment of the effects of waste discharge on aquatic bottom-dwelling organism. *Journal of the Water Pollution Control Federation* 43:755-772.
- Dokulil, Martin T. and Teubner, Katrin. 2003. Eutrophication and restoration of shallow lakes – the concept of stable equilibria revisited. *Hydrobiologia* V. 506-509, P. 29-35
- FDEP. 2008. Integrated Water Quality Assessment for Florida: 2008 305(b) Report and 303(d) List Update. Division of Environmental Assessment and Restoration. 134 pp.
- Francoeur, S.N. 2001. Meta-analysis of lotic nutrient amendment experiments: Detecting and quantifying subtle responses. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* 20(3):358-368.
- Freeman, Angelina M., E. Conrad Lamon III, Craig A. Stow. 2009. Nutrient criteria for lakes, ponds, and reservoirs: A Bayesian TREED model approach. *Ecological Modelling* V. 220, P. 630-639
- Gillespie, R.B., Smiley, P.C., King, K.W., Huang, C. 2008. Relationships of macroinvertebrate communities with nutrients, pesticides, and physicochemical parameters in channelized headwater streams in Indiana and Ohio. American Society of Limnologists and Oceanographers Summer Meeting. p. 29.
- Glibert, Patricia M., Sybil Seitzinger, Cynthia A. Heil, Joann M. Burkholder, Matthew W. Parrow, Louis A. Codispoti, and Vince Kelly. 2005. The Role of Eutrophication in the Global Proliferation of Harmful Algal Blooms – New Perspectives and New Approaches. *Oceanography*, Vol. 18, No. 2, P. 198-209
- Griffith, G. E., J. M. Omernik, C. M. Rohm, and S. M. Pierson. 1994. *Florida regionalization project*. Corvallis, Oregon: U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Research Laboratory.

- Guhl, W. 1987. Aquatic ecosystem characterization by biotic indices. *Internationale Revue der Gesamten Hydrobiologie* 72:431-455.
- Holland, E. A., B. H. Braswell, and J. Sulzman. 2005. Nitrogen deposition onto the United States and Western Europe: synthesis of observations and models. *Ecological Applications*, V. 15, P. 38-57
- Howarth, Robert W., A. Sharpley, and B. Walker. 2002. Sources of pollution to coastal waters in the United States: Implications for Achieving Coastal Water Quality Goals. *Estuaries*, V. 25, No. 4b, p. 656–676
- Howarth, R. W. and R. Marino. 2006. Nitrogen as the limiting nutrient for eutrophication in coastal marine ecosystems: evolving views over three decades. *Limnology and Oceanography*. V. 51, P. 364-376
- Hynes, H. B. N. 1960. *The biology of polluted waters*. Liverpool Univ. Press. 202 p.
- Kolkwitz, R. M. Marsson. 1908. *Okologie der pflanzlichen Saprobien*. *Berichte der Deutschen Botanischen Gesellschaft* 26A:505-519.
- Kolkwitz, R. M. Marsson. 1909. *Okologie der tierischen Saprobien*. *Beitrage zur Lehre von des biologischen Gewasserbeurteilung*. *Internationale Revue der Gesamten Hydrobiologie und Hydrographie* 2:126-152.
- Paerl, Hans W. 2009. Controlling Eutrophication along the Freshwater-Marine Continuum: Dual Nutrient (N and P) Reductions are Essential. *Estuaries and Coasts*
- Pitois, S., M. H. Jackson, and B. J. B. Wood. 2001. Sources of the Eutrophication Problems Associated with Toxic Algae: An Overview. *Journal of Environmental Health*
- Richardson, R.E. 1929. The bottom fauna of the Middle Illinois River 1913-1925. Its distribution, abundance, valuation and index value in the study of stream pollution. *Bulletin of the Illinois Natural History Survey* 17:387-475.
- Schindler, David W., R. E. Hecky, D. L. Findlay, M. P. Stainton, B. R. Parker, M. J Paterson, K. G. Beary, M. Lyng, and S. E. M. Kasian. 2008. Eutrophication of lakes cannot be controlled by reducing nitrogen input: Results of a 37-year whole-ecosystem experiment. *Proceeding of the National Academy of Science USA*, V. 105, P. 11254-11258
- Smith, A. J., Bode, R.W., Kleppel, G.S. 2007. A nutrient biotic index (NBI) for use with benthic macroinvertebrate communities. *Ecological Indicators* 7:371-386.
- Smith, Robert L. 1977. *Elements of Ecology and Field Biology*. Harper & Row, Publishers, New York, NY
- Suplee, M., V. Watson, A. Varghese, and J. Cleland. 2008. *Scientific and Technical Basis of the Numeric Nutrient Criteria for Montana's Wadeable Streams and Rivers*. Montana Department of Environmental Quality. Helena, MT.

Thienemann, A. 1925. Die Binnengewässer Mitteleuropas. Eine Limnologische Einführung. Die Binnengewässer 1:1-25.

Vitousek, P. M., J. D. Aber, R. W. Howarth, G. E. Likens, P. A. Matson, D. W. Schindler, W. H. Schlesinger, and D. G. Tilman. 1997. Human alteration of the global nitrogen cycle: sources and consequences. *Ecological Applications*, V. 7, P. 737-750

Wang, L., Robertson, D.M., Garrison, P.J. 2007. Linkages between nutrients and assemblages of macroinvertebrates and fish in wadeable streams: Implication to Nutrient Criteria Development. *Environ Manage* 39:194-212.

Wetzel, R.G. 2001. *Limnology: Lake and River Ecosystems*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Academic Press, San Diego. 1006 pp.

Xavier, L., M. Vale and V. M. Vasconcelos. 2007. Eutrophication, phytoplankton dynamics and nutrient removal in two man-made urban lakes (Palacio de Cristal and Serralves), Porto, Portugal. *Lakes & Reservoirs: Research and Management*, V. 12, P. 209-214

### **3 Setting Aquatic Life Use Support Thresholds for the Stream Condition Index and Lake Vegetation Index, with Discussion of the Stream Diatom Index**


#### **3.1 Introduction**

The ability to measure whether a water body's aquatic community meets the objective of the CWA can be critical to informing decisions related to implementation of the State and Federal water quality programs. In particular, the establishment of biological assessment measures within State water quality standards can be very valuable for making use attainment decisions for aquatic life use support, which equates to attainment of the CWA goal regarding biological integrity/health. The critical decision is how to develop a quantitative measure, and where to set the threshold that indicates attainment or non attainment of the designated use, given the complexities of actually measuring biological structure and function.

This section describes the factors necessary to consider when developing a quantitative measure of biological health, and describes the basis for the State's position for establishing the appropriate biologic threshold indicating attainment of the designated use. In turn, these biological thresholds are useful for determining particular nutrient concentrations that may interfere with designated use attainment.

#### **3.2 Background**

The response of biological communities to human point source pollution initially received attention in Florida during the late 1950s. In 1958, Bill Beck, a biologist with the Florida State Board of Health, wrote a series of "Biological Letters" in which he introduced the concept of using invertebrates as biological indicators, especially for demonstrating the effects of excess organic matter on streams and lakes (the saprobity index concept). What became known as "Beck's Biotic Index" was developed by sampling invertebrates at control sites located upstream of point source discharges and observing which sensitive taxa were eliminated at sites downstream of the effluent sources (Beck 1954). Concurrently, there typically was a dramatic increase in abundance of tolerant taxa, such as "bloodworms" (certain species of chironomid midges) as illustrated in Figure 3-1.



**Figure 3-1. Typical macroinvertebrate response to organic loading associated with primary wastewater treatment typical in the 1950s and 1960s.**


In the early 1970s and 1980s, benthic invertebrates were routinely sampled via multi-plate artificial substrate samplers (Hester-Dendys). Hester-Dendy samplers are placed in the receiving waters for 28 days, which is a minimum period of time for colonization by a representative benthic community (Figure 3-2). The Hester-Dendy data were summarized using the Shannon-Weaver diversity index, a biological metric derived from information theory that became a popular method to communicate complicated biological results. The Shannon-Weaver diversity index is based upon a combination of the taxa richness at a site and the evenness of the distribution of abundance of individuals. Low diversity scores represent conditions where a few pollution tolerant organisms are very abundant, to the exclusion of other taxa. This index is specified in the Florida's water quality standards as a measure of biological integrity (Rule 62-302.530, F.A.C.). It generally has been applied by comparing site-specific control sites to nearby test sites.



**Figure 3-2. Photo of Hester-Dendy samplers used for determining the Shannon-Weaver diversity index.**

In 1992, EPA promulgated the concept of “rapid bioassessment,” and Florida embraced the concept for establishing biological criteria (Barbour *et al.* 1996). Regional expectations (generally eco-regions) for biological communities were established by sampling reference sites, determined via a Best Professional Judgment approach. Metrics, defined as measures of biological health that respond in a predictable manner to human disturbance, were calculated from the raw reference site data. A distribution of the reference site metric values was calculated, and scores selected to represent the expectations for that metric from a reference site population. A variety of metrics were then combined into a dimensionless index, by assigning points to individual metrics based on their relative similarity to the reference condition, and summing the points.

To successfully use any biological assessment tool, an understanding of the system's biological components and sources of variability is critical. The biota respond to a wide variety of cumulative factors, both natural and anthropogenic (Figure 3-3). As the organisms integrate these factors over time, a characteristic community structure emerges, with a range of natural variability. Note that Florida biologists have determined that much of the variability at minimally disturbed sites may be explained by random, natural events such as sporadic, unpredictable rain and drought, which in turn are associated with the relative abundance of inundated substrates available for invertebrate colonization. These natural stressors (*e.g.*, flood, drought, natural low substrate diversity, periodic natural low dissolved oxygen, etc.) will affect all sites, even those with minimal disturbance from humans. To determine when human actions are responsible for adverse effects (causing an impaired or imbalanced community) one must reasonably account for these natural factors and assure the biological condition has substantially deviated from the reference range.



**Figure 3-3. Many factors affect biological community composition. To conclude that human factors are primarily responsible for biological degradation, reasonable knowledge of the influence of natural factors is essential.**


The DEP's current Stream Condition Index (SCI) and Lake Vegetation Index (LVI) were built on the 1990s concepts. The present indices have utilized a human disturbance gradient (HDG) approach to identify effective metrics, and thresholds for "impaired" and for "exceptional" conditions were established using a combination of the reference site distribution and the Biological Condition Gradient (BCG) approach. The BCG employs a group of experts to individually review species level data and determine the site's ecological status (see below).

### 3.3 **Development of the Stream Condition Index and the Lake Vegetation Index**

The current Florida Stream Condition Index (SCI) was developed in 2004, and adjustments were made in lab counting procedures to reduce variability of results in 2007. It is a multi-metric index that assesses stream health using the benthic macroinvertebrate community. The DEP expends great efforts to ensure that data are produced with the highest quality, both in the field and in the lab. Samplers and lab technicians follow detailed Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), and additional guidance for sampling and data use is provided through a DEP document entitled, "Sampling and Use of the Stream Condition Index (SCI) for Assessing Flowing Waters: A Primer (DEP-SAS-001/09)". Samplers are only approved to conduct the SCI after passing a rigorous audit with the DEP, and laboratory taxonomists are regularly tested and must maintain >95% identification accuracy.

The SCI is composed of ten metrics, eight of which decrease in response to human disturbance, with two metrics (% very tolerant and % dominant) increasing in response to human disturbance. Based on reference site community similarity, three stream Bioregions were established in which there are slightly different expectations for the metrics based on natural differences: the

Panhandle, the Northeast, and the Peninsula (note that the SCI is not calibrated for Ecoregion 76, the Southern Florida Coastal Plain, where few natural streams exist) (Griffith *et al.* 1994; Figure 3-4). To be scientifically defensible, stream systems being evaluated against the SCI should be morphologically identifiable as streams, so that potential human influences can be discerned (the reference streams should be compared to streams, reference streams should not be compared to a system with lake-like or wetland-like conditions). See Appendix 3-A for a description of the development of the SCI.



**Figure 3-4. Sub-ecoregions of Florida, which were aggregated into 3 bioregions, based on multivariate measures of taxonomic similarity.**

The Lake Vegetation Index (LVI) is a multimetric index of the biological integrity of Florida lake plant communities, based on a rapid field sampling method. It was developed by DEP to help resource managers identify healthy and impaired lakes, and to prioritize restoration efforts. The LVI was developed in 2005 and further validated in 2007, and contains four metrics that were shown to be strongly correlated with a human disturbance gradient. Three metrics (percent native taxa, percent sensitive taxa, and coefficient of conservatism of the dominant taxa) decline with increasing human disturbance, while the percent invasive exotics metric increases. As with the SCI, there are detailed SOPs for LVI sampling and taxonomic quality assurance, and additional guidance in “Sampling and Use of the Lake Vegetation Index (LVI) for Assessing Lake Plant Communities in Florida: A Primer (DEP-SAS-002/09)”. See Appendix 3-B for description of the development of the LVI.

### 3.4 **Establishing Expectations for Aquatic Life Use – Stream Condition Index:**

#### 3.4.1 **Application of the Reference Site Approach**

In 2007, DEP calibrated the SCI using primarily the Biological Condition Gradient approach (secondarily on the reference site approach), resulting in an impairment threshold of 34 and exceptional threshold of 67. Subsequent EPA review resulted in the recommendation that Florida use an examination of the lower distribution of reference sites as the principal line of evidence for establishing aquatic life use support thresholds, in combination with the Biological Condition Gradient approach.

In response to this request, DEP's consultant conducted statistical interval and equivalence tests with SCI data from 55 reference streams (predominantly consisting of the recently verified nutrient benchmark sites with additional data from the Fore *et al.* (2007a) analysis). This analysis was performed to determine the lower bounds of the reference site distribution of SCI scores while balancing type I errors (falsely calling a reference site impaired) and type II errors (failing to detect that a site is truly impaired) (see Appendix 3-C for full description of analysis) (Table 3-1). Appendix 3-D contains complete taxa data for the samples used in this analysis. The examination of the two most recent visits at 55 reference streams showed that the 2.5<sup>th</sup> percentile of reference data was in the range of 35-44 points. The middle of this range was 40 points, which represents an impairment threshold that balances Type I and Type II errors.

When calibrating an impairment threshold for an index, the amount of human disturbance inherent at the reference sites is a major issue. Some states select reference sites based on the "best available condition" (may have substantial disturbance), using a Best Professional Judgment approach. Florida has employed a rigorous reference site selection approach, which objectively demonstrates the "minimally disturbed" (limited human influence) nature of Florida's reference sites. When establishing an impairment threshold using a lower distribution of reference sites, a rigorous reference site selection process provides greatly increased confidence that the reference site population is minimally disturbed, thereby significantly reducing Type II errors (*i.e.*, classifying impaired sites as healthy). This increased confidence also allows for establishing the impairment threshold at a low level of the reference site distribution to minimize Type I errors (classifying healthy sites as impaired).


In the proposed threshold for the SCI, impairment will be determined by the average of two site visits, so the threshold determined from the interval and equivalence tests (40, based on an average of two site visits) is closely aligned with the assessment methods. An impairment threshold of 40 would result in approximately 2.5 % of reference sites (known to be minimally disturbed) to be deemed impaired. DEP believes that this threshold is consistent with the CWA aquatic life use support goal and complies with Florida law.

**Table 3-1. Results of interval and equivalence tests conducted on reference sites with 2 SCI results. Shown are site mean, impairment threshold, and range for threshold values defined at the 2.5<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> percentile of reference sites ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $N = 55$  reference sites with two SCI values for each site). Reference site values from Fore *et al.* (2007a) and comprehensively verified nutrient benchmark sites.**

Impairment threshold (description)	Ref site mean	Impairment threshold (numeric)	Impaired	Undetermined	Reference
2.5 <sup>th</sup> percentile of reference	65	40	<35	35–44	>44
5 <sup>th</sup> percentile of reference	65	44	<39	39–47	>47

### 3.4.2 Biological Condition Gradient Approach

The U.S. EPA has outlined a tiered system of aquatic life use designation, along a Biological Condition Gradient (BCG), that illustrates how ecological attributes change in response to increasing levels of human disturbance. The BCG is a conceptual model that assigns the relative health of aquatic communities into one of six categories, from natural to severely changed (Figure 3-5). It is based in fundamental ecological principles and has been extensively verified by aquatic biologists throughout the U.S.



**Figure 3-5. The Biological Condition Gradient Model (from Davies and Jackson 2006).**

The BCG utilizes biological attributes of aquatic systems that predictably respond to increasing pollution and human disturbance. While these attributes are measurable, some are not routinely quantified in monitoring programs (*e.g.*, rate measurements such as productivity), but may be inferred via the community composition data (*e.g.*, abundance of taxa indicative of organic enrichment).

The biological attributes considered in the BCG are:

1. Historically documented, sensitive, long-lived or regionally endemic taxa
2. Sensitive and rare taxa
3. Sensitive but ubiquitous taxa
4. Taxa of intermediate tolerance
5. Tolerant taxa
6. Non-native taxa
7. Organism condition
8. Ecosystem functions
9. Spatial and temporal extent of detrimental effects
10. Ecosystem connectance

The gradient represented by the BCG has been divided into six levels (tiers) of condition that were defined via a consensus process (Davies and Jackson 2006) using experienced aquatic biologists from across the U.S., including Florida representatives. The six tiers are:


- 1) Native structural, functional, and taxonomic integrity is preserved; ecosystem function is preserved within range of natural variability;
- 2) Virtually all native taxa are maintained with some changes in biomass and/or abundance; ecosystem functions are fully maintained within range of natural variability;
- 3) Some changes in structure due to loss of some rare native taxa; shifts in relative abundance of taxa but sensitive–ubiquitous taxa are common and abundant; ecosystem functions are fully maintained through redundant attributes of the system;
- 4) Moderate changes in structure due to replacement of some sensitive–ubiquitous taxa by more tolerant taxa, but reproducing populations of some sensitive taxa are maintained; overall balanced distribution of all expected major groups; ecosystem functions largely maintained through redundant attributes;
- 5) Sensitive taxa are markedly diminished; conspicuously unbalanced distribution of major groups from that expected; organism condition shows signs of physiological stress; system function shows reduced complexity and redundancy; increased buildup or export of unused materials; and
- 6) Extreme changes in structure; wholesale changes in taxonomic composition; extreme alterations from normal densities and distributions; organism conditioning is often poor; ecosystem functions are severely altered.

The six levels described above are used to correlate biological index scores with biological condition, as part of calibrating the index. Once the correlation is well established, a determination is made as to which biological condition represents attainment of the CWA goal

according to paragraph 101(a)(2) related to aquatic life use support, “protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife.”

During the development of the BCG model at National BCG Workshops, each of the break-out groups independently reported that the ecological characteristics conceptually described by tiers 1–4 corresponded to how they interpret attainment of the CWA’s interim goal for protection and propagation of aquatic life (Davies and Jackson 2006). As described in subsequent sections, two panels of Florida experts (one for the SCI, and one for the Lake Vegetation Index) independently arrived at the same conclusions as did the national expert groups. Additionally, the State of Maine has adopted a policy that aquatic communities conceptually aligned with BCG Category 4 meets the CWA’s interim goal for protection and propagation of aquatic life, and this was subsequently approved by EPA.

DEP conducted a BCG exercise to calibrate scores for the SCI. Twenty-two experts examined taxa lists from 30 stream sites throughout Florida, 10 in each Ecoregion, that spanned the range of SCI scores (Appendix 3-E). Without any knowledge of the SCI scores, they reviewed the data and assigned each macroinvertebrate community a BCG score from 1 to 6, where 1 represents natural or native condition and 6 represents a condition severely altered in structure and function from a natural condition. Experts independently assigned a BCG score to each site, and then were able to discuss their scores and rationale, and could opt to change their scores based on arguments from other participants. At the conclusion of the workshop, DEP regressed the mean BCG score given to each stream against the SCI score for that site (Figure 3-6).



**Figure 3-6. Regression line with 90% confidence interval showing the relationship between the mean BCG score and SCI score. The median BCG value the expert group considered meeting a healthy, well balanced community corresponded to a BCG tier of 4 and an SCI score of 34 (this subsequently changed based upon a proportional odds analysis). The “exceptional” threshold was established at 64 and above, based on the score associated with a BCG 2.**

The experts were also asked to identify the lowest BCG level that still provided for the propagation and maintenance a healthy, well-balanced aquatic community (the interim goal of the Clean Water Act) and the BCG category (and higher) represented exceptional conditions (the

ultimate goal of the Clean Water Act, also referred to as “biological integrity”). All of 22 participants thought category 2 SCI scores should be considered exceptional, which corresponds to an SCI score of 64. Eleven of 22 participants thought SCI scores associated with category 5 should be impaired, while nine participants thought category 4 represented an impaired ecological condition and two experts thought that category 4 was the lowest acceptable condition.

### 3.4.3 Evaluation of the Reference Site Approach Coupled with BCG

As part of the SCI calibration process, experts were asked to classify sites into one of the BCG categories based solely on the taxonomic data (not the SCI scores). The relationship between the mean BCG score for each site and the SCI score was then determined using a least squares regression model (Figure 3-6). Experts were also asked to identify the BCG value they considered meeting a healthy, well balanced community. In reaction to this question, the mean expert response corresponded to a BCG tier of 4. Based on the relationship between the BCG and the SCI, this corresponded to an SCI score of 34.

EPA noted the variability in the expert responses within each BCG category, and conducted an additional analysis of the BCG results to further define an acceptable aquatic life use threshold. EPA calculated a proportional odds logistic regression model (Guisan and Harrell, 2000) to better describe the relationship between a continuous variable (SCI scores) and a categorical variable (BCG categories). See Appendix 3-F for a full report of this analysis by Lester Yaun of EPA. This model is based on the cumulative probability of a site being assigned to a given tier (e.g., Tier 3) or to any higher quality tier (Tiers 1 and 2). Thus, five parallel models are fit, modeling the probability of assignment to Tiers 5 to 1, Tiers 4 to 1, Tiers 3 to 1, Tiers 2 to 1, and Tier 1 only. Once these five models are fit, the probability of assignment to any single tier can be extracted from the model results.

In Figure 3-7, the mean predictions of the proportional odds logistic regression models are plotted as solid lines. Lines are color-coded and labeled by different tiers, and each line can be interpreted as the proportion of experts that assigned samples with the indicated SCI value to a particular tier. For example, approximately 90% of experts assigned a sample with the lowest SCI score to Tier 6 (brown line), while the remaining 10% of experts assigned the sample to Tier 5 (purple line). In the figure, the solid circles represent the actual expert assignments recorded from the workshop for each SCI value. The size of the circle is proportional to the number of experts that assigned a sample to a particular tier, and the circles are color-coded by tier. There is some variability among experts in their assignment of BCG scores, but there is a clear central tendency at any given SCI score.




Figure 3-7. BCG tier assignments modeled with a proportional odds logistic regression.

EPA recommended that the threshold be set at an SCI score where there is an approximately equally low probability of assignment to Tier 5 (*i.e.*, impaired) and a low probability of assignment to Tier 2 (*i.e.*, reference conditions). The resultant threshold of 42 balances the probability of mistakenly assessing a degraded site as meeting aquatic life use goals with the probability of mistakenly assessing a reference site as impaired. This score is consistent with the impairment threshold of 40 as determined by the reference site approach.


#### 3.4.4 Setting and Evaluating an SCI Impairment Threshold

Weighing these multiple lines of evidence, the DEP has determined that a SCI score of 40 indicates that the designated use is being met, and a score of 39 is impaired. This impairment threshold is supported by the distribution of benchmark site scores and corresponds with a BCG category midway between Tiers 3 and 4. The proportional odds analysis provides assurance that stream communities deemed exceptional (BCG category 2) will not be considered impaired at a threshold of 40. The DEP evaluated recent data for the individual metrics of the SCI to determine what range of macroinvertebrate attributes would be considered healthy using this impairment threshold. Since DEP conducted the SCI calibration in 2007, the State has collected approximately 700 additional SCI samples from a variety of sites, including minimally disturbed reference sites (for nutrient criteria development), sites located along a nutrient gradient, and randomly chosen sites for the status and trends network. Based upon the relationship described in Figure 3-6, the SCI values from this data set were subdivided into increments representing half-step BCG Categories, and the individual metrics associated with each half step interval were averaged. The metric data bracketing BCG category 2 were averaged to demonstrate metric values associated with exceptional conditions. Data within the range of the impairment threshold of 40 were also averaged to provide an example of the stream condition that Florida's SCI biological criterion will protect (Table 3-2). Note that although there are moderate differences between metrics associated with exceptional biological communities and those near the range of the impairment threshold, the attributes associated with communities near the threshold are still

considered to be indicative of healthy, well balanced communities by the majority of the Florida stream experts who participated in the BCG exercise.

**Table 3-2. Average values for metrics at an SCI score equivalent to a Biological Condition Gradient of category 2, and average values for metrics near the SCI score of impairment. Data was based upon the DEP's data collection effort since 2007 (total N = 696 SCI samples).**

SCI Metric	Metric Average at BCG 2 (Exceptional)	Metric Average Near Impairment Threshold
Number of Total Taxa	32.0	28.7
Number of Clinger Taxa	5.6	3.3
Number of Long Lived Taxa	1.5	1.1
Percent Suspension Feeders and Filterers	22.0	15.8
Number of Sensitive Taxa	5.4	2.7
Percent Tanytarsini	13.3	9.5
Percent Very Tolerant	6.5	14.3
Number of Ephemeroptera Taxa	3.5	2.3
Number of Trichoptera Taxa	4.5	2.6
Percent Dominant	22.6	26.2
Number of Sites in Average	134	64



**Figure 3-8. Relationship between the SCI (2004 data) and the Human Disturbance Gradient (from Fore *et al.*, 2007a).**

During the development of the Stream Condition Index, the DEP established a clear relationship between the SCI and the Human Disturbance Gradient (Figure 3-8). Note the highest range of actual SCI scores were observed in the two groups of lowest human disturbance gradient sites (left most boxes in Figure 3-8). This wide range needs to be considered when establishing the threshold to limit the probability of falsely identifying unimpacted sites as not attaining an aquatic life use. However, the range of scores in the higher human disturbance gradient sites (expected to result in a BCG category 5-6) are low. Therefore, the risk is low (virtually non-existent for the SCI) in applying the biological assessment tool and falsely identifying impacted sites as attaining an aquatic life use.

This variability of the SCI scores within a given range of the human disturbance gradient is generally caused by changes in biological community relative to natural occurrences (droughts, floods, etc.), as well as the inherent limitation of the biological assessment methods.

Biological field observations can be influenced by natural conditions that may have occurred prior to the sampling event. Changes in hydrology, particularly high and low flow events that result in differential water velocities and habitat availability, will affect the biological community in a stream, potentially resulting in lower scores. The variability in low human disturbance gradient sites also reflects the fact that the biological communities in these systems are able to rapidly recover because the habitat and health of the stream is conducive to recovery. In high HDG sites, natural hydrologic events (along with human disturbance) can affect the biology, but any recovery is slow due to the human disturbance impacts and lack of recruitment of organisms from surrounding areas. Therefore, in high human disturbance gradient sites, SCI scores always tend to be low, and the range of values remains small.

The other factor leading to higher variability in scores for low disturbance sites relates to sampling issues. DEP's SCI collection methods follow EPA rapid bioassessment guidance, but do not result in a complete ecological census of all taxa present at a site. Instead, they provide a practical level of effort that can be used to distinguish healthy from impaired sites. Therefore, the sampling method is inherently conducted in a manner that may result in a high range of results where taxa are present and a low range of results where taxa are diminished. In other words, when taking a sample, it is possible to *fail to catch taxa that exist* in the water body, but it is not possible to *catch taxa that do not exist* in the water body.

In statistical terms, undisturbed sites have a higher probability of Type I error (falsely concluding that the site was impaired). Because the variability in the SCIs decreases as human disturbance increases, the disturbed sites fundamentally are subject to much lower occurrence rate of a Type II error (falsely concluding that the site was unimpaired) when compared to undisturbed sites. From a theoretical standpoint, since the error of the method used to collect representative taxa can only fail to capture and count taxa, and only 2 of the 10 metrics result in an improved SCI when specific organisms are missed, it is likely that Type I errors are of greater concern (occur more frequently) with this methodology.

#### **3.4.5 Additional Analysis of Rigorously Verified Benchmark Site SCI Data**


The Stream Condition Index (SCI) scores from an early version of DEP's field-verified nutrient benchmark site dataset were also evaluated to determine the range and variability of biological condition found in Florida's minimally-disturbed sites (note that the list of sites presented here is slightly different than the final list of benchmark sites from which nutrient criteria were derived, as described in Chapter 7). Theoretically, these sites would be expected to have an SCI score reflective of a BCG category 2. In reality, as indicated previously, there is more variability in the actual scores. This benchmark dataset consists of sites determined by experienced DEP scientists to be influenced by only very low levels of anthropogenic stressors. Additional selection criteria included a Landscape Development Intensity index score of <2, absence of upstream point source discharges, examination of aerial photographs, direct observations of watershed land use and hydrologic conditions during site visits, and habitat assessment (see benchmark site discussion, Chapter 7). The dataset included 69 sampling events at a total of 53 stations across the state (16 stations were sampled twice during the verification process).

The mean SCI score from all 69 sampling events was 65.1, and the median was 65. The standard deviation from the mean was 15.8, and the range of scores was 80, spanning from 100 to 20. The one nutrient benchmark site that scored below the impairment threshold of 40 occurred at a Steinhatchee River site (at CR 357), which scored 20 on the SCI on August 12, 2008, after an extended period of low flow conditions (see Figure 3-11). However, when this site was subsequently re-sampled on January 14, 2009 (after a period of higher flows), it scored a 53. Note that another minimally disturbed Steinhatchee River site located approximately 8 miles downstream with slightly more flow (at Canal Road), scored 41 and 62 on the SCI during the same time period. Based on direct observations, the flow regime was the dominant factor for the variability in the SCI scores. DEP SOPs provide clear guidance regarding appropriate conditions during which to sample, including a minimum velocity of 0.05 m/sec. Although the

Steinhatchee at CR 357 achieved this velocity and was not dry prior to sampling, the sluggish flows and less than optimal inundated habitat appeared to be responsible for the low SCI scores, not any human disturbance (the upstream basin is almost 100% forested). This is an example of the type of hydrologic conditions that occur randomly throughout the state, prompting DEP, in an attempt to minimize Type I errors, to select the lower 2.5% distribution of reference sites as the impairment threshold.



**Figure 3-9. Steinhatchee River at CR 357, August 2008.**



**Figure 3-10. Steinhatchee River at CR 357, January 2009.**




Figure 3-11. USGS hydrograph for the Steinhatchee River during the period of the two sampling events. The mean discharge rate for the Steinhatchee River near Cross City was 7.4 ft<sup>3</sup>/sec on 8/12/2008 and 23 ft<sup>3</sup>/sec on 1/14/2009.

### 3.4.6 Evaluation of Benchmark Site Replicate Data: SCI

The 16 benchmark sites with replicate data were analyzed to determine the variability that can occur in SCI scores at the same sampling location. The benchmark sites with replicate data are shown below in Table 3-3. The mean difference in SCI scores from this sub-dataset was 17.1, with a standard deviation of 13.3. The median difference was 18. The largest difference in scores occurred at the St. Marys River at SR 2, which received SCI scores of 50 in June 2008, and 100 in November 2008.

Table 3-3. Minimally disturbed stream benchmark sites with replicate SCI data.


Benchmark Site	Date sampled	SCI score	Difference between replicates
Blackwater River at Highway 4	3/26/2007	56	14
	7/9/2008	70	
Cypress Branch	11/3/2008	66	3
	12/16/2008	63	

Escambia River at Highway 4	9/19/2007	57	6
	7/10/2008	51	
Manatee River at 64	5/16/2007	81	17
	12/17/2008	64	
Orange Creek upstream of Highway 21	2/26/2007	74	8
	5/1/2008	82	
Peters Creek at CR 315	5/28/2008	92	19
	10/28/2008	73	
Sopchoppy River	6/19/2008	41	23
	11/13/2008	64	
Steinhatchee River at CR 357	8/12/2008	20	33
	1/14/2009	53	
Steinhatchee River at Canal Road	8/12/2008	41	21
	1/14/2009	62	
St. Marys River at SR 2	6/18/2008	50	50
	11/12/2008	100	
Telogia Creek at CR 1641	6/10/2008	78	20
	11/20/2008	58	
Suwannee River at CR 6	10/10/2006	53	2
	12/12/2007	51	
Withlacoochee River above River Dr.	5/7/2008	44	2
	10/8/2008	42	
Withlacoochee River at Stokes Ferry	2/20/2007	68	21
	11/7/2007	47	
Yellow River	5/15/2007	54	25

at Hwy 2	7/9/2008	79	
Yon Creek at SR 12	6/13/2008	81	7
	11/20/2008	74	

Differences in SCI scores between replicates can be caused by the natural variability of environmental factors such as recent hydrologic conditions resulting in changes in habitat availability, as well variability associated with laboratory sub-sampling. Based on field observations, it was natural factors (water level and flow), not changes in human disturbance, that were the main drivers of the differences in SCI scores between replicates taken at different times. Note that sampling visits to the sites with duplicate data were not separated by more than fourteen months (most were sampled less than six months apart).

Another indication that human disturbance was not associated with this variability was that no correlation was found between Landscape Development Intensity Index score and SCI score within the entire benchmark site dataset (Figure 3-12). This is in contrast to the strong relationship between the LDI and SCI scores across the entire range of human disturbance (in Figure 3-8, the LDI is a prominent influence on the HDG).



**Figure 3-12. Minimally disturbed benchmark sites plotted against the Landscape Development Intensity Index (LDI). Direct observations indicated that the LDI reflected current land use and disturbance conditions.**

### 3.5 **Establishing Expectations for Aquatic Life Use – Lake Vegetation Index:**

In 2007, DEP calibrated the LVI using primarily the Biological Condition Gradient approach. Subsequent EPA review resulted in the recommendation that Florida use an examination of the lower distribution of reference sites as the principal line of evidence for establishing aquatic life use support thresholds, in combination with the Biological Condition Gradient approach.

#### 3.5.1 LVI Benchmark Site Approach

DEP evaluated data from existing sites to identify benchmark lakes that could be used to determine the appropriate threshold for the LVI. To be considered benchmark, the watershed-scale landscape development intensity (LDI) index score had to be less than 3, and the LDI of the 100-m buffer zone around the lake had to be less than 2. DEP biologists also examined aerial photos and conducted an onsite watershed survey to ensure that there were no adverse human influences not detected by the LDI, and performed a whole-lake habitat assessment. Candidate benchmark lakes were excluded if they had a history of adverse human activity (*e.g.*, aquatic plant control, artificial fertilization) or current human activity (*e.g.*, adjacent citrus groves). Appendix 3-G contains site information and taxa lists for the 30 benchmark lakes used in this analysis, and Appendix 3-H contains maps, photos, and a summary of data for each of the verified benchmark lakes.

DEP's consultant conducted statistical interval and equivalence tests with LVI data from these 30 reference lakes to determine the lower bounds of the reference site distribution. As was described for the SCI, the intent was to identify a threshold for the LVI that balanced type I (falsely calling a reference site impaired) and type II (failing to detect that a site is truly impaired) errors (see Appendix 3-C for statistical description and Appendix 3-I for full analysis). The analysis of the most recent LVIs at all 30 sites showed that the 2.5<sup>th</sup> percentile of reference data was in the range of 33-48 points, while the analysis of the two most recent visits at 15 lakes showed that the 2.5<sup>th</sup> percentile of reference data was in the range of 31-53 points (Table 3-4). The middle of this range was 46 points, representing an impairment threshold that balances Type I and Type II errors. In the proposed water quality threshold for the LVI, impairment will be determined by two site visits, so the threshold of 46 is closely aligned with the assessment methods. An impairment threshold of 46 would limit the percentage of reference sites that will be deemed impaired to 2.5%.

**Table 3-4. Results of interval and equivalence tests conducted on reference sites with 2 SCI results. Shown are site mean, impairment threshold, and range for threshold values defined at the 2.5th and 5th percentile of reference sites ( $p < 0.05$ ;  $N = 15$  reference sites with two LVI values for each site).**

Impairment threshold (description)	Impairment threshold (numeric)	Impaired	Undetermined	Reference
2.5 <sup>th</sup> percentile of reference	46	<31	31–53	>53
5 <sup>th</sup> percentile of reference	50	<37	37–57	>57

### 3.5.2 Evaluation of Replicate Data: LVI

The 15 benchmark sites with replicate data were analyzed to determine the variability that can occur in SCI scores at the same sampling location (Table 3-5). The mean difference in LVI scores from this sub-dataset was 8.2, with a standard deviation of 8.3. The median difference was 4.3.

**Table 3-5. Minimally disturbed benchmark lake sites with replicate LVI data.**

Station	Date	LVI	Range
Blue Cypress Lake	6/14/2007	60.25	1.5
	10/1/2008	58.75	
Gore Lake	9/17/2003	66.11	4.3
	11/13/2006	61.82	
Lake Annie	11/3/2005	77.83	14.9
	10/8/2008	92.75	
Lake Ashby	6/7/2005	45.14	3.1
	11/3/2005	42.03	
Lake Harney	10/19/2005	36.93	29.8
	7/23/2008	66.75	
Lake Norris	10/8/2003	63.03	10.0
	10/29/2008	73	
Lake Palestine	10/11/2005	94.25	3.5
	11/8/2006	90.72	
Merial Lake	6/14/2005	77.52	5.2
	10/26/2005	82.74	
Ocean Pond	10/11/2005	90.44	3.6
	11/1/2006	86.89	
Otter Lake	10/13/2005	69.73	3.1
	10/17/2006	72.84	

Rattlesnake Lake	11/10/2005	82.07	11.9
	10/31/2006	70.21	
Russell Lake	9/30/2003	68.9	5.1
	10/2/2008	74	
Sellers Lake	10/26/2005	78.53	3.2
	10/18/2006	81.71	
Swift Creek Pond	10/11/2005	89.78	22.0
	7/21/2008	67.75	
Wildcat Lake	10/25/2005	92.37	2.3
	10/17/2006	90.10	

### 3.5.3 LVI Biological Condition Gradient Approach

In a process analogous to that for the SCI BCG calibration, 20 Florida plant ecologists, botanists, and field lake managers, all with at least five years of experience, were involved in BCG calibration of the LVI. The experts examined taxa lists from 30 lakes throughout Florida that spanned the range of LVI scores (see Appendix 3-J for site information and taxa lists). Without any knowledge of the LVI scores, they reviewed the plant data and assigned each plant community a BCG score from 1 to 6, where 1 represents natural or native condition and 6 represents a condition severely altered in structure and function from a natural condition. Experts independently assigned a BCG score to each lake, and then were able to discuss their scores and rationale, and could opt to change their scores based on arguments from other participants. At the conclusion of the workshop, DEP regressed the mean BCG score given to each lake against the LVI score for that lake (Figure 3-13).

The experts were also asked to identify the lowest BCG level that still provided for the propagation and maintenance a healthy, well-balanced aquatic community (the interim goal of the Clean Water Act) and the BCG category (and higher) represented exceptional conditions (the ultimate goal of the Clean Water Act, also referred to as “biological integrity”). Thirteen of 19 participants thought category 2 LVI scores should be considered exceptional and one expert did not provide an opinion. Twelve of 20 participants thought LVI scores associated with category 5 should be impaired, while 5 participants thought category 4 represented an impaired ecological condition (see Table 3-6 for summary statistics). Although DEP originally proposed that the LVI impairment threshold be established at the BCG line of 4.6 (Fore *et al.* 2007b), DEP decided, in conjunction with EPA, to establish the LVI impairment threshold based primarily on the benchmark distribution. This analysis suggests that scores of 45 and below should represent impairment, and scores of 78 and above should represent exceptional.




Figure 3-13. The Lake Vegetation Index regressed against the Biological Condition Gradient scores developed “blindly” by a panel of lake experts. These data reflect updated LVI calculations from the 2007 calibration exercise; Fore *et al.* (2007b) contains a previous analysis of these data. The median BCG value the expert group considered meeting a healthy, well balanced community corresponded to a BCG tier of 4 and an LVI score of 45. The “exceptional” threshold was established at 78 and above, based on the score associated with a BCG 2.

Table 3-6. Biological Condition Gradient (BCG) workshop participants’ judgment of which BCG categories should be considered exceptional and impaired for the LVI.

	Exceptional	Impaired
Mean	2	4.6
Median	2	5
Range	1-3	3-6

Results from the LVI BCG workshop were also analyzed with a proportional odds logistic regression model (Guisan and Harrell 2000) to describe the relationship between a continuous variable (LVI scores) and a categorical variable (BCG categories). See Appendix 3-F for a full report of this analysis by Lester Yuan of EPA. This model is based on the cumulative probability of site being assigned to a given tier (*e.g.*, Tier 3) or to any higher quality tier (Tiers 1 and 2). Thus, five parallel models are fit, modeling the probability of assignment to Tiers 5 to 1, Tiers 4 to 1, Tiers 3 to 1, Tiers 2 to 1, and Tier 1 only. Once these five models are fit, the probability of assignment to any single tier can be extracted from the model results.




Figure 3-14. BCG tier assignments based on the Lake Vegetation Index.

The mean predictions of a proportional odds logistic regression models are shown in Figure 3-14. Lines are color-coded and labeled by different tiers, and each line can be interpreted as the proportion of experts that assigned samples with the indicated LVI value to a particular tier. For example, approximately 45% of experts assigned a sample with the lowest LVI score to Tier 6 (brown line), while the remaining 55% of experts assigned the sample to Tier 5 (purple line). In the figure, the solid circles represent the actual expert assignments recorded from the workshop for each LVI value. The size of the circle is proportional to the number of experts that assigned a sample to a particular tier, and the circles are color-coded by tier. There is some variability among experts in their assignment of BCG scores, but there is a clear central tendency at any given LVI score.

The LVI range of approximately 50-58 corresponds with both a low probability of assignment to Tier 5 (*i.e.*, impaired) and a low probability of assignment to Tier 2 (*i.e.*, reference conditions). Thresholds selected in this range of values balance the probability of mistakenly assessing a degraded site as meeting aquatic life use goals with the probability of mistakenly assessing a reference site as impaired.

### 3.5.4 Setting and Evaluating a LVI Impairment Threshold

Weighing these multiple lines of evidence, the DEP has determined that an LVI score of 46 indicates that the designated use is being met, and a score of 45 is impaired. This impairment threshold is supported by the lower distribution of verified reference site scores. The proportional odds analysis provides assurance that plant communities deemed exceptional (BCG category 2) will not be considered impaired at a threshold of 45.

The DEP evaluated recent data for the individual metrics of the LVI to determine what range of plant attributes would be considered healthy by this impairment threshold. This analysis includes 244 LVI samples collected since 2007 from a variety of sites, including sites located along a nutrient gradient and randomly chosen sites for the status network. Based upon the relationship described in Figure 3-13, the LVI values from this data set were subdivided into increments representing half-step BCG Categories, and the individual metrics associated with each half step interval were averaged. The metric data bracketing BCG category 2 were averaged to demonstrate metric values associated with exceptional conditions. Data within the range of the impairment threshold of 46 were also averaged to provide an example of the plant community condition that Florida's LVI biological criterion will protect (Table 3-6). Note that although there are moderate differences between metrics associated with exceptional biological communities and those near the range of the impairment threshold, the attributes associated with communities near the threshold are still considered to be indicative of healthy, well balanced communities by the majority of the Florida lake experts who participated in the BCG exercise.


**Table 3- 6. Average values for metrics at an LVI score equivalent to a Biological Condition Gradient of category 2, and average values for metrics near the LVI score of impairment, associated with DEP's data collection effort since 2007, consisting of 244 LVI samples).**

<b>LVI Metric</b>	<b>Metric Average at BCG 2 (Exceptional)</b>	<b>Metric Average Near Impairment Threshold</b>
Dominant C of C	5.3	3.7
Percent Sensitive Taxa	21.0	7.4
Percent Invasive Taxa	3.9	14.5
Percent Native Taxa	92.4	78.6
Total Taxa	15.5	19.9
Number of Lakes for Average	27	39

### 3.5.5 Differences in the Variability in SCI and LVI Scores

The range of LVI scores within each HDG category do not exhibit the same pattern seen with the SCI (Figure 3-15). DEP believes that this is predominantly due to three main factors:

- Lakes are hydrologically less dynamic than streams, meaning there is considerably less magnitude associated in water level fluctuations in response to rain events. This translates into a reduction of this natural source of stress to lake plants. The organisms collected with the SCI are “rheophyllic”, meaning they require some level of water velocity to maintain a healthy community. During droughts and stagnant flow events, this natural stressor in streams is a highly influential factor, potentially resulting in undisturbed sites to fail. During floods, the SCI method is not capable of capturing organisms lower than approximately 0.5 m in the water column, requiring postponement of sampling until conditions are appropriate. Additionally, high flood velocities could result in “catastrophic drift” to the stream invertebrates, meaning they are scoured from substrates and less likely to be collected, potentially also resulting in reduced SCI scores. Lake plants are much more resilient in coping with the natural water level fluctuations.



**Figure 3-15. Lake Vegetation Index scores vs. the Human Disturbance Gradient.**

- The LVI sampling and analysis method is more effective in collecting the true taxonomic composition of the system, estimated at 80-95% of the “actual” taxa present. This means taxa are less frequently overlooked during collection and a more representative “true” taxonomic list is generated. For example, the LVI frodus sampling device allows collection of plants deep under water, so they may be collected during short term mild high water events.
- The LVI method, since it is based on visual field identification, can assess a much larger surface area (25% of the entire lake), compare to the SCI, which requires laboratory microscopy, and occurs in a 100 m section.


Because of pattern and variability of the LVI response to the HDG, the Type I and Type II errors are more equally balanced using this methodology.

### 3.6 SCI and LVI Conclusions

The DEP, in consultation with EPA, has used two lines of evidence to set thresholds for exceptional and impaired aquatic life conditions for both the Stream Condition Index and the Lake Vegetation Index. The primary method for establishing the impairment thresholds involved an examination of the lower distribution of minimally disturbed, rigorously verified reference site scores. The second approach included an examination of the results of expert opinion elicited through Biological Condition Gradient (BCG) workshops, primarily for the exceptional thresholds, and as a second line of evidence for the impairment thresholds. For the SCI, the exceptional threshold is a score of 64 and above, while scores below 40 are considered impaired. For the LVI, the exceptional threshold is a score of 78 and above, while scores below 46 are considered impaired.

### 3.7 Stream Diatom Index Development

In a process similar to that described for the SCI and LVI, DEP has been developing a periphyton assessment tool, the Stream Diatom Index (SDI) using a combination of the Human Disturbance Gradient (HDG) and Biological Condition Gradient (BCG) approaches. Unfortunately, the diatoms appear to be very strongly influenced by pH (as well as conductivity and color), which confounds the relationship between periphyton community response to human disturbance, including nutrient enrichment effects. Figure 3-15 describes the relationship between the Landscape Development Intensity Index (LDI) and pH. Note that in the minimally disturbed condition ( $LDI < 2$ ), there is a wide range of pH, from about 4 to 8 SU. However, as the systems experience more human disturbance, the pH tends to be above 6.5 SU, so that when the LDI value is higher than 4, it is unlikely that a site will have a pH below 6.5 SU.



**Figure 3-16. LDI and pH are strongly related for Stream Diatom Index development sites. The blue line indicated pH of 6.5, at which sites were divided for SDI development.**




Figure 3-17. There are strong relationships between the Stream Diatom Index and pH throughout various categories of human disturbance.





Figure 3-18. Relationship between the Stream Diatom Index and the Human Disturbance Gradient in low pH sites (< 6.5 SU). Note lack of strong association.



**Figure 3-19. Relationship between the Stream Diatom Index (SDI) and the Human Disturbance Gradient (HDG) in high pH sites ( $\geq 6.5$  SU). Note lack of strong association.**

Based upon a Non-metric Multidimensional Scaling (NMS) analysis and the relationship between LDI and pH (Figure 3-16), Florida streams were divided into two pH categories,  $< 6.5$  SU and  $> 6.5$  SU, for development of the SDI. The SDI does not appear to clearly or predictably respond to objective measures of human disturbance (Figures 3-18 and 3-19), currently making it an unreliable tool for assessing adverse human effects on stream systems. This fact is extremely significant when considering the results from the BCG Workshop described below, and suggests that the expert group may actually be assessing the diatom response to factors other than human disturbance, potentially pH/conductivity, likely related to their lack of experience with Florida's unique and variable background water quality conditions.

### 3.7.1 Stream Diatom Index Calibration

The BCG calibration process was also used for the SDI, with 15 nationally recognized periphyton experts involved in calibration workshop. The correlation between the expert's average BCG ranking with low pH SDI scores is shown in Figure 3-20, and the correlation between the expert's average BCG ranking with high pH SDI scores is shown in Figure 3-21. Site information and taxa lists for samples evaluated in the SDI BCG workshop are in Appendix 3-J. Unlike previous BCG exercises, where two questions were asked of the expert group (the questions distinguished the CWA interim goal from ultimate biological integrity goal), the periphyton expert group was asked only a single question, which was developed by an EPA Headquarters and EPA Region IV committee:

*"In your opinion as an aquatic scientist, where specifically along the gradient would you see a point where critical changes lead to a loss of a balanced natural population of flora and fauna?"*

The average initial response to this question was Category 3.5. After discussion, the final average BCG score for this question was 3.1 (Table 3-7). However, establishing an impairment threshold near category 3 would result in 73% (51 out of 70) of the previously described minimally disturbed nutrient benchmark site samples to be deemed impaired (an unacceptable Type I error).

While the correlations between the BCG ranking and the SDI scores is statistically significant, the fact that there is no significant relationship between the BCG and human disturbance indicate the SDI should not be used as a bioassessment tool. The periphyton community appears to respond more strongly to pH and conductivity than to independent measures of human disturbance, and DEP has much additional work before the periphyton index can be used as a reliable bioassessment tool.




Figure 3-20. Relationship between the Stream Diatom Index and Biological Condition Gradient in low pH sites ( $\text{pH} < 6.5 \text{ SU}$ ) as determined by an expert panel.




Figure 3-21. Relationship between the Stream Diatom Index and Biological Condition Gradient in high pH sites ( $\text{pH} \geq 6.5 \text{ SU}$ ) as determined by an expert panel.

**Table 3-7. Nationally recognized periphyton expert responses to the question, “In your opinion as an aquatic scientist, where specifically along the gradient would you see a point where critical changes lead to a loss of a balanced natural population of flora and fauna?”**

BCG Category	Initial Votes	Final Votes
Between 0/1	0	0
Between 1/2	0	0
Between 2/3	6	7
Between 3/4	3	7
Between 4/5	6	1
Between 5/6	0	0

### 3.8 **References:**

- Barbour M. T., Gerritsen J., G. E. Griffith, R. Frydenborg, E. McCarron, J. S. White, and M. L. Bastian. 1996. A framework for biological criteria for Florida streams using benthic macroinvertebrates. *Journal of the North American Benthological Society* 15:185-211.
- Beck, W. M. 1954. Studies in stream pollution biology. I. A simplified ecological classification of organisms. *Quarterly Journal of the Florida Academy of Sciences* 17(4):212-227.
- Davies, S.P. and S.K. Jackson. 2006. The biological condition gradient: a descriptive model for interpreting change in aquatic systems. *Ecological Applications* 16(4): 1251-1266.
- Fore, L.S, R.B. Frydenborg, D. Miller, T. Frick, D. Whiting, J. Espy, and L. Wolfe. 2007a. *Development and Testing of Biomonitoring Tools for Macroinvertebrates in Florida Streams*. Florida Dept. Environmental Protection. 110 pp.
- Fore, L.S., R. Frydenborg, N. Wellendorf, J. Espy, T. Frick, D. Whiting, J. Jackson, and J. Patronis. 2007b. *Assessing the Biological Condition of Florida’s Lakes: Development of the Lake Vegetation Index (LVI)*. Report to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. 106 pp. [ftp://ftp.dep.state.fl.us/pub/labs/assessment/sopdoc/lvi\\_final07.pdf](ftp://ftp.dep.state.fl.us/pub/labs/assessment/sopdoc/lvi_final07.pdf)
- Griffith, G. E., J. M. Omernik, C. M. Rohm, and S. M. Pierson. 1994. *Florida regionalization project*. Corvallis, Oregon: U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Research Laboratory.
- Guisan, A. and F. E. Harrell. 2000. Ordinal response regression models in ecology. *Journal of Vegetation Science* 11:617 – 626.

DRAFT

## 4 Derivation of the Numeric Criteria for Nitrate – Nitrite in Springs and Clear Florida Streams

### 4.1 Introduction

Springs and their associated spring runs are a unique class of aquatic ecosystem, highly treasured for their biological, economic, aesthetic, and recreational value. Since their principal water source is groundwater, most springs have water that is extremely transparent, and rich with dissolved ions due to prolonged contact with subterranean limestone. Globally, the largest number of springs (approximately 600 – 700) occur in Florida. Springs are often classified based on their flow rate, which ranges from more than 2.8 m<sup>3</sup>/sec (first magnitude) to less than 0.47 L/sec (eighth magnitude). Many of the larger spring ecosystems in Florida have likely been in existence since the end of the last major ice age, approximately 15,000 to 30,000 years (Martin 1966; Munch *et al.* 2006). During this period of time, plant and animal communities have evolved to become highly adapted to the unique water quality and conditions found in the springs. The productivity of the diverse assemblage of aquatic flora and fauna is primarily determined by light availability and secondarily affected by the availability of macro and micro nutrients and by the ambient groundwater temperature.

Springs also represent an important resource for human utilization, both by indigenous peoples (as supported by archeological evidence) and by present day Floridians and tourists, who utilize them for a variety of recreational purposes (Scott *et al.* 2002). People are interested in and fascinated by the intrinsic aesthetics of clear, cool water vigorously emanating from underground. A number of the spring boil areas have been modified to facilitate swimming, recreation, and even “health spas.” Currently, all of the largest springs in Florida, whether privately or publicly owned, are managed as recreational parks, which, in turn, attract a large number of visitors and generate many millions of dollars in revenue on an annual basis. Correspondingly, many springs have suffered declines (generally) in their condition (*e.g.*, up-rooting of vegetation, bank erosion, litter, etc.) due to visitation by ever increasing numbers of people.

Other more serious factors with the potential to permanently alter Florida’s spring ecosystems have been increasingly recognized over the last two decades. The two most significant anthropogenic factors that have been linked with adverse changes in spring ecosystems are:

- 1) Pollution of groundwater, principally with nitrate-nitrogen, resulting from human land use changes, cultural practices, and general population growth; and
- 2) The simultaneous reduction in groundwater supply through consumptive human withdrawals.

Human influences, in the form of nonpoint source pollution, are one of the most critical issues affecting Florida’s springs. Nutrients (predominantly nitrogen) associated with urban and agricultural activities (including fertilization and waste disposal), seep through soils and are transported to springs by way of underground pathways. Under natural conditions, nutrients are essential to the growth of native plants and wildlife. However, when in excess, nutrients can be

harmful to the environment, leading to eutrophication and potentially allowing periphyton (algae) and invasive plant species to displace native plants, which results in an ecological imbalance. Problematic growths of nuisance algae and noxious plants result in reduced habitat and food sources for native wildlife, excess organic carbon production, accelerated decomposition, and lowered substrate quality, all of which affect the overall health and aesthetics of Florida's springs.


## 4.2 Recent Changes to Spring Ecosystems

Prior to wide-scale development of Florida springs and their watersheds, native submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV), primarily *Sagittaria kurziana* and *Vallisneria americana*, dominated the underwater regions near most spring boils (*i.e.*, the limestone vent where the majority of aquifer water is discharged to the surface, sometimes in a turbulent manner). Evidence indicates that macroalgae likely occurred naturally in Florida springs, but not in the excessive abundance commonly observed today. Stevenson *et al.* (2004) found that the majority of the Florida springs studied had nuisance growths of algae, primarily *Vaucheria* and *Lyngbya wollei*. *Vaucheria* has been reported in spring seeps in areas around the world with very limited human activity, but typically not in great abundance. Additionally, historic records of *Lyngbya wollei* exist from Silver Spring (Pinowska *et al.* 2007a), but prior to the last 20-30 years, there were no records of nuisance *Lyngbya* growth.

Within the past 20-30 years, however, anecdotal observations at several springs suggest that nuisance algae species have proliferated, and are now out-competing and replacing SAV. As benthic algal mats accumulate, they kill beneficial SAV through direct smothering or indirectly via shading (Dennison and Abal 1999; Doyle and Smart 1998). Once the native SAV is displaced, other non-native taxa such as *Hydrilla verticillata* (hydrilla) can re-colonize bare substrates, leading to other biological and ecological changes. For example, springs have become increasingly inhospitable to certain fish, snails, crayfish, turtles, and other animals that depend on the spring habitat. The loss of the native SAV, as well as the increased dominance of nuisance filamentous algae results in community metabolism changes and disappearance of higher order animals. This chain of events reflects the significant adverse structural and functional changes that have occurred in spring ecosystems.

Numerous biological studies have documented excessive algal growth at many major springs. In some of the more extreme examples, such as Silver Springs and Weeki Wachee Springs, algal mat accumulations have become several feet thick. The thick benthic algal mats are detrimental to aquatic life and cause significant problems for recreational use. The profuse growth of macroalgae has been linked to increased nutrient levels in the springs (Florida Springs Task Force 2000). In a recent survey of 60 first- and second-magnitude springs in Florida, the most commonly observed algal taxa were filamentous mat-forming cyanobacteria of the genus *Lyngbya*, and the xanthophyte, *Vaucheria* (Stevenson *et al.* 2004; Figure 4-1). When algal cells senesce and die, they cause localized depletion of oxygen and the release of ammonia and hydrogen sulfide, which can further degrade water quality (Joint Nature Conservation Committee 2004). In general, the spread of macroalgae in Florida has resulted in reductions in fish and crab harvests, lost tourism, and removal costs (O'Neil and Dennison 2005; Bonn and Bell 2003). *Lyngbya wollei* proliferation is especially problematic, since more than 70 biologically active

compounds have been isolated from this species, many of which are toxic and/or carcinogenic to humans and can therefore inhibit the recreational use of the resource (Osborne *et al.* 2001). *Lyngbya* are a source of lyngbyatoxin and aplysiatoxin which produce a condition known as “swimmer’s itch” (Mynderse *et al.* 1977; Cardellina *et al.* 1979). *Lyngbya wollei* can produce a variety of paralytic shellfish poisons (*e.g.*, saxitoxin) and other toxins capable of producing dermatitis in humans (Carmichael *et al.* 1997; Onodera *et al.* 1997; Teneva *et al.* 2003; Stewart *et al.* 2006) and deaths in domestic and wild animals that consume algal mats (Edwards *et al.* 1992; Gugger *et al.* 2005; Hamill 2001; Saker *et al.* 1999; Falconer 1999).



**Figure 4-1. *Lyngbya wollei* (A) and *Vaucheria* (B). Insets show photomicrographs of the algae. Larger pictures show masses growing on spring bottom. Taken from Stevenson (2007).**

It is hypothesized that the shift from SAV to blue-green algae in Florida springs is being driven by land-use change in springsheds, specifically increased loading of dissolved nutrients, especially nitrate, and organic matter into the Floridian aquifer system from agriculture and urbanization. For example, in Ichetucknee Springs, mean annual nitrate concentration increased from 0.35 mg/L in 1975 to 0.70 mg/L in 2001 (Scott *et al.* 2004). During that period, anecdotal observations indicate that some areas in the river, including reaches below Blue Hole and Mission springs, became dominated by *Lyngbya*.

Detailed study of two spring ecosystems, Silver Springs and the Rock Creek/Wekiva Spring complex, suggests that there is evidence for ecosystem scale effects of nitrate enrichment. Using a subsidy stress theory to explain the decline in gross primary production (GPP), it is suggested that increases in nitrate act to increase productivity for a time, but then act as a stress to depress productivity above a certain threshold (Knight and Notestein 2008). One study presents compelling evidence for a decrease in overall productivity in Silver Springs from values measured in a 1950 study as compared to today (Knight and Notestein 2008). This declining ecosystem productivity documented at Silver Springs was highly correlated with increasing nitrate nitrogen concentrations during the 50-year period of available data. Declining spring flows, increased shading by riparian trees, and altered fish populations were also observed to be

correlated with declining ecosystem production at Silver Springs and could offer alternate or cumulative explanations of the observed ecosystem changes.

The second study conducted in the Wekiva River and Rock Springs Run also found an inverse correlation between nutrient (total nitrogen and total phosphorus) concentrations and ecosystem metabolism. These spring run ecosystems exhibited other significant environmental stresses caused by humans, including decreases in discharge, intensive exotic plant management efforts, and disturbance due to recreational activities. Studies of whole ecosystem responses to nutrients that would result in direct evidence that increased nutrient levels alone could result in decreased ecosystem productivity and/or photosynthetic efficiency were not available (Knight and Notestein 2008).

In addition to increased nitrate concentrations, there are numerous other biotic and abiotic factors that have also changed in some, but not all, springs. These changes include increased recreational use, decreased water output, decreased dissolved oxygen (O<sub>2</sub>) concentrations in spring discharge, increased need for aquatic weed control, greater abundance of invasive species, and increased salinities. By themselves or in combination, these factors may either accentuate or mask the effects of nutrients in specific spring systems, and may help explain the observed variations in response to increasing nitrate levels observed in Florida's springs over the last several decades. For example, it is believed that aquatic plant control techniques (*e.g.*, herbicide applications or mechanical harvesters) that are used to suppress excessive growth of non-native plants have the potential to serve as severe disturbances that can further promote succession towards algal dominated spring ecosystems.

The specific mechanisms and interactions between nitrate-nitrite enrichment and these other confounding factors which cause the observed changes in Florida springs are not fully understood. However, due to the obvious degradation of other aquatic habitats worldwide as a result of increased nutrient loading, there is justifiable concern for potential negative consequences in Florida spring systems. The potential consequences of nutrient enrichment in springs include an increase in opportunistic primary producers, increased organic matter deposition, greater number of nuisance algae species and algal biomass, decreased plant and animal productivity and diversity, reduced water quality, and not insignificantly, a reduction of the aesthetics these ecosystems have long provided (see Figures 4-2 and 4-3).




Figure 4-2. Change in biota and increase in algae at Weeki Wachee Spring, Hernando County. Pictures of mermaids and underwater hunter in the Weeki Wachee show in the past when no benthic macroalgae are visible (1951 & 1954) and during the last 7 years when macroalgae (*Lyngbya wollei*) are abundant (2001 & 2003). Taken from Stevenson (2007).




**Figure 4-3. Change in biota and increase in algae at Weeki Wachee Spring, Hernando County, 1950s (top photo) and 2001 (bottom photo) (credits: Florida Archives; Agnieszka Pinowska).**

### 4.3 **Why Nitrate-Nitrite Criteria?**

Nitrogen is one of the essential elements for plant life, and nitrate is a form of nitrogen that is readily utilized by aquatic plants and algae. However, nitrate in excess can lead to the development of nuisance aquatic plant problems (Rabalais 2002, Chapter 4). As a result of human land use changes, cultural practices, and general population growth, there has been an increase in the level of pollutants, especially nitrate, in groundwater over the last several decades.

Since there is no geologic store of nitrogen, all of the nitrogen emerging in spring vents originates from that deposited on the land surface. Because there are generally limited biogeochemical mechanisms or processes to retain or remove nitrate once it has been introduced into the ground water below the root zone, it is transported through the groundwater largely as a conservative solute. Consequently, a significant portion of the nitrate introduced at the land surface, especially when in excess of biological demand, finds its way into groundwater and ultimately into the spring system.


Historically, natural background nitrate concentrations in spring discharges are thought to have been 0.05 mg/L or less (Maddox *et al.* 1992), which is sufficiently low to restrict growth of native algae and vegetation under natural conditions. Increasing human populations have altered the global nitrogen cycle and other biogeochemical cycles through land use changes, fertilizer use, fossil fuel combustion and other pathways. Population increases and land use changes resulted in nutrient enrichment. Florida's karst region has experienced unprecedented population growth and changes in land use over the past several decades, with a consequential transfer of nutrients to the relatively unprotected groundwater. Katz *et al.* (1999) utilized isotopic analyses to show that substantial portions of nitrate nitrogen found in the Upper Floridan Aquifer and in spring discharges are derived from anthropogenic activities such as fertilizer application for agriculture and residential uses, livestock waste, and human waste. Figure 4-4 shows the changes in nitrate concentration in Weeki Wachee Spring discharge as related to the population increase in Hernando County, Florida. The spring nitrate concentrations follow a pattern very similar to the population curve with a 10 to 15 year lag. The lag period between changes on the land surface and the subsequent effect on spring discharges is expected since aging measurements of water emerging from springs suggest that on average, it has spent between 10 and 30 years in the subsurface. However, these studies have also shown that a significant portion of water (30-70%) has residence times less than 4 years and that the relative age contributions varying significantly between springs, depending on the characteristics of the springshed.



**Figure 4-4. Changes in nitrate concentration in Weeki Wachee Spring discharge and population of Hernando County, Florida. Note: that nitrate concentrations follow a pattern very similar to the population curve with a 10 to 15 year lag.**

Of 125 spring vents sampled by the Florida Geological Survey in 2001-2002, 52 (42%) had nitrate concentrations exceeding 0.50 mg/L and 30 (24%) had concentrations greater than 1.0 mg/L (Scott *et al.* 2004). Therefore, over 40% of the springs sampled had at least a ten-fold increase in nitrate concentrations above background and approximately one quarter of them demonstrated at least a 20-fold increase. Similarly, a recent evaluation of water quality in 13 first-magnitude springs shows that mean nitrate-nitrite levels have increased from 0.05 mg/L to 0.9 mg/L between 1970 and 2002 (Scott *et al.* 2004; Figure 4-5). Overall, data suggests that nitrate-nitrite concentrations in many spring discharges have increased from 10 to 350 fold over the past 50 years, with the level of increase closely correlated with the anthropogenic activity and land-use changes within the springshed.

As a result of the increased nitrate-nitrite levels in groundwater and spring discharges, downstream nitrate-nitrite loads are also increasing rapidly in many watersheds. For example, nitrate-nitrite concentrations of several springs in the Suwannee River Basin have increased in the last 40 years from less than 0.1 mg/L to more than 5 mg/L (Hornsby and Ceryak 1999, cited in Katz *et al.* 1999) with the nitrate-enriched spring discharge resulting in a two to three-fold increase in the level of nitrate exported to the Gulf by the Suwannee River. Consequently, the Suwannee Sound has experienced phytoplankton blooms in excess of 11  $\mu\text{g/L}$  of chlorophyll *a*, resulting in its placement on the list of verified Impaired Waters.



**Figure 4-5. Increased nitrate concentrations in discharges from 13 selected first-magnitude springs (Alexander, Chassahowitzka Main, Fanning, Ichetucknee Main, Jackson Blue, Madison Blue, Manatee, Rainbow Group composite, Silver Main, Silver Glen, Volusia Blue, Wakulla, and Wacissa #2 Springs) between the 1970s and the early 2000s. Taken from Scott *et al.* 2004.**

As nitrate-nitrite concentrations have increased during the past 20 to 50 years, many Florida springs have concurrently undergone a number of adverse environmental and biological changes as described previously. There is a general consensus in the scientific community that nitrate is an important factor leading to the observed changes in spring ecosystems and their associated biological communities. Nitrogen, particularly nitrate-nitrite, appears to be the most problematic nutrient problem in Florida's karst region.

There are four primary reasons for greater concern about nitrate-nitrite compared to phosphorus. First, increases in nitrate-nitrite concentrations are nearly omnipresent in areas where anthropogenic loading to the land's surface has occurred. Second, once in the ground water, denitrification is negligible and nitrate-nitrite appears to be transported as a conservative solute. Third, although Florida's geology is naturally rich in phosphorus, there does not appear to be a trend of increasing phosphorus concentrations in spring discharges. While nitrate-nitrite concentrations have increased significantly in most spring discharges, phosphorus concentrations have remained relatively constant over the past 50 years. Fourth, since springs are naturally rich in phosphorus, the majority of Florida springs are likely to have been historically nitrogen limited (Inglett *et al.* 2008, Knight and Notestein 2008). In their historical natural state, most Florida springs contain high levels of bioavailable soluble reactive phosphorus levels of between 30-60 ppb, which has been shown to be sufficient to support the observed growth of algae and aquatic plants.

Since nitrate-nitrite has been linked to many of the observed detrimental impacts in spring systems, there is an immediate need to reduce nitrate-nitrite concentrations in spring vents and in up-gradient groundwater. To restore and preserve springs, activities in springsheds that

contribute to the transfer of nitrogen to the groundwater must be properly managed to achieve acceptable levels. Due to the relatively long lag times between activities on the land's surface and the resulting effect on the spring discharge, it will likely be several years before the effects of nitrate control measures will be seen. The first step in the process is to develop a numeric nitrate-nitrite criterion for spring systems that will be protective of this unique resource. Additionally, a nitrate-nitrite criterion will help identify systems at risk of degradation from excessive nitrate pollution, as well as those where detrimental changes have already occurred and restoration is needed. DEP's derivation of such a nitrate criterion is discussed below.

#### 4.4 **Criteria Development Methods**

DEP has worked to derive response-based thresholds that will definitively link nutrient thresholds to biological and environmental risk. DEP has utilized multiple lines of evidence taken from the results of different types of research, as well as empirical data available from various monitoring programs to develop nitrate criteria for springs, which ultimately were applied to all clear streams (< 40 PCU). The information that was evaluated include:

- Results from laboratory dosing studies conducted at various scales;
- *In situ* algal monitoring;
- Real-world surveys of biological communities and nutrient levels in Florida springs; and
- Data regarding nitrate concentrations found in minimally disturbed reference streams.

Similar to the methods being used to establish numeric nutrient criteria for lakes and streams, DEP has utilized multiple lines of evidence taken from the results of different types of research as well as empirical data available from various monitoring programs to develop nitrate criteria for clear streams, including springs. This information and its use in deriving the recommended nitrate criteria for springs are discussed in greater detail below.

#### 4.5 **Laboratory Studies**

The results of laboratory experiments have provided much valuable information about the response of algae (particularly algal growth response) to increasing nutrient concentrations under specific highly controlled conditions. However, experimental systems usually do not include all the complexities and ecological processes that affect the response to nutrients in natural water bodies. The limitations of the small-scale experimental platform must be taken into account when applying the results to natural full-scale systems.

Nutrient amendment bioassay work was conducted by Cowell and Dawes (2004) to determine the nitrate concentration required to achieve a reduction in biomass of *Lyngbya wollei*, a nuisance blue-green benthic algal species that dominates many spring systems due to elevated nitrate concentrations. Using *Lyngbya* cultures incubated in a series of nitrate amendments, they found that both the biomass and growth rates were low in treatment groups with nitrate concentration at or below 300 µg/L, while the growth rates and biomass were significantly higher in treatments with nitrate concentrations at or greater than 600 µg/L (Cowell and Dawes

2004). In addition, the experiment also showed that the biomass and growth rate in treatment groups with nitrate concentrations from 70 to 300  $\mu\text{g N/L}$  were similar, suggesting that further reduction of nitrate concentration below the 300  $\mu\text{g/L}$  level would probably not achieve significant additional reductions of *L. wollei* abundance and growth. They concluded that a nitrate concentration of 300  $\mu\text{g/L}$  should be sufficient to control *L. wollei* growth.

Similarly, Stevenson, *et al.* (2007) found that growth of small *L. wollei* mats in nitrate dosed raceways approached maximum levels at nitrate concentrations above 518 to 546  $\mu\text{g N/L}$ . In similar studies using *Vaucheria*, growth rates were low at nitrate concentrations below 69  $\mu\text{g N/L}$  and increased substantially from 69 to 644  $\mu\text{g N/L}$ . Further growth rate increases at nitrate concentrations above 644  $\mu\text{g N/L}$  were minimal.

In smaller scale microcentrifuge tube microcosm conducted to evaluate the growth response of individual macroalgal filaments to precise levels of nitrate dosing at high phosphate levels, Stevenson *et al.* (2007) found that the growth rate of *Lyngbya wollei* was minimized at nitrate concentrations below 34  $\mu\text{g N/L}$ . Growth rates increased substantially at nitrate concentrations from 34 to 230  $\mu\text{g N/L}$  and approached maximum levels at concentrations above 230  $\mu\text{g N/L}$ . For unexplained reasons, the growth rate of *Vaucheria* did not respond to nitrate additions in the microcentrifuge tube microcosm experiments.

As discussed by Stevenson *et al.* (2007), the difference in results between the raceway and microcentrifuge tube experiments were likely related to the differences in scale of the experiments. In the microcentrifuge tube microcosms using individual macroalgal filaments, very accurate control of nutrient levels was possible. In the larger scale raceways using small algal mats, substantial nutrient depletion was possible and could not be accounted for, which resulted in a higher estimate of regulating nitrate concentrations. Recognizing the limitations of the laboratory experiments, Stevenson *et al.* (2007) recommended using the  $\text{ED}_{90}$  (nitrate-nitrite concentration that produces 90 percent of the maximum growth) determined from the highly controlled microcentrifuge tube experiments as a preliminary nitrate criterion that could be refined using additional information. The best estimate for the nitrate  $\text{ED}_{90}$  s determined from the laboratory experiments was 230  $\mu\text{g N/L}$  for *Lyngbya wollei* and 261  $\mu\text{g N/L}$  for *Vaucheria sp.*

## 4.6 Field Surveys

Numerous surveys of macroalgae and nutrients in springs have been conducted to demonstrate the cause-effect relationships between elevated nutrient concentrations and macroalgal growth, and to evaluate the nitrogen or phosphorus concentrations associated with proliferations of macroalgae. The benefit of using results of field surveys for nutrient criteria development is the direct applicability of observed nutrient concentrations and biological responses.

In a survey of Florida springs, macroalgae were found at 59 of the 60 sampled sites, and an average of 50% of the spring bottoms were covered by macroalgae with the thickness of macroalgal mats commonly being 0.5 m or more and as thick as 2 m in one spring boil (Stevenson *et al.* 2004). *Lyngbya wollei* and *Vaucheria spp.* were the two most common taxa of

macroalgae that occurred in extensive growths in the studied springs, however 23 different macroalgal taxa were observed in the spring survey.


During the surveys, the abundance of *Vaucheria spp.* within the springs was found to be positively related to nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations. Non-linear models of *Vaucheria* percent cover and thickness along the TN and nitrate gradients explained substantially more variation than a linear model, with a clear threshold in *Vaucheria* response at 0.454 mg N/L as nitrate (*i.e.*, 0.591 mg N/L as TN), respectively. Excessive growth and cover of *Vaucheria* were found at sites with nitrate concentrations at or above the 0.454 mg/L threshold with *Vaucheria* abundance being significantly less at sites with lower nitrate levels (Stevenson *et al.* 2007). This excessive growth of macroalgae is considered to constitute an imbalance of the natural biological communities, and not in compliance with Florida's narrative nutrient criteria. Therefore, to provide for a margin of safety, a protective numeric nitrate criterion would need to be below the observed 0.454 mg N/L nitrate *Vaucheria* threshold.

#### 4.7 TMDL Development Activities


The Wekiva River and Rock Springs Run are spring-influenced systems that are on the State's impaired waters list due to evidence of an imbalance in aquatic flora characterized by excessive algal growth and lower ecosystem metabolic activities. There was also evidence that the impairment of the Wekiva River and Rock Springs Run was caused by elevated nitrate and phosphorus levels. The mean nitrate concentration in the Wekiva River and Rock Springs Run ranged between 60-70 µg N/L, which is significantly higher than levels found at nearby minimally disturbed reference sites with similar characteristics (Juniper and Alexander Springs). Additionally, the Wekiva and Rock Springs nitrate-nitrite levels were above the threshold nitrate concentration identified by Stevenson *et al.* (2004) to be associated with nuisance *Vaucheria* growth (Gao 2008).

During the development of the TMDL for these waterbodies, protective nutrient concentration targets were derived using periphyton and water quality data collected from the Suwannee River and two tributaries, the Withlacoochee River and Santa Fe River (Hornsby *et al.* 2000). These data were considered applicable to the Wekiva River and Rock Springs Run since the Suwannee River is heavily influenced by spring inflow, and in the absence of anthropogenic inputs, the algal communities would be expected to be generally similar in composition to those in the Wekiva River and Rock Springs Run.

An evaluation of periphytometer data collected during the period from 1990 through 1998 from 13 sites along the Suwannee River showed positive correlations for both periphyton biomass versus nitrate concentration and cell density versus nitrate concentration. The functional relationships of cell density versus nitrate concentration and periphyton biomass (represented as ash free dry weight, or AFDW) versus nitrate concentration are shown in Figures 4-6 and 4-7, respectively. Data presented in these figures represent long-term average biomass, cell densities, and nitrate concentrations at the stations across the Suwannee River system (Niu and Gao 2007).



**Figure 4-6. Relationship between mean nitrate concentration and mean periphyton cell density from sampling sites on the Suwannee, Santa Fe, and Withlacoochee Rivers (Mattson *et al.* 2006).**



**Figure 4-7. Relationship between mean nitrate concentration and mean periphyton biomass from sampling sites on the Suwannee, Santa Fe, and Withlacoochee Rivers (Mattson *et al.* 2006).**

As can be seen for both cell density and biomass, periphyton abundance significantly increased when nitrate concentration increased above approximately 350  $\mu\text{g/L}$ . The data were further evaluated using a change point analysis to better define the nitrate concentration that may significantly impact the periphyton biomass and cell density. The change point analysis fits a step function through observed data by examining the probability of each data point as the change point. For both periphyton cell density and periphyton biomass, change point step functions were shown to be the best model among the models tested, which supports the use of change point analysis.


For the relationship between cell density and nitrate concentration, the change point step function identified two populations of sites. The first set of sites had cell densities near 163,000 cells/cm<sup>2</sup> ( $P = 0.009$ ), which was considered as the baseline condition under which no significant nitrate impact was detected. The second group of sites had cell densities near 616,000 cells/cm<sup>2</sup> ( $P = 0.0001$ ), which was significantly elevated above the baseline condition. The change-point analyses also indicated that the critical increase in mean algal cell density occurred as the mean nitrate concentration increased from 286 to 401  $\mu\text{g N/L}$  (Niu and Gao 2007). This suggests that to prevent the periphyton cell density from increasing to the higher level, the nitrate concentration a target concentration should be established below 401  $\mu\text{g/L}$ .

Similarly, the change point analysis of the relationship between periphyton biomass and nitrate concentration identified two populations of sites. The first set of sites had a periphyton biomass near 1.73 g/m<sup>2</sup> ( $p < 0.0001$ ), which was considered to be the baseline condition under which no significant nitrate impact was detected. The second group of sites had an increased algal biomass near 4.15 g/m<sup>2</sup> ( $p = 0.0001$ ), which was significantly elevated above the baseline condition. The change point analyses also indicated that the critical increase in mean periphyton biomass occurred as the mean nitrate concentration increased from 401 to 420  $\mu\text{g N/L}$  (Niu and Gao 2007). This suggests that to prevent the periphyton cell density from increasing to the higher level, the nitrate concentration a target concentration should be established below 420  $\mu\text{g N/L}$ .


Since periphyton cell density exhibited a slightly more sensitive response to increasing nitrate concentrations, that relationship was used as the basis for the nitrate target concentration. Although the nitrate concentration that resulted in the periphyton cell density increase could be any at level between 0.286 mg/L and 0.401 mg/L, 0.286 mg/L was chosen to be the TMDL nitrate target concentration for the Wekiva River and Rock Springs Run systems. Choosing the nitrate target concentration of 0.286 mg N/L provided a conservative criterion with an adequate margin of safety that is reasonably protective of the biological communities within these systems (Gao 2008).

Following adoption of the TMDL, the change point analysis was repeated using additional data collected from 1990 through 2007 for the same 13 sites located along the Suwannee River. To account for any long-term temporal changes at a site, the period of record was divided into four periods. The average periphyton abundance and nitrate-nitrite data for each period for each site were used to repeat the change point analysis. The results were very similar to those obtained from the original analyses as described above. A nitrate concentration change point of 440  $\mu\text{g N/L}$  was determined for both periphyton cell density and biomass (Figures 4-8 and 4-9). Since these change points represent the lower concentration range for the group of sites with

significantly higher periphyton abundance, as compared to the baseline group, a protective nitrate criterion should include an appropriate safety margin to assure that sites do not reach this level.



**Figure 4-8. Change point analysis for data from the 13 stations At the Suwannee River System (Mean Cell Density vs. Mean NOx). Change Point = 0.44 mg N/L. The 95% confidence interval for the change point based on 1000 bootstrapping samples is 0.378 to 0.629.**



**Figure 4-9. Change point analysis for data from the 13 stations At the Suwannee River System (Mean Biomass vs. Mean NOx). Change Point = 0.44. The 95% confidence interval for the change point based on 1000 Bootstrapping samples is 0.441 to 0.584  $\mu\text{g N/L}$ .**

Figures 4-10 and 4-11 illustrate the same observed relationships between periphyton cell density versus and algal biomass versus nitrate concentrations, respectively, with field and laboratory results illustrated in red lines. The 0.44 mg N/L change point represents the upper nitrate-nitrite concentration where the observed biological changes occur. Additionally, the 0.23 mg N/L nitrate-nitrite threshold based on the laboratory studies, which represents the lower bound of the range in which biological changes occur, are also shown on the graphs for reference. Both graphs clearly indicate that algal abundance is restricted at nitrate concentrations below approximately 0.35 mg N/L, with the potential for increased algal cell density and biomass increasing substantially near the 0.44 mg N/L change point.




Figure 4-10. Relationship between mean nitrate concentration and mean periphyton abundance for sampling sites on the Suwannee, Santa Fe, and Withlacoochee Rivers. Values with nitrate concentrations above and below 0.35 mg N/L are shown in different colors. Red dotted lines are at 0.23 mg N/L and 0.44 mg N/L, representing results from lab and field studies, respectively.





Figure 4-11. Relationship between mean nitrate concentration and mean periphyton biomass for sampling sites on the Suwannee, Santa Fe, and Withlacoochee Rivers. Values with nitrate concentrations above and below 0.35 mg N/L are shown in different colors. Red dotted lines are at 0.23 mg N/L and 0.44 mg N/L, representing results from lab and field studies, respectively.

In addition to the observed increases in periphyton cell density and biomass, shifts in the structure and taxonomic composition of the periphyton community were also observed across this nitrate-nitrite gradient. The abundance of taxa indicative of eutrophic conditions (Van Dam *et al.* 1994) increased significantly with increasing nitrate-nitrite concentrations above approximately 0.35 mg N/L (Figure 4-12). Similar to the changes in the algal abundance and biomass, the abundance of the eutrophic taxa are similar at sites with nitrate-nitrite concentrations below 0.35 mg N/L, while the abundance of these taxa increases with increasing nitrate-nitrite concentrations above 0.35 mg N/L. The significant alterations in community composition, in combination with the increases in cell density and biomass, clearly demonstrate that increased nitrate-nitrite levels in the range between the 0.23 mg N/L laboratory threshold and the 0.44 mg N/L change point based on field observations were associated with an imbalance of aquatic flora (Rule 62-302, FAC). Since the 0.23 mg N/L laboratory limit is likely unnecessarily protective and the 0.44 mg N/L change point is not adequately protective, this range must be refined to develop an appropriate criterion.



**Figure 4-12.** The mean cell density of Van Dam eutrophic indicator diatoms increases with increasing nitrate-nitrite concentrations. Red dotted lines are at 0.23 mg N/L and 0.44 mg N/L, representing results from lab and field studies, respectively.

Based on the analyses performed, multiple lines of evidence indicate that the biological changes appear to occur at sites with nitrate-nitrite concentrations above approximately 0.40 mg N/L. Since the 0.44 mg N/L change point represents the upper bound of the range in which the biological changes occur, an appropriate safety factor to assure that sites do not reach this level should be applied to the change point to derive a protective nitrate-nitrite criterion.

To define this safety factor, two complimentary analyses were conducted and the results averaged (Figure 4-13). The full confidence interval procedure resulted in a protective threshold of 0.33 mg/L, and the upper half of the confidence interval method yielded a protective threshold of 0.38 mg/L. The average of these complimentary methods resulted in the final protective threshold of 0.35 mg/L.




Figure 4-13. An example of the full range confidence interval procedure to develop a nitrate-nitrite criterion. The full confidence interval procedure resulted in a protective threshold of 0.33 mg/L. The upper half of confidence interval method yielded a protective threshold of 0.38 mg/L. The average these complimentary methods resulted in the final protective threshold of 0.35 mg/L.

#### 4.8 Analysis of Nutrient Gradient Study Rapid Periphyton Data

In Chapter 6, an analysis of algal responses (Rapid Periphyton Survey) to nutrients and other variables is presented. The analyses demonstrated that periphyton thickness was significantly correlated with nitrate-nitrite, canopy cover, and water color, but not with TP. It should be noted that color is a strong confounding factor in these analyses since it is correlated to some extent with canopy cover, nitrate-nitrite concentration, and TP concentration. The analyses of the rapid periphyton assessment data are provided in greater detail in Appendix 6-G. Note that in streams where color was less than 40 PCU and canopy was relatively open, there was a significant correlation between nitrate-nitrite and excess algal growth (defined as >50% of the measurements having algal thickness exceeding 2 cm). The area of uncertainty associated with the nitrate-nitrite concentration that elicited the response included the 0.35 mg/L threshold found for clear spring systems. Based on this finding, and to assure protection against excess algal growth in Florida streams, it is reasonable to apply the 0.35 mg/L nitrate-nitrite limit to all streams with color measurements of less than 40 PCU.

#### 4.9 Summary and Conclusions

Multiple lines of evidence indicate that reducing nitrate-nitrite concentrations in clear stream systems should reduce macroalgal growth rates. Although originally investigated for application

in springs, additional analyses indicated that response-based nitrate-nitrite criteria would be appropriate in streams with color less than 40 PCU. Control of nitrate-nitrite is expected to result in a reduced frequency, intensity, and duration of nuisance macroalgal growth in clear streams and to prevent biological imbalances (*i.e.*, to restrict growth and accumulations of nuisance macroalgae and to preserve the native periphyton community structure).

The most accurate and conservative experimental results, those from microcentrifuge tube experiments, suggest that nitrate concentrations less than 0.230 mg NO<sub>3</sub>-N/L are needed to slow growth of *Lyngbya wollei*. Similarly, to reduce the growth of *Vaucheria* under laboratory conditions, nitrate concentrations below approximately 0.261 mg NO<sub>3</sub>-N/L would be required.

Results of periphyton field surveys conducted at a large number of spring systems indicated that nitrate concentrations would need to be reduced below the observed 0.454 mg N/L threshold to reduce the nuisance abundance and cover of *Vaucheria* spp. in Florida springs (Pinowska *et al.* 2007a). Since the 0.454 mg N/L threshold represents the lower range of nitrate concentrations for sites with excessive algal growth and cover, an appropriate safety factor is needed to turn the threshold into a protective criterion.

In addition, nearly two decades of scientific results from periphytometers deployed in the relatively low color (generally <40 PCU) Suwannee, Santa Fe, and Withlacoochee (north) Rivers clearly indicated significant increases in cell density and biomass along with alterations in taxonomic community structure (which are indicative of an imbalance) occur as nitrate concentrations approach the 0.441 mg N/L change point.

A margin of safety, derived by averaging the upper half-range and full range 95 percent confidence intervals, was applied to the 0.44 mg N/L change point to derive the final 0.35 mg/L nitrate-nitrite criterion. At monthly concentrations below 0.35 mg/L, there is a high confidence (95% Confidence Interval) that adverse responses will not be observed.

Rapid Periphyton Survey analyses indicated that nitrate-nitrite, in a range of uncertainty which included 0.35 mg/L, was significantly correlated with excess algal growth in clear streams (< 40 PCU). As a result, DEP will apply the protective 0.35 nitrate-nitrite criterion to all streams with color below 40 PCU.

#### 4.10 **References**

- Albertin, A., J. O. Sickman, M. Anderson, A. Pinowska, and R. J. Stevenson. 2007. Macroalgal responses to nitrate additions under conditions of low phosphorus in recirculating stream channels. Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Bonn, M.A. and F.W. Bell. 2003. Economic Impact of Selected Florida Springs on Surrounding Local Areas. Report prepared for the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Tallahassee, FL.
- Cardellina, J.H., F.J. Marner, and R.E. Moore. 1979. Seaweed dermatitis: structure of lyngbyatoxin 16 A. *Science* 204:193–195.

- Carmichael, W.W., W.R. Evans, Q.Q. Yin, and P. Bell, and P. Moczydlowski, 1997. Evidence for paralytic shellfish poisons in the freshwater cyanobacterium *Lyngbya wollei* (Farlow ex Gomont) comb. nov. *Applied Environmental Microbiology*. 63: 3104–3110.
- Cowell, B. C. and C. J. Dawes. 2004. Growth and nitrate-nitrogen uptake by the cyanobacterium *Lyngbya wollei*. *J. Aquatic Plant Management* 42: 69-71.
- Dennison, W.C., and E.G. Abal. 1999. Moreton Bay Study: A Scientific Basis for the Healthy Waterways Campaign, South East Queensland Regional Water Quality Management Strategy Team, Brisbane, p. 245.
- Doyle, R.D. and R.M. Smart. 1998. Competitive reduction of noxious *Lyngbya wollei* mats by rooted aquatic plants. *Aquatic Botany* 61: 17-32.
- Edwards, C., K.A. Beattie, C.M. Scrimgeour, and G.A. Codd. 1992. Identification of anatoxin-a in benthic cyanobacteria (blue-green algae) and in associated dog poisonings at Loch Insh, Scotland. *Toxicon* 30 (10), 1165–1175.
- Falconer, I.R., (1999) An overview of problems caused by toxic blue-green algae (Cyanobacteria) in drinking and recreational water. *Environmental Toxicology*. 14: 5–36 12.
- FDEP. 2009. State of Florida Numeric Nutrient Criteria Development Plan. <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/water/wqssp/nutrients/docs/fl-nutrient-plan-v030309.pdf>
- Gugger, M., S. Lenoir, C. Berger, A. Ledreux, J.C. Druart, J.F. Humbert, C. Guette, and C. Bernard. 2005. First report in a river in France of the benthic cyanobacterium *Phormidium favosum* producing anatoxin-a associated with dog neurotoxicosis. *Toxicon* 45, 919–928.
- Florida Administrative Code. Chapter 62-302, Surface water quality standards.
- Florida Administrative Code. Chapter 62-303, Identification of impaired surface waters.
- Florida Springs Task Force. 2000. Florida's springs: strategies for protection & restoration. <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/springs/reports/index.htm>, Florida Springs Report., Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Gao, Xueqing. 2008. Nutrient TMDLs for the Wekiva River (WBIDs 2956, 2956A, and 2956C) and Rock Springs Run (WBID 2967). Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Hamill KD. (2001) Toxicity in benthic freshwater cyanobacteria (blue-green algae): first observations in New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of Marine & Freshwater Research* 35(5):1057-1059.
- Hornsby, D. and Ceryak, R., 2000, Springs of the Aucilla, Coastal, and Waccasassa Basins in Florida: Live Oak, Suwannee River Water Management District WR 00-03 66 p.
- Hornsby, D., R. A. Mattson, and T. Mirti. 2000. Surface water quality and biological monitoring. Annual Report. 1999. Suwannee River Water Management District Technical Report WR-00-04. iv, 148 pp
- Inglett, P. W, K. S. Inglett, and K. R. Reddy, 2008. Chapter 3: Biogeochemical processes and implications for nutrient cycling. *In: Summary and synthesis of the available literature*

- on the effects of nutrients on spring organisms and systems*. Report prepared for the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Tallahassee, FL
- Jacoby, C. A., T. K. Frazer, and E. J. Phlips. 2008. Chapter 4: Nutrient effects on spring flora and fauna. *In: Summary and synthesis of the available literature on the effects of nutrients on spring organisms and systems*. Report prepared for the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Tallahassee, FL
- Joint Nature Conservation Commission, 2004. Common Standards Monitoring Guidance for Inlets and Bays, Version 10 August 2004. Peterborough: Joint Nature Conservation Committee, ISSN 1743-8160. 11 <http://www.jncc.gov.uk/page-2236>.
- Katz, B.G., H.D. Hornsby, J.F. Bohlke and M.F. Mokray. 1999. Sources and chronology of nitrate contamination in spring water, Suwannee River Basin, Florida. U. S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 99-4252. Reston, VA.
- Knight, R. L., and S. K. Notestein. 2008. Chapter 6: Effects of nutrients on spring ecosystems. *In: Summary and synthesis of the available literature on the effects of nutrients on spring organisms and systems*. Report prepared for the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Tallahassee, FL
- Maddox, G.L., J.M. Lloyd, T.M. Scott, S.B. Upchurch and R. Copeland. 1992. Florida's Groundwater Quality Monitoring Program – Background Hydrochemistry. Florida Geological Survey Special Publication 34. Tallahassee, FL.
- Martin, R.A. 1966. *Eternal Spring: Man's 10,000 Years of History at Florida's Silver Springs*. Great Outdoors Press, Inc., St. Petersburg, FL.
- Mattson, R. A., E. F. Lowe, C. L. Lippincott, D. Jian, and L. Battoe. 2006. *Wekiva River and Rock Springs Run Pollution Load Reduction Goals*. St. Johns River Water Management District, Palatka, Florida.
- Munch, D.A., D.J. Toth, C. Huang, J.B. Davis, C.M. Fortich, W.L. Osburn, E.J. Phlips, E.L. Quinlan, M.S. Allen, M.J. Woods, P. Cooney, R.L. Knight, R.A. Clarke, S.L. Knight. 2006. Fifty-year retrospective study of the ecology of Silver Springs, Florida. Publication Number: SJ2007-SP4. St. Johns River Water Management District, Palatka, FL.
- Mynderse, J.S., R.E. Moore, M. Kashiwagi, and T.R. Norton. 1977. Antileukemia activity in the Oscillatoriaceae: isolation of Debromoaplysiatoxin from *Lyngbya*. *Science* 196:538–21 540.
- Niu, X, and X. Gau. 2007. Change point analysis of Suwannee River algal data. Technical report prepared for the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Tallahassee, FL. 20 pp.
- O'Neil, J.M., and W.C. Dennison. 2005. *Lyngbya majuscula* in Southeast Queensland waterways. In: Abal, E., Dennison, W.C. (Eds.), *Healthy Catchment, Healthy Waterways: South East Queensland Regional Water Quality Strategy*. Brisbane City Council, Brisbane, p. 143.

- Onodera, H., M. Satake, Y. Oshima, T. Yasumoto, and W.W. Carmichael. 1997. New saxitoxin analogues from the filamentous cyanobacterium *Lyngbya wollei*. *Natural Toxins* 5: 146–151.
- Osborne, N.J.T., P.M. Webb, and G.R. Shaw. 2001. The toxins of *Lyngbya majuscula* and their human and ecological health effects. *Environment International*. 27, 381–392.
- Pinowska, A., R. J. Stevenson, J. O. Sickman, A. Albertin, and M. Anderson. 2007a. Integrated interpretation of survey for determining nutrient thresholds for macroalgae in Florida Springs: Macroalgal relationships to water, sediment and macroalgae nutrients, diatom indicators and land use. Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Pinowska, A., R. J. Stevenson, J. O. Sickman, A. Albertin, and M. Anderson. 2007b. Integrated interpretation of survey and experimental approaches for determining nutrient thresholds for macroalgae in Florida Springs: Laboratory experiments and disturbance study. Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Rabalais, N. 2002. Nitrogen in aquatic ecosystems. *Ambio* 31:102-112.
- Saker, M.L., A.D. Thomas, and J.H Norton. 1999. Cattle mortality attributed to the toxic cyanobacterium *Cylindrospermopsis raciborskii* in an outback region of North Queensland. *Environmental Toxicology*. 14, 179–182.
- Scott, T.M., G.H. Means, R.C. Means, and R.P. Meegan. 2002. First magnitude springs of Florida. Florida Geological Survey. Open File Report No. 85. Tallahassee, FL. 138 pp.
- Scott, T.M., G.H. Means, R.P. Meegan, R.C. Means, S.B. Upchurch, R.E. Copeland, J. Jones, T. Roberts, and A. Willet. 2004. Springs of Florida. Bulletin No, 66. Florida Geological Survey. Tallahassee, FL. 677 pp.
- Sickman, J. O., M. Anderson, A. Albertin, A. Pinowska, and R. J. Stevenson. 2007. Estimation of Autochthonous Sources of C, N, and P in Florida Springs. Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Stevenson, R. J., A. Pinowska, and Y.-K. Wang. 2004. Ecological condition of algae and nutrients in Florida springs. Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Tallahassee, FL.
- Stevenson, R. J., and A. Pinowska. 2007. Diatom indicators of ecological conditions in Florida springs. Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Stevenson, R.J., A. Pinowska, A. Albertin, and J.O. Sickman. 2007. Ecological condition of algae and nutrients in Florida springs: The Synthesis Report. Prepared for the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Tallahassee, FL. 58 pp.
- Stewart, I., I.M. Robertson, P.M. Webb, P.J. Schluter, and G.R. Shaw. 2006. Cutaneous hypersensitivity reactions to freshwater cyanobacteria – human volunteer studies. *BMC Dermatology* 6: 6.
- Teneva, I., D. Asparuhova, B. Dzhabazov, R. Mladenov, and K. Schirmer. 2003. The freshwater cyanobacterium *Lyngbya aerugineo-coerulea* produces compounds toxic to mice and to mammalian and fish cells. *Environ. Toxicol.* 18, 9-20.

USEPA. 2000. Nutrient criteria technical guidance manual: rivers and streams. EPA-822-B-00-002, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C.

Van Dam, H., A. Mertens, and J. Sinkeldam. 1994. A coded checklist and ecological indicator values of freshwater diatoms from the Netherlands. *Netherlands Journal of Aquatic Ecology*, 28 (1): 117-133.

DRAFT

DRAFT

## 5 Regionalization of Florida's Numeric Nutrient Criteria for Streams

### 5.1 Purpose of Developing a Regionalization Scheme

Spatial frameworks are important for structuring the research, assessment, monitoring, and management of environmental resources. Ecoregions are usually defined by patterns of homogeneity in a combination of factors such as climate, physiography, geology, soils, and vegetation (Griffith *et al.* 1994). Classification or regionalization of streams provides a framework upon which to develop and base protective nutrient criteria. Proper classification ensures homogeneous populations of streams with similar and comparable nutrient regimes and biological communities. It helps assure that thresholds selected from a benchmark or reference approach are truly inclusive of the natural frequency distribution and thus will be inherently protective of the natural populations of flora and fauna inhabiting these systems.

It should be noted that Florida's geology includes fairly recent sedimentary deposits of marine origin. Certain marine clays (*e.g.*, the Hawthorne Formation) and limestone formations that lie near the surface are extremely high in phosphorus. Some of these phosphatic deposits are mined, making Florida one of the larger producers of phosphate (Florida produces approximately 25% of phosphate used throughout the world). Proper spatial classification to capture regional differences in natural nutrient concentrations is essential.

### 5.2 Development of Ecoregional and Biological Regionalization Schemes for Florida

DEP initially used Level IV ecological subregions (Griffith *et al.* 1994, Figure 5-1) from Florida's bioassessment program as a starting point for regionalization efforts necessary to establish nutrient criteria. During development of the bioassessment program, DEP analyzed stream reference site macroinvertebrate community patterns in all nine ecological subregions north of Lake Okeechobee (Barbour *et al.* 1996). The data indicated the presence of four distinct bioregions, within which there were similar biological community composition and structure (Figure 5-2). These bioregions include the panhandle (regions 65f, 65g, 65h, and the majority of 75a), the northeast (region 75e and 75f), the peninsula (regions 75b, 75c, and 75d, and a small part of 75a), and the Everglades (regions 76a, 76b, 76c, and 76d). Similar patterns of relatively homogeneous groupings in the Peninsula versus the Panhandle have been observed in wetlands macrophyte, algae, and invertebrate data (Lane *et al.* 2003).




Figure 5-1. Level IV subcoregions for Florida’s small/wadeable streams.



Figure 5-2. Stream Bioregions of Florida.

### 5.3 **Refinement of Regionalization for Nutrient Criteria Development**

DEP used streams bioregions as a starting point for the development of nutrient criteria regions. Based upon the observed biological community resemblance within a bioregion, it is logical that these biologically-similar regions will have analogously similar responses to nutrient concentrations. However, subsequent evaluation of nutrient concentrations in the benchmark sites revealed additional spatial patterns; that is, the bioregions were not sufficiently homogenous with regards to nutrient concentration. Alternative nutrient regions were developed based on a consideration of the bioregions, ecoregions, geological formations (*e.g.*, Bone Valley and Peace River), benchmark nutrient levels, geostatistical analysis, and drainage basins.

DEP recognized there was a sub-region of the Peninsula bioregion with exceptionally high natural phosphate levels during initial work to derive reference-based TMDLs for the Northern Lake Okeechobee tributaries. As part of the analysis, the DEP utilized an outlier analysis to exclude benchmark sites within the Peninsula bioregion with exceptionally high phosphorus levels, and the vast majority of the excluded data were from the Bone Valley. This naturally high phosphate area is in portions of Hillsborough, Polk, Hardee, and Manatee, DeSoto, Sarasota counties (due to natural phosphatic deposits, which occur primarily in the Peace River Formation and the Bone Valley Member).

The Peace River Formation crops out or is beneath a thin overburden on the southern part of the Ocala Platform extending into the Okeechobee Basin (Figure 5-3). These sediments were mapped from Hillsborough County southward to Charlotte County. Within this area, the Peace River Formation is composed of interbedded sands, clays and carbonates. The sands are generally light gray to olive gray, poorly consolidated, clayey, variably dolomitic, very fine to medium grained and phosphatic. The clays are yellowish gray to olive gray, poorly to moderately consolidated, sandy, silty, phosphatic and dolomitic. The carbonates are usually dolostone in the outcrop area. The dolostones are light gray to yellowish gray, poorly to well indurated, variably sandy and clayey, and phosphatic. Opaline chert is often found in these sediments. The phosphate content of the Peace River Formation sands is frequently high enough to be economically mined. Naturally occurring phosphorus pebbles are frequently observed in streams within this formation.

The Bone Valley Member (originally the Bone Valley Formation of Matson and Clapp 1909), and the Peace River Formation occurs in a limited area on the southern part of the Ocala Platform in Hillsborough, Polk and Hardee Counties (Figure 5-3). Throughout its extent, the Bone Valley Member is a clastic unit consisting of sand-sized and larger phosphate grains in a matrix of quartz sand, silt and clay. The lithology is highly variable, ranging from sandy, silty, phosphatic clays and relatively pure clays to clayey, phosphatic sands to sandy, clayey phosphorites (Webb and Crissinger 1983). In general, consolidation is poor and colors range from white, light brown and yellowish gray to olive gray and blue green. Mollusks are found as reworked, often phosphatized casts. Vertebrate fossils occur in many of the beds within the Bone Valley Member. Shark's teeth are often abundant. Silicified corals and wood are occasionally present as well. The Bone Valley Member is an extremely important, unique phosphate deposit and has provided much of the phosphate production in the United States during the twentieth century. Mining of phosphate in the outcrop area began in 1888 (Cathcart 1985) and continues to the present. Phosphatic pebbles are observed in the streams and rivers within the area of this formation.





Figure 5-3. Location of the Peace River and Bone Valley geologic formations.

DEP used the geographic distribution of the Peace River Formation and Bone Valley member to delineate a more homogeneous nutrient region hereafter known as the Bone Valley region. The area was delineated by overlaying the geological formation with Hydrologic Unit Codes (HUC) 8 and 12 drainage basin GIS coverages (Figure 5-4). Drainage basins that significantly overlap either formation and drainage basins downstream of the formations were included in the region. The Bone Valley region extends from Peace River drainage to the east and south, and Hillsborough River to the north. The Hillsborough River, excluding its headwaters in HUC 0310020802002, is included in the Bone Valley. The characteristics of the Hillsborough River headwaters are dominated more by the Green Swamp than by the Peace River Formation. The remainder of the Hillsborough River is highly influenced by streams draining the Peace River Formation, and these segments are most appropriately categorized as part of the Bone Valley region.

The stream bioregions of Florida were further refined into nutrient regions based on a review of spatial nutrient patterns, primarily phosphorus. Spatial patterns in phosphorus do not entirely correspond to the bioregional divisions. In addition to the Bone Valley region, there is a second region with high natural phosphorus, located in north central Florida in portions of the Northeast, Panhandle, and Peninsula bioregions (Figure 5-5). Ordinary kriging analysis, conducted in the Geostatistical Analysis add-in for ArcGIS, was used to further explore nutrient spatial patterns and help inform delineation of more homogenous regions. The kriging algorithm was used to produce contour plots of expected stream nutrient levels (Figure 5-6). These contours represent patterns of high and low phosphorus concentrations across the state.

The contours were not used to directly define regional boundaries due to data density limitations and the fact that the statistical model does not take into account flow patterns or watershed boundaries. Instead, the contours, together with the spatial distribution of benchmark WBID TP levels, were used to inform decisions regarding where to combine watersheds based on similarity in nutrient conditions. Stream TP contour plots were overlaid with GIS drainage basins to refine the regionalization in north Florida. Drainage basins (8-digit HUCs) overlapping the high natural phosphate were grouped into a new region named the North Central region.

This new region was formed by splitting the northeast stream bioregion between the naturally high phosphate Santa Fe and Upper Suwannee River drainage basins to the west and the significantly lower phosphate drainage of the St. Marys River to the east. The region was extended west beyond the boundary of the Northeast stream bioregions into the Alapaha and Withlacoochee drainage basins to capture the higher natural phosphate levels in these systems. The southwestern boundary of the North Central region was defined based on the boundary of ecoregion 65h (Tifton Upland/Tallahassee Hills). Additionally, the Peninsula region was extended through the Florida Big Bend area westward to and including the Econfina River drainage because this minimally disturbed area exhibits stream TP concentrations more similar to the Peninsula bioregion than to the remainder of the Panhandle. These higher phosphate levels are due in part to the fact that the Big Bend region is downstream of the natural high phosphate North Central region. Therefore, extension of the Peninsula region accounts for upstream conditions, allows for processes of assimilation and dilution, while maintaining protective expectations; that is, as opposed to extending the North Central region into the Big Bend all the way to the coast. The final stream nutrient regions are shown in Figure 5-7.



**Figure 5-4. Overlay of Florida drainage basin (8-digit HUCs) boundaries with the Peace River Formation and the Bone Valley Member. The yellow highlighted area illustrates the spatial extent of the Bone Valley nutrient region.**




Figure 5-5. Spatial distribution of benchmark WBID TP levels, excluding the Bone Valley region. The Bone Valley was excluded to avoid biasing data distribution and allow investigation of additional spatial patterns. Note the high phosphate concentrations in WBIDS along the Northeast and Panhandle bioregion boundary.




Figure 5-6. Stream total phosphorus contour plot based on ordinary kriging analysis of benchmark stream concentrations across Florida.




Figure 5-7. Stream nutrient (TP) regions of Florida used to establish region benchmark nutrient expectations and evaluate biological responses to nutrients.

DEP also evaluated the spatial patterns of stream nitrogen concentrations following the same general procedure for stream phosphorus concentrations. While Total Nitrogen levels in Florida's streams are not as spatially heterogeneous as are the phosphorus levels, Total Nitrogen levels were generally lower in the Panhandle than the rest of the state (Figure 5-8). Areas of relatively high TN corresponded to wetland dominated drainages (*e.g.*, Green Swamp, Okefenokee). DEP combined the Northeast, North Central, Peninsula, and Bone Valley regions for purposes of nitrogen criteria development because the benchmark streams in these regions exhibited similar TN concentration levels, in particular at the upper end of the frequency distributions (Figure 5-9).

DRAFT




Figure 5-8. Stream total nitrogen contour plot based on ordinary kriging analysis of benchmark stream concentrations across Florida.




Figure 5-9. Boxplot of annual geometric mean total nitrogen concentrations in benchmark Florida streams.

### 5.1 **References**

Barbour, M., J. Gerritsen, and J. White. 1996. Development of the Stream Condition Index (SCI) for Florida. Tetra Tech, Inc., Owings Mills, MD.

Cathcart, J.B., 1985, Economic geology of the Land-Pebble Phosphate District of Florida and its southern extension: in Cathcart, J.B., and Scott, T.M., eds., Florida Land-Pebble Phosphate District: Geological Society of America Annual Meeting, Orlando, Florida, field trip guidebook, p. 4-27.

Gerritsen, J, B. Jessup, E. Leppo, and J. White. 2000. Development of Lake Condition Indexes for Florida. FDEP.

Griffith, G.E., J.M. Omernik, C.M. Rohm, and S.M. Pierson. 1994. Florida Regionalization Project. Environmental Research Laboratory, United States Environmental Protection Agency, Corvallis, OR.

Lane, C.R., M.T. Brown, M. Murry-Hudson, and M. B. Vivas. 2003. The Wetland Condition Index (WCI): Biological Indicators of Wetland Condition for Isolated Depressional Herbaceous Wetlands in Florida. FDEP. 165 pp.

Matson, G. C. and Clapp, F. G., 1909, A preliminary report on the geology of Florida: Florida Geological Survey Second Annual Report, p. 23-173.

Webb, S.D., and Crissinger, D.B., 1983, Stratigraphy and vertebrate paleontology of the central and southern Phosphate District of Florida: in Central Florida Phosphate District, Geological Society of America, Southeast Section Field Trip Guidebook, p. 28-72.

DRAFT

DRAFT

## 6 Stressor-Response Analyses for Florida Streams

### 6.1 Introduction

As specified in EPA's guidance and acknowledged in Florida's Nutrient Criteria Development Plan, the most comprehensive and scientifically defensible approach to developing numeric nutrient criteria is to relate nutrient concentrations to dependably measured adverse biological responses. EPA further suggests that the observed dose-response relationship could be described by a model (*e.g.*, trophic state classification, regional predictive model, biocriteria, etc.), which in turn would quantitatively link nutrient concentrations to the relative risk of environmental harm. DEP supports this approach, since it establishes a correlative relationship between nutrients and valued ecological attributes, and is linked to the maintenance of designated uses of waterbodies.

In attempting to define the effect of anthropogenic nutrient increases on the biological communities in Florida's streams, DEP conducted extensive statistical evaluations to investigate the relationship between nutrients and biological indices such as the Stream Condition Index (SCI), and the Stream Diatom Index (SDI) (currently under development) as well as the individual metrics that comprise these indices. DEP also evaluated the effects of increased nutrient levels on other biological measures such as chlorophyll *a*, taxonomic composition of macroinvertebrate and algal communities, and frequency of occurrence and abundance of algae (as measured via the Rapid Periphyton Survey, RPS).

To investigate the potential relationships between nutrients and biological response measures, DEP utilized a variety of statistical techniques, including linear regression, multiple linear regression, non-linear regression, LOESS regression, change point analysis, CART, correlation analysis, and paired variable plots. A brief discussion of the results from some of the assessments performed is provided below, with more detailed information concerning the analyses provided in the referenced appendices.

The results of the analyses generally indicate that many of the biological measures evaluated exhibit a significant adverse response to anthropogenic nutrient enrichment. However, the statistical relationships between the biological response variables and nutrient levels are weak, and DEP could not identify specific thresholds for establishing numeric nutrient criteria from the analyses. The direct and indirect adverse effects of nutrient enrichment on biological communities have been demonstrated repeatedly under controlled conditions (Stevenson *et al.* 2007). The analyses did not show strong statistical relationships between nutrients and these effects. This may be because the biological responses can be confounded by numerous other factors (including low residence time for uptake) and confounding variables under real world conditions found in natural streams. This is especially true for Florida streams, which can range from:

- crystal clear spring fed streams with low nutrient levels and high conductivity, to
- highly colored streams fed by wetlands with an abundance of organic nitrogen, to

- streams that exhibit naturally high phosphorus levels resulting from geologic phosphate deposits lying near the surface, to
- streams that can be any combination of the above.

The source water and the geologic conditions also influence other water quality variables such as pH and specific conductivity, which can have an overarching effect on the biological communities, which in-turn can alter or be more significant than the response to nutrients. In addition, most Florida streams are heavily canopied with the resulting light limitation also confounding the biological response to nutrients.

Similar results were reported by Robertson *et al.* (2008) who found good relationships between nutrient enrichment and various adverse biological responses in open non-wadeable Wisconsin rivers. The relationships were much weaker in smaller wadeable streams due to the influence of other confounding environmental factors, with nutrients alone explaining only a small portion of the response (Robertson *et al.* 2006). Most of the biological measures exhibited a wedge-shaped response to increases in nutrient concentrations. At relatively low nutrient concentrations, the biotic indices ranged widely, but at relatively high concentrations, the indices generally were poor. The wedge-shaped distribution indicates that at low nutrient concentrations, factors other than nutrients often limit the health of biotic communities, whereas, at high nutrient concentrations, nutrients and factors correlated with high nutrient concentrations are the predominant factors. Simply stated, it is difficult to find a healthy population at a nutrient enriched site, but common to find a poor population at low nutrient sites due to the influence of other factors.

This type of response is not surprising given the fact that the biotic community represents the overall ecological integrity of the stream (*i.e.*, physicochemical habitat and biotic integrity) and thus provides a broad measure of the cumulative effect of all stressors (Barbour *et al.* 1999). The physicochemical habitats within the streams are in turn controlled by watershed characteristics such as geomorphology, geochemistry, hydrology, and land use/land cover and are therefore important factors affecting the biotic communities present. In Florida streams, the response to nutrients is confounded by broad ranges of biologically important physicochemical parameters such as pH, color, and specific conductance that occur naturally, sometimes at small spatial scales. As Robertson *et al.* (2006) concluded, even with these confounding factors, it is important to establish numeric nutrient criteria to reduce the risk of adverse effects on the biological communities in the water body as well as in downstream receiving waters.

In addition to the inherent variations in the confounding physicochemical factors described above, Florida streams also exhibit a very wide range of nutrient levels, especially phosphorus, that occur regionally under natural conditions. Phosphorus concentrations can naturally range from less than 10 ppb (highly oligotrophic) to many hundred ppb where the water body is in direct contact with geologic phosphate deposits (see Chapter 5: Regionalization). To account for the natural spatial variation in nutrient concentrations, the evaluation of the biological response to nutrients was conducted on a regional basis where there were sufficient data. A summary of the individual analyses conducted is provided below.

## 6.2 **Macroinvertebrate Exploratory Analysis**

The relationship between the macroinvertebrate community and nutrient levels in streams was examined using Florida's Stream Condition Index (SCI), the individual measures of the macroinvertebrate community that comprise the index, and the abundance of other taxonomic groupings. Chapter 3 has an explanation of the various biological measures. Multiple linear regression techniques were used to evaluate potential relationships between nutrient concentrations and the measures of the macroinvertebrate community.

The results of the analyses indicate that several macroinvertebrate variables, including SCI, % sensitive taxa, % clinger taxa, % clingers, % long lived taxa, % very tolerant taxa, and % dominant taxa, exhibited a significant adverse response to increased levels of nitrogen. In addition, the analyses indicated that the macroinvertebrate community also responded to other environmental factors such as water color, conductivity, and pH. It is likely that other unmeasured variables such as water velocity, water level, habitat conditions, and antecedent conditions also play an important role in determining the macroinvertebrate community composition. The adjusted r-squared values for the multiple-linear regression models predicting the macroinvertebrate responses ranged from 0.05 to 0.55 in the models that included some form of nitrogen and a combination of the other environmental factors. Due to the confounding effects of these other factors, the macroinvertebrate response to nutrients was statistically weak and could be depicted by a wedge-shaped relationship as described previously.

Figure 6-1 shows the typical relationship observed between nutrient levels and macroinvertebrate response variables. At low nutrient levels, the response is highly variable due to the controlling effects of other factors such as pH, conductivity, color, flow, water level, habitat conditions, etc. The analyses also demonstrate that the macroinvertebrate community responds negatively to increased nutrient levels, however, due to the influence of other environmental factors on the response, DEP could not identify specific thresholds for establishing numeric nutrient criteria. The macroinvertebrate analyses and results are presented in greater detail in Appendix 6-A.




Figure 6-1. Example relationships between macroinvertebrate response variables and nutrient levels. TSIN is Total Soluble Inorganic Nitrogen (ammonia plus nitrate-nitrite).

### 6.3 Exploratory Analysis of Periphyton Response to Nutrients

Since the algal community can be expected to respond more rapidly and directly to nutrients than macroinvertebrates, DEP also evaluated the relationship between the periphyton community and nutrient levels in streams. The primary focus of the evaluation was the Florida's Stream Diatom Index (SDI) (see Chapter 3), which is currently under development, and the five individual component metrics that comprise the SDI (*i.e.*, % pollution sensitive, % pollution tolerant, % taxa requiring high dissolved oxygen (DO), % oligosaprobic taxa, and average of Van Dam trophic taxa score), but DEP also evaluated other taxonomic groupings (*i.e.*, phosphorus and nitrogen sensitive diatoms).

A combination of multiple-linear regression techniques and change point analyses were used to evaluate potential relationships between nutrient concentrations and the algal response variables. The analyses also evaluated the role of other environmental variables such as color, pH, and conductivity in determining the algal response. The analyses were conducted on both the raw untransformed data as well as data transformed by various techniques. To control the variability caused by natural regional differences in nutrient concentrations, the analyses were conducted

for each nutrient region independently, starting with the panhandle and peninsula regions, for which more data exist.

As with the macroinvertebrate community, the analyses of the periphyton data indicate that several algal variables exhibited a significant adverse response to increased nutrient levels. In addition, the analyses indicated that periphyton also respond to other environmental factors such as water color, conductivity, and pH. However, other unmeasured variables such as water velocity, water level, and antecedent conditions likely play an important role in determining the composition of the periphyton community. Since the biota are responding to the combined effect of all of these factors along with nutrients, the natural variation in these other environmental factors confound the observed biological response to nutrients.

The results of the multiple-linear regression analysis for the panhandle nutrient region are summarized in Table 6-1. Due to the confounding interactions between the factors included in the models as well as those for which data are not available, all of the adjusted r-squared values for the regression equations were below 0.3. The results of the multiple-linear regression analyses are provided in more detail in Appendices 6-B and 6-C.

**Table 6-1. Summary of multiple-linear regression analyses conducted for the panhandle nutrient region.**

Panhandle Nutrient Region										
	Response Variable									
	PollSens	PollTol	%Tol low DO	% Oligosap	VD TSI	TP Sens Dia	TIN Sens Dia	N Metab	pH Optima	SDI
Data Transformation	None	SQRT	arcsin(sqrt(x))	arcsin(sqrt(x))	None	None	None	Recip	Recip	arcsin(sqrt(x))
1	pH	pH	pH	pH	pH	CondL	pH	pH	pH	pH
2	ColorL	ColorL	TNL	TNL	CondL	pH		TNL		
3	TNL	TNL			TINL	TPL				
4	TPL	TPL			TPL	TINL				
5					ColorL					
Adjusted r <sup>2</sup> =	0.25	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.27	0.20	0.18	0.11	0.13	0.12
	Yellow shading = Pr < 0.05									

Since the regression analyses showed that various forms of nutrients were significant factors in determining the periphyton response, change point analyses were performed to attempt to determine where significant thresholds in the periphyton response to nutrients occurred. Prior to performing the change point analyses, the data were adjusted for the other significant variables indicated by the regression analyses. An example of the step function and associated change point and confidence interval is provided in Figure 6-2, and the results of the change point analyses for the periphyton response variables versus TP are summarized in Table 6-2.




Figure 6-2. Change-Point Model (Step Function) of percent pollution sensitive diatoms vs. total phosphorus. Response adjusted for ColorL and CondL.

Table 6-2. Summary of change-point analyses conducted for the panhandle nutrient region.

	Response Variable									
	PollSens	PollTol	% high DO	% Oligosap	VD TSI	TP Sens Dia	TIN Sens Dia	SDI	N Metab	pH Optima
Data Transformation	None	log	arcsin (sqrt)	arcsin (sqrt)	sqrt	arcsin(sqrt)	None			
Model	SF	NL	SF	SF	SF	SF	SF	SF	SF	SF
1st Change Pt. [confidence interval]	22 ppb [22,83]	10 ppb [8,78]	15 ppb [10,93]	18 ppb [15,131]	22 ppb [22,40]	22 ppb [10,60]	22 ppb [10,67]	22 ppb [22,40]	15 ppb [15,93]	22 ppb [10,36]
2nd Change Pt. [confidence interval]	83ppb [10,131]	78 ppb [8,94]	90 ppb [18,149]	131 ppb [*]	131 ppb [*]	NA	67 ppb [8,129]	82 ppb [8,131]	131 ppb [*]	NA
2nd Change Pt. Confidence Level	75%	80%	80%	80%	80%	NA	75%	80%	80%	NA
SF = Step Function, NL = Non-Linear, L = Linear, NCP = No Change Point										
[*] = Extreme interval outside data range										

The primary change points indicated in Table 6-2 ranged from 10 ppb to 22 ppb TP and were all significant at the 95% level. However, all of the primary change points occurred well below TP levels found at the majority of Florida’s minimally disturbed nutrient benchmark sites (see

Chapter 7) and appear to be highly influenced by factors other than nutrients. Most notably, these data were analyzed using two different laboratory method detection limits (MDLs for TP of 4 µg/L and 20 µg/L), and this inconsistency appeared to have significantly influenced the results. The confidence intervals around the change points were also very wide, further limiting their usefulness in criteria development.


For most periphyton variables, a second higher change point was also detected. The secondary change points ranged from 67 ppb to 131 ppb TP, however, they were not significant at the 95% confidence level. These changes were significant at the 75 to 80% level with extremely wide confidence intervals. The change point analyses conducted are presented in greater detail in Appendix 6-D.

As with the analyses of the macroinvertebrate data, the results of the periphyton data analyses establish that increased nutrient levels have adverse impacts on the periphyton community, however, the response to nutrients is confounded by other environmental factors and DEP could identify no clear thresholds to form the bases of numeric nutrient criteria.

#### 6.4 **Quantile Regression Analysis of Periphyton Response to Nutrients**

As described previously, the biological response to nutrients is confounded by other measured environmental parameters as well as a number of unmeasured factors. Often, these confounding variables cause the biological measures to exhibit a wedge-shaped response to increased nutrient levels. At relatively low nutrient concentrations, the biological measures range widely, but at relatively high concentrations, the measure is generally poor with less variation. The wedge-shaped distribution indicates that at low nutrient concentrations, factors other than nutrients often limit the health of biotic communities, whereas, at high nutrient concentrations, nutrients and factors correlated with high nutrient concentrations are the predominant limiting factors. As found with the analyses of the macroinvertebrate and periphyton data, linear regression and step-function models do not fit this type of response very well. Even though the linear regression and change-point analyses indicate that increased nutrient levels have negative biological effects, it is important to confirm this finding using statistical techniques better suited to describing complex relationships such as those found with nutrient effects on biological communities. Therefore, quantile regression was used to confirm that increased nutrient levels result in adverse biological responses in Florida streams.

Quantile regression is a useful method for estimating effects associated with a measured subset of limiting factors while accounting for the effects of unmeasured factors in an ecologically realistic manner (Cade *et al.* 1999). This regression technique considers changes in a biological response variable (*e.g.*, species biomass) as a function of limiting factors (*e.g.*, habitat conditions) that are measured and as a function of other limiting factors (*e.g.*, non-habitat factors such as weather and disease) that may not be measured. In this example, Cade *et al.* (1999) note that change in species biomass does not exceed limits imposed by the habitat conditions, but can be reduced by non-habitat factors.



**Figure 6-3. Example of results from quantile regression analyses showing highly significant relationships between the Stream Diatom Index and both total phosphorus and conductivity levels.**

The quantile regression approach was applied to the stream periphyton data from the Florida panhandle nutrient region by fitting models to the 0.50 and 0.85 quantiles, with the periphyton metrics used in the earlier analysis as dependent variables and TP, TN, TIN, and specific conductance as independent variables. The logarithm (Base e) transformation was performed on the four predictor variables, and the periphyton metrics were transformed using the transformations chosen in the earlier analyses (Table 6-1). The quantile regression approach was repeated for periphyton data from the peninsula nutrient region, with models fitted to the 0.50 and 0.90 quantiles with the same periphyton metrics as dependent variables and TP, TN, TIN, and pH as independent variables. In the peninsula analysis, pH was substituted for conductivity as an independent variable based on the higher significance of pH found in the earlier analyses.

Detailed results of the quantile regression analyses are provided in Appendices 6-E and 6-F for the Panhandle and Peninsula, respectively. The results for the Panhandle indicated that all of the periphyton metrics exhibited significant responses to both total phosphorus and conductivity. In addition, the 0.50 quantile for some of the metrics (*i.e.*, TP sensitive diatoms and TIN sensitive diatoms) showed significant responses to total nitrogen. An example of the quantile regression analysis using SDI as the dependent variable is provided in Figure 6-3.

In contrast, the results for the peninsula indicate that total nitrogen was the primary nutrient influencing the periphyton community in that region. This is not unexpected since the phosphorus-rich geology of the peninsula results in much higher natural background phosphorus levels when compared with the panhandle. The higher natural phosphorus levels would result in less phosphorus limitation in the biological community response in the peninsula. In addition to total nitrogen, several periphyton metrics (*i.e.*, Van Dam's average taxa TSI, average N-metabolism score, and pH optima score) showed a significant relationship to total inorganic nitrogen and some metrics (*i.e.*, % pollution tolerant taxa and % TIN sensitive taxa) were significantly correlated to total phosphorus. The analysis also indicated that all of the periphyton metrics were influenced by pH. The previous analysis showed that periphyton in the peninsula responded more to pH than conductivity, which was the dominant non-nutrient factor in the panhandle. As with phosphorus, natural conductivity levels in the peninsula are typically higher

than those found in the panhandle, which may result in pH exerting a greater influence on the peninsula diatoms. However, conductivity and pH are generally highly correlated.

Despite the confounding effects of other physicochemical variables, these results confirm that nutrient enrichment, primarily total phosphorus in the panhandle and nitrogen in the peninsula, has a significant negative effect on periphyton composition in Florida streams. Although DEP could not identify specific thresholds for establishing numeric nutrient criteria, the analyses provide further support for the need for nutrient criteria in order to protect against adverse biological effects.


### **6.5 Analysis of Rapid Periphyton Survey Data**

Because excessive abundance of algae has been identified as a nuisance condition that should be avoided (see Chapter 4), the role of nutrients in determining the frequency of occurrence and abundance of algae in streams was also examined (in addition to the compositional metrics for the periphyton community described previously). The abundance of periphyton found in streams was evaluated using the Rapid Periphyton Survey (RPS) method, consisting of a series of 99 observations (9 observations across each of 11 transects along a 100 meter stream reach) of periphyton presence, thickness and type, per DEP-SOP-001/01 FS 7130. The RPSs were conducted in streams across the state in conjunction with nutrient and other physicochemical measurements.

Correlation analysis was conducted to determine which nutrient and physicochemical variables exhibited the greatest influence on algal abundance in streams. Due to data limitations, the analysis of the algal abundance data was conducted on data collected over the entire state and not separated regionally. The results of the analyses are summarized in Table 6-3. The analyses indicated that canopy cover, color, pH, total Kjeldahl nitrogen, organic nitrogen, and nitrate-nitrite were the factors most highly correlated to algal thickness. The strong correlations with color and canopy cover were expected since they can cause light limitation and therefore directly reduce periphyton growth. The relatively strong correlations between pH, TKN, and organic nitrogen and algal biomass were unexpected, but can likely be explained by their strong correlations with color (Spearman correlations were 0.79, 0.80, and -0.52, respectively).

**Table 6-3. Correlation matrix for algal abundance measures from rapid periphyton assessment data vs. nutrients and other physicochemical parameters. Darker green shading indicates stronger positive relationships and darker red shading indicates stronger negative relationships. Values given are Spearman r values.**

	Sum of Algal Thickness	Mean Algal Thickness	Maximum Algal Thickness	Sum of Algal Thickness Scores	Mean Algal Thickness Score	Maximum Algal Thickness Score	Sum of Algal Type Score	Mean Algal Type Score	Maximum Algal Type Score	Sum of Algal Scores	Mean Algal Score	Maximum Algal Score
Chlorophyll a	0.14	0.22	0.18	0.12	0.22	0.16	0.08	0.16	0.16	0.1	0.16	0.14
Canopy Cover	-0.29	-0.38	-0.38	-0.26	-0.36	-0.37	-0.25	-0.35	-0.36	-0.28	-0.35	-0.35
Maximum Canopy Cover	-0.18	-0.26	-0.25	-0.15	-0.24	-0.24	-0.15	-0.23	-0.23	-0.16	-0.22	-0.22
Minimum Canopy Cover	-0.32	-0.41	-0.42	-0.29	-0.39	-0.4	-0.27	-0.37	-0.4	-0.31	-0.38	-0.39
Total Nitrogen	-0.11	-0.05	-0.09	-0.11	-0.06	-0.12	-0.10	-0.07	-0.08	-0.13	-0.10	-0.13
Total Inorganic Nitrogen	0.18	0.22	0.18	0.17	0.22	0.17	0.13	0.17	0.16	0.13	0.16	0.14
Organic Nitrogen	-0.33	-0.29	-0.33	-0.32	-0.30	-0.36	-0.26	-0.25	-0.25	-0.31	-0.29	-0.32
Ammonia	-0.19	-0.16	-0.21	-0.18	-0.15	-0.23	-0.20	-0.19	-0.20	-0.25	-0.23	-0.26
Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen	-0.32	-0.28	-0.32	-0.32	-0.29	-0.35	-0.27	-0.25	-0.25	-0.32	-0.29	-0.33
Nitrate + Nitrite	0.23	0.29	0.26	0.22	0.29	0.36	0.19	0.15	0.25	0.20	0.25	0.23
Total Phosphorus	-0.03	-0.04	-0.04	-0.03	-0.04	-0.03	-0.02	-0.04	-0.03	-0.03	-0.04	-0.05
Dissolved Oxygen	0.07	0.01	0.10	0.05	0.00	0.09	0.10	0.06	0.11	0.14	0.09	0.15
Conductivity	0.21	0.25	0.23	0.20	0.24	0.22	0.15	0.18	0.23	0.18	0.22	0.21
pH	0.22	0.24	0.24	0.21	0.24	0.24	0.18	0.20	0.24	0.21	0.24	0.24
Color	-0.41	-0.42	-0.42	-0.40	-0.42	-0.42	-0.35	-0.36	-0.38	-0.38	-0.40	-0.41
Temperature	0.07	0.07	0.05	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.08	0.09	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04
Velocity	-0.01	0.00	0.04	-0.01	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.04	0.04



**Figure 6-4. Relationships between periphyton abundance and selected environmental predictors. The smooth curves are the locally weighted smoothing lines. The vertical lines are the change points (solid lines) and their confidence intervals (dashed lines).**

As shown in Figure 6-4, periphyton thickness appears to be significantly correlated with nitrate-nitrite, canopy cover, and water color, but not with TP. It should be noted that color is a strong confounding factor in these analyses since it is correlated to some extent with canopy cover, nitrate-nitrite concentration, and TP concentration. The initial analyses of the rapid periphyton assessment data are provided in greater detail in Appendix 6-G.

To account for the confounding effect of color, streams were classified based on color, and the relationships between algal biomass and nutrients were re-examined. The relationships between nutrients and periphyton thickness were much stronger in clear streams (Figure 6-5 a1-a3) than in colored streams (Figure 6-5 c1-c3), indicated by the stronger spearman correlations as well as

improved LOESS regressions in the clear streams. The main relationships observed were between nitrogen parameters and benthic algal thickness. The effect of phosphorus did not appear to be significant in these analyses. Where color is increased (increased potential for light limitation), nutrients do not exert as important a role in algal biomass accumulations.




Figure 6-5. Relationships between nutrient concentrations and algal thickness in clear (color  $\leq 40$  pcu, Figures a1-3), intermediate (color  $> 40$ -100 pcu, Figures b1-3) and highly colored (color  $> 100$  pcu, Figures c1-3) streams.

Analysis was also conducted to evaluate the relationship between nutrients and phytoplankton chlorophyll *a* collected for the same sites. In contrast to algal biomass data, the relationships between phytoplankton chlorophyll *a* and nutrients were much stronger in colored streams (Figure 6-6 b1-c3) than in clear streams (Figure 6-6 a1-a3), especially between total nitrogen and chlorophyll *a* concentrations. The Spearman correlations between chlorophyll *a* and total nitrogen were 0.36 and 0.42, respectively, in intermediate and high color streams, but was -0.16 in clear streams. With the increased color and stronger light limitation to periphyton, phytoplankton appear more able to utilize the available nutrients than periphyton. Chlorophyll *a* appeared to respond somewhat to phosphorus, but all of the responses were statistically weak.





Figure 6-6. Relationships between nutrient concentrations and chlorophyll *a* concentrations in clear ( $\leq 40$  pcu, Figures a1-3), intermediate (40-100 pcu, Figures b1-3) and highly colored ( $> 100$  pcu, Figures c1-3) streams.

Further analysis of unshaded clear streams (*i.e.*, color  $\leq 40$  and canopy cover  $\leq 40\%$ ) indicate that TN and TIN were the variables having the strongest correlation with algal abundance measurements (Figure 6-7 a-c). The analysis also showed that TP concentration alone was not a strong predictor of the algal biomass rank (Figure 5-8). However based on the N:P ratios, N and P could be co-limiting algal growth in the stream system. To test this hypothesis, both N and P concentrations were ranked from 1 to 10 based on their range, mean, and standard deviation, and the ranked nutrient variables were combined (TN+ TP and NO<sub>x</sub> +TP) to test if the addition of TP improved the nutrient relationships with algal thickness. As indicated in Figure 6-7 d-e, the combined nutrient variables have a stronger correlation to algal thickness than the individual nutrient concentrations, potentially indicating N and P co-limitation for some streams. This finding also indicates that both nitrogen (TN and NO<sub>x</sub>) and phosphorus are significant in controlling algal thickness in streams. More details concerning these analyses are provided in Appendix 6-G.



**Figure 6-7.** The relationships between periphyton thickness and TN, TP, and NO<sub>x</sub> concentrations as well as combined ranks of nutrients in clear streams (transect canopy  $\leq 40\%$  and color  $\leq 40$  pcu). Each dot represents a stream reach. The dashed curves are the loess regression lines 95% confidence limits; and the vertical lines are change points and 95% confidence limits.

## 6.6 **Conclusions**

DEP has conducted multiple analyses using a variety of statistical techniques to investigate the effects of anthropogenic nutrient increases on the biological communities in Florida's streams. These analyses were performed to define relationships between nutrients and biological response variables that could be used to develop numeric nutrient criteria. These analyses evaluated the influence of nutrients on biological indices such as the Stream Condition Index, the Stream Diatom Index (currently under development), the individual metrics that comprise these indices, and other biological measures such as chlorophyll *a*, taxonomic composition of macroinvertebrate and algal communities, and frequency of occurrence and abundance of algae (RPS).

The results of the analyses generally indicate that many of the biological measures evaluated exhibit a statistically significant adverse response to nutrient enrichment, however, the relationships between the biological response variables and nutrient levels were confounded by numerous other factors such as color, pH conductivity, and canopy cover. The confounding effects of these other variables result in weak statistical relationships between measures of the biological communities and nutrient levels. While DEP believes the effect of nutrients on the biological communities is not clear enough to be used as the sole basis for establishing numeric nutrient criteria, the observed relationships between nutrients and the various biological measures demonstrate the need for nutrient criteria to prevent adverse biological effects in Florida streams.

The statistical significance indicates that numeric nutrient criteria should be established and supports the decision to implement an alternative approach to deriving protective criteria, the Nutrient Benchmark Distribution Approach that is described in the next chapter. While the analysis in this chapter did not produce numeric thresholds that could be used as water quality criteria, the relationships that were determined, while relatively weak, do support the values derived using the Nutrient Benchmark Approach. Both the analysis of the Rapid Periphyton Survey (regarding probability of increased algal thickness) and the analysis of the second change point in the stream periphyton response to nutrients indicate that the biological response to nutrient enrichment will generally occur at levels higher than the values generated using the Benchmark Distribution Approach.

## 6.7 **References**

- Barbour, M.T., Gerritsen, J., Snyder, B.D., and Stribling, J.B., 1999, Rapid bioassessment protocols for use in streams and rivers, benthic macroinvertebrates and fish (2d ed.): Washington D.C., U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, EPA 841-B-99-002
- Cade, B. S., Terrell, J. W., and Schroeder, R. L. 1999. Estimating Effects of Limiting Factors with Regression Quantiles. *Ecology* 80:311-323.

Robertson, D.M., Graczyk, D.J., Garrison, P.J., Wang, L., LaLiberte, G., and Bannerman, R., 2006. Nutrient concentrations and their relations to the biotic integrity of wadeable streams in Wisconsin: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1722, 139 p.

Robertson, D.M., B.M. Weigel, and D.J. Graczyk. 2008. Nutrient Concentrations and Their Relations to the Biotic Integrity of Nonwadeable Rivers in Wisconsin: U.S. Geological Survey Professional Paper 1754, 81 p.

Stevenson, R.J., A. Pinowska, A. Albertin, and J.O. Sickman. 2007. Ecological condition of algae and nutrients in Florida springs: The Synthesis Report. Prepared for the Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Tallahassee, FL. 58 pp.

DRAFT

## 7 Florida's Nutrient Benchmark Site Distributional Approach for Rivers and Streams

### 7.1 Introduction

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) *Nutrient Criteria Technical Guidance Manual: Rivers and Streams* (USEPA 2000) recommended that the most defensible approach for criteria development is to establish cause-effect relationships between nutrients and biological health endpoints. EPA guidance subsequently states that if these relationships were determined to be insufficiently robust for establishing numeric thresholds, the next best plan, involving a reference site distributional approach, should be employed. For this approach, which DEP has expanded and called the "Nutrient Benchmark Site Distributional Approach", EPA recommends setting criteria based on an inclusive distribution of values obtained from reference sites in a designated ecoregion (based on climate and geology, etc.).

DEP expanded this approach by identifying streams that were minimally affected by human disturbance and nutrients, and also by documenting the existence of full aquatic life full use support (using SCI methods). According to published EPA guidance, reference reaches may be identified for each class of streams within a state based on best professional judgment (BPJ). DEP expanded beyond EPA's BPJ approach regarding selection of reference streams, and developed an extremely rigorous, multi-step process (described below) to ensure that the sites eventually selected truly represented minimal human disturbance and full designated use support. If streams are documented to be minimally affected by humans and characterized by healthy biota, then it logically follows that the range of nutrient concentrations within those streams are also protective of the designated use.

DEP, after deliberating with its technical advisory committee (TAC), selected the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the benchmark distribution for threshold purposes in all nutrient regions except the Bone Valley. The 90<sup>th</sup> percentile is justified primarily because of the additional verification steps, including the documentation that the benchmark site population had healthy, well-balanced aquatic communities (see discussion below). In the Bone Valley, the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile is proposed due to the limited number of minimally disturbed streams available. Advantages of using DEP's Nutrient Benchmark Site Distributional Approach for nutrient criteria development include the following:

- Use of the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of nutrient concentrations derived from a distribution of minimally disturbed streams is inherently protective of aquatic life, including biota inhabiting downstream waters; and
- Documentation of healthy biological communities directly demonstrates that aquatic life uses are fully met within the associated range of nutrients.

One disadvantage of using the benchmark approach is that it does not identify the specific nutrient levels at which biological impairment occurs. For this reason, it cannot be concluded *a priori* that adverse effects on aquatic life actually occur at concentrations above these values.

## 7.2 **Extensive Verification Process for Selection of Benchmark Sites**

A critical component of DEP's benchmark approach is the comprehensive, multi-step evaluation process through which potential benchmark sites were thoroughly verified to assure that they represented minimally disturbed conditions. This multi-step evaluation included:

- Selection of candidate reference sites by identifying sites with a corridor Landscape Development Intensity Index (LDI) score of  $\leq 2$  (this step alone eliminated the majority of Florida sites from further consideration (Figure 7-1). Two additional benchmark exclusions were ultimately based on a whole watershed LDI analysis conducted by Tetra Tech;
- Elimination of sites included on the state's 303(d) list of impaired waters due to nutrients or dissolved oxygen related to nutrients;
- Elimination of sites with nitrate concentrations greater than the 0.35 mg/L proposed nitrate-nitrite criterion, which reduced the possibility of including sites with far-field human disturbance from groundwater inputs;
- Verification of surrounding land-use by examining high resolution aerial photographs taken in 2004-2005;
- Obtaining input from DEP District scientists knowledgeable of the area;
- Performing a statistical outlier analysis of nutrient concentrations to remove potentially erroneous data; and
- Finally, conducting an extensive field evaluation process, including a watershed assessment with verification of surrounding land-use and biological evaluation, of a large percentage of the remaining water bodies containing benchmark sites, with the emphasis on sites with nutrient concentrations greater than the mid-range of the distribution.

Through this process, candidate reference sites were subjected to a systematic, comprehensive evaluation process prior to including them as benchmark sites. Maps, photos, and a summary of the data collected at each of the verified benchmark sites can be found in Appendix 7-A. Each of the above steps is described in more detail below.

### 7.2.1 **Landscape Development Intensity Index (LDI) score of $\leq 2$**

Candidate benchmark sites were initially selected based on an application of the landscape development intensity index (LDI). Brown and Vivas (2003) developed the LDI as an estimate of the intensity of human land uses based on nonrenewable energy flow. Application of the LDI is based on the ecological principle that the intensity of human dominated land uses in a landscape affect ecological processes of natural communities. More intense activities will result in greater effects on ecological processes. Natural landscapes with little or no agricultural or urban development will likely have intact ecological systems and processes. The LDI was developed specifically as an index of human disturbance, and has been shown to provide predictive capability regarding nutrient loading (Figure 7-2).




Figure 7-1. LDI results for 5570 stations by sub-ecoregion for initial candidate reference site evaluation. Sites scoring above 2 on the LDI were eliminated from further consideration (except for a single site in the Bone Valley Region, which due to the sparseness of reference sites, was accepted at an LDI of 2.2).




Figure 7-2. Relationship between nutrient loading (nitrogen in panel (a), phosphorus in panel (b)) and the LDI in the St. Marks Watershed, Florida (from Brown and Vivas 2003).

The LDI is calculated as the area-weighted value of the land uses within an area of influence (Figure 7-3). Using the land use coefficients and the percent area occupied by each land use as determined by GIS land use coverage developed from high resolution aerial photographs, the LDI is calculated as follows:

$$LDI_{Total} = \sum (LDC_i * \%LU_i)$$

where,

$LDI_{Total}$  = Landscape Development Intensity Index for the area of influence


$\%LU_i$  = percent of total area of influence in land use  $i$

$LDC_i$  = landscape development intensity coefficient for land use  $i$

The LDI calculated on the land uses within a 100 meter corridor of a stream was found to be a better predictor of ecological health than the LDI calculated on an entire catchment (Fore 2004). Sources of disturbance near a stream exert greater influence than do far field human influences (Brown and Vivas 2003). Fore (2004) previously demonstrated that LDIs calculated using a 100 meter corridor were slightly better predictors of biological health (i.e., Stream Condition Index) than LDIs calculated on the entire upstream catchment area (watershed).

The utility of this corridor approach is related to the demonstrated effectiveness of the riparian corridor zones in removing pollutants, especially nutrients, from storm water inputs (both surface and subsurface flow). Studies have shown that corridor zone widths of 60 meters are sufficient to reduce nutrient loads by up to 95% before reaching the stream (Peterjohn and Corell 1985). Additionally, corridor zones in the Coastal Plain areas have been shown to be effective in retaining nutrients because of gradual slopes, permeable soils, and the abundance of roots that enter the shallow groundwater zones (Lowrance *et al.* 1997). Since phosphorus is typically found bound to sediments, riparian zones retain most of the incoming phosphorus by capturing sediments. Other studies have shown that nitrate in shallow groundwater beneath riparian zones was removed by 85 to 90% due to plant uptake and denitrification in riparian zones 50-70 meters wide (Lowrance 1992; Jordan *et al.* 1993; Jacobs and Gilliam 1985; Lowrance *et al.* 1997).

For purposes of benchmark site selection, LDI values were calculated from land uses within a corridor area of 100 meters on each side of the stream and tributaries within a 10 kilometer radius upstream of the sampling point as shown in Figure 7-3. While numerous studies have concluded that corridor widths of 50 to 70 meters are sufficient to reduce storm water nutrient loads to streams by as much as 95%, additional corridor width provides additional protection to the water body. Based on these literature findings and the better correlations with biological health described above, DEP concluded that using a corridor width of 100 meters would provide adequate protection to Florida's water bodies and that a LDI calculated based on a 100 meters corridor is an appropriate method of selecting candidate benchmark sites with minimal human disturbance and healthy biological communities.



**Figure 7-3. Depiction of land use area (light yellow) included in a LDI calculation.**

An additional analysis by Tetra Tech (Appendix 7-B) compared the nutrient distributions of sites characterized by corridor LDIs  $\leq 2$  with LDIs of the same sites calculated on a larger watershed area. This analysis suggested exclusion of two additional sites, one from the Bone Valley region (South Prong Alafia River) and one from the North Central region (Camp Branch), and closer scrutiny of additional sites in the Bone Valley region. The analysis indicated that higher total phosphorus concentrations observed at the South Prong Alafia River and Camp Branch could be explained by human disturbance, based on the higher watershed LDI values found at the WBIDs. After exclusion of these two sites, DEP recalculated the nutrient distributions, which resulted in values different from earlier calculations (Table 7-3).

As discussed in DEP's Nutrient Plan (2009), the LDI was specifically designed as a measure of human disturbance. LDI values of less than or equal to 2.0 within the 100 meter corridor area are indicative of areas with very minimal levels of human disturbance. Numerous studies and evaluations have demonstrated, across multiple water body types and taxonomic groups, that the LDI is an accurate predictor of biological health; that is, healthy well-balanced biological systems are much more likely to occur at sites with low LDIs ( $\leq 2.0$ ) than at higher disturbance levels (Fore 2004, Niu 2004, Brown and Reiss 2006, FDEP 2009, Fore *et al.* 2007). Furthermore, it has been demonstrated that a LDI of 2.0 is a consistent and conservative

biologically significant break point that can be used to distinguish benchmark conditions from potentially disturbed areas.

A more detailed discussion of the LDI and its use to select minimally impacted benchmark sites is provided in Appendix A of Florida's Numeric Nutrient Criteria Development Plan (FDEP 2009). Since it has been demonstrated that the LDI is highly correlated with multiple measures of biological health, use of the LDI as an initial screening to select candidate benchmark sites is a conservative and ecologically reliable method.

### **7.2.2 Screening against the 303(d) List of Impaired Waters**

Sites located within WBIDs listed on the State's Verified 303(d) lists as impaired for nutrients or dissolved oxygen, where nutrients were identified as the causative parameters, were excluded as benchmark sites. Additionally, sites within WBIDs listed on the Verified or Planning 303(d) lists for biological impairments, regardless of cause, were excluded from the benchmark population.

It should be noted that since the benchmark sites exhibit low LDIs and minimal human disturbance, WBIDs identified as impaired for dissolved oxygen with factors other than nutrients as the cause likely represent natural conditions for those sites. Further, moderate dissolved oxygen excursions below Florida's current dissolved oxygen criteria of 5.0 mg/L have not been associated with any adverse biological impacts (in fact some benchmark sites with exceptional SCI scores had dissolved oxygen less than 5.0 mg/L). Therefore, sites with dissolved oxygen levels less than 5.0 mg/L were not excluded from the benchmark data set.

### **7.2.3 Screening Against the 0.35 mg/L Proposed Nitrate-nitrite Threshold**

As stated above, phosphorus adheres tightly to particulates, meaning that soils are exceedingly effective at trapping and removing storm water containing phosphorus. For this reason, phosphorus generated by human activities beyond a 100 m corridor is unlikely to reach a stream via a groundwater pathway. However, nitrate-nitrite is very mobile in groundwater, and may travel in subsurface aquifers for significant distances to be discharged into streams via seeps or springs. DEP has determined that anthropogenic activities are responsible for elevated groundwater nitrate-nitrite concentrations and is proposing a nitrate-nitrite criterion of 0.35 mg/L for clear streams. Since DEP is confident that this response-based proposed criterion is protective, candidate benchmark sites that exceed this nitrate concentration (0.35 mg/L) were eliminated from consideration as benchmark sites. This step provides assurances that the benchmark sites were not influenced by far-field anthropogenic nutrients.

### **7.2.4 Verification of Surrounding Land-use by Examining High Resolution Aerial Photographs**

The minimally disturbed condition of every candidate site was confirmed via a review of recent (2004-2005) high resolution (1-m ground resolution) aerial photographs. This review consisted of searching the photos for recent land clearing or development, in particular any disturbance that encroached into the 100 meter corridor area used to calculate the LDI. Additionally, sites not representative of freshwater streams (*e.g.*, tidally influenced or channelized) were excluded. Many sites were excluded based on the review of aerial photographs, including several that

appeared to be within canals or channelized streams and therefore were not considered representative of a minimally disturbed stream condition.

### 7.2.5 Obtaining Input from DEP District Biologists

DEP district scientists familiar with streams in their area were asked to provide feedback on the list of candidate benchmark sites. Specifically, they were presented with the following information and question:

*For ongoing nutrient criteria development, we are identifying sites with benign land uses in their upstream watershed ( $LDI < 2$ ) to define the benchmark condition. Ken Weaver has produced the attached table of low LDI peninsular benchmark sites. Can you please look over the list to determine if there are any human activities at particular sites, which may not have been captured by the LDI that would disqualify the site from being used to define "benchmark" for nutrient criteria?*

Over twenty study sites were excluded from the benchmark set based on feedback and best professional judgment comments provided by District staff. The staff identified additional channelized streams, estuarine sites, and potentially disturbed sites. In some cases the staff identified potential point source discharges or localized disturbances (e.g., cattle in the stream) that may not have been captured in the LDI calculation. In other cases, sites were excluded because the reviewer was aware of moderate to high levels of development within the watershed that were outside the 100 meter corridor, but in their opinion, could potentially affect the nutrient regime. Exclusion of these potentially disturbed sites represents an additional conservative component of DEP's approach designed to ensure that the benchmark set consists solely of minimally disturbed locations.

Additional sites were excluded because they were potentially estuarine or tidally influenced based on proximity to the coast and a subsequent review of specific conductance data. All potentially estuarine sites routinely had specific conductance levels above 1,275  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$  and episodic values above 4,500  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ . A conductivity of 4,500  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$  is approximately equivalent to a chloride concentration of 1,500 mg/L, which is used in Florida as the threshold between predominantly fresh and marine waters.

### 7.2.6 Field Evaluation Process, Including Watershed Assessment and Biological Appraisal of Benchmark Sites

In 2007 and 2008, experienced DEP Tallahassee staff conducted a comprehensive study of a large number of the candidate benchmark sites, selected via the above process, as a means of providing additional assurance that the sites were truly representative of minimally disturbed conditions. The population of candidate benchmark sites selected for additional review consisted predominantly of WBIDs with nutrient concentrations higher than the mid-range of the distribution. The objective of this final in-field verification step, which included a watershed survey and biological assessment, was to build ultimate confidence in the selection of the final benchmark sites, focusing especially on those with nutrient concentrations higher than the middle of the distribution.

Sites visited were selected to be representative of most of the WBIDs in the candidate benchmark dataset. The site with the most extensive and longest period of nutrient data was selected to represent the WBID.

Site evaluations included a survey of anthropogenic inputs and surrounding land uses. The survey included a driving tour of the portions of the watershed accessible to DEP, guided by high resolution aerial photographs taken in 2004-2005, and maps of the entire drainage basin. During the watershed survey, DEP investigators made a series of observations regarding potential human disturbances in the watershed, including potential nonpoint source inputs and hydrologic modifications (using the DEP hydrologic scoring system). The hydrologic scoring system was originally developed to support the development of Florida's SCI and is based on knowledge of water removal, patterns of drought, and hydrographs for the sites under evaluation, and serves as a rough measure of hydrologic disturbance in a system (Fore 2004, Fore *et al.* 2007).

Stream Habitat Assessments (HA) were conducted following DEP-SOP-001/01 FT 3100 (FDEP, 2008). The HA evaluates substrate condition and availability, water velocity, habitat smothering (*e.g.*, by sand and silt), channelization, bank stability, and the width and condition of riparian vegetation. In addition to the 100 meter reach of the stream examined during the HA, investigators also physically examined a minimum of 200 meters upstream of the site, including potential riparian zone breaches.

At each site, trained and experienced DEP staff also collected and analyzed the biological, chemical, and physical parameters listed in Table 7-1 following DEP SOPs: (<http://www.dep.state.fl.us/labs/sop>). Water levels were evaluated by both reviewing hydrographs from the given stream or other streams in the general vicinity and by visual inspection of the stream habitats. Biological samples (*e.g.*, SCI) were not collected if, based on the judgment of the experienced investigator, current or antecedent flow conditions were inappropriate, or a majority of the aquatic habitat was exposed to the air rather than being inundated. Water chemistry samples were collected at all sites unless there were only discontinuous pools of water, in which case no samples were collected. These sites were, however, still included in the benchmark data set. Note that sites with an average score of less than 40 (the revised impairment threshold) on the SCI were excluded from the benchmark data set for calculation of the final nutrient distribution.

Information acquired during the site and watershed evaluations was used to provide final confirmation that the benchmark sites chosen by DEP were in fact representative of minimally disturbed conditions for the region. Taken together with the extensive screening criteria, the results of the stream surveys provide an extremely high level of confidence that nutrients associated with DEP's benchmark data set fully support healthy, well-balanced aquatic communities (see discussion below).

Table 7-1. List of parameters monitored during the benchmark stream survey

<u>Biological Parameters</u>	<u>Chemical and Physical Parameters</u>
• Stream Condition Index (SCI)	• Total Phosphorus
• Rapid Periphyton Assessment	• Nitrite + Nitrate
• Qualitative Periphyton Sampling (i.e., periphyton taxonomy)	• Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen
	• Ammonia
	• Color
• Habitat Assessment	• Turbidity
• Chlorophyll-a	• Total Suspended Solids
• Phaeophytin	• Total Organic Carbon
• Hydrologic Modification Scoring	• Specific Conductance ( <i>in situ</i> )
• Linear Vegetation Survey	• Dissolved Oxygen ( <i>in situ</i> )
• Percent Canopy Cover	• pH ( <i>in situ</i> )
	• Water Temperature ( <i>in situ</i> )

### 7.3 Results of Benchmark Screening Process

The initial set of candidate reference sites identified by DEP statewide, with available nutrient data of known quality and LDI values less than or equal to 2.0, consisted of 1,171 sites distributed among 507 WBIDs. After excluding sites due to the multi-step screening process, a total of 493 stations in 129 WBIDs remained. Due to time and resource considerations, not all of these WBIDs could be visited; therefore, DEP emphasized field verification of sites with nutrient values higher than the mid-range of the distribution. The total number of benchmark sites that successfully passed the field verification was 63. Because of hydrologic conditions (predominantly low-water conditions), biological sampling was not conducted at all of the field-verified sites; however, these sites were determined to be minimally disturbed through the watershed survey and habitat assessment process. As of the date of this document, SCI samples were collected at 51 sites, the Rapid Periphyton Survey was conducted at 54 sites, and periphyton community structure data was collected at 60 sites. Summary descriptions and evaluations for each of the benchmark sites are included in Table 7-4 at the end of this chapter. Further screening of sites was based on outliers identified from the near-field watershed LDI analysis by Tetra Tech (Appendix 7-A).

### 7.4 Analysis of Nutrient Benchmark Sites Biological Data

The SCI scores from the list of field-verified nutrient benchmark sites (based upon all the verification steps previously described) were compared to their corresponding LDI, TP, and TN values, in order to determine whether the ranges of these parameters were supportive of healthy biological communities. The dataset includes 66 sampling events at a total of 49 stations across

the state (thirteen stations were sampled twice, and two were sampled three times). All of the SCI values were calculated using the SCI\_2007 method (Fore *et al.* 2007).

As described previously, the SCI is negatively correlated across the whole range of LDI, meaning biological health decreases in response to increasing levels of human activities (Figure 7-4). However, within the low range of LDI ( $\leq 2$ ) associated with the nutrient benchmark site dataset, no correlation was found between LDI score and SCI score (Figure 7-5). (Note that SCI scores were averaged for sites with more than one SCI sampling event.) This indicates that LDI scores of up to 2.2 (the LDI value at one of the Bone Valley sites), when coupled with DEP's verification process, are associated with healthy biological communities.





Figure 7-4. Relationship between the Landscape Development Intensity Index and Stream Condition Index across the entire range of LDI.



**Figure 7-5.** In contrast to the figure 7-4, note the lack of correlation between SCI and LDI values of minimally disturbed sites ( $LDI \leq 2$ , with one exception where LDI was 2.2).

The graphs of SCI scores vs. TN and TP (Figures 7-6 and 7-7) indicate that the benchmark sites support healthy well-balanced populations of flora and fauna even at nutrient concentrations above the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the benchmark distribution. In fact, exceptional biological communities ( $SCI \geq 68$ ) were found at sites with TP concentrations as high as approximately 600  $\mu\text{g/L}$ , and TN concentrations as high as approximately 3  $\text{mg/L}$ . Therefore, it can be concluded that TP and TN concentrations at least as high as the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile, which is derived and discussed below, are protective of the natural populations of flora and fauna in minimally disturbed streams.




Figure 7-6. Benchmark site SCI vs. total nitrogen. Note the lack of correlation between SCI and total nitrogen throughout the range of benchmark sites. This indicates that there are no adverse effects by establishing nutrient criteria at the upper 90th percentile of the benchmark distribution. Sites scoring less than 40 on the SCI (after QA review) were excluded from the benchmark data set for calculation of the final nutrient distribution.




Figure 7-7. Benchmark site SCI vs. total phosphorus. Note the lack of correlation between SCI and Total phosphorus throughout the range of benchmark sites. This indicates that there are no adverse effects by establishing nutrient criteria at the upper 90th percentile of the benchmark distribution. Sites scoring less than 40 on the SCI (after QA review) were excluded from the benchmark data set for calculation of the final nutrient distribution.

Periphyton community composition and taxonomy, and the extent and thickness of algae coverage (RPS), were also collected at benchmark sites. The periphyton community response to environmental factors is complex, and data analysis indicates that factors such as pH, conductivity, canopy cover, and color appear to exert significant confounding influences on the periphyton response to nutrients (see Chapter 6). The analysis of the periphyton data to date suggests that changes in algal community structure and abundance are, in part, significantly related to nutrients, however, DEP concluded that the relationships discerned were statistically too weak to establish credible numeric nutrient thresholds. Benchmark sites in general exhibited low algal coverage and thickness, except for a few sites with limestone outcroppings, where algal growth was moderate. Based on the periphyton analyses and observations made during benchmark site field studies, evidence supports the selection of the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the benchmark site nutrient distribution for establishment of protective criteria.

### 7.5 **Conclusions for Use of the Benchmark Distribution to Establish Nutrient Criteria**

As stated in the previous chapter, DEP has invested significant resources it attempting to derive criteria based on dose-response relationships. However, DEP has concluded that specific thresholds could not be established due to the inherent variability within and between streams and the compounding complexity from other factors. Since the benchmark distributional approach is derived from healthy streams that are fully supportive of the designated use, DEP plans to apply these criteria to control anthropogenic discharges to streams through source control efforts such as the NPDES and TMDL program.

DEP will also incorporate the benchmark-based stream criteria into our 303(d) assessment procedures. However, identification of impaired waters will be implemented through a two step process. At sites with nutrient concentrations higher than the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile, an additional variable that responds to nutrient enrichment would have to be exceeded (*i.e.*, chlorophyll *a*, biological health criteria, Dissolved Oxygen, or “free from” criteria) to verify that biological impairment is occurring and, if so, to definitively establish that nutrients are a reasonable cause of designated use impairment. In the absence of such confirmatory data, DEP will place these waters on the Planning List, which captures those water bodies that are potentially impaired and are targeted for follow-up monitoring and analysis.

The nutrient gradient stressor-response analysis (Chapter 6) clearly demonstrated the complexity inherent in the relationship between nutrients, the interaction with other environmental factors, and biological responses. Although statistically significant relationships were found, the variability in biological response explained by nutrients alone was statistically weak, and DEP concluded that the analyses provided no basis for establishing specific nutrient thresholds. Therefore, following EPA guidance, DEP proposes an upper percentile distribution of the benchmark distribution as a viable method to establish criteria.

DEP considered the advantages and disadvantages of using the 90<sup>th</sup>, 95<sup>th</sup>, and 99<sup>th</sup> percentiles of the benchmark distribution in setting criteria. Based upon the statistical model on which the distributions were derived, DEP determined that there was less certainty in the inclusiveness of the 95<sup>th</sup> and 99<sup>th</sup> percentiles given the sparseness of data at the extreme end of the distribution.

However, DEP had high assurance that the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile was inclusive of the distribution of minimally disturbed sites due to the sufficiency of the data surrounding this range.

Note that the lack of a demonstration that biological impairment actually occurs at specific nutrient levels greater than the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the benchmark sites is a disadvantage of using this approach. For this reason, for future assessments, DEP supports conducting additional evaluation at sites with nutrient values higher than the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile to definitively establish that nutrients are a reasonable cause of designated use impairment.

In summary, DEP is proposing to establish numeric nutrient criteria for TP and TN in streams using the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the benchmark distribution, except for the Bone Valley nutrient region where data is limited, based upon the following reasons:

- It is consistent with EPA guidance;
- DEP conducted a rigorous verification to demonstrate that the benchmark sites were minimally disturbed;
- DEP confirmed that healthy, well balanced biological communities were maintained at nutrient levels above the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile (greatly minimizing Type II error, the mistake of classifying an impaired site as acceptable);
- The stressor/response analyses, while demonstrating significant relationships between nutrients and biological response, provided no basis for establishing specific nutrient thresholds;
- Use of a 75<sup>th</sup> percentile would result in an excessive Type I error (25% of benchmark sites, and a large number of healthy sites would incorrectly be classified as impaired, and subsequent use of resources to “restore” such unimpacted sites would constitute unwise public policy, and would contradict State Law, F.S. 403); and
- Although the 95<sup>th</sup> and 99<sup>th</sup> percentiles were considered, DEP determined that there was insufficient certainty in the inclusiveness of the 95<sup>th</sup> and 99<sup>th</sup> percentiles given the sparseness of data at the extreme end of the distribution. However, DEP has high assurance that the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile is inclusive of the distribution of minimally disturbed sites due to the sufficiency of the data surrounding this range in all nutrient regions except for the Bone Valley. In the Bone Valley the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile was used due to the limited amount of data available.

## 7.6 **Calculation of Benchmark Derived Nutrient Criteria**

### 7.6.1 **Data Handling**

Nutrient data from the benchmark sites were queried from Florida STORET, DEP’s Status and Trends dataset (GWIS database), and the benchmark site verification dataset. Data were screened for potential data quality issues (e.g., improper sample preservation, analysis performed outside of hold time, etc.). Additionally, statistical outlier analysis was performed on individual data points by region to exclude extreme outliers that are likely erroneous and/or not representative of normal site conditions. The outlier analysis was performed using standard statistical methods by defining the extreme outlier limit as:

75th percentile + 3.0 \* Interquartile Range.

Data points identified as outliers were excluded from the dataset (Table 7-2).

DRAFT

**Table 7-2. Summary of the regional data outlier analysis and exclusions for the Florida stream nutrient benchmark dataset.**

Parameter	Region	N	25th Percentile	75th Percentile	Outlier Limit	Percent Outlier
TP (mg/L)	Panhandle	1507	0.016	0.050	0.152	2.6
	Northeast	761	0.026	0.096	0.306	1.8
	North Central	2134	0.088	0.280	0.856	5.0
	Peninsula	2421	0.045	0.101	0.269	1.6
	Bone Valley	176	0.192	0.544	1.60	1.1
TN (mg/L)	Panhandle	1287	0.35	0.70	1.75	2.4
	Northeast, North Central, Peninsula, and Bone Valley	4645	0.71	1.41	3.49	0.8

A number of the benchmark water bodies were sampled numerous times and by different agencies. The sampling sites used by the different samplers are often located within several hundred meters of each other. Therefore, to avoid biasing the analyses toward the larger water bodies with multiple sampling sites within close proximity to each other, the station level data was aggregated by WBID.

Elevated nutrient levels are not acutely toxic in the aquatic environment; instead, their effects are chronic and cumulative over time. Nutrient concentrations are typically variable over time and exhibit a log-normal distribution in the aquatic environment. Therefore, instantaneous criteria are not generally considered practical or appropriate for nutrients, and are better expressed as an average over a longer period of time. Additionally, the geometric mean, rather than an arithmetic mean, is often used to provide a more accurate representation of the central tendency of positively skewed data (*e.g.*, log-normal), such as nutrient concentrations. The use of the annual geometric mean mutes the short-term variability in sampling quality data to provide a more reliable, long-term value for assessing the nutrient status in aquatic environments.

For the reasons discussed above, annual WBID geometric means were calculated for purposes of evaluating the frequency distribution of nitrogen and phosphorus by region for benchmark streams. Additionally, to reduce the effect of low sample sizes, while capturing the temporal variability and maintaining the maximum amount of data being considered, a minimum of 4 samples per year in each WBID was established to be the appropriate requirement for the data to be included in further analysis of the regional distribution.

### 7.6.2 Final Dataset Statistics

The final datasets (following all of the screening of the candidate benchmark sites) used to derive TN and TP criteria contained an ample amount of data collected throughout the state. The final TP dataset consisted of 565 WBID-years with a minimum of 4 TP measurements. The 565 WBID-years of data included 5,999 individual TP measurements collected from 127 WBIDs across the state. Likewise, the final TN dataset consisted of 523 WBID-years that had a minimum of 4 TN measurements. The 536 WBID-years of data included 5,037 individual TN measurements within 127 WBIDs. Upper percentile thresholds were calculated based on the log-normal frequency distribution of annual WBID geometric mean concentrations by region (Table 7-3).

Phosphorus criteria were calculated as the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile annual geometric mean concentration separately for the Panhandle, Northeast, North Central, and Peninsula nutrient regions. The phosphorus criterion for the Bone Valley was calculated as the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile annual geometric mean concentration. A lower percentile was selected for the Bone Valley due to greater uncertainty in the upper end of the distribution for this region given the limited number of benchmark sites and WBIDs.

Total nitrogen criteria were calculated as the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile annual geometric mean concentrations for the Panhandle nutrient region and combined Northeast, North Central, Peninsula and Bone Valley region. As discussed in Chapter 5, nitrogen concentrations did not exhibit the same regional spatial patterns observed for phosphorus. The primary regional difference was between the Panhandle and the remainder of the state. Therefore, a single TN criterion can be applied to the Northeast, North Central, Peninsula, and Bone Valley regions.

Table 7-3. Regional total phosphorus and total nitrogen criteria for Florida streams. DEP recommends that stream nutrient criteria be established as the 90th percentile values, with the exception of TP in the Bone Valley where the 75th percentile is more defensible (due to small sample size). These final values are the result of all the various verification and exclusion steps mentioned above. TIN values are shown for informational purposes only, since a nitrate-nitrite criterion has been established for clear streams based on algal responses to nitrate-nitrite.

Stream Benchmark Distribution Derived Criteria Limits							
Parameter	Region	WBID Years	WBIDS	Mean LN	Std Dev LN	75th %tile	90th %tile
TP (mg/L)	Panhandle	125	44	-3.662	0.768	0.043	<b>0.069</b>
	Northeast	54	20	-3.205	0.714	0.066	<b>0.101</b>
	North Central	180	18	-1.973	0.656	0.216	<b>0.322</b>
	Peninsula	193	42	-2.746	0.464	0.088	<b>0.116</b>
	Bone Valley	13	3	-1.211	0.491	<b>0.415</b>	0.559
TN (mg/L)	Panhandle	123	42	-0.76	0.45	0.63	<b>0.82</b>
	NE-NC-Pen-BV	400	85	-0.03	0.45	1.31	<b>1.73</b>
TIN (mg/L)	Panhandle	120	44	-2.25	0.79	0.18	<b>0.29</b>
	NE-NC-Pen-BV	379	84	-2.54	0.72	0.13	<b>0.20</b>

**Table 7-4. Summary of information collected from field-verified nutrient benchmark sites.**

DRAFT

Station Name	STORET ID	WBID	Habitat Assessment Score	Stream Condition Index Score*	Qualitative Periphyton Sampling Conducted	Rapid Periphyton Survey Conducted
<b>Bone Valley Region</b>						
Deer Prairie Creek	27051558216422	1978	117	74	Yes	Yes
East Fork Manatee River	273116508208152	1811	128	71	Yes	Yes
Manatee River @ SR 64	24010002	1807C	108	64	Yes	Yes
<b>North Central Region</b>						
Alapaha River @ CR 150	21010008	3324	138	59	Yes	Yes
Deep Creek @ US 441	DEP010C1	3388	97	80	Yes	Yes
Falling Creek @ C-131	FAL020C1	3477	142	55	Yes	Yes
Little Creek @ US 441	21010033	3368	127	89	Yes	Yes
New River @ SR 18	21030049	3506	130	76	Yes	Yes
Olustee Creek @ SR 100	UNI234LV	3504	118	44	Yes	Yes
Robinson Branch @ C-246	ROB01C1	3448	128	81	Yes	Yes
Sampson River @ SW 106 Ave	3598-B	3598	131	65	Yes	Yes
Santa Fe River @ Worthington Springs	SFR030C1	3605D	132	64	Yes	Yes
Suwannee River @ CR 6	3535	3341B	130	52	Yes	Yes
Suwannee River @ White Springs, FL (US 41)	21010040	3341A	145	69	Yes	Yes
Swift Creek @ CR 239	21030088	3530	105	-	Yes	Yes
<b>Northeast Region</b>						
Alligator Creek @ US 301 & SR115	19020052	2153	137	63	Yes	Yes
Ates Creek @ CR 315	CLA243LV	2498	144	91	Yes	Yes
Black Creek @ SR 16	CLA254LR	2415C	133	91	Yes	Yes
Greens Creek @ CR 315	GC315	2478	114	-	Yes	Yes
Little St. Marys River @ CR 121 A	19010046	2106	117	-	Yes	Yes
Middle Prong St. Marys River @ CR 125	19010041	2211	137	78	Yes	Yes
Middle Prong St. Marys River @ CR 127	MPS	2211	131	71	Yes	Yes
Mills Creek SE of 200	-	2120A	118	-	No	No
North Fork Black Creek @ Jennings Landing	14264	2387	137	73	Yes	Yes
Peters Creek @ CR 315 A	CLA246GS	2444	146	83	Yes	Yes
Plummer Creek @ SR A1A	19020064	2130	117	-	No	No
South Fork Black Creek @ SR 21	20030481	2415E	144	83	Yes	Yes
St. Marys River @ SR 2	19010006	2097K	124	75	Yes	Yes
St. Marys River @ Tompkins Landing	19010077	2097F	114	-	Yes	Yes
<b>Panhandle Region</b>						
Aucilla River @ Highway 90	22040004	3310C	126	61	Yes	Yes
Blackwater River @ Highway 4 NW of Baker	3545	24C	128	63	Yes	Yes
Econfina Creek @ Scott Road	32030023	553	130	82	Yes	Yes
Econfina River @ Highway 98	TAY170LR	3402	99	-	Yes	No
Escambia River @ Highway 184	33020007	10D	115	-	Yes	No
Escambia River @ Highway 4	3549	10C	120	54	Yes	Yes
Mule Creek @ SR 12	LIB104LV	684	132	67	Yes	Yes
Quincy Creek above 267	22020093	1303	122	57	Yes	Yes
Sopchoppy River	WAK158LR	998	125	53	Yes	No
St. Marks River	WAK168LR	793B	155	45	Yes	Yes
Swamp Creek @ SR 159	S232	427	112	49	Yes	Yes
Telogia Creek @ CR 1641	NUTREF001	1300	133	68	Yes	Yes
Wacissa River near Big Blue Spring	22040009	3424A	138	40	Yes	Yes
Yellow River @ Highway 2	3546	30	137	67	Yes	Yes
Yon Creek @ SR 12	GAD106GS	626	135	78	Yes	Yes
<b>Peninsula Region</b>						
Bee Branch	28020299FTM	3235E	141	49	Yes	Yes
Blackwater Creek @ State Road 44A	20010455	2929A	125	77	Yes	No
Blackwater Creek upstream of Carter Prop Bridge	20010536	2929A	130	-	Yes	Yes
Cow Creek @ CR 138	21030086	3649	134	-	Yes	Yes
Cypress Branch above 78	GLA630GS	3235G	137	65	Yes	Yes
Econlockhatchee River @ Snowhill Road	ECH	2991A	106	52	Yes	No
Little Orange Creek	PUT308GS	2713	131	75	Yes	Yes
Little Orange Creek below Cabbage Creek	LOCBCC	2713	130	89	Yes	Yes
Moses Creek @ US 1	27010050	2535	138	60	Yes	Yes
Orange Creek upstream of Highway 21	21202	2747	119	78	Yes	Yes
St. Johns River near DeLand	2236000	2893B	128	-	Yes	No
Steinhatchee River @ Canal Road	22050083	3573A	148	52	Yes	Yes
Steven's Branch off CR 204	27010070	2551A	128	76	Yes	Yes
Tosohatchee Creek @ WMA	ORA331LV	3035	116	-	Yes	Yes
Waccasassa River above SR 24	LEV502GS	3699	138	69	Yes	Yes
Withlacoochee River @ County Park	23010464	1329	144	43	Yes	Yes
Withlacoochee River @ SR 471	WITHLACORVR1	1329F	119	-	Yes	Yes
Withlacoochee River @ Stokes Ferry	3513	1329C	153	58	Yes	Yes
Withlacoochee River @ Trails End	FL0052000087500	1329E	118	-	No	No

## 7.7 References

- Brown, M.T., and K.C. Reiss. 2006. *Proposed breakpoint of LDI  $\leq$  2.0 for determining minimally affected reference conditions for water bodies*. Gainesville, FL: Center for Environmental Policy, Department of Environmental Engineering Sciences, University of Florida. Technical report submitted to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.
- Brown, M.T., and M.B. Vivas. 2003. *A Landscape Development Intensity Index*. Gainesville, FL: Center for Environmental Policy, Department of Environmental Engineering Sciences, University of Florida. Technical report submitted to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.
- Brown, M.T., and M.B. Vivas. 2005. Landscape Development Intensity Index. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 101:289–309
- FDEP. 2009. State of Florida Numeric Nutrient Criteria Development Plan. <http://www.dep.state.fl.us/water/wqssp/nutrients/docs/fl-nutrient-plan-v030309.pdf>
- Fore, L.S. 2004. *Development and testing of biomonitoring tools for macroinvertebrates in Florida streams*. Final report to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.
- Fore, L.S., R. Frydenborg, D. Miller, T. Frick, D. Whiting, J. Espy, and L. Wolfe. 2007. *Development and testing of biomonitoring tools for macroinvertebrates in Florida streams (Stream Condition Index and BioRecon)*. Final report to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection.
- Jacobs, T.C., and J. W. Gilliam. 1985. Riparian losses of nitrate from agricultural drainage waters. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 14:472-478.
- Jordan, T.E., D.L. Correll, and D.E. Weller. 1993. Nutrient interception by a riparian forest receiving inputs from adjacent cropland. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 22:467-473.
- Lowrance, R. 1997. Water quality functions of riparian forest buffers in Chesapeake Bay watersheds. *Environmental Management* 21:687–712.
- Lowrance, R. 1992. Groundwater nitrate and denitrification in a coastal plain riparian soil. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 21:401-405.
- Niu, X. 2004. *Change point analysis of the chlorophyll-a and LDI data from the IWRM Status Network Cycle 1 lakes study*. Tallahassee, FL: Department of Statistics, Florida State University. Technical report submitted to the Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Tallahassee, FL.
- Peterjohn, W.T., and D.L. Corell. 1985. Nutrient dynamics in an agricultural watershed: Observations on the role of a riparian forest. *Ecology* 65:1466-1475.
- USEPA. 2000. *Nutrient criteria technical guidance manual: Rivers and streams*. EPA 822-B-00-002. Washington, DC: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

## 8 Nutrient Longitudinal Study: Downstream Effects of Nutrients in Selected Florida Rivers/Estuaries

### 8.1 Introduction

DEP initiated the Nutrient Longitudinal Study during the summer of 2008 to evaluate downstream biological responses to naturally high upstream phosphorus levels. Biological responses to excess nutrients can be separated in space and time from enrichment sources—*i.e.*, an adverse response to nutrients may occur well downstream from the actual enrichment. DEP's hypothesis is that within systems with low levels of human disturbance and intact ecological processes, naturally high levels of nutrients can usually be assimilated into the ecosystem without causing adverse biological responses to the streams or downstream estuaries (*i.e.*, the systems have evolved over time in conjunction with the existing nutrient regime). The goal of this study was to determine whether nutrient concentrations representative of the upper portion of the benchmark site distribution are protective of the designated use of downstream reaches.

#### 8.1.1 Project Objectives

The objectives of the study were as follows:

- (1) Collect physical, chemical, and biological data throughout the length of selected Florida river/estuary systems to establish the relationship between nutrient levels and adverse biological responses, including the most sensitive (generally downstream) reaches; and*
- (2) Analyze the resulting dataset as one line of evidence in DEP's effort to establish numeric nutrient criteria, particularly relating to the protection of downstream waters.*

#### 8.1.2 Project Description

The longitudinal study focused on relating the effects of nutrients on various biological systems, from upstream to downstream, including the most sensitive areas, which typically are slowly flowing lower reaches or estuaries. Two systems were studied: the Waccasassa River and Estuary and the Steinhatchee River and Estuary. Both rivers are in the Big Bend region of the state and the Peninsula nutrient region. Blue Spring in Levy County forms the source of the Waccasassa River, which flows south to the Gulf of Mexico. The Steinhatchee River originates in Lafayette County and flows south, forming the border between Taylor and Dixie Counties, and empties into the Gulf. Both systems were selected to represent conditions of relatively low human disturbance, meaning the existing nutrient concentrations represent minimal amounts of anthropogenic influence.

Sampling of both systems was conducted in August 2008 and January 2009. All samples were collected according to DEP-SOP-001/01. The DEP Bureau of Laboratories in Tallahassee analyzed the water and biological samples. All of the sampling and assessments listed below were performed at two upstream freshwater sites in each river. In addition, five estuary sites and

an additional freshwater site for each system were sampled for the first two parameters only (water chemistry and meter readings).

- Water Chemistry (total Kjeldahl nitrogen, nitrate-nitrite, ammonia, total phosphorus, turbidity, chlorophyll *a*, color, total organic carbon, total suspended solids)
- Meter Readings (dissolved oxygen, specific conductance, pH, and temperature)
- Stream Condition Index (SCI) sampling
- Habitat Assessment
- Percent canopy cover
- Rapid Periphyton Survey (RPS)
- Qualitative Periphyton Sampling
- Linear Stream Vegetation Survey

Since the objective of the study was to emphasize the effects of nutrients on biota, attempts were made to minimize or account for confounding factors during site selection. Habitat suitability (substrate diversity and abundance), flow, and length of inundation were examined when deciding appropriate sites to sample in each system. A Habitat Assessment and percent canopy cover determination were performed at each site where biological sampling was conducted, in order to adequately characterize these important variables.

### 8.1.3 Sampling Sites

The following sites were chosen for the nutrient longitudinal study:

#### Steinhatchee River and Estuary Sites

- Steinhatchee River at CR 357 (WBID 3573B)
- Steinhatchee River at Canal Road (WBID 3573A)
- Steinhatchee River at the waterfall (WBID 3573)
- Steinhatchee Estuary #1, where houses end (WBID 3573C)
- Steinhatchee Estuary #2, at bridge (WBID 3573C)
- Steinhatchee Estuary #3, at boat ramp (WBID 3573C)
- Steinhatchee Estuary #4, at channel marker 38 (WBID 3573C)
- Steinhatchee Estuary #5, at channel marker 23 (WBID 3573C)

#### Waccasassa River and Estuary Sites

- Waccasassa River at Wildlife Management Area (WMA) (WBID 3699)
- Waccasassa River at OB Road #3 (WBID 3699)
- Wekiva River at Beck Park (WBID 3731)

- Waccasassa Estuary #1, below Wekiva (WBID 3699A)
- Waccasassa Estuary #2, at USGS station (WBID 3699A)
- Waccasassa Estuary #3, at “Caution Rocks” sign (WBID 3699B)
- Waccasassa Estuary #4, at channel marker 33 (WBID 3699B)
- Waccasassa Estuary #3, at channel marker 24 (WBID 3699B)
- 

Sampling locations were chosen after a reconnaissance trip, and are shown in Figures 8-1 and 8-2 below. Photographs of the sites can be found in Appendix 8-A.

DRAFT




Figure 8-1. Map of the Steinhatchee River and estuary sampling locations.




Figure 8-2. Map of the Waccasassa River and estuary sampling locations.

## 8.2 Sampling Results

### 8.2.1 Water Quality

#### 8.2.1.1 Steinhatchee River and Estuary

Tables 8-1 and 8-2 below show the water quality results for the Steinhatchee River and estuary from the August 12, 2008 and January 14, 2009 sampling trips, respectively. The sites are listed upstream to downstream from left to right. Table 8-3 shows the Peninsula benchmark stream 50<sup>th</sup>, 75<sup>th</sup>, and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile values for total nitrogen and total phosphorus. These values are shown to give a general idea of how the nutrient concentrations in the Steinhatchee compare to the distribution of nutrient concentrations at benchmark sites within the same nutrient region. Note that the numbers in Tables 8-1 and 8-2 below are instantaneous values, whereas the benchmark site nutrient percentile values to which they are compared (Table 8-3) are based on annual geometric means (see Chapter 7 of this document for more information on how the percentiles were generated.)

Graphs of the average concentrations per site (mean of the August 2008 and January 2009 results) of total nitrogen, nitrate-nitrite and total Kjeldahl nitrogen, total phosphorus, and chlorophyll *a*, are shown in Figures 8-3 to 8-6 below. Sites are listed upstream to downstream from top to bottom in the graphs.

**Table 8-1. Sampling results for Steinhatchee River and Estuary sites on 8/12/2008.**

Steinhatchee River Water Chemistry 8/12/2008	Biological Sites		River Site	Estuary sites				
	CR 357	Canal Rd	Waterfall	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
Chlorophyll-a, corrected (µg/L)	2.5	2.7	2	8.2	5.2	5	9.3	7.2
Phaeophytin-a (µg/L)	0.93	0.63 I	0.24 U	0.24 U	1.5	2.5	1.6	2.7
Turbidity (NTU)	13	6.7 A	1.4	1.3	1.9	3.1 A	2.6	3.9
Color (PCU)	80	50	50	40	40	40	40	40
Ammonia-N (mg/L)	0.051	0.012 I	0.07	0.047	0.082	0.084	0.031	0.01 U
Nitrate-Nitrite (mg/L)	0.005 I	0.017	0.004 U	0.039	0.029	0.024	0.011	0.005 I
Kjeldahl Nitrogen (mg/L)	0.48	0.49	0.42	0.55	0.61	0.66 J	0.56	0.69
Total Nitrogen (mg/L)	0.49	0.51	0.42	0.59	0.64	0.68 J	0.57	0.70
Organic Carbon (mg/L)	10	9.9	7.5	7.3 I	7.3 I	8.1 I	8.3 I	7.7 I
Total Phosphorus (mg/L)	0.34	0.13	0.048 I	0.046 I	0.052 I	0.049 I	0.033 I	0.039 I
Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)	6 I	8 I	4 U	5 I	6 I	10 I	4 I	11 I
Secchi Depth (m)	–	–	–	2.4	1.6	1.4	–	–
Temperature (°C)	24.1	25.3	23	28.4	29.5	29.7	28.8	28.8
Specific Conductance (µmhos/cm)	501	690	521	10,758	21,518	27,950	30,802	40,627
pH (SU)	7.1	7.3	7.1	7.5	7.5	7.7	7.8	8.0
Dissolved Oxygen	5.3	8.0	2.1	4.0	4.2	4.6	6.1	6.2

"U"= Below Method Detection Limit; "I"= Below Practical Quantitation Limit; "A"= Value reported is the mean of two or more determinations; "J"= Estimated value; "L" = Actual value is known to be greater than the reported value

**Table 8-2. Sampling results for Steinhatchee River and Estuary sites on 1/14/2009.**

Steinhatchee River Water Chemistry 1/14/2009	Biological Sites		River Site	Estuary sites				
	CR 357	Canal Rd	Waterfall	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
Chlorophyll-a, corrected (µg/L)	0.55 U	0.55 U	0.57 I	0.78 I	0.93 I	1.7	3.5	2.5
Phaeophytin-a (µg/L)	0.24 U	0.24 U	0.24 U	0.24 U	0.24 U	0.8	0.38 I	0.75
Turbidity (NTU)	2.6 A	1.2	1.7	1.1	1.1	2.1	1.6 A	2.2
Color (PCU)	40	30	50	40	30	30	20	20
Ammonia-N (mg/L)	0.05 U	0.05 U	0.058	0.04	0.042	0.054	0.065	0.039
Nitrate-Nitrite (mg/L)	0.004 U	0.007 I	0.021	0.047	0.051	0.047	0.04	0.024
Kjeldahl Nitrogen (mg/L)	0.4	0.68	0.52	0.85	0.85	0.77	0.8	0.76
Total Nitrogen (mg/L)	0.40	0.69	0.54	0.90	0.90	0.82	0.84	0.78
Organic Carbon (mg/L)	9.7	18	11	9.2 I	8.5 I	8 I	7.8 I	7 I
Total Phosphorus (mg/L)	0.15	0.072	0.041 I	0.031	0.029	0.031	0.028	0.023
Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)	4 U	4 U	4 U	4 U	5 I	7 I	5 I	11 I
Secchi Depth (m)	-	-	1	3.2	1.5 L	2.2 L	2.2 L	2 L
Temperature (°C)	10.76	11.25	18	14.4	14.2	14.4	14.2	13.5
Specific Conductance (µmhos/cm)	523	525	540	7,420	14,001	19,490	24,053	30,254
pH (SU)	7.6	7.7	7.3	7.4	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.8
Dissolved Oxygen	7.27 J	8.44 J	5.4	7.6	8.5	8.3	9.1	8.9

"U"= Below Method Detection Limit; "I"= Below Practical Quantitation Limit; "A"= Value reported is the mean of two or more determinations; "J"= Estimated value; "L" = Actual value is known to be greater than the reported value

**Table 8-3. Distribution of Peninsula Nutrient Benchmark site total nitrogen and phosphorus (annual geometric means).**

Peninsula Nutrient Benchmark Percentiles			
Percentile	50th	75th	90th
Total Nitrogen (mg/L)	0.97	1.31	1.73
Total Phosphorus (mg/L)	0.064	0.088	0.116




Figure 8-3. Average total nitrogen values at the Steinhatchee River and estuary sites.




Figure 8-4. Average nitrate-nitrite and total Kjeldahl nitrogen values at the Steinhatchee River and estuary sites.





Figure 8-5. Average total phosphorus values at the Steinhatchee River and Estuary sites. Percentile lines are distribution levels (annual geometric means) for Peninsula Nutrient Benchmark sites, shown for comparison.



**Figure 8-6. Average chlorophyll *a* values at the Steinhatchee River and estuary sites.**

Total nitrogen values generally increased from freshwater to estuary sites. As shown in Figure 8-4, nitrate-nitrite made up only a small portion of the total nitrogen in the Steinhatchee River, and most of the TN was TKN.

The average total phosphorus value of 0.245 mg/L at CR 357 is greater than the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the Peninsula benchmark streams (0.116 mg/L), and the average value of 0.101 mg/L at the Canal Rd. site is greater than the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile (0.088 mg/L). Average total phosphorus values in the Steinhatchee River decreased with distance downstream, and estuarine concentrations were below 0.05 mg/L.

Chlorophyll *a* concentrations in the Steinhatchee River were higher in the estuary than in the freshwater portions of the river. However all of the average values at the estuary sites were well below the threshold for nutrient impairment of estuarine waters in the Impaired Waters Rule (11 µg/L annual mean for estuaries). As well, chlorophyll *a* values for the freshwater sites all were much lower than threshold for nutrient impairment of streams from the Impaired Waters Rule (20 µg/L annual mean for streams).

### 8.2.1.2 Waccasassa River and Estuary

Tables 8-4 and 8-5 below show the water quality results for the Waccasassa River and estuary from the August 11, 2008 and January 13, 2009 sampling trips, respectively. Table 8-3 above shows the Peninsula benchmark stream 50<sup>th</sup>, 75<sup>th</sup>, and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile values for total nitrogen and total phosphorus, as a means of comparison for how the nutrient concentrations in the

Waccasassa compare to the distribution of benchmark sites within the same nutrient region. As before, note that the numbers in Tables 8-4 and 8-5 below are instantaneous values, whereas the percentile values in Table 8-3 are based on annual geometric means.

Graphs of the average concentrations per site (mean of the August 2008 and January 2009 results) of total nitrogen, nitrate-nitrite and total Kjeldahl nitrogen, total phosphorus, and chlorophyll *a* are shown in Figures 8-7 to 8-10 below. Sites are listed upstream to downstream from top to bottom in the graphs.

**Table 8-4. Sampling results for Waccasassa River and Estuary sites on 8/11/2008.**

Waccasassa River Water Chemistry 8/11/2008	Biological Sites		Wekiva Site	Estuary sites				
	WMA	OB Rd #3	Beck Park	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
Chlorophyll-a, corrected (µg/L)	0.55 U	0.55 U	0.55 U	3.4	—	5.9	12	14
Phaeophytin-a (µg/L)	0.29 I	0.24 U	0.24 U	0.24 U	0.48 U	0.36 I	1.4	1.6
Turbidity (NTU)	1.1	1.1	0.55	4.2	3.5	6.5	9.8	5.2
Color (PCU)	100	160	100	150	200	250	200	60 A
Ammonia-N (mg/L)	0.02	0.027	0.01 I	0.019 I	0.01 I	0.043	0.01 U	0.01 U
Nitrate-Nitrite (mg/L)	0.16	0.12	0.50	0.26	0.18	0.084	0.008 I	0.004 U
Kjeldahl Nitrogen (mg/L)	0.65	0.72	0.35	0.76	1.6	0.94	0.9	0.8
Total Nitrogen (mg/L)	0.81	0.84	0.84	1.02	1.78	1.02	0.91	0.80
Organic Carbon (mg/L)	11	17	7.9	16	17	16	12	9.8 I
Total Phosphorus (mg/L)	0.058 I	0.087	0.057	0.08	0.14	0.096	0.094	0.08
Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)	7 I	4 U	4 U	4 U	9 I	9 I	13 I	16
Secchi Depth (m)	—	—	1.1	1.5	1.1	1.1	1.1	1
Temperature (°C)	24.9	24.2	23.1	25.36	28.9	29.9	29.1	29.6
Specific Conductance (µmhos/cm)	249	336	225	312	7,368	24,340	30,729	35,932
pH (SU)	6.5	6.1	7.7	7.5	7.4	7.6	7.9	7.9
Dissolved Oxygen	9.9	9.0	5.5	5.8	3.8	4.5	6.2	5.9

"U"= Below Method Detection Limit; "I"= Below Practical Quantitation Limit; "A"= Value reported is the mean of two or more determinations; "J"= Estimated value; "L" = Actual value is known to be greater than the reported value

**Table 8-5. Sampling results for Waccasassa River and Estuary sites on 1/13/2009.**

Waccasassa River Water Chemistry 1/13/2009	Biological Sites		Wekiva Site	Estuary sites				
	WMA	OB Rd #3	Beck Park	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5
Chlorophyll-a, corrected (µg/L)	0.56 I	0.55 U	0.55 U	2.5	1.3 I	1.4 I	1.3 I	1.9
Phaeophytin-a (µg/L)	0.3 I	0.24 U	0.24 U	2.4	0.92	0.82	0.41 I	0.24 U
Turbidity (NTU)	4.1	0.65	0.75	5.8	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.5
Color (PCU)	40	20	10 A	20	20	30	40	40
Ammonia-N (mg/L)	0.05 U	0.05 U	0.012 I	0.01 U	0.014 I	0.03	0.02 I	0.01 U
Nitrate-Nitrite (mg/L)	0.08	0.064	0.59	0.37	0.24	0.24	0.075	0.008 I
Kjeldahl Nitrogen (mg/L)	0.56	0.26	0.18 I	0.47	0.42	0.82	0.95	0.96
Total Nitrogen (mg/L)	0.64	0.32	0.77	0.84	0.66	1.06	1.03	0.97
Organic Carbon (mg/L)	7	4.3 I	1 U	2.9 I	3.7 I	3.9 I	6.6 I	7 I
Total Phosphorus (mg/L)	0.05 I	0.052 I	0.059	0.076	0.055 I	0.06 A	0.052 A	0.047
Total Suspended Solids (mg/L)	4 I	4 U	4 U	16	5 I	5 I	5 I	8 I
Secchi Depth (m)	—	—	2 L	0.9	1.3 L	1.2	1.2	1.2 L
Temperature (°C)	13.17	14.14	20.7	15.9	15.2	15.3	14.8	14.5
Specific Conductance (µmhos/cm)	211	298	226	386	622	3760	17701	30717
pH (SU)	7.46	7.34	7.9	7.5	7.7	7.8	7.9	8.1
Dissolved Oxygen	8.51 J	8.89 J	7.6	9.3	8.4	8.2	8.4	9.1

"U"= Below Method Detection Limit; "I"= Below Practical Quantitation Limit; "A"= Value reported is the mean of two or more determinations; "J"= Estimated value; "L" = Actual value is known to be greater than the reported value




Figure 8-7. Average total nitrogen values at the Waccasassa River and estuary sites. Percentile lines are distribution levels (annual geometric means) for Peninsula Nutrient Benchmark sites, shown for comparison.




Figure 8-8. Average nitrate-nitrite and total Kjeldahl nitrogen values at the Waccasassa River and estuary sites.




Figure 8-9. Average total phosphorus values at the Waccasassa River and estuary sites. Percentile lines are distribution levels (annual geometric means) for Peninsula Nutrient Benchmark sites, shown for comparison.




Figure 8-10. Average chlorophyll a values at the Waccasassa River and estuary sites.

Average total nitrogen values were higher in the estuary sites than the upstream values. The increase in TN in the vicinity of the estuary was probably due to export of organic nitrogen from the extensive *Spartina* and *Juncus* marshes surrounding the lower Waccasassa system (see Figure 8-2).

Total phosphorus values were also higher in the estuary sites than the freshwater sites. The average TP value for the Estuary #2 site (0.098 mg/L) was greater than the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile for benchmark streams (0.088 mg/L), and the OB Rd #3 site and five estuary sites all had values greater than the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile (0.064 mg/L).

The chlorophyll *a* values in the Waccasassa River showed a general trend of increasing with distance downstream at the estuarine sites. Chlorophyll *a* concentrations at all three freshwater sites were below the method limits of detection (MDL, U-qualified data), and thus average values all were well below the threshold for nutrient impairment of streams from the Impaired Waters Rule (20 µg/L annual mean). For the estuarine sites, average values of validated data also were below the threshold for nutrient impairment of estuarine waters in the Impaired Waters Rule (11 µg/L annual mean for estuaries). Chlorophyll *a* data for the Waccasassa Estuary #2 site sampled during August 2008 was excluded from the average for that site, as it was determined to be an anomalously high and inexplicably spurious result. The chlorophyll *a* value at the sites immediately upstream and downstream of the Estuary #2 site on the same day were 3.4 µg/L and 5.9 µg/L respectively, and there were no observable differences in Secchi depth, color, or turbidity at the Estuary #2 site relative to the upstream and downstream sites.

## 8.2.2 Historical Trends in Nutrient Concentrations

### 8.2.2.1 Steinhatchee River

The graphs below show time series nutrients and chlorophyll *a* concentrations in the Steinhatchee River. Values shown are geometric means of available data from the Impaired Waters Rule database for a given Water Body ID (WBID) within a given year. WBIDs are shown in the legends from upstream to downstream (top to bottom). WBID 3573Z represents Steinhatchee Spring, which is located directly on the river. WBIDs 3573A and 3573 are freshwater portions of the river, and WBID 3573C encompasses the estuary. The Peninsula benchmark stream percentiles for nutrients (annual geometric means) are shown where relevant.




Figure 8-11. Annual WBID geometric mean values of total nitrogen in the Steinhatchee River and estuary from 1995-2009. Percentile lines are distribution levels for Peninsula Nutrient Benchmark sites, shown for comparison.




Figure 8-12. Annual WBID geometric mean values of total phosphorus in the Steinhatchee River and estuary from 1995-2009. Percentile lines are distribution levels for Peninsula Nutrient Benchmark sites, shown for comparison.




Figure 8-12. Annual WBID geometric mean values of chlorophyll *a* in the Steinhatchee River from 1999-2009.

The above graphs demonstrate that while total phosphorus levels in the Steinhatchee River have typically been above average compared to TP values in Peninsula benchmark streams, there has been no adverse effect on chlorophyll *a* levels within the river. Chlorophyll *a* concentrations were mostly below the MDL, and show no trend over the ten-year time period (the drop in the reported concentration in 2009 is due to a lower MDL than for previous years).

### 8.2.2.2 Waccasassa River

Time series of nutrients and chlorophyll *a* concentrations in the Waccasassa River are shown in the graphs below. Values shown are yearly geometric means of available data for WBID 3699, which encompasses a large freshwater stretch of the river (there were insufficient data for other WBIDs). The Peninsula benchmark stream percentiles for nutrients (annual geometric mean) are shown where relevant.




Figure 8-13. Annual geometric mean values of total nitrogen for WBID 3699 within the Waccasassa River from 1995-2009. Percentile lines are distribution levels for Peninsula Nutrient Benchmark sites, shown for comparison.




Figure 8-14. Annual geometric mean values of total phosphorus for WBID 3699 within the Waccasassa River from 1995-2009. Percentile lines are distribution levels for Peninsula Nutrient Benchmark sites, shown for comparison.




Figure 8-15. Annual geometric mean values of chlorophyll *a* for WBID 3699 within the Waccasassa River from 1999-2009.

The above graphs demonstrate that nutrient levels within the Waccasassa River are associated with low chlorophyll *a* values, with no trend noted in the chlorophyll *a* data.

### 8.2.3 Freshwater Biological Sampling Results

Tables 8-6 and 8-7 below show the Habitat Assessment and Stream Condition Index (SCI) sampling results for the freshwater biological sites from the Steinhatchee River and Waccasassa River, respectively. SCI sampling and Habitat Assessments were conducted per DEP-SOP-001/0, FS 7320 and FT 3100, respectively.

Table 8-6. Habitat assessment and Stream Condition index Results for Steinhatchee River sites.

Date	Steinhatchee River					
	CR 357			Canal Rd		
	8/12/2008	1/14/2009	Average	8/12/2008	1/14/2009	Average
Habitat Assessment Score	130	126	128	151	145	148
Stream Condition Index Score	20	53	36.5	41	62	51.5

Table 8-7. Habitat assessment and Stream Condition Index results for Waccasassa River sites.

Date	Waccasassa River					
	WMA			OB Rd. #3		
	8/11/2008	1/13/2009	Average	8/11/2008	1/13/2009	Average
Habitat Assessment Score	118	138	128	126	137	131.5
Stream Condition Index Score	79	80	79.5	67	96	81.5

The average Habitat Assessment scores for each site were in the “Optimal” range ( $\geq 120$  out of a possible 160 points). The average SCI scores were all above the impairment threshold of 40, except for the Steinhatchee at CR 357. However, the SCI sampling that took place at CR 357 on 8/12/2008, which yielded a SCI score of 20, was done under low flow conditions. Based on USGS hydrograph data from the nearest station downstream of the sampling site, as shown in Figure 8-16 below, the discharge rate for the Steinhatchee River had been low for over a month before sampling; therefore, it is likely that the CR 357 site had little to no flow and low water levels within the weeks prior to sampling, and the SCI score of 20 for the 8/12/2008 sampling event was probably due to hydrologic conditions. By the January sampling event, water flow had increased, and the SCI score improved.




Figure 8-16. USGS hydrograph of the Steinhatchee River at Cross City. The mean discharge rate for the Steinhatchee River near Cross City was 7.4 ft<sup>3</sup>/sec on 8/12/2008 and 23 ft<sup>3</sup>/sec on 1/14/2009.

Although the Steinhatchee and Waccasassa sites are all minimally disturbed stream sites, SCI results were lower for the Steinhatchee sites, despite high habitat assessment scores. These lower SCI scores may be due to the naturally higher specific conductance in the Steinhatchee River, most likely due to influences from the limestone substrate. DEP has shown that increasing specific conductance is related to lower numbers of sensitive taxa and lower SCI scores, even in minimally disturbed systems (FDEP 2008).


Periphyton was collected for taxonomic identification from natural substrates in the freshwater sampling sites per the Qualitative Periphyton Sampling method outlined in DEP-SOP-001/01, FS 7120. The results of this analysis (August and January trips are averaged) are listed below in Table 8-8, which shows the percentages of Bacillariophyta (diatoms), Chlorophycota (green algae), Cyanophycota (cyanobacteria), Euglenophycota, and Cryptophycophyta identified in the samples, as well as the total number of taxa identified.

**Table 8-8. Results of Qualitative Periphyton Sampling for Steinhatchee and Waccasassa River sites.**

	Qualitative Periphyton Sampling Results			
	Steinhatchee River at CR 357	Steinhatchee River at Canal Rd	Waccasassa River at WMA	Waccasassa River at OB Rd #3
% Bacillariophyta	76.5	63.8	82.4	66.2
% Chlorophycota	5.7	9.3	2.0	2.5
% Cyanophycota	17.7	26.3	13.5	31.0
% Euglenophycota	0.2	0.0	0.7	0.4
% Cryptophycophyta	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.0
Total # Taxa	56	63	61	62

The periphyton community at each of the sites was dominated by diatoms (Bacillariophyta). The percentages of algal taxa and the total number of taxa identified were relatively similar among sites.

In addition to periphyton taxa identification, algal thickness was measured at 99 points within a 100 m stretch of stream, per the Rapid Periphyton Survey (RPS) method described in DEP-SOP-001/01, FS 7130. Results are shown in Figure 8-17 below, along with the descriptions of algal thickness ranks.



0	1	2	3	4	5
0 mm, rough	<0.5 mm or slimy	0.5-1 mm	>1 to <6 mm	6-20 mm	>20 mm

Figure 8-17. Rapid periphyton survey (RPS) results are shown as the percentage of points in each algal thickness rank category within a given site.

At most sites, the majority of periphyton observed was less than 0.5 mm long or non-visible. The Steinhatchee at Canal Rd. site had filamentous algae growing on a section of rocky limestone substrate within the 100 m assessment area; however, this algal growth did not adversely affect the macroinvertebrate community, as evidenced by the average SCI score of 51.5 (see Table 8-6).

### 8.2.4 Biological Health in the Steinhatchee and Waccasassa Estuaries

Seagrass beds are extremely valuable ecological and economic assets to Florida’s coasts. They are considered to be a keystone habitat for a diverse array of marine and estuarine species, and support important recreational and commercial fisheries. Seagrass beds may be adversely affected when high nutrient runoff from rivers causes excess phytoplankton growth in the water column, increased epiphyte load on seagrass blades, or macroalgal blooms covering seagrass beds, reducing the amount of photosynthetically active radiation reaching seagrasses.

Maps of seagrass beds near the mouths of the Steinhatchee River (Deadman Bay) and Waccasassa River (Waccassassa Bay) were evaluated to determine trends or difference between

the two systems. Figures 8-18 and 8-19 show the areas of continuous and discontinuous seagrasses in Deadman and Waccasassa Bays, respectively. This coverage was created by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Fish and Wildlife Research Institute from aerial photos dating from 1987 to 2007. Seagrass coverage is more extensive in Deadman Bay than Waccasassa Bay. This is most likely due to greater light limitation from the high color in Waccasassa Bay, since the average measures of color in the Waccasassa estuary during the August and January sampling trips were roughly three times higher than in the Steinhatchee estuary.

Figures 8-20 and 8-21 show the change in seagrasses from 2001 to 2006, north and south of the Steinhatchee River, respectively (Carlson 2008). Paul Carlson from the Fish and Wildlife Research Institute (personal communication) noted that while some physical damage took place from the 2004 and 2005 tropical storms, very little seagrass loss has taken place around the Steinhatchee River, and the seagrass beds are stable and in good condition. An analysis of this type could not be conducted for the Waccasassa Bay because there are insufficient data to establish historical trends in seagrass beds for Waccasassa Bay (Mattson *et al.* 2007). There is anecdotal evidence that forestry practices in the watersheds of both rivers might have moderately increased color to both estuaries, but there is no evidence to suggest that nutrients have had any adverse effects on the estuary (Mattson *et al.* 2007).

As shown in the maps below, the seagrass communities in Waccasassa and Deadman Bays appear healthy and intact. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude that the nutrient concentrations from the Waccasassa and Steinhatchee Rivers are supporting the health of these downstream ecosystems.




Figure 8-18. Seagrass coverage near the mouth of the Steinhathee River.



Figure 8-19. Seagrass coverage near the mouth of the Waccasassa River.




Figure 8-20 and 8-21. Changes in seagrass coverage north and south of the Steinhatchee River mouth. Areas where seagrasses have not diminished between 2001 and 2006 are shown in green.

As another measure of the biological health of these systems, DEP pursued information on the bay fisheries. Commercial fish landings data were not available specifically for the Steinhatchee river/estuary (which divides Taylor and Dixie Counties), or the Waccasassa (in Levy County). However, the sum of commercial landings from Taylor, Dixie, and Levy Counties in 2007 was 3,462,694 lbs., which represents approximately 4% of the 2007 statewide commercial landings. Additionally, anecdotal information from area fishermen suggests an abundant and stable marine fishery at both systems.

### 8.3 Conclusions

Total phosphorus at the upper Steinhatchee River exceeded the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the nutrient benchmark sites and TP in the Waccasassa estuary approached the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile, yet no adverse effects were observed in the sensitive estuarine reaches, where healthy seagrass communities and fisheries prevailed. This study found that chlorophyll *a* concentrations in both estuaries were below the 11 ug/L impairment threshold adopted in Chapter 62-303, F.A.C. Compared with their respective headwaters, organic nitrogen was higher in both the Waccasassa and Steinhatchee estuaries, probably as a result of input from the extensive *Spartina* and *Juncus* marshes. This study, conducted at two minimally disturbed river/estuary systems, supports the position that establishing nutrient criteria at the 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of the reference site distribution is protective of the biological integrity of sensitive downstream waters.

### 8.4 References

- Carlson, P. R., L. A. Yarbro, K. Kaufman, and R. A. Mattson. In review. Vulnerability and Resilience of Seagrasses to Hurricane and Runoff Impacts Along Florida's West Coast. Submitted to Hydrobiologia.
- FDEP. 2008. Technical Support Document: Derivation of a Revised Specific Conductance Criterion for Florida Class I & III Freshwaters. Florida Dept. Environmental Protection, Standards and Assessment Section. 19 pp.
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 2007. 2007 Annual Landings Summary. Marine Fisheries Information System.  
[http://research.myfwc.com/engine/download\\_redirection\\_process.asp?file=sumcnty\\_07.pdf&objid=19224&dctype=article](http://research.myfwc.com/engine/download_redirection_process.asp?file=sumcnty_07.pdf&objid=19224&dctype=article)
- Mattson, R.A., Frazer, T.K., Hale, J., Blitch, S., and Ahijevych, L.. 2007. Florida Big Bend. In: Handley, L., Altsman, D., and DeMay, R., eds., 2007, Seagrass Status and Trends in the Northern Gulf of Mexico: 1940-2002. U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2006-5287 and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency 855-R-04-003, 267 p.
- Suwannee River Water Management District. 2008. Changes in Seagrass Abundance in Florida's Big Bend Region, 2001-2006. SRWMD Contract No. 02/03-225: Final Report

USGS. 2009. Real-Time Water Data for USGS 02324000 STEINHATCHEE RIVER NEAR CROSS CITY, FLA <http://waterdata.usgs.gov/nwis/uv?02324000>

DRAFT

## 9 Basis for the Proposed Lake Chlorophyll *a* Thresholds in Florida's Numeric Nutrient Criteria Development

### 9.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the scientific basis for the chlorophyll *a* thresholds used by DEP to establish numeric nutrient criteria for lakes. Based on several lines of evidence, DEP is proposing a chlorophyll *a* threshold of 20 µg/L for colored lakes and clear lakes with conductivities above 100 µmhos/cm, and 9 µg/L for clear lakes with conductivities below 100 µmhos/cm. The Department plans to adopt these thresholds as numeric nutrient criteria (response variables) and will also use them to develop numeric criteria for TP and TN (using regression equations that relate nutrient concentrations to annual geometric mean chlorophyll *a* levels) for Florida lakes.

### 9.2 History of the Trophic State Index

DEP has a long history of using a modification of Carlson's Trophic State Index (TSI) (Carlson, 1977) as a measure of lake trophic state and lake water quality for the State's 305(b) and 303(d) assessments. Trophic state reflects the biological response to several factors, including nutrient effects on phytoplankton chlorophyll *a*, which may be modified or mitigated by water retention time, grazing, and macrophyte nutrient uptake. Havens (2000) reported that the TSI approach provides an effective, low cost method for tracking long-term changes in pelagic structure and function and has value in monitoring lake ecology and responses to management actions.

Carlson's original TSI classified lakes based on chlorophyll *a* levels and nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations, and included three indicators—Secchi depth, chlorophyll *a*, and total phosphorus—to describe a lake's trophic state. A 10-unit change in the index represents a doubling or halving of algal biomass (chlorophyll *a*).

Carlson, from Kent State University in Ohio, created the following interpretation scheme for the TSI based on nutrient/chlorophyll *a* responses in northern lakes (Carlson 1977). Note that Florida lakes do not have certain attributes of northern lakes, including the presence of cold-water or cool-water fisheries and fully oxygenated hypolimnetic (bottom) areas.

<b>TSI &lt; 30</b>	Classical Oligotrophy: Clear water, oxygen throughout the year in the hypolimnion, salmonid fisheries in deep lakes.
<b>TSI 30 – 40</b>	Deeper lakes still exhibit classical oligotrophy, but some shallower lakes will become anoxic in the hypolimnion during the summer.
<b>TSI 40 - 50</b>	Water moderately clear, but increasing probability of anoxia in hypolimnion during summer.
<b>TSI 50 – 60</b>	Lower boundary of classical eutrophy: Potential for decreased transparency, anoxic hypolimnia during the summer and macrophyte growth, warm-water fisheries only.
<b>TSI 60 - 70</b>	Dominance of blue-green algae, algal scums probable, extensive macrophyte problems.
<b>TSI 70 – 80</b>	Heavy algal blooms possible throughout the summer, dense macrophyte beds, but extent limited by light penetration. Often would be classified as hypereutrophic.
<b>TSI &gt; 80</b>	Algal scums, summer fish kills, few macrophytes, dominance of rough fish.

Salas and Martino (1991) proposed an alternate TSI categorization based on their work in phosphorus limited warm-water tropical lakes, which is more directly applicable to Florida conditions. The TSI and chlorophyll *a* values in Table 9-1 were determined based upon the TSI relationship with TP. Note that while Carlson would consider a TSI of 50-60 to represent the lower boundary of eutrophy in northern lakes, Salas and Martino considered that same range of TSI values to be mesotrophic in warm-water lakes, while eutrophic conditions would not occur until a warm water lake exhibited a TSI of 70.

As stated earlier, the TSI equation describes a theoretical relationship between chlorophyll *a*, total phosphorus, and total nitrogen. Note that chlorophyll *a* doubles with every 10 point increase in the TSI (Table 9-2).

**Table 9-1. Warm-water TSI categories (after Salas and Martino 1991).**

<b>TSI</b>	<b>Category</b>	<b>TP (µg/L)</b>	<b>Chlorophyll <i>a</i></b>
40	Oligotrophic	21.3	5
50	Mesotrophic	39.6	10
70	Eutrophic	118.7	40

**Table 9-2. Relationship between chlorophyll *a*, total phosphorus, and total nitrogen, as described by Florida's TSI.**

<b>Trophic State Index</b>	<b>Chlorophyll <i>a</i> (µg/L)</b>	<b>Total Phosphorus (mg/L)</b>	<b>Total Nitrogen (mg/L)</b>
0	0.3	0.003	0.06
10	0.6	0.005	0.10
20	1.3	0.009	0.16
30	2.5	0.01	0.27
40	5.0	0.02	0.45
50	10.0	0.04	0.70
60	20	0.07	1.2
70	40	0.12	2.0
80	80	0.20	3.4
90	160	0.34	5.6
100	320	0.58	9.3

As part of the State's 305(b) assessment, DEP revised the TSI by a) replacing Secchi depth with total nitrogen, and b) adding equations that adjust the nutrient component of the TSI to reflect the limiting nutrient. Use of Secchi depth in Florida as a measure of trophic state was unsuccessful due to the high frequency of dark-water lakes (< 40 PCU), where tannins originating from the breakdown of vascular plant tissues, rather than algae, diminish transparency.

The resultant TSI is now based on chlorophyll *a*, total nitrogen, and total phosphorus concentrations, as follows:

$$\text{TSI} = (\text{CHLATS}i + \text{NUTRTS}i)/2$$

Where:

CHLATS $i$  =  $16.8 + 14.4 \times \text{LN}(\text{CHLA})$ , and

NUTRTS $i$  is based on limiting nutrient considerations, as follows:

If  $\text{TN}/\text{TP} > 30$ , then lake is phosphorus limited and  $\text{NUTRTS}i = \text{TP2TS}i$

$$\text{TP2TS}i = 10 \times [2.36 \times \text{LN}(\text{TP} \times 1000) - 2.38]$$

If  $\text{TN}/\text{TP} < 10$ , then lake is nitrogen limited and  $\text{NUTRTS}i = \text{TN2TS}i$

$$\text{TN2TS}i = 10 \times [5.96 + 2.15 \times \text{LN}(\text{TN} + 0.0001)]$$

If  $10 < \text{TN}/\text{TP} < 30$ , then co-limited and  $\text{NUTRTS}i = (\text{TPTS}i + \text{TNTS}i)/2$

$$\text{TNTS}i = 56 + [19.8 \times \text{LN}(\text{TN})]$$

$$\text{TPTS}i = [18.6 \times \text{LN}(\text{TP} \times 1000)] - 18.4$$

These equations were determined based on the analysis of data from 313 Florida lakes, and were adjusted so that a chlorophyll *a* concentration of 20  $\mu\text{g}/\text{L}$  was equal to a TSI value of 60. For the 1998 305(b) report, a TSI threshold of 60 was used to represent "fair" lakes, while lakes above 70 were assessed as "poor."

During development of the Impaired Waters Rule (IWR) in 1999 – 2000, the IWR Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the TSI used in the 305(b) assessment and recommended that it be used to assess lakes for impairment. Based on then current EPA guidance that "fair" waters should be included on State 303(d) lists, the TAC recommended that the nutrient impairment threshold for most lakes (for those with a color higher than 40 platinum cobalt units) should be an annual average TSI of 60.

While they recommended use of the TSI threshold of 60 for most lakes, they also recognized that some lakes are naturally oligotrophic and have significantly lower natural background TSIs. The TAC requested that DEP evaluate data from reference lakes from the Department's Bioassessment Sampling Program using principal components analysis (PCA) in an attempt to identify different types of lakes based on water quality, with the goal to establish different TSI thresholds for each type.

While many different parameters were evaluated, the analysis initially focused on a four-part chemical classification of Florida lakes consisting of acid-clear, acid-colored, alkaline-clear, and alkaline-colored. This classification system had originally been proposed by Shannon and Brezonik (1972) and was subsequently confirmed as part of the development of the Lake Condition Index for Florida (Gerritsen *et al.* 2000). However, the analysis conducted for the IWR indicated that the most significant differences in the TSI and TSI-related parameters (nutrients and chlorophyll) were seen when the lakes were classified by color alone, with lakes with a color of less than 40 platinum cobalt units having significantly lower TSIs. This low color classification system also covered a previously identified target population of oligotrophic lakes that the TAC wanted to address (low color, oligotrophic lakes in the panhandle region of Florida). The Department then recommended, and the TAC agreed, to establish a TSI threshold of 40 for these lakes, which is equivalent to a chlorophyll *a* of 5 µg/L.

### 9.3 Other Efforts to Establish Chlorophyll *a* Thresholds

Appendix 9-A contains a review of literature pertaining to establishment of protective chlorophyll *a* thresholds, predominantly from the USA. The literature suggests six main approaches for establishment of protective chlorophyll *a* thresholds in lakes:

- Paleolimnologic studies, where pre-human disturbance chlorophyll *a* values are inferred from an analysis of diatom communities in deep sediment cores;
- Expert elicitation, or best professional judgment, for the determination of protective TSI or chlorophyll *a* values;
- Fisheries responses to chlorophyll *a* or TSI levels, dependent upon type of fisheries which are in turn adapted to associated dissolved oxygen conditions (i.e., cold water vs. warm water fisheries);
- Associating lake user visual perceptions (for swimming and aesthetics) with simultaneously measured chlorophyll *a*;
- Setting the criterion to maintain the existing condition (protection strategy); and
- Using an upper percentile of the distribution of reference lakes.

#### 9.3.1 Paleolimnological Studies

Paleolimnological studies in Florida, where pre-human disturbance chlorophyll *a* values were inferred from an analysis of diatom communities in deep sediment cores, indicate that most peninsular Florida lakes would be considered to be at the lower boundary of classical eutrophy (or above), even prior to human habitation of the state (Whitmore and Brenner 2002; Whitmore 2003). Paleolimnological studies conducted at (colored) Lakes Shipp, Lulu, Haines, May, Conine and Bonny in the Florida peninsula suggest that the average chlorophyll *a* in these lakes would naturally range between 14 to 20 µg/L. This is one line of evidence for supporting the chlorophyll *a* threshold of 20 µg/L that is part of the IWR's TSI threshold. However, paleolimnology of (colored) Lakes Wauberg and Hancock suggests that historic chlorophyll *a* in those lakes naturally ranged from 38-48 µg/L and 74-133 µg/L, respectively. Note that although Lake Hancock may be somewhat atypical, the paleolimnological results suggest that any proposed nutrient criteria will need to allow for site specific alternative criteria (SSAC) in lakes with naturally higher (or lower) nutrient levels.

### 9.3.2 Expert Opinion

Several states have used input from scientific advisory committees or a best professional judgment (BPJ) approach to establish chlorophyll *a* or TSI targets. Virginia and Iowa queried a panel of experts to establish protective chlorophyll *a* targets, and the scientists in both states independently arrived at a recommended level of 25 µg/L as a yearly average (Gregory 2007; Wilton 2008). Virginia's panel further recommended that chlorophyll *a* not exceed 50 µg/L as an instantaneous measurement. Arizona, using a TSI and a weight of evidence approach, established lake summer time (peak season) chlorophyll *a* targets at 20-30 µg/L (ADEQ 2008). Maryland established lake summer time chlorophyll *a* targets using the rationale that a TSI of 50 (10 µg/L chlorophyll *a*) would prevent mesotrophic lakes from becoming eutrophic, and that a TSI of 60 (20 µg/L chlorophyll *a*) would protect against excessive eutrophication (Rule 2004). West Virginia used a BPJ approach to establish a chlorophyll *a* threshold of 33 µg/L. Additionally, Iowa has established annual average TMDL targets in specific lakes for the protection of aquatic life use (Lost Lake), which were subsequently approved by EPA, using a chlorophyll *a* threshold of 33 µg/L (EPA 2008).

The various BPJ thresholds that would protect against excessive eutrophication, expressed as annual or summertime averages, yields a range from 20 to 33 µg/L of chlorophyll *a*. This range of values suggests that Florida's Impaired Waters Rule TAC recommendation of 20 µg/L in colored lakes is as protective as those established by many other states.

### 9.3.3 Biological Responses

The responses of valued ecological attributes, such as benthic macroinvertebrates or fish, to various chlorophyll *a* levels, would provide the most direct method for establishing targets that would protect aquatic life. Florida investigated establishment of a Lake Condition Index, using benthic macroinvertebrates as a response variable in lakes. Unfortunately, although initial results were promising, Florida eventually concluded that color was more responsible for explaining benthic response than were human disturbance measures, such as the Landscape Development Intensity Index (Fore 2007).

Other states have used a fisheries response variable. For example, the state of Virginia conducted an analysis to determine the effect of chlorophyll *a* levels on the health of fisheries, and concluded that summer average chlorophyll *a* concentrations of 25 µg/L in coolwater lakes and 35-60 µg/L in warmwater lakes were protective of fish health (Gregory 2007). Minnesota, using multiple lines of evidence, including regional patterns, reference lakes, fish response, lake user perception, paleolimnology, and nuisance algal bloom frequency, established summer mean chlorophyll *a* targets of 3 to 5 µg/L for designated coldwater trout fisheries, 9-22 µg/L for deep lakes, and 20-30 µg/L for shallow (< 4.5 m) lakes (Heiskary and Wilson 2008). Colorado proposed that summer average chlorophyll *a* be maintained below 25 µg/L to assure high quality fisheries (Saunders 2009). Note that only warm water fisheries occur in Florida.

DEP currently is investigating fish community composition data collected from Florida lakes by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission for comparison to chlorophyll *a* data. Results of initial analyses do not yield a notable response signal in the data and thus do not currently further inform the determination of chlorophyll *a* targets.

### 9.3.4 User Perceptions

In Texas, a study of lake user perceptions indicated that in reservoirs without inorganic turbidity (> 1 m Secchi) chlorophyll *a* levels below approximately 20-25 µg/L still support full immersion recreational uses, as well as aesthetics (Glass 2006). For this study, lake users were asked to fill out a questionnaire concerning their visual perceptions (for swimming and aesthetics) while chlorophyll *a* was simultaneously measured. A similar study conducted in Florida demonstrated that there were differences in user perceptions depending upon lake region (Hoyer *et al.* 2004). In the Florida study, when lake users responded to a question concerning suitability of the lake for recreation and aesthetic enjoyment by saying, “beautiful, could not be nicer,” chlorophyll *a* ranged from approximately 30 µg/L in the Central Valley Lake region (generally high color) to approximately 3 µg/L in the Trail Ridge Region (generally uncolored lakes) (Hoyer *et al.* 2004). These studies did not associate chlorophyll *a* values with public health concerns, only the public perception of whether swimming was desirable or not. Based on user perceptions, clear and colored lakes in Florida may need different chlorophyll *a* targets.

### 9.3.5 Maintaining Existing Conditions

The State of Alabama’s approach to establishing lake or reservoir chlorophyll *a* targets may be described as a method designed to “maintain the existing condition” (Macindoe 2006). Alabama’s chlorophyll *a* targets for specific lakes or reservoirs range from 5 µg/L to 27 µg/L. The Florida IWR TAC’s recommendation of a TSI of 40 for Florida clear reference lakes was based upon the concept of maintaining the current condition of panhandle region sandhill lakes. A TSI of 40 equates to a chlorophyll *a* value of 5 µg/L.

### 9.3.6 Reference Approach


Finally, a reference site approach, coupled with other techniques, including contour plot interpolation, was suggested as a method to establish chlorophyll *a* thresholds in Florida (Paul and Gerritsen 2003). Based on the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of reference sites, determined via BPJ with contour plot interpolation, Tetra Tech proposed chlorophyll *a* targets for Florida clear lakes (< 40 PCU) ranging from 2 µg/L to 8 µg/L, and colored lake targets ranging from 9 µg/L to 18 µg/L. Since that study, Florida has proposed using a 90<sup>th</sup> percentile of reference conditions for establishment of nutrient criteria when other responses to nutrient dose were not available and the reference sites were thoroughly verified. The lakes Tetra Tech included for their reference site approach were based primarily upon BPJ, therefore they suggested a lower percentile.

## 9.4 **Investigating Relationships between Cyanobacteria Abundance and Chlorophyll *a***

It is well established that cyanobacteria can become very abundant and completely dominate the phytoplankton community in lakes when conditions are right. Some cyanobacteria blooms can be toxic and present a health risk to people recreating in and on the water. The World Health Organization (WHO) has established recommendations for recreational exposure during cyanobacterial blooms (WHO 1999). Their recommendations reflect their findings that a chlorophyll *a* level of 10 µg/L in which cyanobacteria are dominant presents a relatively low probability of mild irritative or allergenic effects, while a chlorophyll *a* level of 50 µg/L in which cyanobacteria are dominant presents a moderate risk of adverse health effects. The WHO’s guidance for recreation in waters (WHO 2003, section 8.1) states that 46 species of

cyanobacteria have been shown to cause toxic effects in vertebrates, and that any species or genera of cyanobacteria cannot be ruled out as potentially toxic. They caution that “it is prudent to presume a toxic potential in any cyanobacterial population.”

Due to the potential human health risks associated with cyanobacteria blooms, DEP considered the possibility of a chlorophyll *a* threshold that might be associated with a high probability of cyanobacteria blooms. DEP examined the relationship between chlorophyll *a* and the percent cyanobacteria in 1,364 phytoplankton samples from small and large lakes randomly sampled between 2000 and 2006 in Florida’s probabilistic sampling network. Figure 9-1 shows chlorophyll *a* values regressed against the percent cyanobacteria for each sample. Based on the graph, there does not appear to be any increased probability of cyanobacteria dominance as chlorophyll *a* increases. Samples dominated by one of the 13 harmful algal bloom (HAB) taxa listed by the WHO (WHO 2003, section 8.1) did not show an increasing trend of cyanobacteria dominance with chlorophyll *a* either. This analysis did not further inform the determination of chlorophyll *a* targets.



**Figure 9-1. The relationship between chlorophyll *a* concentrations (note the log scale) and the percent cyanobacteria in 1,364 lake samples collected for Florida’s statewide probabilistic monitoring program.**

## 9.5 Conclusions

Carlson and Simpson (1996) noted that trophic state is not synonymous with the concept of water quality. While trophic state is an absolute scale that describes the biological condition of a water body, water quality is used to describe the condition of a water body in relation to human needs or values, relative to the use of the water and the expectations of the user. Water quality standards are created to protect the designated uses of water bodies. In the case of Florida lakes, the designated uses are for the protection of healthy, well balanced populations of fish and wildlife, and for recreation in and on the water. Criteria must provide protection for these sometimes competing interests. For example, an oligotrophic to mesotrophic lake may have water quality deemed desirable for swimming, however this same lake may not be considered to be optimal for bass fishing. For this reason, DEP has taken a weight of evidence approach for establishing protective chlorophyll *a* thresholds.

Multiple lines of evidence were used to evaluate the rigor of protection inherent in the Impaired Waters Rule (IWR) Technical Advisory Committee's TSI- based chlorophyll *a* recommendations, which were adopted into the IWR in 2002 (Chapter 62-303, FAC). Table 9-3 contains a summary of the various approaches.

**Table 9-3. Lines of evidence used in determining support of the 2002 Florida Impaired Waters Rule Technical Advisory Committee's chlorophyll *a* target recommendations.**

Line of Evidence	Chlorophyll <i>a</i> target	State
Paleolimnological studies	14 to 20 µg/L (higher for some lakes)	Florida
Expert opinion	20-33 µg/L	Virginia, Iowa, West Virginia, Maryland
Fisheries responses (warmwater)	35-60 µg/L	Virginia
Fisheries responses (coldwater trout and coolwater)	3-5 µg/L and 25 µg/L, respectively	Minnesota, Colorado
Lake user perceptions	20-25, up to 30 µg/L in colored lakes; as low as 3 µg/L in Florida Trail Ridge clear lakes	Texas and Florida
Existing levels approach	5-27 µg/L	Alabama
Reference lake approach	2-8 µg/L in clear lakes, 9-18 µg/L in colored lakes	Florida, using 75 <sup>th</sup> percentile

Multiple lines of evidence, including paleolimnology, fisheries success, and user perception, converge to support the Florida IWR TAC's original recommendation that 20 µg/L of

chlorophyll *a* in colored lakes is protective of designated uses. It has been hypothesized that phytoplankton populations may switch to communities dominated by cyanobacteria at chlorophyll *a* levels above 20 µg/L, however, this pattern was not observed in an analysis of 1,364 Florida lakes. Cyanobacteria are usually an unfavorable food source to zooplankton and many other aquatic animals, and some may even produce toxins, which could be harmful to fish and other animals. For this reason, the World Health Organization considers it to be a high risk for swimming when waters are dominated by cyanobacteria and accompanied by an instantaneous chlorophyll *a* of 50 µg/L (symptoms such as skin irritation and conjunctivitis may be more prevalent). Based upon the above multiple lines of evidence, DEP proposes that an annual average chlorophyll *a* of 20 µg/L in colored lakes is protective of designated uses.

There is less support for the IWR TAC's recommendation of 5 µg/L in clear lakes, which was based on a "maintain existing condition approach" and which was primarily targeted at a specific geographic region of Florida (the panhandle). Although some Alabama lakes do have a target that low (again, based on maintenance of existing condition), the range of acceptable chlorophyll *a* in Alabama ranged from 5-27 µg/L. Coldwater trout fisheries (which do not exist in Florida) require chlorophyll *a* in the 3-5 µg/L range. A reference lake approach proposed by Tetra Tech suggests that chlorophyll *a* values of up to 8 µg/L in clear lakes represent the 75<sup>th</sup> percentile of reference lakes. Moreover, the TSI categorization of Salas and Martino (1991), based on warm water lakes, would consider a chlorophyll *a* of 10 µg/L (TSI of 50) to be mesotrophic. Thus, a multiple lines of evidence approach suggests that a chlorophyll *a* concentration <10 µg/L would be a protective threshold for Florida's clear lakes. DEP solicited input from the Nutrient TAC in June, 2009, and the Nutrient TAC also suggested that maintaining chlorophyll *a* below 10 µg/L in low conductivity (<100 µmhos/cm) clear lakes would be protective of the designated use, since a value of <10 µg/L would still be categorized as oligotrophic. Therefore, DEP has established the low conductivity clear lake chlorophyll *a* threshold at 9 µg/L. The TAC suggested that different nutrient and chlorophyll *a* expectations should be established for high conductivity (>100 µmhos/cm) clear lakes because of the naturally higher, aquifer-derived phosphorus levels this subset of clear lakes. The TAC suggested that nutrient thresholds in clear, high conductivity lakes be based on preventing the annual average chlorophyll *a* from exceeding 20 µg/L. The following chapter contains a detailed explanation on lake numeric nutrient criteria threshold development.

The literature also noticeably supported the concept of allowing site specific alternative criteria (SSACs) for lakes where either higher or lower levels could be justified, based upon scientific information, and DEP plans to allow development of SSACs for nutrients. This is consistent with provisions in the IWR that allow development of site-specific thresholds that better represent the levels at which nutrient impairment occurs and the use of a higher TSI if paleolimnological data indicate a lake was naturally above the applicable TSI.

## 9.6 **References**

Carlson, R.E. 1977. A trophic state index for lakes. *Limnology and Oceanography*. 22:361-369.

- Carlson, R.E. and J. Simpson. 1996. A Coordinator's Guide to Volunteer Lake Monitoring Methods. North American Lake Management Society. 96 pp.
- Fore, L. 2007. An evaluation of benthic macroinvertebrate assemblages as indicators of lake condition. Final Report to FDEP. 16 pp.
- Gerittsen, J, B. Jessup, E. Leppo, and J. White. 2000. Development of Lake Condition Indexes for Florida. FDEP.
- Glass, P. 2006. Development of use based chlorophyll *a* criteria for recreational use of reservoirs. WEFTEC. 13 pp.
- Gregory, J. 2007. Lessons learned in nutrient criteria development in Virginia.
- Havens, K. 2000. Using Trophic State Index (TSI) values to draw inferences regarding phytoplankton limiting factors and seston: composition from routine water quality monitoring data. Korean J. Limnol. 33 (3): 187~196.
- Heiskary, S. and B. Wilson. 2008. Minnesota's approach to lake nutrient criteria development. Lake and Reservoir Management 24:282-297.
- Hoyer, M, C. Brown, and D. Canfield. 2004. Relations between water chemistry and water quality as defined by lake users in Florida. Lake and Reservoir Management 20(3): 240-248.
- Macindoe, J. 2006. Why establish nutrient criteria for Alabama lakes? Alabama Dept. Environ. Management. Presentation to Tallapoosa Watershed Conference.
- Paul, M. and J. Gerrittsen. 2003. Development of Florida lake nutrient criteria: summary and synthesis. Tetra Tech. 12 pp.
- Shannon and Brezonik. 1972. Relations between lake trophic state and nitrogen and phosphorus loading rates. Environ. Sci. Technol. 6 (8): 719-725.
- Salas, H. J. and P. Martino. 1991. A simplified phosphorus trophic state index for warm water tropical lakes. Wat. Res. 25(3): 341-350.
- Saunders, J. 2009. Colorado lake Nutrient criteria- Update. Standards Unit. Water Quality Control Division. CO Dept Public Health & Environment.
- Smeltzer, E. and S.A. Heiskary. 1990. Analysis and applications of lake user survey data. Lake and Reservoir Management.
- Rule T. 2004. Nutrient Criteria in Lakes and Reservoirs: Maryland's Approach. Watershed Modeling Division. TMDL Development and Application Program. Maryland Department of the Environment.

- Whitmore, T. 2003. Water quality trends associated with algal changes in Florida lakes: Historic evidence for defining nutrient criteria conditions in EPA defined Florida lake regions. 29 pp.
- Whitmore, T. and M. Brenner. 2002. Paleologic characterization of pre-disturbance water quality conditions in EPA defined Florida lake regions. Univ. Florida Dept Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences. 30 pp.
- Wilton, T. 2008. Nutrient criteria and its connection to local water quality. Alabama Dept. Environ. Quality.
- World Health Organization. 1999. Toxic Cyanobacteria in Water: A guide to their public health consequences, monitoring and management. Chorus, I. and J. Bartram, eds. ISBN 0-419-23930-8
- World Health Organization. 2003. Guidelines for Safe Recreational Water Environments, Volume 1: Coastal and Fresh Waters. Geneva.  
[http://www.who.int/water\\_sanitation\\_health/bathing/srwe1/en/](http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/bathing/srwe1/en/)

DRAFT

## 10 Stressor-Response Analyses of Florida Lakes

### 10.1 Introduction

As previously stated for streams, the most comprehensive and scientifically defensible approach to developing numeric nutrient criteria is to establish cause and effect relationships between nutrients (stressors) and valued ecological attributes. The approach is further strengthened when the valued ecological attribute response can be linked to designated use support. Various lines of evidence discussed in Chapter 9 provided justification for use of chlorophyll *a* as an indicator of designated use support, primarily as measure of excessive algal growth, which can result in imbalances of natural populations of flora or fauna. Additionally, the Lake Vegetation Index (LVI) is a direct assessment of the floral community and can therefore be used to demonstrate use support.

DEP evaluated responses in both chlorophyll *a* and the Lake Vegetation Index to total phosphorus and total nitrogen concentrations. Lakes were initially categorized based on color categories previously adopted in Florida's Impaired Waters Rule. Lakes with period of record color less than or equal to 40 platinum cobalt units (PCU) were categorized as clear, and lakes with color greater than 40 PCU were categorized as colored. Based upon recommendations from the Nutrient TAC, DEP also evaluated whether there were any differences in the relationships between nutrients and chlorophyll *a* in clear lakes with specific conductance values above and below 100  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ . The specific conductance threshold was designed to capture lakes that receive input from calcareous aquifer sources, which naturally contain higher levels of phosphorus than do lakes that receive most of their water from (low conductivity) rainfall.


### 10.2 Macrophyte Analyses

The relationship between lake macrophytes and nutrients was examined using Florida's Lake Vegetation Index (LVI). Initial analysis evaluated the response of the LVI to nutrients using instantaneous nutrient measurements collected the same day as the LVI. These initial analyses showed weak, yet statistically significant relationships in clear lakes (Table 10-1), but only the relationship between LVI and TP was significant in colored lakes. The weak initial relationships are not surprising because macrophytes integrate lake nutrient conditions over time and primarily obtain nutrients through uptake from sediments rather than the water column. Therefore, DEP evaluated the LVI response to long-term nutrient conditions, specifically average conditions one year prior to the LVI sampling event.


**Table 10-1. Spearman rank correlation coefficients between instantaneous nutrient concentrations and Florida's Lake Vegetation Index.**

	All Lakes	Clear Lakes	Colored Lakes
<b>TP</b>	-0.396	-0.397	-0.364
<b>TN</b>	-0.324	-0.314	-0.211

Lake Vegetation Index samples from 91 clear and 53 colored lakes were paired with nutrient data from STORET, DEP's Ambient Program's database (GWIS), and Florida's biological database (SBIO). Nutrient data collected during the one year period prior to LVI sample collection were averaged using a geometric mean concentration. Only lakes with a minimum of three water chemistry samples during the period were analyzed further. Statistically significant relationships were found between LVI and one-year geometric mean TP and TN concentrations in both colored and clear lakes (Figures 10-1 and 10-2). The analyses indicate that lake vegetation exhibits a significant adverse response to nutrients. However, the adjusted  $R^2$  values were still low, primarily because the macrophyte community also responds to other environmental factors such as sediment conditions, physical disturbance, introduction of exotic taxa, and the presence or absence of herbivores. Since the biology responds to the combined effect of all these factors along with nutrients, the natural variation in these other environmental factors blur the observed biological response to nutrients. With the exception of the clear lakes TP and LVI relationship, the LVI response to nutrients was insufficiently robust to be used as the basis to establish numeric nutrient criteria. The TP relationship could potentially be used as a line of evidence to support numeric nutrient criteria to protect populations of flora in Florida's clear lakes.



**Figure 10-1. Relationships between LVI and geometric mean (A) TP and (B) TN in clear (color  $\leq 40$  PCU) Florida lakes. The nutrient concentrations were calculated as the geometric mean of samples collected within the lakes during the 365 day period prior to LVI collection. Solid black line is the least squares regression and the blue dashed lines are the 95% C.I. of the regression. Note that x-axis is expressed on a log-scale.**



**Figure 10-2. Relationships between LVI and geometric mean (A) TP and (B) TN in colored (color > 40 PCU) Florida lakes. The nutrient concentrations were calculated as the geometric mean of samples collected within the lakes during the 365 day period prior to LVI collection. Solid black line is the least squares regression and the blue dashed lines are the 95% C.I. of the regression. Note that x-axis is expressed on a log-scale.**

### 10.3 Chlorophyll *a* Analyses

Water chemistry and chlorophyll *a* data in Florida lakes were queried from the Florida STORET and the GWIS database. The initial dataset consisted of 33,622 samples from 4,417 sites distributed within 1,599 lakes. All data were spatially linked to USGS lake reach codes based on station coordinates. Water chemistry and chlorophyll *a* data were averaged by parameter, lake reach code and date. Data from 324 lakes were used to assess chlorophyll *a* response to nutrients based on over 9,600 paired results.

#### 10.3.1 Clear Lakes

As was the case for the LVI data, the Department categorized the data into clear and colored lakes. Clear lakes were further sub-divided based upon low and high conductivity (using 100  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$  as the demarcation point). Where necessary, data were log-transformed. Paired nutrient and chlorophyll *a* data were available for 195 clear lakes. Regional differences among the lakes were evaluated, but clear lakes showed similar chlorophyll *a* responses regardless of location, with some differences in the range of nutrient concentrations (Figures 10-3 and 10-4). Chlorophyll *a* concentrations exhibited statistically significant positive responses to both total phosphorus and nitrogen on an annual average basis (Figure 10-5). These relationships explain a large portion of the annual average variability observed in chlorophyll *a* concentrations ( $R^2=0.68-0.77$ ). Figure 10-6 shows that there are no significant seasonal chlorophyll *a* differences in the data set used to develop the nutrient criteria, indicating a yearly average is appropriate. Therefore, the regression relationships shown in Figures 10-3 and 10-4 can be used to develop scientifically defensible nutrient criteria designed to prevent excess algal growth based on protective chlorophyll *a* thresholds of 9 and 20  $\mu\text{g/L}$  for clear lakes with specific conductance values above and below 100  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ , respectively (Table 10-3).

The sub-categorization of clear lakes was based on recommendations from the Nutrient TAC to evaluate differences in natural nutrient expectations within clear lakes. The TAC recommended that the clear lakes needed to be sub-categorized to capture the differences between lakes receiving groundwater input from calcareous aquifer sources (higher conductivity), which contain natural higher levels of phosphorus from lakes that receive most of their water from (low conductivity) rainfall. They recommended that a conductivity threshold of 100  $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$  would provide a scientifically defensible and implementable basis for sub-categorizing Florida's clear lakes. Furthermore, the TAC recommended that clear, but higher conductivity lakes should be held to a 20  $\mu\text{g/L}$  chlorophyll *a* threshold for aquatic life use protection. The higher threshold acknowledges the fact that these higher conductivity lakes would be expected to have higher chlorophyll *a* levels related to the higher natural phosphorus conditions.






Figure 10-3. Relationship between Ln transformed chlorophyll *a* and total phosphorus in clear lakes by nutrient region. Note: that the lakes exhibit a similar chlorophyll response to TP independent of



region.

**Figure 10-4. Relationship between Ln transformed chlorophyll *a* and total nitrogen in clear lakes by nutrient region. Note: that the lakes exhibit a similar chlorophyll response to TN independent of region.**

DRAFT



**Figure 10-5.** Regression analyses annual geometric mean chlorophyll a concentrations and annual geometric mean (A) TP and (B) TN concentrations in clear Florida lakes. Note that x-axis and y-axis are both expressed on a log-scale.




Figure 10-6. Box plots of chlorophyll *a* by season in clear (left panel) and colored (right panel) lakes.

### 10.3.2 Colored Lakes

Paired nutrient and chlorophyll *a* data were available for 129 colored lakes. Initial analyses revealed statistically significant ( $p < 0.001$ ) yet weak relationships between chlorophyll *a* and both TP ( $R^2 = 0.38$ ) and TN ( $R^2 = 0.47$ ). Other factors influencing the chlorophyll *a* response were then investigated in an attempt to improve the relationship with nutrients. Despite initial lake sub-categorization by color, a significant inverse relationship (Spearman  $R = -0.25$ ) remained between color and chlorophyll *a*, with the influence of color most pronounced in lakes with color in excess of 150 to 200 PCU. Chlorophyll *a* level in these highly colored lakes were typically reduced when compared to the levels in less colored lakes, despite similar nutrient concentrations; that is, color in excess of approximately 150 PCU depresses the nutrient response (light limitation).

A multiple regression model (adjusted  $R^2 = 0.507$ ) was constructed between chlorophyll *a* (dependent variable) and TP and TN (independent variables) to investigate the influence of lake color on chlorophyll *a* response in colored lakes (Table 10-2). Model residual error was plotted against both color expressed as a long-term geometric mean (period of record) and annual geometric mean color. This evaluation demonstrated that the nutrient regression model tended to underestimate (positive residuals) chlorophyll *a* concentrations at lakes with color less than approximately 150 PCU and overestimated (negative residuals) chlorophyll *a* levels at lake with color over approximately 150 PCU (Figure 10-7). Classification and Regression Tree (CART) analysis was used to discriminate a breakpoint in the model residual error. A significant breakpoint that explained 36.4% percent of the relative error in the residuals was found at a long-term lake color of 143 PCU. Additional breakpoints were found at annual geometric mean colors of 54 and 360 PCU. These subsequent breakpoints provided only marginal improvements in the amount of explained variance (Figure 10-8). Based on the CART analysis, the colored lakes were further sub-categorized to long-term ranges of >40-140 PCU (moderately colored;  $n = 100$  lakes) and >140 PCU (highly colored;  $n = 29$  lakes), for purposes of investigating nutrient responses, to account for the substantial remaining influence of color on the chlorophyll *a*.

Regional differences among the moderately colored lakes (color between 40 and 140 PCU) were evaluated, but it was concluded that these colored lakes showed similar chlorophyll *a* responses regardless of location, although there were differences in the range of nutrient concentrations (Figures 10-9 and 10-10). Chlorophyll *a* exhibited statistically significant positive responses to both total phosphorus and nitrogen on an annual average basis in the moderately colored lakes (Figure 10-11). These relationships are sufficiently robust to develop scientifically defensible and protective criteria.

The relationships between TP and TN and chlorophyll *a* in the highly colored lakes (greater than 140 PCU) were significant but weak (Figure 10-12). These relationships demonstrate that nutrients influence chlorophyll *a* response (excess algal growth) in highly colored lakes and thus provide support for the need to develop numeric nutrient criteria to protect the designated use. However, the relationships are not sufficiently robust to directly derive numeric nutrient criteria given the high level of uncertainty and unexplained variance. In the absence of a strong and robust nutrient-chlorophyll *a* relationship in the highly colored (>140 PCU) lakes, fully protective criteria for these systems can be developed based on the response relationships from the moderately colored lakes (40-140 PCU), although these criteria will be somewhat overprotective given that high color will reduce algal response and biomass.

**Table. 10-2. Summary of the linear multiple regression between Ln transformed chlorophyll *a* and Ln transformed TP and TN in colored Florida lakes. The regression multiple  $R^2$  and adjusted  $R^2$  were 0.510 and 0.507, respectively.**

Effect	Coefficient	Std Error	Std Coef.	Tolerance	t	P(2 Tail)
<b>CONSTANT</b>	2.703	0.272	0	.	9.922	0.0000
<b>LTP</b>	0.347	0.085	0.213	0.457	4.091	0.0000
<b>LTN</b>	1.546	0.149	0.542	0.457	10.395	0.0000

Source	Sum-of-Squares	df	Mean-Square	F-ratio	P
<b>Regression</b>	449.764	2	224.882	205.223	0.0000
<b>Residual</b>	432.839	395	1.096		





Figure 10-7. Relationship between the residual error in the TP and TN chlorophyll model and (A) period of record geometric mean lake color and (B) annual geometric mean lake color. Note that both relationships exhibit a significant negative slope.



Split	Variable	PRE*	Improvement
1	POR_COLOR	0.333	0.333
2	Annual_COLOR	0.371	0.039
3	Annual_COLOR	0.409	0.037

\*Proportion reduction in error.

Figure 10-8. Classification and Regression Tree (CART) analysis, using a least-squares fitting method, of the residual error from the TP and TN model for chlorophyll *a* response in colored Florida lakes. The analysis demonstrates that colored lakes can be split into two large groups, using the first CART split, where the chlorophyll *a* response to TP and TN differs due to the confounding effect of color.




Figure 10-9. Relationship between Ln transformed chlorophyll *a* and TP in moderately colored lakes by nutrient region. Note that the lakes exhibit a similar chlorophyll response to TP independent of region.






Figure 10-10. Relationship between Ln transformed chlorophyll *a* and TN in moderately colored lakes by nutrient region. Note that the lakes exhibit a similar chlorophyll response to TN independent of region.



**Figure 10-11. Regression analyses annual geometric mean chlorophyll a concentrations and annual geometric mean (A) TP and (B) TN concentrations in moderately colored (>40-140 PCU) Florida lakes. Note that the x-axis and y-axis are both expressed on a log-scale.**



**Figure 10-12.** Regression analyses annual geometric mean chlorophyll a concentrations and annual geometric mean (A) TP and (B) TN concentrations in highly colored (>140 PCU) Florida lakes. Note: x-axis and y-axis are both expressed on a log-scale.

## 10.4 **Criteria Derivation**

Regression models describe the relationship between two variables where the magnitude of one variable (dependent) is assumed to be a function of one or more independent variables; that is, a degree of the variance in the dependent variable is explained by the independent variable(s). The regression line and equation define the average relationship (*i.e.*, half the data points fall above the line and half below it). Essentially, there is a 50% probability that a given level of N or P will elicit the chlorophyll *a* response corresponding to the regression equations shown in Figures 10-5 and 10-11. The DEP concluded that a simple application of an average response was not adequately protective and that a more complex application was needed to account for uncertainty in the dose-response relationship.

In the case of nutrient criteria, response uncertainty can be managed by considering nutrient concentrations in a range between a level that is unlikely (*e.g.*, 25% probability) to elicit a given threshold of response and a level that is likely to elicit a response (*e.g.*, 75% probability). Regression prediction intervals provide a range above and below the regression line that incorporate the unexplained variability of the independent variable, as well as the uncertainty in the model parameters (slope and intercept). Within this range of nutrient concentrations (between the upper and lower prediction interval), there is less certainty that a response (exceedance of the chlorophyll target) will or will not occur. This represents a range of conditions in which nutrients may be managed while considering the potential for Type I (incorrectly identifying a water as impaired) and Type II (failing to identify an impaired water) errors.

Nutrient concentrations less than or equal to the lower end (upper prediction interval) are unlikely to elicit the response threshold and therefore can be used as the basis for protective criteria, with a low probability of Type II statistical error but a high potential for Type I error. Conversely, a high likelihood of an undesirable response occurs when the nutrient concentration exceeds the upper end of the range (lower prediction interval). The probabilities of statistical errors at the upper end of the nutrient range are inverted compared with those at the lower end; that is, there is a low probability of Type I error and a higher probability for Type II error.

Because algal response is influenced by factors other than nutrients (grazing, macrophyte nutrient uptake, water retention time), the most scientifically defensible strategy for managing nutrients within the range of uncertainty is to verify a biological response prior to taking management action. If data demonstrate that a given lake is biologically healthy and does not experience excess algal growth (*e.g.*, < 20 µg chlorophyll *a*/L in a colored lake or high conductivity clear lake) despite having nutrient concentrations within the range of uncertainty, then no nutrient reductions are needed. However, if the lake exhibits excess algal growth or biological impairment within this band of uncertainty, corrective action is warranted. In the absence of chlorophyll *a* data, decisions should be made with an abundance of caution and assume an impaired condition if nutrients exceed the lower threshold. If chlorophyll *a* data subsequently indicate that the designated use is indeed maintained at nutrient levels within the upper and lower prediction interval, then those existing levels should be deemed acceptable.

Given this “performance based approach” and using annual average chlorophyll *a* values of 20 µg/L for colored lakes and higher conductivity clear lakes, and 9 µg/L for clear, low conductivity Florida lakes, respectively, criteria ranges associated with protection of designated uses can be defined based on the 50% prediction intervals depicted in Figure 10-5 and 10-11. The resultant lower and upper thresholds for clear/low conductivity lakes, clear/higher conductivity lakes, and colored lakes, are provided in Table 10-3.

**Table 10-3. Total phosphorus and total nitrogen criteria ranges for clear (<40 PCU) and colored Florida lakes (>40 PCU). The lower and upper thresholds were based on the intersection of chlorophyll *a* response concentrations with the 50% predictions intervals shown in Figures 10-10 and 10-10.**

Lake Type	Response (Chl- <i>a</i> µg/L)	Stressor	Lower Threshold	Upper Threshold
<b>Clear and Low Conductivity</b> (≤ 40 PCU and ≤ 100 µmhos/cm)	9	TP (mg/L)	0.015	0.043
	9	TN (mg/L)	0.85	1.14
<b>Clear but High Conductivity</b> (≤40 PCU but > 100 µmhos/cm)	20	TP (mg/L)	0.030	0.087
	20	TN (mg/L)	1.0	1.81
<b>Colored</b>	20	TP (mg/L)	0.05	0.157
	20	TN (mg/L)	1.23	2.25

Because color (PCU) is important in determining the applicable nutrient criteria, DEP performed an analysis to establish the most appropriate averaging period for classifying a lake as clear or colored. For this analysis, DEP obtained color data sets from several example lakes. Color data from multiple stations and years in a lake were then calculated as annual geometric means for each year. A rolling average was then calculated from the annual geometric means using varying time periods to evaluate the time period over which to average in order to minimize the variance in the resultant data set. Results indicated that a five year rolling average was generally sufficient to ensure minimization of the variance (see Figure 10-13 for example data set).




Figure 10-13. Variance in Lake Okeechobee color data from 8 pelagic stations, averaged over varying time periods.