Draft Outline to Guide Teleconference Discussion

2. Characterization of Nutrient Fate, Transport and Sources

Charge: Nutrient loads, concentrations, speciation, seasonality and biogeochemical recycling processes have been suggested as important causal factors in the development and persistence of hypoxia in the Gulf. The Integrated Assessment (CERN 2000) presented information on the geographic locations of nutrient loads to the Gulf and the human and natural activities that contribute nutrient loadings.

Based on your understanding of the current science:

- **Are there summaries, conclusions, and recommendations presented in the 2000 Integrated Assessment that you believe are no longer accurate or valid?**
- **What new findings are most relevant to this review and how do they alter our understanding of nutrient sources, fate, and transport and our ability to model the system(s)?**
- **What are the strengths and limitations of those new findings and models that will determine the level of confidence in our conclusions and recommendations, and will help to identify major gaps in our understanding?**

A. Given the available literature and information (especially since 2000), data and models on the loads, fate and transport and effects of nutrients, evaluate the importance of various processes in nutrient delivery and effects. These may include:

*Topic 2Ai: The pertinent **temporal** (annual and seasonal) characteristics of nutrient **loads/fluxes** throughout the Mississippi river basin and, ultimately, to the Gulf of Mexico. (David & Howarth)*

David: Estimate Temporal Loads/Fluxes Thoughout Basin

Howarth: Comparison of Landscape Scale Models for Estimating N/P Fluxes and Sources

*Topic 2Aii: The ability to determine an accurate **mass balance** of the nutrient loads throughout the basin. (David)*

David: Estimate Nutrient Mass Balance Throughout Basin

*Topic 2Aiii: Nutrient transport processes (**fate/transport, sources/sinks, transformation**, etc.) through the basin, the deltaic zone, and into the Gulf. (Meyer, Howarth, Lowrance, Crumpton, Boynton)*

Meyer: Nutrient Transport and Transformation in Small Streams and Rivers
(* = added or modified since previous version)

I. Identified research needs relevant to this topic from Integrated Assessment reports

A. Goolsby et al. (1999)

1. Studies in small watersheds to identify dynamics and timing of N transport from croplands to streams, to better define the extent and density of tile and other agricultural drainage, and to better understand the impact of these drainage practices on nutrient flux in large rivers. (7.2)
2. Reduce uncertainty about the role of instream processes such as denitrification (particularly in small streams) in removing N and identify ways to enhance these processes to reduce nitrate leaching to streams and ground water. (7.3)

B. Mitch et al. (1999)

1. Better understanding of N behavior during floods, particularly ecotechnological methods for nitrate control, such as riparian zones and other wetlands.

II. Recent research

*A. In-stream nitrogen removal in river networks: it can be substantial; however, in tile-drained agricultural regions in-stream removal accounts for a small fraction of total N export.

1. Estimates of in-stream nitrogen removal in regional drainages in the Mississippi River basin range from 10-60% (SPARROW model, Alexander et al. 2000) and 18 to 50% (Donner et al. 2004) of nitrogen inputs to surface waters. In sixteen river networks in the Northeastern United States, Riv-N model predicted that 37 to 76% of nitrogen inputs were removed within streams (Seitzinger et al. 2002), and the SPARROW model predicted that 7 to 54% of nitrogen inputs were removed (Alexander et al. 2002). For the Rhine and Elbe river basins, another model (PolFlow) predicted that 14 to 45% of N input to surface water was removed in the river network (De Wit 2001). In the Seine watershed, N retention retention in rivers is 24-32 x 10^3 tons/yr, whereas retention is 70-110 x 10^3 tons/yr in riparian zones. From 25-55% of N coming from below rooting zone or aquifer is retained before entering the river. There is a direct relationship between % watershed drained via tile drains and

riparian transfer coefficient (i.e. % N transported through riparian zone increases with increasing tile drainage) (Billen 1999).

*2. In midwestern tile-drained streams, denitrification is significant in N removal during low flow, warm periods (summer and autumn), improving in-stream water quality at those times (Royer et al. 2004). However, most of the nitrate is exported during high flows from January – June (Royer et al. 2006), and denitrification removes an insignificant fraction of this (Royer et al. 2004, 2006). Incorporating denitrification associated with aquatic vegetation does not alter these conclusions (Schaller et al. 2004). The proportion of nitrate load that is denitrified is highest in forested systems, lowest in urban and intermediate in agricultural streams in Michigan (Inwood et al. 2005). These authors conclude that "effective management solutions should address excess N application at the landscape scale to reduce stream N loads."

*3. In Illinois, denitrification in reservoirs reduces N export by 58% (David et al. 2006). Effectiveness of N removal increases with water retention time (David et al. 2006).

*4. Floodplain backwaters are limited in their effectiveness in N removal by denitrification because of a lack of hydrologic connectivity with the main stem and short water retention times (Richardson et al. 2004, David et al. 2006).

B. The role of small streams

1. Network nitrogen removal increased with total stream length (r^2 = 0.84), and increasing drainage density in a watershed (i.e., increasing map scale of hydrography from 1:500,000 to 1:100,000 increased the proportion of nitrogen removed by 8 to 31 percentage points) (Seitzinger et al. 2002).

2. Small streams remove a higher proportion of their incoming nitrogen per unit of water travel time (Alexander et al. 2000), per stream reach (Seitzinger et al. 2002), and per unit length (Wollheim et al. 2006, Helton 2006). Although larger stream reaches remove smaller fractions of their nitrogen, they remove larger masses of nitrogen because more nitrogen passes through them (Seitzinger et al. 2002, Wollheim et al. 2006, Helton 2006).

3. In a mixed-use NC watershed (~400 km^2), 50% of NO_3-N removal occurred in streams with catchment areas less than 20 km^2, and in a 1000 km^2 KS watershed with 27% agricultural land use, 50% of NO_3-N removal occurred in stream segments with catchment areas less than 10 km^2 (models in Helton 2006; MS Thesis).

4. SPARROW modeling in the Northeast has shown that N removal in headwaters reduces N load in headwaters by 12%, and in 6th order streams by 5-6%. This means that 40% (5/12) of the headwater load reduction is still observable in 6th order streams (Alexander et al. 2007).

*5. Removal of nitrate from stream water and its assimilation into biological tissues does not remove nitrogen from aquatic systems, but it

does transform nitrogen from dissolved to particulate form, which reduces the rate at which it is transported downstream.

*6. A greater fraction of N was removed by denitrification in meandering than in channelized streams, but removal never exceeded 15%/day except during periods of low flow and warm temperature (Opdyke et al. 2006).

*7. Enhancing N and P removal by 50% during low flows (Q < median) would reduce export by < 2%, whereas enhancing removal by 25% during high flows (>75th percentile flows) would increase removal by 20 - 24% (Royer et al. 2006).

C. Studies in small watersheds

1. In small (2nd order streams) Minnesota watersheds with sandy soils, extensive wetlands, and intermittently grazed pasture, nitrate removal from ridge through the riparian zone is a function of organic C availability; removal in hyporheic zone and streams is a function of temperature (i.e., there is adequate stored organic C) (Triska et al. 2007).

2. N loads to headwaters account for 45% of entire load delivered to the entire river network (1:100,000 scale) in streams in the Northeast. N loads from headwaters account for decreasing amounts of N in higher order rivers and streams: from 65% in 2nd order to 40% in sixth order (Alexander et al. 2007).

D. Model comparisons

In NE watersheds, 6 different models were able to predict measured nitrogen export to within 50% in majority of watersheds ranging in size from 475 to 70,000km^2. Models overpredicted export where there was little agriculture in the basin and where runoff was low; models underpredicted export where there was a lot of agriculture and where runoff was high. Models (SPARROW and Howarth) with greatest detail on N sources, attenuation, and water flow paths were the best predictors (Alexander et al. 2002).

III. Conclusions

A. Models based on a hydrography layer that does not adequately capture actual drainage density will underestimate the capacity for nutrient removal by in-stream processes.

*B. Enhancing nutrient removal capacity of small streams is likely to be effective in improving in-stream water quality during most of the year, but is not likely to be effective during periods of high flow when most of the nutrient export to the Gulf is occurring.

*C. Strategies for reducing N loading to the Gulf should include enhancing hydrologic exchange and retention in backwater habitats of rivers of intermediate size when discharge and nitrate concentrations are high.

D. Enhancing nitrogen removal capacity in riparian zones requires an adequate supply of bio-available organic carbon.

Howarth: Denitrification and P Sorption/Desorption in Larger Rivers and Gulf

Lowrance: Effectiveness of Wetlands, Agricultural Practices, and Understanding the Timing, Application Rates, and Forms of Current-Use Fertilizers

Crumpton: Effectiveness of Wetlands, Buffers, and Agricultural Management Practices (Including Drainage Management)

Boynton: Nutrient Fate in Wetlands and Estuaries

B. Given the available literature and information (especially since 2000) on nutrient sources and delivery within and from the basin, evaluate capabilities to:

*Topic 2Bi: **Predict nutrient delivery to the Gulf**, using currently available scientific tools and models. (Mankin & Reckhow)*

Mankin: Transport Processes Throughout the Basin – Source to Stream

Reckhow: Focus on the Current Ability to Model Nutrient Delivery

*Topic 2Bii: **Route nutrients** from their various sources and account for the **transport processes** throughout the basin and deltaic zone, using currently available scientific tools and models. (Mankin & Reckhow)*

Mankin: Account for Transport Processes Throughout the Basin

Reckhow: Focus on the Current Ability to Model Nutrient Routing

Literature Cited

Alexander, R.B., E.W. Boyer, R.A. Smith, G.E. Schwarz, and R.B. Moore. 2007. The role of headwater streams in downstream water quality. Journal of the American Water Resources Association. In Press.

Alexander, R. B., P. J. Johnes, E. W. Boyer and R. A. Smith (2002). A comparison of models for estimating the riverine export of nitrogen from large watersheds. Biogeochemistry **57**(1): 295-339.

Alexander, R. B., R. A. Smith and G. E. Schwarz (2000). Effect of stream channel size on the delivery of nitrogen to the Gulf of Mexico. Nature **403**: 758-761.

Billen, G. (1999). N transfers throughout the Seine drainage network: a budget based on application of the RIVERSTRAHLER model. Hydrobiologia 410: 139-150.

*David, M.B., L.G. Wall, T.V. Royer and J.L. Tank. In press. Denitrification and the nitrogen budget of a reservoir in an agricultural landscape. Ecological Applications.

de Wit, M. J. M. (2001). Nutrient fluxes at the river basin scale. I: the PolFlow model. Hydrological Processes **15**(5): 743-759.

*Dodds, W.K., M.A. Evans-White, N.M. Gerlanc, L. Gray, D.A. Gudder, M.J. Kemp, A.L.Lopez, D. Stagliano, E.A. Strauss, J.L. Tank, M.R. Whiles, W.M. Wollheim. 2000. Quantification of the nitrogen cycle in a prairie stream. Ecosystems 3: 574 – 589.

Helton, A. 2006. An inter-biome comparison of stream network nitrate dynamics. M.S. Thesis, University of Georgia, Athens GA.

*Inwood, S.E., J.L. Tank, and M.J. Bernot. 2005. Patterns of denitrification associated with land use in 9 midwestern headwater streams. Journal of the North American Benthological Society 24: 227 – 245.

*Opdyke, M.R., M.B. David and B.L. Rhoads. 2006. Influence of geomorphological variability in channel characteristics on sediment denitrification in agricultural streams. Journal of Environmental Quality 35: 2103-2112.

*Richardson, W.B., E.A. Strauss, L.A. Bartsch, E.M. Monroe, J.C. Cavanaugh, L. Vingum and D.M. Soballe. 2004, Denitrification in the Upper Mississippi River: rates, controls and contribution to nitrate flux. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 61: 1102-1112.

*Royer, T.V., J.L. Tank, M.B. David. 2004. Transport and fate of nitrate in headwater agricultural streams in Illinois. Journal of Environmental Quality 33: 1296-1304.

*Royer, T.V., M.B. David and L.E. Gentry. 2006. Timing of riverine export of nitrate and phosphorus from agricultural watersheds in Illinois: implications for reducing nutrient loading to the Mississippi River. Environmental Science and Technology 40: 4126-4131.

*Schaller, J.L., T.V. Royer, M.B. David and J.L. Tank. 2004. Denitrification associated with plants and sediments in an agricultural stream. JNABS 23: 667-676.

Seitzinger, S. P., R. V. Styles, E. W. Boyer, R. B. Alexander and G. Billen (2002). Nitrogen retention in rivers: model development and application to watersheds in the northeastern U.S.A. Biogeochemistry **57**(1): 199-237.

Triska, F.J., J.H. Duff, A.P. Jackman, R. Sheibley, and R.J. Avanzino. 2007. Mississippi River hypoxia: in the beginning…. Journal of the American Water Resources Association. In Press.

Wollheim, W. M., C. J. Vorosmarty, B. J. Peterson, S. P. Seitzinger and C. S. Hopkinson (2006). Relationship between river size and nutrient removal. Geophysical Research Letters **33**(L06410): doi:10.1029/2006GL025845.