TABLE 1: Summary characteristics of monitoring stations on the Patuxent River estuary. Chlorophyll-*a* and salinity values are based on averages from 1986 to 2014. Stations used for the analysis are in bold. Segments are salinity regions in the Patuxent for the larger Chesapeake Bay area (TF = tidal fresh, OH = oligohaline, MH = mesohaline).

Station	Lat	Long	Segment	Distance (km)	Depth (m)	ln-Chl (μg/L)	Sal (ppt)
TF1.3	38.81	-76.71	TF	74.90	2.9	1.52	0.00
TF1.4	38.77	-76.71	TF	69.50	2.0	2.31	0.02
TF1.5	38.71	-76.70	TF	60.30	10.6	2.88	0.27
TF1.6	38.66	-76.68	OH	52.20	6.2	2.44	0.90
TF1.7	38.58	-76.68	ОН	42.50	3.0	2.09	4.09
RET1.1	38.49	-76.66	MH	32.20	11.2	2.47	10.25
LE1.1	38.43	-76.60	MH	22.90	12.1	2.31	12.04
LE1.2	38.38	-76.51	MH	13.40	17.1	2.16	12.73
LE1.3	38.34	-76.48	MH	8.30	23.4	2.12	12.89
LE1.4	38.31	-76.42	MH	0.00	15.4	2.21	13.46

TABLE 2: Summaries of model performance using **RMSE!** (deviance in parentheses) of observed to predicted ln-**chla!** for each station (LE1.2 and TF1.6). Overall performance for the entire time series is shown at the top with groupings by different time periods below. Time periods are annual groupings every seven years (top), seasonal groupings (middle), and flow periods based on quantile distributions of discharge.

Period	LE	1.2	TF	TF1.6		
	GAM	WRTDS	GAM	WRTDS		
All						
	0.51 (139.5)	0.51 (135.1)	0.50 (128.4)	0.52 (138.6)		
Annual						
1986-1993	0.50 (41.1)	0.50 (40.9)	0.48 (37.2)	0.49 (39.1)		
1994-2000	0.51 (34.7)	0.50 (33.2)	0.55 (39.3)	0.58 (44.9)		
2001-2007	0.61 (51.5)	0.60 (49.6)	0.50 (33.7)	0.53 (37.5)		
2008-2014	0.37 (12.1)	0.36 (11.4)	0.45 (18.2)	0.44 (17.1)		
Seasonal						
JFM	0.60 (38.1)	0.58 (35.3)	0.49 (24.4)	0.49 (23.8)		
AMJ	0.64 (65.2)	0.64 (65.3)	0.54 (45.7)	0.58 (51.9)		
JAS	0.35 (19.3)	0.35 (18.6)	0.45 (30.4)	0.46 (32.2)		
OND	0.39 (16.8)	0.38 (15.9)	0.52 (27.9)	0.54 (30.7)		
Flow						
1 (Low)	0.36 (17.4)	0.36 (16.7)	0.45 (26.5)	0.46 (27.7)		
2	0.43 (24.4)	0.42 (23.5)	0.53 (36.6)	0.54 (37.8)		
3	0.58 (43.8)	0.57 (42.9)	0.49 (31.3)	0.52 (35.4)		
4 (High)	0.64 (53.9)	0.63 (52.0)	0.51 (34.0)	0.54 (37.7)		

TABLE 3: Summaries of flow-normalized trends from each model at LE1.2 for different time periods. Summaries are averages and percentage changes of ln-**chla!** (μ g/L) based on annual means within each category. Percentage changes are the differences between the last and first years in the periods. Time periods are annual groupings every seven years (top), seasonal groupings (middle), and flow periods based on quantile distributions of discharge.

Period		GAM	V	WRTDS		
	Ave.	% Change	Ave.	% Change		
All						
	2.17	24.28	2.18	18.85		
Annual						
1986-1993	1.99	9.60	2.03	1.75		
1994-2000	2.12	5.49	2.12	5.50		
2001-2007	2.24	5.50	2.24	5.35		
2008-2014	2.37	3.20	2.37	6.07		
Seasonal						
JFM	2.57	20.06	2.58	14.04		
AMJ	2.32	31.20	2.33	22.47		
JAS	2.01	18.48	2.01	19.91		
OND	1.82	25.29	1.83	15.14		
Flow						
1 (Low)	1.90	20.86	1.93	16.77		
2	2.10	13.71	2.11	7.73		
3	2.28	15.66	2.29	9.24		
4 (High)	2.34	25.09	2.33	22.29		

TABLE 4: Summaries of flow-normalized trends from each model at TF1.6 for different time periods. Summaries are averages and percentage changes of ln-**chla!** (μ g/L) based on annual means within each category. Percentage changes are the differences between the last and first years in the periods. Time periods are annual groupings every seven years (top), seasonal groupings (middle), and flow periods based on quantile distributions of discharge.

Period		GAM	V	WRTDS		
	Ave.	% Change	Ave.	% Change		
All						
	2.43	-4.81	2.44	-2.28		
Annual						
1986-1993	2.62	-4.93	2.60	-3.06		
1994-2000	2.69	-5.05	2.65	-3.55		
2001-2007	2.15	-22.42	2.19	-21.51		
2008-2014	2.24	47.10	2.30	38.35		
Seasonal						
JFM	1.52	9.03	1.48	32.72		
AMJ	2.63	5.47	2.62	5.14		
JAS	3.06	0.04	3.08	0.79		
OND	2.17	-18.16	2.20	-17.55		
Flow						
1 (Low)	2.89	-4.78	2.93	-0.42		
2	2.41	16.71	2.43	20.31		
3	2.28	6.53	2.27	15.20		
4 (High)	2.22	-11.58	2.21	-11.27		

TABLE 5: Comparison of predicted results between **WRTDS!** and **GAM!**s using average differences (%) and **RMSE!**. Overall comparisons for the entire time series are shown at the top with groupings by different time periods below. Time periods are annual groupings every seven years (top), seasonal groupings (middle), and flow periods based on quantile distributions of discharge. Negative percentages indicate **WRTDS!** predictions were lower than **GAM!** predictions (??).

Period	LE	1.2	TF1	TF1.6		
	Ave. diff.	RMSE!	Ave. diff.	RMSE!		
All						
	-0.11	0.09	0.01	0.13		
Annual						
1986-1993	0.20	0.10	-0.74	0.11		
1994-2000	0.34	0.09	-1.29	0.15		
2001-2007	-0.55	0.07	0.68	0.13		
2008-2014	-0.53	0.08	3.10	0.14		
Seasonal						
JFM	0.39	0.12	-2.00	0.14		
AMJ	0.22	0.10	-0.66	0.14		
JAS	-0.71	0.06	0.76	0.10		
OND	-0.46	0.05	1.04	0.15		
Flow						
1 (Low)	-0.27	0.07	-0.15	0.10		
2	-0.14	0.09	0.70	0.13		
3	0.49	0.11	1.07	0.14		
4 (High)	-0.53	0.09	-1.75	0.15		

TABLE 6: Regression fits comparing predicted (*pred*) and flow-normalized (*norm*) results for **WRTDS!** and **GAM!**s. Values in bold-italic are those where the intercept (β_0) estimate was significantly different from zero or the slope (β_1) estimate was significantly different from one. Fits for the entire time series are shown at the top. Time periods are annual groupings every seven years (top), seasonal groupings (middle), and flow periods based on quantile distributions of discharge.

Period	LE	21.2	TF	1.6	LF	21.2	TF	1.6
	$\beta_{0, pred}$	$\beta_{1, pred}$	$\beta_{0, pred}$	$\beta_{1,pred}$	$\beta_{0,norm}$	$\beta_{1,norm}$	$\beta_{0,norm}$	$\beta_{1,norm}$
All								
	0.05	0.97	0.08	0.97	0.15	0.94	0.02	0.99
Annual								
1986-1993	0.02	0.99	-0.02	1.00	0.20	0.92	-0.12	1.03
1994-2000	0.16	0.93	-0.03	0.99	0.17	0.92	-0.12	1.02
2001-2007	0.02	0.99	0.13	0.95	0.06	0.98	0.11	0.97
2008-2014	0.00	1.00	0.12	0.97	0.01	0.99	0.08	0.99
Seasonal								
JFM	-0.01	1.01	0.09	0.92	0.01	1.00	0.20	0.84
AMJ	0.28	0.88	0.27	0.89	0.38	0.84	0.34	0.87
JAS	-0.08	1.03	0.34	0.89	0.30	0.85	0.39	0.88
OND	0.02	0.98	0.13	0.95	0.38	0.80	0.03	1.00
Flow								
1 (Low)	0.14	0.92	-0.03	1.01	0.46	0.77	0.16	0.95
2	0.00	1.00	0.12	0.96	0.14	0.94	0.01	1.00
3	0.09	0.96	0.21	0.91	0.12	0.96	-0.02	1.00
4 (High)	0.09	0.96	0.03	0.97	0.09	0.96	0.09	0.95

TABLE 7: Summaries of model performance comparing observed **chla!** with predicted values $(Chl_{obs} \sim \widehat{Chl}_{obs})$ and biological **chla!** with flow-normalized values $(Chl_{bio} \sim \widehat{Chl}_{bio})$ for the three simulated time series (no flow, constant flow, and increasing flow effect). Summaries are **RMSE!** values (deviance in parentheses) comparing results from each model (**GAM!**, **WRTDS!**).

Simulations	$Chl_{obs} \sim \widehat{Chl}_{obs}$	$Chl_{bio} \sim \widehat{Chl}_{bio}$	
No flow			
GAM	0.51 (31.2)	0.53 (33.2)	
WRTDS	0.50 (29.4)	0.52 (31.7)	
Constant flow			
GAM	0.51 (31.2)	0.58 (39.8)	
WRTDS	0.53 (32.8)	0.57 (38.9)	
Increasing flow			
GAM	0.51 (31.2)	0.54 (35.0)	
WRTDS	0.50 (29.7)	0.52 (31.9)	

TABLE 8: Qualitative comparisons of generalized additive models and WRTDS!. Qualities are grouped by ease of use and statistical considerations. Ease of use qualities are described as good, moderate, or poor and statistical qualities as yes/no.

Quality	GAM!	WRTDS!
ease of use		
computational requirements	good	poor
interpretation ¹	poor	moderate
software and documentation ²	moderate	good
visualization	moderate	good
statistical		
additional variables	y	n
censored data	n	у
confidence intervals	y	y
quantile fits	n	y

¹Relates to statistical foundation, not results ²In reference to analysis of water quality trends