Seagrass light requirements using an algorithm to spatially resolve depth of colonization

Marcus W. Beck[1], **James D. Hagy III**[2]

[1]*ORISE Research Participation Program*
USEPA National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory
Gulf Ecology Division, 1 Sabine Island Drive, Gulf Breeze, FL 32561
Phone: 850-934-2480, Fax: 850-934-2401, Email: beck.marcus@epa.gov

[2]*USEPA National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory*
Gulf Ecology Division, 1 Sabine Island Drive, Gulf Breeze, FL 32561
Phone: 850-934-2455, Fax: 850-934-2401, Email: hagy.jim@epa.gov

1 Introduction

Seagrasses are ecologically valuable components of aquatic systems that have a structural and functional role maintaining aquatic habitat. These ‘ecosystem engineers’ can affect aquatic systems through multiple feedback mechanisms with other ecosystem components (Jones et al. 1994, Koch 2001). For example, seagrass beds create habitat for juvenile fish and crabs by reducing wave action and stabilizing sediment (Williams and Heck 2001, Hughes et al. 2009). Seagrasses also respond to changes in water clarity through direct physiological linkages with light availability. Increased nutrient loading contributes to reductions in water clarity through increased algal concentrations, inhibiting the growth of seagrass through light limitation (Duarte 1995). Empirical relationships between nutrient loading, water clarity, light requirements, and the maximum depth of seagrass colonization have been identified (Duarte 1991, Kenworthy and Fonseca 1996, Choice et al. 2014). These relationships have often been used to identify quantitative limits that maintain light regimes sufficient for seagrass growth (Steward et al. 2005). Conversely, seagrass depth limits have formed the basis of quantititative criteria for nutrient load targets as used in water quality management (Janicki and Wade 1996). Contrasted with targets based on nutrients and phytoplankon limits, seagrass-based estimates may be more practical for developing water quality standards given that seagrasses are integrative of system-wide conditions over time and less variable with changes in nutrient regimes (Duarte 1995).

A variety of techniques have been developed for estimating seagrass depth limits as a basis for identifying critical nutrient load limits or developing a more robust description of aquatic habitat. Such efforts have been useful for site-specific approaches where the analysis needs are driven by a particular management or research context (e.g., Iverson and Bittaker 1986, Hale et al. 2004). However, a lack of standardization among methods has prevented broad-scale comparisons between regions and has even contributed to discrepancies between measures of depth limits based on the chosen technique. For example, seagrass depth limits based on in situ techniques can vary with the sampling device (Spears et al. 2009). Despite the availability of data, techniques for estimating seagrass depth of colonization using remotely sensed data have not been extensively developed. Such techniques have the potential to facilitate broad-scale comparisons between regions given the spatial coverage and annual availability of many products. For example, recent analyses by Hagy, In review have shown that standardized techniques using seagrass coverage maps and bathymetric data can be developed to compare growth patterns over time among different coastal regions of Florida. Such methods show promise, although further development to improve the spatial resolution of the analysis are needed. Specifically, methods for estimating seagrass depth limits should be reproducible for broad-scale comparisons, while also maintaining flexibility for site-specific estimates depending on management needs.

A useful application of depth limits is the estimation of light requirements to evaluate ecologically relevant characterisics of seagrass communities. Growth of submersed aquatic plants is generally most limited by light availability as a function of attenuation from the surface (Barko et al. 1982, Hall et al. 1990, Dennison et al. 1993). However, variation in the maximum depth of growth for a given level of water clarity is not uncommon based on variation in light requirements (Dennison et al. 1993, Choice et al. 2014); seagrasses with low light requirements are expected to grow deeper than seagrasses with high requirements. Duarte (1991) indicate that minimum light requirements for seagrasses are on average 11% of surface irradiance, although requirements are species-specific and variable by latitude such that values may range from less than 5% to greater than 30% (Dennison et al. 1993). Variation in light requirements in seagrasses along the Gulf

Coast of peninsular Florida were attributed to morphological and physiological differences between species and adaptations to regional light regimes (Choice et al. 2014). Spatial heterogeneity in light requirements is, therefore, a useful diagnostic tool for evaluating additional factors that may limit seagrass growth. Potentially novel insights into ecological characteristics of aquatic systems can be obtained by evaluating light requirements. For example, high light requirements estimated from maximum depth of colonization and water clarity may suggest seagrass growth is limited by high biomass of epiphytic algal growth that further reduces light availability on the leaf surface (Kemp et al. 2004). Accordingly, quantitative and flexible methods for estimating seagrass depth limits and light requirements have the potential to greatly improve ecological descriptions of aquatic habitat.

This article describes a method for estimating seagrass depth of colonization using information-rich datasets to create a spatially explicit and flexible measure. In particular, an empirical algorthm is described that estimates seagrass depth limits from aerial coverage maps and bathymetric data using an *a priori* defined area of influence. The specific objectives are to 1) describe the method for estimating seagrass depth limits within a relevant spatial context, 2) apply the technique to four distinct regions of Florida to illustrate improved clarity of description for seagrass growth patterns, and 3) develop a spatially coherent relationship between depth limits, water clarity, and light requirements for the case studies. Overall, these methods are expected to inform the description of seagrass growth patterns to develop a more ecologically relevant characterization of aquatic habitat. The method is applied to data from Florida although the technique is easily transferable to other regions with comparable data.

2 Methods

Predefined management units are commonly used as relevant spatial units for characterizing seagrass depth limits. For example, Steward et al. (2005) describe a segmentation scheme for the Indian River Lagoon on the east coast of Florida that was used to assign seagrass depth limits to 19 distinct geospatial units. Although useful within a limited scope, substantial variation in growth patterns and water quality characteristics may be apparent at different spatial scales that precludes xyz.

xxxxxxxxxxxx

A segment-wide average of seagrass depth of colonization (Z_c), although unbiased, may potentially reduce the ability to relate patterns in Z_c to relevant water quality variables. Considerable spatial heterogeneity in the observed seagrass growth patterns suggests that a segment-wide estimate of seagrass Z_c may not fully describe variation at relevant spatial scales. Fig. 2a illustrates variation in seagrass distribution for a location in the Big Bend region of Florida. Using methods in Hagy, In review, the segment-wide estimate for maximum depth of seagrass colonization (shown as a red contour line) does not adequately describe within-segment variation in depth limits. Z_c is greatly over-estimated at the outflow of the Steinhatchee River where high concentrations of dissolved organic matter reduce water clarity and naturally limit seagrass growth. This example suggests that it may be useful to have improved spatial resolution in estimates of Z_c, particularly when site-specific characteristics may require a more detailed description of seagrass growth patterns. Although the current example is immediately relevant for the Big Bend region of Florida, the remaining examples discussed throughout also provide a justification for a more comprehensive assessment of seagrass growth patterns.

{acro:doc

Development of a spatially-resolved approach to estimate seagrass Z_c relied extensively on data and partially on methods described in Hagy, In review. The following is a summary of data sources, methods and rationale for improving spatial resolution in seagrass Z_c estimates, and evaluation of the approach including relationships with water clarity.

2.1 Data sources

2.1.1 Study sites

Four locations in Florida were chosen for the analysis: Choctawhatchee Bay (Panhandle), Big Bend region (northeast Gulf of Mexico), Tampa Bay (central Gulf Coast), and Indian River Lagoon (east coast) (Table 1 and Fig. 1). These locations represent different geographic regions in the state, in addition to having available data and observed gradients in water clarity that contribute to heterogeneity in seagrass growth patterns. For example, the Big Bend region was chosen based on location near an outflow of the Steinhatchee River where higher concentrations of dissolved organic matter are observed. Seagrasses near the outflow were observed to grow at shallower depths as compared to locations far from the river source. Coastal regions and estuaries in Florida are partitioned as distinct spatial units based on a segmentation scheme developed by US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for the development of numeric nutrient criteria. {acro:EPA} One segment from each geographic location was used to estimate seagrass Z_c and to evaluate variation in growth patterns. The segments included portions of Choctawhatchee Bay (segment 303), the big bend region (820), Old Tampa Bay (902), and Indian River Lagoon (1502) (Fig. 1).

2.1.2 Seagrass coverage and bathymetry {sec:data_

Spatial data describing seagrass aerial coverage combined with co-located bathymetric depth information were used to estimate Z_c. These geospatial data products are pubically available in coastal regions of Florida through the US Geological Survey, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, and watershed management districts. Seagrass coverage maps were obtained for recent years in each of the study sites described above (Table 1). Coverage maps were produced using photo-interpretations of aerial images to categorize seagrass as absent, discontinuous (patchy), or continuous. For this analysis, we considered seagrass as only present (continuous and patchy) or absent since differences between continuous and patchy coverage were often inconsistent between data sources.

Bathymetric depth layers for each location were obtained from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's (NOAA) National Geophysical Data Center (http://www.ngdc.noaa.gov/) as either Digital Elevation Models (DEMs) or raw sounding data {acro:DEM from hydroacoustic surveys. Tampa Bay data provided by the Tampa Bay National Estuary Program are described in Tyler et al. (2007). Bathymetric data for the Indian River Lagoon were obtained from the St. John's Water Management District (Coastal Planning and Engineering 1997). NOAA products were referenced to mean lower low water, whereas Tampa Bay data were referenced to the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88) and the Indian River {acro:NAVD Lagoon data were referenced to mean sea level. Depth layers were combined with seagrass coverage layers using standard union techniques for raster and vector layers in ArcMap 10.1 (Environmental Systems Research Institute 2012). To reduce computation time, depth layers were first masked using a 1 km buffer of the seagrass coverage layer. Raster bathymetric layers were converted to vector point layers to combine with seagrass coverage maps, described below. All spatial data were referenced to the North American Datum of 1983 as geographic coordinates. Depth values in each seagrass layer were further adjusted from the relevant vertical reference datum to local mean sea level (MSL) using the NOAA VDatum tool (http://vdatum.noaa.gov/). {acro:MSL}

2.1.3 Water clarity

Seagrass light requirements can be estimated by evaluating spatial relationships between depth of colonization and water clarity. Secchi measurements provide a precise estimate of water clarity and have been obtained at numerous locations documented in the Florida Department of Environmental Protection's Impaired Impaired Waters Rule (IWR) database. {acro:IWR} Secchi data (as depth in meters, Z_{secchi}) for Florida coastal waters were obtained from update 40 of the IWR database for all of Tampa Bay (2010 coverage) and the Indian River Lagoon (2009 coverage) given the spatial extent of secchi observations for the two locations relative to the Big Bend and Choctawhatchee segments. Secchi data within the previous ten years of the seagrass coverage data were evaluated to capture water quality trends from the most recent decade (i.e., 1999–2009 for the Indian River Lagoon and 2000–2010 for Tampa Bay). Stations with less than five observations and observations that were flagged indicating that the value was lower than the maximum depth of the observation point were removed. Secchi data were also compared with bathymetric data to verify unflagged values were not missed by initial screening. Secchi observations that were measured at the same geographic location were averaged across all dates. This approach was preferred given that seagrass depth patterns are more representative of long-term trends in water clarity as opposed to individual secchi measures that may be highly variable (Dennison 1987, Dennison et al. 1993).

2.2 Flexible estimation of seagrass depth of colonization for finite areas

The general approach to estimating seagrass depth of colonization uses combined seagrass coverage maps and bathymetric depth data described above. The combined layer used for analysis was a point shapefile with attributes describing location (latitude, longitude, segment), depth (m), and seagrass (present, absent). Seagrass Z_c values are estimated from these data by quantifying the proportion of points with seagrass at each observed depth. Three unique measures describing seagrass depth limits obtained from these data are minimum ($Z_{c,\,min}$), median ($Z_{c,\,med}$), and maximum ($Z_{c,\,max}$) depth of colonization. Operationally, these terms describe characteristics of the seagrass coverage map with quantifiable significance. $Z_{c,\,max}$ is defined as the deepest depth at which a significant coverage of mappable seagrasses occured independent of outliers, whereas $Z_{c,\,med}$ is the median depth occurring at the deep water edge. $Z_{c,\,min}$ is the depth at which seagrass coverage begins to decline with increasing depth and may not be statistically distinguishable from zero depth, particularly in turbid waters. Specific methods for estimating each Z_c value using spatially-resolved information are described below.

The spatially-resolved approach for estimating Z_c begins by choosing an explicit location in cartesian coordinates within the general boundaries of the available data. Seagrass depth data (i.e., merged bathymetric and seagrass coverage data) that are located within a set radius from the chosen location are selected for estimating seagrass Z_c values (Fig. 2). The estimate for each location is quantified from a plot of the proportion of sampled points that contain seagrass at decreasing 0.1 meter depth bins from the surface to the maximum observed depth in the sample (Fig. 3a). Although the chosen radius for selecting depth points is problem-specific, the minimum radius should be chosen to sample a sufficient number of points for estimating Z_c. In general, an appropriate radius will produce a plot that indicates a decrease in the proportion of points that are occupied by seagrass with increasing depth. If more than one location is used to estimate Z_c, appropriate radii for each point would have minimal overlap with the seagrass depth data sampled by neighboring points.

A curve is fit to the sampled depth points using non-linear regression to characterize the reduction in seagrass as a function of depth (Fig. 3b). Specifically, a decreasing logistic growth curve is used with the assumption that seagrass decline with increasing depth is monotonic and asymptotic at the minimum and maximum depths of colonization. The curve is fit by minimizing the residual sums-of-squares with the Gauss-Newton algorithm (Bates and Chambers 1992) and starting parameters estimated from the observed data that are initial approximations of the curve characteristics. The model has the following form:

$$Proportion = \frac{\alpha}{1 + \mathrm{e}^{(\beta - Z)/\gamma}} \qquad (1)$$ {eqn:prop}

where the proportion of points occupied by seagrass at each depth, Z, is defined by a logistic curve with an asymptote α, a midpoint inflection β, and a scale parameter γ. Finally, a simple linear curve is fit through the inflection point (β) of the logistic curve to estimate the three measures of depth of colonization (Fig. 3c). The inflection point is considered the depth at which seagrass are decreasing at a maximum rate and is used as the slope of the linear curve. The maximum depth of seagrass colonization, $Z_{c,\,max}$, is the x-axis intercept of the linear curve. The minimum depth of seagrass growth, $Z_{c,\,min}$, is the location where the linear curve intercepts the upper asymptote of the logistic growth curve. The median depth of seagrass colonization, $Z_{c,\,med}$, is the depth halfway between $Z_{c,\,min}$ and $Z_{c,\,max}$. $Z_{c,\,med}$ is typically the inflection point of the logistic growth curve.

Estimates for each of the three Z_c measures are obtained only if specific criteria are met. These criteria were implemented as a safety measure that ensures a sufficient amount and appropriate quality of data were sampled within the chosen radius. First, estimates were provided only if a sufficient number of seagrass depth points were present in the sampled data to estimate a logistic growth curve. This criteria applies to the sample size as well as the number of points with seagrass in the sample. Second, estimates were provided only if an inflection point was present on the logistic curve within the range of the sampled depth data. This criteria applied under two scenarios where the curve was estimated but a trend was not adequately described by the sampled data. That is, estimates were unavailabled if hte logistic curve described only the initial decrease in points occupied as a function of depth but the observed points do not occur at depths deeper than the predicted inflection point. The opposite scenario occurred when a curve was estimated but only the deeper locations beyond the inflection point were present in the sample. Third, the estimate for $Z_{c,\,min}$ was set to zero depth if the linear curve through the inflection point intercepted the asymptote at x-axis values less than zero. The estimate for $Z_{c,\,med}$ was also shifted to the depth value halfway between $Z_{c,\,min}$ and $Z_{c,\,max}$ if $Z_{c,\,min}$ was fixed at zero. Finally, estimates were considered invalid if the 95% confidence interval for $Z_{c,\,max}$ included zero. Methods used to determine confidence bounds on Z_c estimates are described below.

2.3 Estimating uncertainty in depth of colonization estimates

Confidence intervals for the Z_c values were estimated using a Monte Carlo simulation approach that considered the variance and covariance between the model parameters (Hilborn and Mangel 1997). For simplicity, we assume that the variability associated with parameter estimates is the dominant source of uncertainty. A 95% confidence interval for each Z_c estimate was constructed by repeated sampling of a multivariate normal distribution followed by prediction of the proportion of points occupied by seagrass as in eq. (1). The sampling distribution assumes:

$$x \sim N(\mu, \Sigma) \tag{2}$$

where x is a predictor variable used in eq. (1) (depth) that follows a multivariate normal distribution with mean μ, and variance-covariance matrix Σ. The mean values are set at the depth value corresponding to the inflection point on the logistic curve and the predicted model parameters (i.e., α, β, and γ), whereas Σ is the variance-covariance matrix of the model parameters. A large number of samples ($n = 10000$) were drawn from the distribution to characterize the uncertainty of the depth value at the inflection point. The 2.5$^{\text{th}}$ and 97.5$^{\text{th}}$ quantile values of the sample were considered bounds on the 95% confidence interval.

The uncertainty associated with the Z_c estimates was based on the upper and lower limits of the estimated inflection point on the logistic growth curve. This approach was used because uncertainty in the inflection point is directly related to uncertainty in each of the Z_c estimates that are based on the linear curve fit through the inflection point. Specifically, linear curves were fit through the upper and lower estimates of the depth value at the inflection point to identify upper and lower limits for the estimates of $Z_{c,\,min}$, $Z_{c,\,med}$, and $Z_{c,\,max}$. These values were compared with the initial estimates from the linear curve that was fit through the inflection point on the predicted logistic curve (i.e., Fig. 3c). This approach provided an indication of uncertainty for individual estimates for the chosen radius. Uncertainty estimates were obtained for each Z_c estimate for the grids in each segment.

The algorithm for estimating Z_c was implemented custom-made and pre-existing functions in program R. Nonlinear least squares models were based on the `nls` and `SSlogis` functions that used a self-starting logistic growth model (Bates and Chambers 1992, R Development Core Team 2014). Multivariate normal distributions used to evaluate uncertainty were simulated using functions in the MASS package (Venables and Ripley 2002). Geospatial data were imported and processed using functions in the rgeos and sp packages (Bivand et al.

2008, Bivand and Rundel 2014).

2.4 Evaluation of spatial heterogeneity of seagrass depth limits

Spatially-resolved estimates for seagrass Z_c were obtained for each of the four coastal segments described above. Segment-wide estimates obtained using all data were used as a basis of comparison such that departures from these values at smaller scales were evidence of spatial heterogeneity in seagrass growth patterns and improved clarity of description in depth estimates. A sampling grid of locations for estimating each of the three depth values in Fig. 3 was created for each segment. The grid was masked by the segment boundaries, whereas seagrass depth points used to estimate Z_c extended beyond the segment boundaries to allow sampling by grid points that occurred near the edge of the segment. Initial spacing between sample points was chosen arbitrarily as 0.02 decimal degrees, which is approximately 2 km at 30 degrees N latitude. The sampling radius around each sampling location in the grid was also chosen as 0.02 decimal degrees to allow for complete coverage of seagrass within the segment while also minimizing redundancy of information described by each location. In other words, radii were chosen such that the seagrass depth points sampled by each grid location were only partially overlapped by those sampled by neighboring points.

2.5 Developing a spatially coherent relationship of water clarity with depth of colonization

The relationship between the quantified seagrass depth limits and secchi measurements were explored by estimating light requirements from standard attenuation equations. The traditional Lambert-Beer equation describes the exponential decrease of light availability with depth:

$$I_z = I_O \cdot \exp\left(-K_Z \cdot Z\right) \quad (3)$$ {eqn:lambe

such that the irradiance of incident light at depth Z (I_Z) can be estimated from the irradiance at the surface (I_O) and a light extinction coefficient (K_Z). Light requirements of seagrass at a specific location can be estimated by rearranging eq. (3):

$$\%\,light = \exp\left(-K_Z \cdot Z_{c,\,max}\right) \tag{4}$$ {eqn:percl

where the percent light requirements of seagrass at $Z_{c,\,max}$ are empirically related to light extinction. A conversion factor is often used to estimate the light extinction coefficient from secchi depth Z_{secchi}, such that such that $c = K_Z \cdot Z_{secchi}$, where c has been estimated as 1.7 (Poole and Atkins 1929, Idso and Gilbert 1974). Thus, K_Z can be replaced with the conversion factor and Z_{secchi}:

$$\%\,light = \exp\left(-\left(\frac{1.7}{Z_{secchi}}\right) \cdot Z_{c,\,max}\right) \tag{5}$$ {eqn:cperc

Variation in seagrass light requirements by location can be considered biologically meaningful.

The geographic coordinates for each secchi measurement in all of Tampa Bay and the Indian River Lagoon were used as locations for estimating $Z_{c,\,max}$. These estimates were compared with the averaged secchi estimates for the prior ten years to identify seagrass light requirements at each location (i.e., 2000–2010 for Tampa Bay, 1999–2009 for Indian River Lagoon). However, the relationship may vary depending on the specific radius around each sample point for estimating $Z_{c,\,max}$. A sufficiently large radius was chosen that was approximately an order of magnitude larger than that used for the individual segments given that $Z_{c,\,max}$ estimates were to be compared for whole bays rather than within segments. The estimated maximum depth values and light requirements of each point were plotted by location to evaluate spatial variation in seagrass growth as a function of light-limitation.

3 Results

3.1 Segment characteristics and seagrass depth estimates

Each of the four segments varied by several key characteristics that potentially explain within-segment variation of seagrass growth patterns (Table 1). Mean surface area was 191.2 square kilometers, with area decreasing for the Big Bend (271.4 km), Indian River Lagooon (NA km), Old Tampa Bay (205.5 km), and Choctawhatchee Bay (59.4 km) segments. Seagrass coverage as a percentage of total surface area varied considerably by segment. Seagrasses covered a majority of the surface area for the Big Bend segment (74.8 %), whereas coverage was much less for Indian River Lagoon (NA %), Old Tampa Bay (11.9 %), and Choctawhatchee Bay (5.9 %). Visual examination of the seagrass coverage maps for the respective year of each segment suggested that seagrasses were not uniformly distributed (Fig. 1). Seagrasses in the Choctawhatchee Bay segments were generally sparse with the exception of a large patch located to the west of the inlet connection with the Gulf of Mexico. Seagrasses in the Big Bend segment were located throughout the segment with noticeable declines near the outflow of the Steinhatchee River, whereas seagrasses in Old Tampa Bay and the Indian River Lagoon segment were generally confined to shallow areas near the shore. Seagrass coverage showed a partial decline toward the northern ends of both Old Tampa Bay and the Indian River Lagoon segments. Mean depth was less than 5 meters for each segment, excluding Choctawhatchee Bay which was slightly deeper than the other segments on average (5.3 m). Maximum depths were considerably deeper for Choctawhatchee Bay (11.9 m) and Old Tampa Bay (10.4 m), as compared to the Big Bend (3.6 m) and Indian River Lagoon (NA m) segments. Water clarity as indicated by average secchi depths was similar between the segments (1.5 m), although Choctawhatchee Bay had a slightly higher average (2.1 m).

Estimates of seagrass Z_c using a segment-wide approach that did not consider spatially explicit locations indicated that seagrasses generally did not grow deeper than three meters in any of the segments (Table 2). Maximum and median depth of colonization were deepest for the Big Bend segment (3.7 and 2.5 m, respectively) and shallowest for Old Tampa Bay (1.1 and 0.9 m), whereas the minimum depth of colonization was deepest for Choctawhatchee Bay (1.8 m) and shallowest for Old Tampa Bay (0.6 m). Averages of all grid-based estimates for each segment were different than the segment wide estimates, which suggests potential bias associated with using a whole segment as a relevant spatial unit for estimating depth of colonization. In most cases, the averages of all grid-based estimates were less than the whole segment estimates, suggesting the latter provided an over-estimate of seagrass growth limits. For example, the average of all grid estimates for $Z_{c,\,max}$ in the Big Bend region suggested seagrasses grew to approximately 2 m, which was 1.6 m less than the whole segment estimate. This reduction is likely related to improved resolution of seagrass depth limits near the outflow of the Steinhatchee river. Although reductions were not as severe for the average grid estimates for the remaining segments, considerable within-segment variation was observed depending on grid location. For example, the deepest estimate for $Z_{c,\,min}$ (2 m) in the Indian River Lagoon exceeded the average of all grid locations for $Z_{c,\,max}$ (1.7 m). $Z_{c,\,min}$ also had minimum values of zero meters for the Big Bend and Old Tampa Bay segments, suggesting that seagrasses declined continously from the surface for several locations.

Visual interpretations of seagrass depth estimates using the grid-based approach provided further information on the distribution of seagrasses in each segment (Fig. 4). Spatial heterogeneity in depth limits was particularly apparent for the Big Bend and Indian River Lagoon segments. As expected, depth estimates indicated that seagrasses grew deeper at locations far from the outflow of the Steinhatchee River in the Big Bend segment. Similarly, seagrasses were limited to shallower depths at the north end of the Indian River Lagoon segment near the Merrit Island National Wildlife Refuge. Seagrases were estimated to grow at maximum depths up to 2.1 m on the eastern portion of the Indian River Lagoon segment. Spatial heterogeneity was less distinct for the remaining segments. Seagrasses in Old Tampa Bay grew deeper in the northeast portion of the segment and declined to shallower depths near the inflow at the northern edge. Spatial variation in the Choctawhatchee Bay segment was not apparent, although the maximum Z_c estimate was observed in the northeast portion of the segment. Z_c values were not available for all grid locations givne the limitations imposed in the estimation method. Z_c could not be estimated in locations where seagrasses were sparse or absent, nor where seagrasses were present but the sampled points did not exhibit a sufficient decline with depth. The latter scenario was most common in Old Tampa Bay and Choctawhatchee Bay where seagrasses were unevenly distributed or confined to shallow areas near the shore. The former scenario was most common in the Big Bend segment where seagrasses were abundant but locations near the shore were inestimable given that seagrasses did not decline appreciably within the depths that were sampled.

Uncertainty for estimates of $Z_{c,\,max}$ indicated that confidence intervals were generally acceptable (i.e., greater than zero), although the ability to discriminate between the three depth estimates varied by segment (Fig. 5 and Table 3). Mean uncertainty for all estimates in each segment measured as the width of a 95% confidence interval was 0.2 m. Greater uncertainty was observed for Choctawhatchee Bay (mean width of all confidence intervals was 0.7 m) and Old Tampa Bay (0.4 m), compared to the Big Bend (0.1 m) and Indian River Lagoon (0.1 m) segments. The largest confidence interval for each segment was 1 m for Old Tampa Bay, 2.5 m for Choctawhatchee Bay, 0.4 m for the Big Bend, and 0.3 m for the Indian River Lagoon segments. However, most confidence intervals for the remaining grid locations were much smaller than the maximum in each segment. A comparison of overlapping confidence intersals for $Z_{c,\,min}$, $Z_{c,\,med}$, and $Z_{c,\,max}$ at each grid location indicated that not every measure was unique. Specifically, only 12.5% of grid points in Choctawhatchee Bay and 38.9% in Old Tampa Bay had significantly different estimates, whereas 84% of grid points in the Indian River Lagoon and 94.1% of grid points in the Big Bend segments had estimates that were significantly different. By contrast, all grid estimates in Choctawhatchee Bay and Indian River Lagoon had $Z_{c,\,max}$ estimates that were significantly greater than zero, whereas all but 10% of grid points in Old Tampa Bay and 5.6% of grid points in the Big Bend segment had $Z_{c,\,max}$ estimates significantly greater than zero.

3.2 Evaluation of seagrass light requirements

Estimates of seagrass depth limits and corresponding light requirements for all segments of Tampa Bay and the Indian River Lagoon indicated substantial variation, both between and within the different bays (Table 4 and Figs. 6 and 7). Seagrass Z_c estimates were obtained for 61 locations in Tampa Bay and 50 locations in the Indian River Lagoon where secchi observations were available in the Florida IWR database. Mean secchi depth for all recorded observations was 1.9 m ($n = 61$) for Tampa Bay and 1 m ($n = 50$) for Indian River Lagoon. Mean light requirements were significantly different between the bays (two-sided t-test, $t = 8.5$, $df = 109$, $p < 0.001$) with a mean requirement of 23% for Tampa Bay and 10.6% for Indian River Lagoon. Within each bay, light requirements were significantly different between segments (ANOVA, $F = 5.6$, $df = 3, 57$, $p = 0.00$ for Tampa Bay, $F = 5.2$, $df = 7, 42$, $p = 0.000$ for Indian River

Lagoon). However, post-hoc evaluation of all pair-wise comparisons of mean light requirements indicated that significant differences were only observed between a few segments within each bay. Significant differences in Tampa Bay were observed between Old Tampa Bay and Hillsborough Bay (Tukey multiple comparisons, $p = 0.032$). Significant differences in the Indian River Lagoon were observed between the Upper Indian River Lagoon and Banana River ($p = 0.915$), the Upper Indian River Lagoon and Lower Indian River Lagoon ($p = 0.140$), and Upper Indian River Lagoon and Lower St. Lucie ($p = 0.103$) segments. In general, spatial variation of light requirements in Tampa Bay suggested that seagrasses were less light-limited (i.e., lower percent light requirements at $Z_{c,\,max}$) in Hillsborough Bay and western areas of Lower Tampa Bay near the Gulf of Mexico (Fig. 6). Seagrassess in the Indian River Lagoon were generally less light-limited towards the south and in the Banana River segment (Fig. 7).

4 Discussion

References

Barko JW, Hardin DG, Matthews MS. 1982. Growth and morphology of submersed freshwater macrophytes in relation to light and temperature. Canadian Journal of Botany, 60(6):877–887.

Bates DM, Chambers JM. 1992. Nonlinear models. In: Chambers JM, Hastie TJ, editors, Statistical Models in S, pages 421–454. Wadsworth and Brooks/Cole, Pacific Grove, California.

Bivand R, Rundel C. 2014. rgeos: Interface to Geometry Engine - Open Source (GEOS). R package version 0.3-8.

Bivand RS, Pebesma EJ, Gómez-Rubio V. 2008. Applied Spatial Data Analysis with R. Springer, New York, New York.

Choice ZD, Frazer TK, Jacoby CA. 2014. Light requirements of seagrasses determined from historical records of light attenuation along the Gulf coast of peninsular Florida. Marine Pollution Bulletin, 81(1):94–102.

Coastal Planning and Engineering. 1997. Indian River Lagoon bathymetric survey. A final report to St. John's River Water Management District. Technical Report Contract 95W142, Coastal Planning and Engineering, Palatka, Florida.

Dennison WC. 1987. Effects of light on seagrass photosynthesis, growth and depth distribution. Aquatic Botany, 27(1):15–26.

Dennison WC, Orth RJ, Moore KA, Stevenson JC, Carter V, Kollar S, Bergstrom PW, Batiuk RA. 1993. Assessing water quality with submersed aquatic vegetation. BioScience, 43(2):86–94.

Duarte CM. 1991. Seagrass depth limits. Aquatic Botany, 40(4):363–377.

Duarte CM. 1995. Submerged aquatic vegetation in relation to different nutrient regimes. Ophelia, 41:87–112.

Environmental Systems Research Institute. 2012. ArcGIS v10.1. ESRI, Redlands, California.

Hagy JD. In review. Seagrass depth of colonization in Florida estuaries.

Hale JA, Frazer TK, Tomasko DA, Hall MO. 2004. Changes in the distribution of seagrass species along Florida's central gulf coast: Iverson and Bittaker revisited. Estuaries, 27(1):36–43.

Hall MO, Durako MJ, Fourqurean JW, Zieman JC. 1990. Decadal changes in seagrass distribution and abundance in Florida Bay. Estuaries, 22(2B):445–459.

Hilborn R, Mangel M. 1997. The Ecological Detective: Confronting Models with Data. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Hughes AR, Williams SL, Duarte CM, Heck KL, Waycott M. 2009. Associations of concern: declining seagrasses and threatened dependent species. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 7(5):242–246.

Idso SB, Gilbert RG. 1974. On the universality of the Poole and Atkins secchi disk-light extinction equation. Journal of Applied Ecology, 11(1):399–401.

Iverson RL, Bittaker HF. 1986. Seagrass distribution and abundance in eastern Gulf of Mexico coastal waters. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science, 22(5):577–602.

Janicki A, Wade D. 1996. Estimating critical external nitrogen loads for the Tampa Bay estuary: An empically based approach to setting management targets. Technical Report 06-96, Tampa Bay National Estuary Program, St. Petersburg, Florida.

Jones CG, Lawton JH, Shachak M. 1994. Organisms as ecosystem engineers. OIKOS, 69(3):373–386.

Kemp WC, Batiuk R, Bartleson R, Bergstrom P, Carter V, Gallegos CL, Hunley W, Karrh L, Koch EW, Landwehr JM, Moore KA, Murray L, Naylor M, Rybicki NB, Stevenson JC, Wilcox DJ. 2004. Habitat requirements for submerged aquatic vegetation in Chesapeake Bay: Water quality, light regime, and physical-chemical factors. Estuaries, 27(3):363–377.

Kenworthy WJ, Fonseca MS. 1996. Light requirements of seagrasses *Halodule wrightii* and *Syringodium filiforme* derived from the relationship between diffuse light attenuation and maximum depth distribution. Estuaries, 19(3):740–750.

Koch EW. 2001. Beyond light: Physical, geological, and geochemical parameters as possible submersed aquatic vegetation habitat requirements. Estuaries, 24(1):1–17.

Poole HH, Atkins WRG. 1929. Photo-electric measurements of submarine illumination throughout the year. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom, 16:297–324.

R Development Core Team. 2014. R: A language and environment for statistical computing, v3.1.2. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. http://www.R-project.org.

Spears BM, Gunn IDM, Carvalho L, Winfield IJ, Dudley B, Murphy K, May L. 2009. An evaluation of methods for sampling macrophyte maximum colonisation depth in Loch Leven, Scotland. Aquatic Botany, 91(2):75–81.

Steward JS, Virnstein RW, Morris LJ, Lowe EF. 2005. Setting seagrass depth, coverage, and light targets for the Indian River Lagoon system, Florida. Estuaries, 28(6):923–935.

Tyler D, Zawada DG, Nayegandhi A, Brock JC, Crane MP, Yates KK, Smith KEL. 2007. Topobathymetric data for Tampa Bay, Florida. Technical Report Open-File Report 2007-1051 (revised), US Geological Survey, US Department of the Interior, St. Petersburg, Florida.

Venables WN, Ripley BD. 2002. Modern Applied Statistics with S. Springer, New York, New York, fourth edition.

Williams SL, Heck KL. 2001. Seagrass community ecology. In: Bertness MD, Gaines SD, Hay ME, editors, Marine Community Ecology. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts.

Table 1: Characteristics of coastal segments used to evaluate seagrass depth of colonization estimates (see Fig. 1 for spatial distribution). Year is the date of the seagrass coverage and bathymetric data. Latitude and longitude are the geographic centers of each segment. Area and depth values are meters and square kilometers, respectively. Secchi measurements (m) were obtained from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection's Impaired Waters Rule (IWR) database, update number 40. Secchi mean and standard errors are based on all observations within the ten years preceding each seagrass survey. tab:seg_summ

	Big Bend	Choctawhatchee Bay	Old Tampa Bay	Upper Indian R. Lagoon
Year[a]	2006	2007	2010	2009
Latitude	29.61	30.43	27.94	28.61
Longitude	-83.48	-86.54	-82.62	-80.77
Surface area	271.37	59.41	205.50	228.52
Seagrass area	203.02	3.51	24.48	74.89
Depth (mean)	1.41	5.31	2.56	1.40
Depth (max)	3.60	11.90	10.40	3.70
Secchi (mean)	1.34	2.14	1.41	1.30
Secchi (se)	0.19	0.08	0.02	0.02

[a] Seagrass coverage data sources, see section 2.1.2 for bathymetry data sources:
Big Bend: http://atoll.floridamarine.org/Data/metadata/SDE_Current/seagrass_bigbend_2006_poly.htm
Choctawhatchee Bay: http://atoll.floridamarine.org/data/metadata/SDE_Current/seagrass_chotawhatchee_2007_poly.htm
Tampa Bay: http://www.swfwmd.state.fl.us/data/gis/layer_library/category/swim
Indian R. Lagoon: http://www.sjrwmd.com/gisdevelopment/docs/themes.html

Table 2: Summary of seagrass depth estimates (m) for each segment using all grid locations in Fig. 4. Whole segment estimates were obtained from all seagrass depth data for each segment. tab:est_summ

Segment[a]	Whole segment	Mean	St. Dev.	Min	Max
BB					
$Z_{c,\,min}$	1.25	1.33	0.82	0.00	2.64
$Z_{c,\,med}$	2.46	1.68	0.77	0.66	2.85
$Z_{c,\,max}$	3.66	2.03	0.80	0.86	3.31
CB					
$Z_{c,\,min}$	1.82	1.57	0.72	0.00	2.27
$Z_{c,\,med}$	2.16	1.98	0.46	1.19	2.48
$Z_{c,\,max}$	2.50	2.40	0.32	1.86	2.74
OTB					
$Z_{c,\,min}$	0.61	0.52	0.29	0.05	0.98
$Z_{c,\,med}$	0.88	0.85	0.27	0.30	1.24
$Z_{c,\,max}$	1.15	1.18	0.39	0.37	1.81
UIRL					
$Z_{c,\,min}$	1.25	1.32	0.23	1.00	2.02
$Z_{c,\,med}$	1.51	1.49	0.21	1.12	2.08
$Z_{c,\,max}$	1.77	1.66	0.21	1.23	2.14

[a]BB: Big Bend, CB: Choctawhatchee Bay, OTB: Old Tampa Bay, UIRL: Upper Indian River Lagoon.

Table 3: Summary of uncertainty for seagrass depth estimates (m) for each segment using all grid locations in Fig. 5. The uncertainty values are equally applicaable to each seagrass depth measure ($Z_{c,\,min}$, $Z_{c,\,med}$, $Z_{c,\,max}$). tab:sens_summ

Segment[a]	Mean	St. Dev	Min	Max
BB	0.11	0.10	0.01	0.35
CB	0.72	0.74	0.22	2.52
OTB	0.36	0.28	0.11	1.04
UIRL	0.09	0.06	0.01	0.30

[a]BB: Big Bend, CB: Choctawhatchee Bay, OTB: Old Tampa Bay, UIRL: Upper Indian River Lagoon.

Table 4: Summary of water clarity data (Z_{secchi}), depth of colonization ($Z_{c,\,max}$), and estimated light requirements for bay segments with available data for the Indian River Lagoon and Tampa Bay. Water clarity data were obtained from secchi observations in the Florida Impaired Waters Rule database for all available locations and dates within ten years of the seagrass survey in each bay. Values are minimum and maximum years of secchi data, sample size of secchi data ($n_{Z_{secchi}}$), mean values (m) of secchi data, sample size of seagrass depth estimates ($n_{Z_{c,\,max}}$) at each unique secchi location, mean $Z_{c,\,max}$, and estimated % light requirements for each segment. See Figs. 6 and 7 for spatial distribution of the results. tab:secc_summ

Segment[a]	Min year	Max year	$n_{Z_{secchi}}$	Z_{secchi}	$n_{Z_{c,\,max}}$	$Z_{c,\,max}$	% light
Indian River Lagoon							
BR	2000	2009	899	1.06	2	1.38	11.96
LCIRL	2000	2009	644	1.02	12	1.41	9.23
LIRL	2000	2005	111	0.93	6	1.84	4.06
LML	2000	2009	217	1.14	4	1.14	17.84
LSL	2000	2005	52	0.94	3	2.37	2.02
UCIRL	2000	2009	1148	1.14	18	1.19	10.84
UIRL	2000	2009	593	1.30	1	1.15	20.32
UML	2000	2009	258	1.03	4	1.21	19.08
Tampa Bay							
HB	2001	2003	412	1.25	10	1.36	15.32
LTB	2001	2009	807	2.47	22	2.14	22.60
MTB	2001	2009	570	2.19	14	1.64	28.03
OTB	2001	2003	671	1.44	15	1.18	24.05

[a]BR: Banana R., LCIRL: Lower Central Indian R. Lagoon, LIRL: Lower Indian R. Lagoon, LML: Lower Mosquito Lagoon, LSL: Lower St. Lucie, UCIRL: Upper Central Indian R. Lagoon, UIRL: Upper Indian R. Lagoon, UML: Upper Mosquito Lagoon, HB: Hillsborough Bay, LTB: Lower Tampa Bay, MTB: Middle Tampa Bay, OTB: Old Tampa Bay.



Fig. 1: Locations and seagrass coverage of estuary segments used to evaluate depth of colonization estimates. Seagrass coverage layers are from 2007 (CB: Choctawhatchee Bay), 2006 (BB: Big Bend), 2010 (OTB: Old Tampa Bay), and 2009 (UIRL: Upper Indian R. Lagoon).

{fig:seg_a



Fig. 2: Examples of data and grid locations for estimating seagrass depth of colonization for a region of the Big Bend, Florida. Fig. 2a shows the seagrass coverage and depth contours at 2 meter intervals, including the whole segment estimate for depth of colonization. Fig. 2b shows a grid of sampling locations with sampling radii for estimating Z_c and seagrass depth points derived from bathymetry and seagrass coverage layers. Fig. 2c shows an example of sampled seagrass depth points for a test location. Estimates in Fig. 3 were obtained from the test location in Fig. 2c. {fig:buff_

(a) Proportion of points with seagrass by depth



(b) Logistic growth curve fit through points



(c) Depth estimates



Fig. 3: Methods for estimating seagrass depth of colonization using sampled seagrass depth points around a single location. Fig. 3a is the proportion of points with seagrass by depth using depth points within the buffer of the test point in Fig. 2. Fig. 3b adds a decreasing logistic growth curve fit through the points. Fig. 3c shows three depth estimates based on a linear curve fit through the inflection point of logistic growth curve.

{fig:est_e



Fig. 4: Spatially-resolved estimates of seagrass depth limits (m) for four coastal segments of Florida. Estimates include minimum ($Z_{c,\,min}$), median ($Z_{c,\,med}$), and maximum depth of colonization ($Z_{c,\,max}$). Estimates are assigned to grid locations for each segment, where grid spacing was fixed at 0.02 decimal degrees. Radii for sampling seagrass bathymetric data around each grid location were fixed at 0.06 decimal degrees. BB: Big Bend, CB: Choctawhatchee Bay, OTB: Old Tampa Bay, UIRL: Upper Indian R. Lagoon.

{fig:all_e



Fig. 5: Size of confidence intervals (m) for depth of colonization estimates in Fig. 4. Points are colored and sized based on the difference between the upper and lower bounds of a 95% confidence interval for all three Z_c estimates ($Z_{c,min}$, $Z_{c,med}$, $Z_{c,max}$). Bounds were obtained using Monte Carlo simulations to estimate uncertainty associated with the inflection point of the estimated logistic curve (Fig. 3) for each sample. BB: Big Bend, CB: Choctawhatchee Bay, OTB: Old Tampa Bay, UIRL: Upper Indian R. Lagoon. {fig:all_s



Fig. 6: Estimated maximum depths of seagrass colonization and light requirements for multiple locations in Tampa Bay, Florida. Map locations are georeferenced observations of water clarity from secchi measurements in the Florida Impaired Waters Rule database, update 40. Estimates are also summarized by bay segment as boxplots where the dimensions are the 25th percentile, median, and 75th percentile. Whiskers extend beyond the boxes as 1.5 multiplied by the interquartile range. Light requirements are based on averaged secchi values within ten years of the seagrass coverage data and estimated maximum depth of colonization using a radius of 0.02 decimal degrees for each secchi location to sample seagrass depth points. HB: Hillsborough Bay, LTB: Lower Tampa Bay, MTB: Middle Tampa Bay, OTB: Old Tampa Bay. {fig:light



Fig. 7: Estimated maximum depths of seagrass colonization and light requirements for multiple locations in Indian River Lagoon, Florida. Map locations are georeferenced observations of water clarity in the Florida Impaired Waters Rule database, update 40. Estimates are also summarized by bay segment as boxplots as in Fig. 6. Light requirements are based on averaged secchi values within ten years of the seagrass coverage data and estimated maximum depth of colonization using a radius of 0.02 decimal degrees for each secchi location to sample seagrass depth points. BR: Banana R., LCIRL: Lower Central Indian R. Lagoon, LIRL: Lower Indian R. Lagoon, LML: Lower Mosquito Lagoon, LSL: Lower St. Lucie, UCIRL: Upper Central Indian R. Lagoon, UIRL: Upper Indian R. Lagoon, UML: Upper Mosquito Lagoon. {fig:light