

Assessing linkages between watershed nutrient
loading and water quality in a subtropical estuary
with semiparametric models.

Michael Schramm^{1*}

^{1*}Texas Water Resources Institute, Texas A&M AgriLife Research,
College Station, United States, 77840, TX, 1001 Holleman Dr. E..

Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): michael.schramm@ag.tamu.edu;

Abstract

Lavaca Bay is a small secondary embayment on the Texas coast that is displaying early signals of water quality degradation. This study applied a semiparametric approach to assess both watershed nutrient loads and the responses in estuary water quality to nutrient loading and streamflow. Cross-validation indicated that, despite data constraints, semiparametric models performed well at nutrient load prediction. Based on these models, delivered annual nutrient loads varied substantially from year to year. In contrast, minimal changes in calculated flow-normalized loads indicate that changes in nutrient loading were driven by natural variation in precipitation and runoff as opposed to changes in non-point sources. Estuary water quality models did not identify significant long-term changes within Lavaca Bay for dissolved oxygen or chlorophyll-*a*. However, site specific long-term increases in both organic and inorganic nitrogen are concerning. Further analysis found freshwater inflow was a strong driver of nutrient and chlorophyll-*a* concentrations within Lavaca Bay but there was no evidence that changes in nutrient loading explained variation in dissolved oxygen or chlorophyll-*a* concentrations. In addition to providing a baseline assessment of watershed nutrient loading and water quality responses in the Lavaca Bay watershed, this study provides methodological support for the use of semiparametric methods in load regression models and estuary assessments.

Keywords: key, dictionary, word

1 Introduction

Like many coastal areas globally, the coastal watersheds along the Texas Gulf coast are facing pressures from increasing population, increases in point source and non-point source pollution and alterations to freshwater flows that degrade water quality in downstream estuaries (Bricker et al, 2008; Kennicutt, 2017; Bugica et al, 2020). Despite these escalating pressures, national scale assessments have classified coastal estuaries in Texas as moderate or low risk for eutrophic conditions (Bricker et al, 2008). However, a suite of recent studies indicates that estuary water quality dynamics in both agriculturally dominated and urban watersheds within Texas are in fact expressing conditions that are increasingly conducive to algal blooms and eutrophication (Wetz et al, 2016, 2017; Bugica et al, 2020; Chin et al, 2022). With identification of localized areas of estuary water quality concern along the Texas coast (Bugica et al, 2020), localized studies are being prioritized to better inform management actions.

This project aims to provide an assessment of nutrient loading and water quality responses in Lavaca Bay, Texas. Lavaca Bay is a secondary bay in the larger Matagorda Bay system located roughly halfway between Houston, Texas and Corpus Christi, Texas. Lavaca Bay faces substantial challenges associated with legacy contamination but general water quality parameters such as dissolved oxygen (DO), nutrients, and biological parameters have been well within state water quality standards. More recently identified long-term declines in abundance, biomass, and diversity of benthic fauna in Lavaca Bay have been linked to reductions in freshwater inflows and changes in estuary salinity (Beseres Pollack et al, 2011; Palmer and Montagna, 2015; Montagna et al, 2020) and are a concern to local stakeholders. Water quality assessments identified monotonic increases in total phosphorus (TP), orthophosphate, total Kjeldahl nitrogen (TKN), and chlorophyll-*a* at sites within Lavaca Bay (Bugica et al, 2020). Although long-term changes in DO concentrations were not identified, the trends in nutrient concentrations are concerning due to the role of nitrogen as a limiting factor

for primary production in many Texas estuaries ([Gardner et al, 2006](#); [Hou et al, 2012](#); [Dorado et al, 2015](#); [Paudel et al, 2019](#); [Wetz et al, 2017](#)) and the ramifications that changes in nitrogen loadings could have for productivity and eutrophication in Lavaca Bay.

There are ongoing efforts between local, state, and federal agencies to address water quality impairments in the freshwater portions of the Lavaca Bay watershed ([Jain and Schramm, 2021](#); [Schramm et al, 2018](#); [Berthold et al, 2021](#)). However, at a statewide scale, these approaches have shown limited success and emphasize a need for improved efforts at assessing and linking management actions with downstream water quality to identify and replicate effective management actions across the state ([Schramm et al, 2022](#)). The identification and communication of changes and trends in water quality is complicated by the fact that trends are often non-linear and confounded by precipitation and runoff that hinder traditional analysis ([Wazniak et al, 2007](#); [Lloyd et al, 2014](#)). The development and application of statistical methods such as Weighted Regressions on Time, Discharge and Season (WRTDS, [Hirsch et al, 2010](#)) and Generalized Additive Models (GAMs, [Wood, 2011](#)) has provided effective tools for researchers to quantify and communicate non-linear changes in river and estuary pollutant loadings.

WRTDS calculates a time series of in stream concentrations or loads (daily, monthly, or annually) and flow-normalized estimates of concentrations and loads using locally weighted regression for unique combinations of time, discharge, and season. WRTDS has been widely used to assess and identify trends in riverine nutrients ([Oelsner and Stets, 2019](#); [Stackpoole et al, 2021](#)), chlorides ([Stets et al, 2018](#)), and other pollutants of concern ([Shoda et al, 2019](#)). WRTDS has also been successfully adapted to assess trends in estuarine water quality concentrations ([Beck et al, 2018](#)).

139 While WRTDS is a statistical approach developed specifically for water quality
140 applications, GAMs are a broadly applicable statistical method. GAMs are a semipara-
141 metric extension of generalized linear models where the linear predictor is represented
142 as the sum of multiple unknown smooth functions and parametric linear predictors
143 (Wood, 2011). Although the underlying parameter estimation procedure of GAMs is
144 substantially different than WRTDS, both the functional form and results have been
145 demonstrated to be similar (Beck and Murphy, 2017). Water quality applications of
146 GAMs include river and catchment nutrient concentration and load models (Wang
147 et al, 2011; Kroon et al, 2012; Kuhnert et al, 2012; Robson and Dourdet, 2015; Hage-
148 mann et al, 2016; McDowell et al, 2021; Biagi et al, 2022). GAMs can also be used
149 to identify non-linear temporal trends (including flow-normalized trends) in pollutant
150 concentrations and loads (Beck and Murphy, 2017; Murphy et al, 2019). Recently
151 GAMs have also been used to link water quality responses in receiving water bodies
152 to changes in nutrient inputs (Murphy et al, 2022). Beck and Murphy (2017) pro-
153 vides a substantial discussion on the differences (and similarities) between GAMs and
154 WRTDS for water quality applications.

165 To provide actionable information for resource managers in Lavaca Bay, water
166 quality conditions must be evaluated relative to changes in natural environmental
167 drivers to better understand and manage potential human impacts. This study utilizes
168 GAMs to develop estimates of delivered and flow-normalized nutrient loads and assess
169 changes in loads delivered to Lavaca Bay. GAMs were chosen over other regression-
170 based approaches for use in this study due to; (1) the ability to easily explore and
171 incorporate different model terms; (2) the incorporation of non-linear smooth functions
172 that do not require explicit a priori knowledge of the expected shape; and (3) inclusion
173 of a link function that related the expected value of the response to linear predictors
174 thus avoiding unneeded data transformations and bias corrections. The study also
175 assesses the response of water quality parameters in Lavaca Bay over time and in
176

response to freshwater inflow controlled for seasonality and to watershed nutrient loads
that are controlled for environmentally driven variation.

2 Methods

2.1 Location and Data

Lavaca Bay is 190 km² with the majority of freshwater inflow provided by the Lavaca and Navidad River systems (Figure 1). The Garcitas-Arenosa, Placedo Creek, and Cox Bay watersheds provide additional freshwater inflows. The entire watershed land area is 8,149 km² and primarily rural. Watershed land cover and land use is 50% grazed pasture and rangeland, 20% cultivated cropland (primarily rows crops such as corn, cotton, and sorghum), and 5% suburban/urban. Pasture and rangeland is concentrated in the Lavaca River watershed, while cultivated crops are generally located along the eastern tributaries of the Navidad river. The Lavaca and Navidad River watersheds are a combined 5,966 km², or approximately 73% of the entire Lavaca Bay watershed area. Discharge from the Navidad River is regulated by Lake Texana which has been in operation since 1980. Lake Texana provides 0.210 km³ of water storage and discharges into the tidal section of the Navidad River which ultimately joins the tidal section of the Lavaca River 15 km upstream of the confluence with the Lavaca Bay.

Daily discharges for the Lavaca River (USGS-08164000, Figure 1) were obtained from the United States Geologic Survey (USGS) National Water Information System using the *dataRetrieval* R package (De Cicco et al, 2022). Gaged daily discharges from the outlet of Lake Texana on the Navidad River (USGS-0816425) were provided by the Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) (April 21, 2022 email from R. Neupane, TWDB).

Water quality sample data for the two freshwater and three estuary locations were obtained from the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) Surface Water Quality Monitoring Information System. Data submitted through the system




Fig. 1 Map of Lavaca Bay and the contribution watershed. The freshwater sites are the most downstream freshwater stream locations with water quality and streamflow data used for nutrient load models. Water quality concentration data at the three Lavaca Bay sites were used to assess relationships between freshwater flows, loads and estuary water quality.

Table 1 Summary of gauged streamflow and freshwater water quality samples between January 1, 2000 and December 31, 2020.

Station ID		Mean	SD	N
USGS-08164000	TP (mg/L)	0.21	0.09	80
	NO ₃ (mg/L)	0.18	0.24	74
	Mean Daily Streamflow (cfs)	332.78	1667.47	7671
USGS-08164525	TP (mg/L)	0.20	0.08	81
	NO ₃ (mg/L)	0.29	0.26	62
	Mean Daily Streamflow (cfs)	666.14	2957.79	7671

are required to be collected under Quality Assurance Project Plans and lab method procedures outlined by the TCEQ’s procedures manual. The QAPP and procedures manuals ensure the consistent collection and laboratory methods are applied between samples collected by different entities and under different projects. All sites had varying lengths of and availability of data. For freshwater locations, TP from January 2000 through December 2020 and nitrate-nitrogen (NO₃) data from January 2005 through December 2020 were downloaded (Table 1). Less than 5-years of total nitrogen and TKN concentration data were available at the freshwater sites and deemed insufficient to develop load estimation models (Horowitz, 2003; Snelder et al, 2017). The three estuary sites included an upper Lavaca Bay site near the outlet of the Lavaca River system (TCEQ-13563), a mid-Lavaca Bay site (TCEQ-13383), and the lower Lavaca Bay site near the mouth of the Bay (TCEQ-13384). For estuary locations, we obtained data for TP, Nitrite+Nitrate (NO_x), TKN, chlorophyll-*a*, and DO concentrations from January 2005 through December 2020 (Table 2).

2.2 Estimating Watershed Based Nutrient Loads

Estimates of NO₃ and TP loads at the Lavaca River (USGS-08164000) and the outlet of Lake Texana on the Navidad River (USGS-08164525) were developed using GAMs relating nutrient concentration to river discharge, season, and time. Separate models were fit at each station for each parameter and used to predict nutrient concentrations for each day in the study period. GAMs were fit using the *mgcv* package in R which

Table 2 Summary of estuary water quality samples collected between January 1, 2005 and December 31, 2020.

Station ID		Mean	SD	N
TCEQ-13383	TP (mg/L)	0.11	0.05	47
	NOx (mg/L)	0.07	0.15	51
	TKN (mg/L)	0.94	0.49	45
	Chlorophyll-a (ug/L)	9.43	5.31	47
	DO (mg/L)	7.22	1.35	55
TCEQ-13384	TP (mg/L)	0.08	0.03	51
	NOx (mg/L)	0.06	0.08	52
	TKN (mg/L)	0.76	0.40	48
	Chlorophyll-a (ug/L)	8.22	6.44	46
	DO (mg/L)	7.51	1.32	54
TCEQ-13563	TP (mg/L)	0.13	0.06	50
	NOx (mg/L)	0.09	0.13	53
	TKN (mg/L)	0.94	0.37	49
	Chlorophyll-a (ug/L)	9.67	5.33	49
	DO (mg/L)	7.91	1.34	56

makes available multiple types of smooth functions with automatic smoothness selection (Wood, 2011). The general form of the model related NO_3 or TP concentration to a long term trend, season, streamflow, and two different antecedent discharge terms, shown in Eq. 1:

$$g(\mu) = \alpha + f_1(ddate) + f_2(yday) + f_3(\log1p(Q)) + f_4(ma) + f_5(fa),$$

$$y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2) \quad (1)$$

where μ is the conditional expected NO_3 or TP concentration, $g()$ is the log-link, α is the intercept, $f_n()$ are smoothing functions. y is the response variable (NO_3 or TP concentration) modeled as normally distributed with mean μ and standard deviation σ . $ddate$ is the date converted to decimal notation, $yday$ is numeric day of year (1-366), and $\log1p(Q)$ is the natural log of mean daily streamflow plus 1.

Moving average (ma) is an exponentially smoothed moving average that attempts to incorporate the influence of prior streamflow events on concentration at the current

time period (Wang et al, 2011; Kuhnert et al, 2012; Zhang and Ball, 2017), using Eq. 2:

$$ma(\delta) = d\kappa_{i-1} + (1 - \delta)\hat{q}_{i-1},$$

$$\kappa_i = \sum_{m=1}^i \hat{Q}_m \quad (2)$$

where δ is the discount factor (here, set equal to 0.95), κ_i is the cumulative flow (Q) up to the i th day.

Flow anomaly (fa) is a unitless term that represents how wet or dry the current time period is from a previous time period (Vecchia et al, 2009; Zhang and Ball, 2017). Long-term flow anomaly ($ltfa$) is the streamflow over the previous year relative to the entire period (Zhang and Ball, 2017) and calculated using Eq. 3:

$$ltfa(t) = \bar{x}_{1\text{ year}}(t) - \bar{x}_{entire\ period} \quad (3)$$

and the short-term flow anomaly ($stfa$) calculated as the current day flow compared to the preceding 1-month streamflow using 4:

$$stfa(t) = x_{current\ day}(t) - \bar{x}_{1\ month}(t) \quad (4)$$

where x are the averages of log-transformed streamflow over the antecedent period (1-year , 1-month , etc.) for time t . We used $ltfa$ in NO_3 models and $stfa$ in TP models based on previous work demonstrating major improvements in NO_x regression models that incorporated $ltfa$ and moderate improvements in TP regression models that incorporated $stfa$ (Zhang and Ball, 2017).

The calculation of model terms for the Lake Texana site were modified because daily loads are not a function of natural stream flow processes alone, but of dam

releases and nutrient concentrations at the discharge point of the lake. Q , ma , and fa terms were calculated based on total gaged inflow from the 4 major tributaries to the lake. Thin-plate regression splines were used for $ddate$, $\log_{1p}(Q)$, fa , and ma . A cyclic cubic regression spline was used for $yday$ to ensure the ends of the spline match (day 1 and day 366 are expected to match). First order penalties were applied to the smooths of flow-based variables which penalize departures from a flat function to help constrain extrapolations for high flow measurements.

Left-censored data were not uncommon in this dataset. Several methods are available to account for censored data. We transformed left-censored nutrient concentrations to one-half the detection limit. Although this simple approach can introduce bias (Hornung and Reed, 1990), we considered it acceptable because high concentrations and loadings are associated with high-flow events and low-flow/low-concentration events will account for a small proportion of total loadings (McDowell et al, 2021).

Daily loads were estimated as the predicted concentration multiplied by the daily streamflow. For the Navidad River (USGS-08164525) site, daily loads at the dam were calculated from the discrete daily concentration at the discharge point of the lake and corresponding reported daily discharge from the dam. Flow-normalized loads were estimated similar to WRTDS by setting flow-based covariates on each day of the year equal to each of the historical values for that day of the year over the study period (Hirsch et al, 2010). The flow-normalized estimate was calculated as the mean of all the predictions for each day considering all possible flow values. Standard deviations and credible intervals were obtained by drawing samples from the multivariate normal posterior distribution of the fitted GAM (Wood, 2006; Marra and Wood, 2012; McDowell et al, 2021). Uncertainty in loads were calculated as 90% credible intervals estimated by drawing 1000 realizations of parameter estimates from the multivariate normal posterior distribution of the model parameters. GAM performance was evaluated using repeated 5-fold cross validation (Burman, 1989) and average Nash-Sutcliffe

Efficiency (NSE), Pearson sample correlation (r) and percent bias (PBIAS) metrics across folds were calculated for each model.

2.3 Linking Estuary Water Quality to Hydrology and Nutrient Loads

To test if changes in freshwater inflow and nutrient loading had explanatory effect on changes in estuary water quality a series of GAM models were fit at each site relating parameter concentration to temporal trends (Eq. 5), temporal trends and inflow (Eq. 6), and temporal trends, inflow, and nutrient loads (Eq. 7):

$$g(\mu) = \alpha + f_1(ddate) + f_2(yday), \quad (5)$$

$$g(\mu) = \alpha + f_1(ddate) + f_2(yday) + f_3(Q), \quad (6)$$

$$g(\mu) = \alpha + f_1(ddate) + f_2(yday) + f_3(Q) + f_4(Load) \quad (7)$$

where μ is the conditional expected response (nutrient concentration), $g()$ is the log link, and response variable was modeled as Gamma distributed with mean μ and scale λ . $f_1(ddate)$ is decimal date smoothed with a thin-plate regression spline, $f_2(yday)$ is the numeric day of year smoothed with a cyclic cubic regression spline, $f_3(Q)$ is mean daily inflow (the combined measurements from Lavaca River and Navidad River) and $f_4(Load)$ is the total NO_3 or TP watershed load. The set of models specified for each water quality response are in Table 3.

Because streamflow and nutrient loads are tightly correlated, freshwater inflow can mask signals from nutrient loads alone. Following the methodology implemented by Murphy et al (2022), both streamflow and nutrient loads were preprocessed to account for season and flow. Freshwater inflow and nutrient loads were replaced by seasonally adjusted log transformed inflow and flow-adjusted log transformed nutrient loads obtained by fitting a GAM relating season (day of year) to log transformed daily

Table 3 Set of GAM models specified for each water quality parameter response.

Parameter	Model	Model Terms
TP	Temporal	$s(\text{ddate}) + s(\text{yday})$
	Flow	$s(\text{ddate}) + s(\text{yday}) + s(Q)$
	Flow+Load	$s(\text{ddate}) + s(\text{yday}) + s(Q) + s(\text{TP Load})$
NO _x	Temporal	$s(\text{ddate}) + s(\text{yday})$
	Flow	$s(\text{ddate}) + s(\text{yday}) + s(Q)$
	Flow+Load	$s(\text{ddate}) + s(\text{yday}) + s(Q) + s(\text{NO}_3 \text{ Load})$
Chlorophyll- <i>a</i>	Temporal	$s(\text{ddate}) + s(\text{yday})$
	Flow	$s(\text{ddate}) + s(\text{yday}) + s(Q)$
	Flow+Load	$s(\text{ddate}) + s(\text{yday}) + s(Q) + s(\text{TP Load}) + s(\text{NO}_3 \text{ Load})$
Dissolved Oxygen	Temporal	$s(\text{ddate}) + s(\text{yday})$
	Flow	$s(\text{ddate}) + s(\text{yday}) + s(Q)$
	Flow+Load	$s(\text{ddate}) + s(\text{yday}) + s(Q) + s(\text{TP Load}) + s(\text{NO}_3 \text{ Load})$
TKN	Temporal	$s(\text{ddate}) + s(\text{yday})$
	Flow	$s(\text{ddate}) + s(\text{yday}) + s(Q)$

freshwater inflow values and a GAM relating log transformed NO₃ or TP loads to log transformed daily inflow. Response residuals from the respective GAM models were used as Q and $Load$ in Eq. 6 and Eq. 7.

This study used an information theoretic approach to evaluate if nutrient loads and/or freshwater inflows provided evidence of effects on water quality concentrations in Lavaca Bay. Model probabilities were calculated and compared using the AIC_c scores between each group of temporal, flow, and flow+load models (Burnham et al, 2011). Improvements in model probabilities provide evidence that the terms explain additional variation in the response variable. If model probabilities were tied, there wasn't evidence the more complicated model explains additional variation in water quality.

3 Results

3.1 Watershed Nutrient Loads

Using evaluation criteria recommended by Moriasi et al (2015), predictive performance of nutrient loading GAMs ranged from “satisfactory” to “very good” based on




Fig. 2 Density plots of goodness-of-fit metrics (NSE, r , and PBIAS) from repeated 5-fold cross validation between predicted nutrient loads from GAM models and measured nutrient loads. Color indicates the tail probability calculated from the empirical cumulative distribution of the goodness-of-fit metrics.

median NSE, r , and PBIAS metrics calculated using 5-fold cross validation. Median goodness-of-fit metrics for NO_3 models in the Lavaca River were 0.34 NSE, 0.70 r , and 2.00 PBIAS. Navidad River NO_3 models appeared to perform slightly better with 0.48 NSE and 0.87 r but with higher bias at 10.90 PBIAS. Generally, TP models performed better than NO_3 models. Median goodness-of-fit metrics for TP in the Lavaca River were 0.81 NSE, 0.93 r , and -7.20 PBIAS. Navidad River TP models has similar performance with 0.91 NSE, 0.99 r , and -3.30 PBIAS. Density plots of metrics show similar distribution of values between sites for the same parameter, with the exception r values for NO_3 loads where Lavaca River had a much larger variance in values compared to the Navidad River (Figure 2). TP GAMS had higher average NSE and r values and lower variance in metric values compared to NO_3 .

Predicted annual NO_3 and TP loads show considerable variation, generally following patterns in discharge (Figures 3, 4). Flow-normalized TP loads at both sites




Fig. 3 Aggregated estimated annual and flow-normalized annual NO_3 and TP loads for USGS-08164000 and USGS-08164525.

and flow-normalized NO_3 loads in the Lavaca River indicated watershed based loads did not change much over time when accounting for variation driven by streamflow (Figure 3). Flow-normalized loads in the Lavaca River showed small variation over time with some decreases in NO_3 loads since 2013.

Aggregated across both sites, the mean annual NO_3 load 2005 through 2020 was 205,405 kg (126,867 kg - 341,569 kg, 90% CI). Annual NO_3 loads ranged from 12,574 kg in 2011 to 794,510 kg in 2007. Total annual TP loads ranged from 7,839 kg in 2011 to 595,075 kg in 2007. Mean annual TP loading from 2005 through 2020 was 182,673 kg (152,227 kg - 219,310 kg, 90% CI). On average, the Navidad River accounted for 68% of NO_3 loads and 59% of TP loads from 2005 through 2020. However, during periods of extreme drought the Lavaca River became the primary source of nutrient loading in the watershed with the Navidad River only accounting for 15% and 25% of NO_3 and TP loads in 2011 (Figure 4).




Fig. 4 Comparison of delivered annual loads and annual discharge at the Lavaca (USGS-08164000) and Navidad (USGS-08164525) Rivers.

3.2 Linkages Between Water Quality and Watershed Flows and Loads

GAMs did not identify significant changes in TP or DO concentrations at any of the Lavaca Bay sites from 2005 through 2020 (Figure 5). The upper-bay site, TCEQ-13563, had a linear increase in NO_x concentration and a decrease in chlorophyll-*a* from 2005 through 2014. The mid-bay site, TCEQ-13383, showed a periodic pattern in NO_x concentration that appeared similar to precipitation/inflow patterns, as well




Fig. 5 Smoothed temporal trend component for water quality paramaters obtained from temporal estuary GAMs.

as a post 2011 increase in TKN concentrations. No significant long-term trends in concentrations were identified by GAMs for the lower-bay TCEQ-13384 site.

Freshwater inflow provided additional explanation for changes in TP and NO_x concentration at all of the Lavaca Bay sites according to AIC_c and model probability values (Table 4). TCEQ-13563, the site closest to the river outlet, was the only site that had improvements in the explanations of DO and TKN concentration with the inclusion of inflow. Both TCEQ-13563 and TCEQ-13383, the mid-bay site, saw improvements in explanations for variations in chlorophyll-*a* with the inclusion of freshwater inflow. The addition of nutrient loads (both TP and NO₃) terms did not provide additional explanation for changes in chlorophyll-*a* or DO concentrations. Inclusion of TP loads provided additional explanation of TP concentrations at the upper- and mid-bay sites, TCEQ-13563 and TCEQ-13383. Inclusion of NO₃ loads

Table 4 Estuary GAM AIC_c values and associated model probabilities (in parenthesis). Models with the highest probability for each site and water quality parameter combination are bolded and italicized for emphasis.

Parameter	Site	Temporal	Flow	Flow + Load
TP	TCEQ-13383	-152.1 (0.03)	-156.1 (0.24)	-158.2 (0.72)
	TCEQ-13384	-194.4 (0.03)	-200.2 (0.49)	-200.2 (0.49)
	TCEQ-13563	-145.3 (0)	-156.6 (0.41)	-157.3 (0.59)
NO _x	TCEQ-13383	-218.9 (0)	-244.8 (0.5)	-244.8 (0.5)
	TCEQ-13384	-263.4 (0)	-311.7 (0.48)	-311.9 (0.52)
	TCEQ-13563	-175.1 (0)	-190.2 (0.5)	-190.2 (0.5)
Chlorophyll- <i>a</i>	TCEQ-13383	279.7 (0.18)	278.1 (0.41)	278.1 (0.41)
	TCEQ-13384	268.2 (0.33)	268.2 (0.33)	268.2 (0.33)
	TCEQ-13563	289.5 (0.08)	286.1 (0.46)	286.1 (0.46)
TKN	TCEQ-13383	42.2 (0.66)	43.5 (0.34)	-
	TCEQ-13384	34.3 (0.57)	34.8 (0.43)	-
	TCEQ-13563	31.1 (0.22)	28.7 (0.78)	-
DO	TCEQ-13383	146.4 (0.34)	146.4 (0.34)	146.5 (0.32)
	TCEQ-13384	135.9 (0.47)	137 (0.27)	137 (0.27)
	TCEQ-13563	138.3 (0.25)	137.2 (0.43)	137.8 (0.32)

only provided marginal improvements in the explanation of NO_x concentration at the lower-bay TCEQ-13384 site.

GAMs showed that increases in freshwater inflow resulted in nearly linear increases in TP and NO_x concentration at all three sites (Figure 6). At the upper-bay TCEQ-13563 site, GAMs showed that increases in freshwater inflow initially increased chlorophyll-*a* and DO concentration but concentrations leveled and potentially decreased at higher flows. The mid-bay TCEQ-13383 site showed a nearly linear increase in chlorophyll-*a* concentration in response to increases freshwater inflow. Freshwater flow did not have significant effects on chlorophyll-*a*, TKN, or DO at the lower-bay TCEQ-13384 site.

Increased TP loads resulted in nearly linear increases of TP concentration at the upper- and mid-bay sites, TCEQ-13563 and TCEQ-13383 respectively (Figure 7). The relative effect size appeared to much smaller than the effect of freshwater inflow alone. Increased NO₃ loads only showed an effect at the lower-bay TCEQ-13384 site.




Fig. 6 Estimated effects of mean daily inflow residuals on mean TP, NO_x , chlorophyll-*a*, TKN, and DO concentrations in Lavaca Bay obtained from flow estuary GAMs.

The effect was quite small compared to streamflow and provided only small improvements to the model (Table 4). As noted above, nutrient loadings did not provide any explanation in changes in the remaining assessed water quality parameters.

4 Discussion

resume here

TP and NO_3 loadings from the Lavaca Bay watershed showed high inter-annual variability tied with changes in discharge. There is little evidence for changes in flow-normalized TP loads in either rivers. There is some evidence of recent decreases in flow-normalized NO_3 loads in the Lavaca River. Although there is no work directly correlating water quality planning and implementation efforts in the watershed to water quality outcomes, efforts to increase agricultural producer participation in the




Fig. 7 Estimated effects of nutrient load residuals on TP and NO_x concentrations in Lavaca Bay obtained from flow+load estuary GAMs.

watershed have been ongoing since 2016 (Schramm et al, 2018; Berthold et al, 2021). The decrease in flow-normalized NO_3 loads could be a reflection of those collective efforts but further data collection and research is required to support that statement.

Converted to average annual yield, the estimates of annual TP loads for the Lavaca River are within the ranges in previous published studies (Table 5, Dunn, 1996; Rebich et al, 2011; Omani et al, 2014; Wise et al, 2019). It isn't obvious why TP estimates in Dunn (1996) were notably lower. Given that none of the studies identify substantially sized trends in TP, it is possible that the period used in Dunn (1996) was drier on average than the other studies. The SPARROW models used in Rebich et al (2011) and Wise et al (2019) utilize a version of LOADEST in the underlying load estimation procedure, so a difference due to methodology alone is unlikely.

Cross-validation of the GAM loading models indicated that GAMs performed well on average at predicting daily nutrient loading values. The variance in scores was very high indicating subsets of values were problematic at characterizing functional relationships between nutrients and predictors. Because all of the water quality data for these two locations in the TCEQ databases were ambient water quality data, collected to be representative of typical flow conditions, there were few data at the highest

Table 5 Comparisons of previously published estimates of mean annual TP yield at the Lavaca River site.

Reported Yield (kg·km ² ·year ⁻¹)	Approach	Time Period	Reference
35.2 (28.8, 43.3) ^a	GAM	2005-2020	This work
45.2	SPARROW	2000-2014	Wise et al (2019)
42	SWAT	1977-2005	Omani et al (2014)
20.81-91.58 ^b	SPARROW	1980-2002	Rebich et al (2011)
28.9	LOADEST	1972-1993	Dunn (1996)

^a Mean of the annual point estimates and the lower and upper 95% credible intervals.

^b Represents a binned value range from a choropleth map.

portions of the flow-duration curve. It was beyond the scope of the current study to evaluate the subsets of cross-validation data and scores. However, the cross-validation procedure is indicative that more robust sampling would be beneficial for reducing prediction variance. Supplementary flow-biased monitoring targeting storm- or high-flow conditions is recommended here to improve the precision of GAM predictions (Horowitz, 2003; Snelder et al, 2017).

The non-linear temporal water quality trends identified using GAMs differed slightly from previously identified trends (Bugica et al, 2020). This is not unexpected due to the different time periods, different methodology, and generally small slopes identified for most of the significant water quality parameters in prior work. The trend in DO and chlorophyll-*a* concentrations are stable in comparison to other Texas estuaries that are facing larger demands for freshwater diversions, higher population growth, and more intense agricultural production (Wetz et al, 2016; Bugica et al, 2020). The trend of increasing NO_x concentration at the upper-bay TCEQ-13563 site and recent increases in TKN concentration at the mid-bay TCEQ-13383 site are concerning due to the nitrogen limitation identified in many Texas estuaries (Gardner et al, 2006; Hou et al, 2012; Dorado et al, 2015; Paudel et al, 2019; Wetz et al, 2017) and the relatively low ambient concentrations observed in Lavaca Bay.

The strong positive effect of freshwater inflow on NO_x, TKN, and TP are suggestive of nonpoint watershed sources, consistent with watershed uses and with other

studies relating freshwater inflow with nutrient concentrations in Lavaca Bay and other estuaries (Russell et al, 2006; Caffrey et al, 2007; Peierls et al, 2012; Palmer and Montagna, 2015; Cira et al, 2021). Inflow had a non-linear relationship with TKN at the two upstream sites, with TKN increasing as freshwater inflow transitioned from low to moderate levels. At higher freshwater inflows, the effect was attenuated, possibly indicating a flushing effect at higher freshwater inflow. No relationship between TKN and freshwater inflow were observed at TCEQ-13384 located in the lower reach of Lavaca Bay. Tidal flushing from Matagorda Bay could be responsible for diluting TKN and acting as a control on the effects of freshwater inflow in lower reaches of Lavaca Bay. Previous work suggests the processing of organic loads in the upper portions of Lavaca Bay might reduce the transport of nutrients into the lower reaches of the Bay (Russell et al, 2006).

Freshwater inflow had a strong positive effect on chlorophyll-*a* at the upper- and mid-bay sites. The upper-bay site, TCEQ-13563, showed decreases in chlorophyll-*a* at the highest freshwater inflow volumes. Freshwater flushing or increases in turbidity are associated with decreases in chlorophyll-*a* in other estuaries (Peierls et al, 2012; Cloern et al, 2014). No relationships between inorganic nitrogen or TP loadings with chlorophyll-*a* were observed. Due to the lack of TKN loading information, no assessment between organic nitrogen loads and chlorophyll-*a* were possible.

Although other studies have identified complex relationships between estuary nutrient concentrations, nutrient loading and chlorophyll-*a* concentrations in Texas estuaries (Örnólfsson et al, 2004; Dorado et al, 2015; Cira et al, 2021; Tominack and Wetz, 2022), this study specifically used flow-adjusted freshwater derived nutrient loads to parse out contributions from changes in nutrient loadings while accounting for variations in load due to flow. Loading GAMs indicated no evidence of changes in flow-normalized TP loads in either river, and no changes in flow-normalized NO₃ loads in the Navidad River. The small changes in flow-normalized NO₃ loads in the Lavaca

967 River are probably masked under most conditions by discharge from the Navidad
968 River. Given the relatively small variation in flow-normalized loads, it can be expected
969 that they would contribute little to the variance in downstream water quality.
970

971 GAMs did not identify responses in DO concentration to inflows or nutrient loads.
972 The seasonality term in the temporal GAM models explained a substantial amount of
973 DO variation at all of the sites. Responses of estuary metabolic processes and resulting
974 DO concentrations can be quite complicated and often locally specific (Caffrey, 2004).
975 While the lack of total nitrogen or TKN loading data hinders interpretation, the large
976 seasonal effect on DO suggests physical factors play an important role and should be
977 included in future models. Prior work suggests that Lavaca Bay may not be limited
978 by nutrients alone, with high turbidity or nutrient processing in upper portions of
979 the Bay or intertidal river limiting production (Russell et al, 2006). Finally, it is
980 reasonable to assume that fluctuations in DO may not occur immediately in response
981 to nutrient pulses or freshwater inflow. Work has shown that various water quality
982 parameters may have lagged effects lasting days or even months following storms and
983 large discharge events (Mooney and McClelland, 2012; Wetz and Yoskowitz, 2013;
984 Bukaveckas et al, 2020; Walker et al, 2021). However, our work only evaluates responses
985 to loading and inflows occurring the day of water quality observations.
986

997 5 Conclusion

1000 GAM models appear to provide reliable estimates of nutrient loads in the Lavaca Bay
1001 watershed. However, additional flow-biased data collection efforts would decrease the
1002 prediction variance and improve accuracy at critical high flow events. Ongoing projects
1003 will fill data gaps for total nitrogen and TKN loading. This study, consistent with
1004 others along the Texas coast, found strong effects of freshwater flow on nutrient and
1005 chlorophyll-*a* concentrations. DO concentrations, dominated by seasonal effects, did
1006 not show strong direct responses to freshwater flow. Small variance in flow-adjusted
1007

nutrient loads indicates that (1) there have been limited changes in non-point sources of nutrients and (2) that there isn't strong evidence that those small changes have had effects on chlorophyll-*a* or dissolved oxygen in Lavaca Bay. Although the study did not identify strong responses to changes in nutrient loading, this does provide a baseline assessment for future water quality management activities in the watershed.

Acknowledgments. The author extends thanks to Dr. Mike Wetz (Harte Research Institute, Texas A&M Corpus Christi), Chad Kinsfather and Partick Brzozowski (Lavaca-Navidad River Authority), Brian Koch (Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board), Bill Balboa (Matagorda Bay Foundation), Jason Pinchbeck (Texas General Land Office) and the Lavaca Bay Foundation for supporting development of this project and providing valuable feedback.

Declarations

Funding. This project was funded in part by a Texas Coastal Management Program grant approved by the Texas Land Commissioner, providing financial assistance under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended, awarded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Office for Coastal Management, pursuant to NOAA Award No. NA21NOS4190136. The views expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of NOAA, the U.S. Department of Commerce, or any of their subagencies.

Data Availability. Reproducible code and datasets generated during this study are available in the Zenodo repository, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.733075>.

References

Beck MW, Murphy RR (2017) Numerical and qualitative contrasts of two statistical models for water quality change in tidal waters. JAWRA Journal of the American

1059 Water Resources Association 53(1):197–219. [https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.](https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.12489)
 1060 [12489](https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.12489)
 1061
 1062
 1063 Beck MW, Jabusch TW, Trowbridge PR, et al (2018) Four decades of water quality
 1064 change in the upper San Francisco Estuary. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science
 1065 212:11–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2018.06.021>
 1066
 1067
 1068
 1069 Berthold TA, Olsovsky T, Schramm MP (2021) Direct mailing education campaign
 1070 impacts on the adoption of grazing management practices. Journal of Contemporary
 1071 Water Research & Education (174):45–60. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-704X.](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-704X.2021.3360.x)
 1072 [2021.3360.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-704X.2021.3360.x)
 1073
 1074
 1075
 1076 Beseres Pollack J, Palmer T, Montagna P (2011) Long-term trends in the response of
 1077 benthic macrofauna to climate variability in the Lavaca-Colorado Estuary, Texas.
 1078 Marine Ecology Progress Series 436:67–80. <https://doi.org/10.3354/meps09267>
 1079
 1080
 1081
 1082 Biagi K, Ross C, Oswald C, et al (2022) Novel predictors related to hysteresis
 1083 and baseflow improve predictions of watershed nutrient loads: An example from
 1084 Ontario’s lower Great Lakes basin. Science of The Total Environment 826:154023.
 1085
 1086
 1087 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2022.154023>
 1088
 1089
 1090 Bricker S, Longstaff B, Dennison W, et al (2008) Effects of nutrient enrichment in the
 1091 nation’s estuaries: A decade of change. Harmful Algae 8(1):21–32. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hal.2008.08.028)
 1092 [10.1016/j.hal.2008.08.028](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hal.2008.08.028)
 1093
 1094
 1095
 1096 Bugica K, Sterba-Boatwright B, Wetz MS (2020) Water quality trends in Texas estu-
 1097 aries. Marine Pollution Bulletin 152:110903. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2020.110903)
 1098 [2020.110903](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2020.110903)
 1099
 1100
 1101 Bukaveckas PA, Tassone S, Lee W, et al (2020) The influence of storm events on
 1102 metabolism and water quality of riverine and estuarine segments of the James,
 1103
 1104

Mattaponi, and Pamunkey Rivers. *Estuaries and Coasts* 43(7):1585–1602. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-020-00819-9>

Burman P (1989) A comparative study of ordinary cross-validation, v-fold cross-validation and the repeated learning-testing methods. *Biometrika* 76(3):503–514. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/76.3.503>

Burnham KP, Anderson DR, Huyvaert KP (2011) AIC model selection and multimodel inference in behavioral ecology: Some background, observations, and comparisons. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 65(1):23–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-010-1029-6>

Caffrey JM (2004) Factors controlling net ecosystem metabolism in U.S. estuaries. *Estuaries* 27(1):90–101. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02803563>

Caffrey JM, Chapin TP, Jannasch HW, et al (2007) High nutrient pulses, tidal mixing and biological response in a small California estuary: Variability in nutrient concentrations from decadal to hourly time scales. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 71(3-4):368–380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2006.08.015>

Chin T, Beecraft L, Wetz MS (2022) Phytoplankton biomass and community composition in three Texas estuaries differing in freshwater inflow regime. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 277:108059. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2022.108059>

Cira EK, Palmer TA, Wetz MS (2021) Phytoplankton dynamics in a low-inflow estuary (Baffin Bay, TX) during drought and high-rainfall conditions associated with an El Niño event. *Estuaries and Coasts* 44(7):1752–1764. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-021-00904-7>

Cloern JE, Foster SQ, Kleckner AE (2014) Phytoplankton primary production in the world’s estuarine-coastal ecosystems. *Biogeosciences* 11(9):2477–2501. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2022.108059>

1151 [org/10.5194/bg-11-2477-2014](https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-11-2477-2014)
 1152
 1153 De Cicco LA, Hirsch RM, Lorenz DL, et al (2022) dataRetrieval: R packages for
 1154 discovering and retrieving water data available from Federal hydrologic web services.
 1155 U.S. Geological Survey, <https://doi.org/10.5066/P9X4L3GE>
 1156
 1157
 1158
 1159 Dorado S, Booe T, Steichen J, et al (2015) Towards an understanding of the interac-
 1160 tions between freshwater inflows and phytoplankton communities in a subtropical
 1161 estuary in the Gulf of Mexico. PLOS ONE 10(7):e0130931. [https://doi.org/10.1371/](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0130931)
 1162 [journal.pone.0130931](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0130931)
 1163
 1164
 1165
 1166
 1167 Dunn D (1996) Trends in Nutrient Inflows to the Gulf of Mexico from Streams Draining
 1168 the Conterminous United States, 1972-93. Water-Resources Investigations Report
 1169 96-4113, USGS, Austin, Texas, <https://doi.org/10.3133/wri964113>
 1170
 1171
 1172
 1173 Gardner WS, McCarthy MJ, An S, et al (2006) Nitrogen fixation and dissimilatory
 1174 nitrate reduction to ammonium (DNRA) support nitrogen dynamics in Texas estu-
 1175 aries. Limnology and Oceanography 51(1part2):558–568. [https://doi.org/10.4319/](https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2006.51.1.part.2.0558)
 1176 [lo.2006.51.1.part.2.0558](https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2006.51.1.part.2.0558)
 1177
 1178
 1179
 1180 Hagemann M, Asce SM, Kim D, et al (2016) Estimating Nutrient and Organic Carbon
 1181 Loads to Water-Supply Reservoir Using Semiparametric Models. J Environ Eng p 9.
 1182 [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)EE.1943-7870.0001077](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)EE.1943-7870.0001077)
 1183
 1184
 1185
 1186 Hirsch RM, Moyer DL, Archfield SA (2010) Weighted Regressions on Time, Dis-
 1187 charge, and Season (WRTDS), with an application to Chesapeake Bay River inputs.
 1188 JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association 46(5):857–880.
 1189 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2010.00482.x>
 1190
 1191
 1192
 1193 Hornung RW, Reed LD (1990) Estimation of average concentration in the presence of
 1194 nondetectable values. Applied Occupational and Environmental Hygiene 5(1):46–51.
 1195
 1196

https://doi.org/10.1080/1047322X.1990.10389587	1197
	1198
Horowitz AJ (2003) An evaluation of sediment rating curves for estimating suspended	1199
sediment concentrations for subsequent flux calculations. Hydrological Processes	1200
17(17):3387–3409. https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.1299	1201
	1202
	1203
	1204
Hou L, Liu M, Carini SA, et al (2012) Transformation and fate of nitrate near	1205
the sediment–water interface of Copano Bay. Continental Shelf Research 35:86–94.	1206
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2012.01.004	1207
	1208
	1209
	1210
Jain S, Schramm MP (2021) Technical Support Document for One Total	1211
Maximum Daily Load for Indicator Bacteria in Lavaca River Above	1212
Tidal. Technical Report AS-221, Texas Commission on Environmen-	1213
tal Quality, Austin, Texas, URL https://www.tceq.texas.gov/downloads/	1214
water-quality/tmdl/lavaca-river-above-tidal-rocky-creek-recreational-108/	1215
108-lavaca-river-addendum-tsd-2021-october-as-221.pdf	1216
	1217
	1218
	1219
	1220
	1221
Kennicutt MC (2017) Water Quality of the Gulf of Mexico. In: Ward CH (ed) Habitats	1222
and Biota of the Gulf of Mexico: Before the Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill. Springer	1223
New York, New York, NY, p 55–164, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-3447-8_2	1224
	1225
	1226
	1227
Kroon FJ, Kuhnert PM, Henderson BL, et al (2012) River loads of suspended solids,	1228
nitrogen, phosphorus and herbicides delivered to the Great Barrier Reef lagoon.	1229
Marine Pollution Bulletin 65(4-9):167–181. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.	1230
2011.10.018	1231
	1232
	1233
	1234
Kuhnert PM, Henderson BL, Lewis SE, et al (2012) Quantifying total suspended sedi-	1235
ment export from the Burdekin River catchment using the loads regression estimator	1236
tool. Water Resources Research 48(4). https://doi.org/10.1029/2011WR011080	1237
	1238
	1239
	1240
	1241
	1242

1243 Lloyd C, Freer J, Collins A, et al (2014) Methods for detecting change in hydrochemical
 1244 time series in response to targeted pollutant mitigation in river catchments. Journal
 1245 of Hydrology 514:297–312. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.04.036>
 1246
 1247
 1248 Marra G, Wood SN (2012) Coverage properties of confidence intervals for Generalized
 1249 Additive Model components: Coverage properties of GAM intervals. Scandinavian
 1250 Journal of Statistics 39(1):53–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9469.2011.00760.x>
 1251
 1252
 1253 McDowell RW, Simpson ZP, Ausseil AG, et al (2021) The implications of lag times
 1254 between nitrate leaching losses and riverine loads for water quality policy. Scientific
 1255 Reports 11(1):16450. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-95302-1>
 1256
 1257
 1258 Montagna PA, Cockett PM, Kurr EM, et al (2020) Assessment of the Relationship
 1259 Between Freshwater Inflow and Biological Indicators in Lavaca Bay. Tech. Rep.
 1260 Contract # 1800012268, Harte Research Institute, Texas A&M University-Corpus
 1261 Christi, Corpus Christi, Texas
 1262
 1263
 1264 Mooney RF, McClelland JW (2012) Watershed export events and ecosystem responses
 1265 in the Mission–Aransas National Estuarine Research Reserve, South Texas. Estu-
 1266 aries and Coasts 35(6):1468–1485. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-012-9537-4>
 1267
 1268 Moriasi DN, Gitau MW, Pai N, et al (2015) Hydrologic and Water Quality Mod-
 1269 els: Performance Measures and Evaluation Criteria. Transactions of the ASABE
 1270 58(6):1763–1785. <https://doi.org/10.13031/trans.58.10715>
 1271
 1272
 1273 Murphy RR, Perry E, Harcum J, et al (2019) A Generalized Additive Model approach
 1274 to evaluating water quality: Chesapeake Bay case study. Environmental Modelling
 1275 & Software 118:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2019.03.027>
 1276
 1277
 1278 Murphy RR, Keisman J, Harcum J, et al (2022) Nutrient improvements in Chesa-
 1279 peake Bay: Direct effect of load reductions and implications for coastal management.
 1280
 1281
 1282
 1283
 1284
 1285
 1286
 1287
 1288

Environmental Science & Technology 56(1):260–270. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c05388	1289
	1290
	1291
	1292
Oelsner GP, Stets EG (2019) Recent trends in nutrient and sediment loading to coastal	1293
areas of the conterminous U.S.: Insights and global context. Science of The Total	1294
Environment 654:1225–1240. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.10.437	1295
	1296
	1297
	1298
Omani N, Srinivasan R, Lee T (2014) Estimation of sediment and nutrient loads to	1299
bays from gauged and ungauged watersheds. Applied Engineering in Agriculture pp	1300
869–887. https://doi.org/10.13031/aea.30.10162	1301
	1302
	1303
	1304
Örnólfssdóttir EB, Lumsden S, Pinckney JL (2004) Nutrient pulsing as a regulator of	1305
phytoplankton abundance and community composition in Galveston Bay, Texas.	1306
Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 303(2):197–220. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2003.11.016	1307
	1308
	1309
	1310
	1311
Palmer TA, Montagna PA (2015) Impacts of droughts and low flows on estuarine water	1312
quality and benthic fauna. Hydrobiologia 753(1):111–129. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-015-2200-x	1313
	1314
	1315
	1316
	1317
Paudel B, Montagna PA, Adams L (2019) The relationship between suspended solids	1318
and nutrients with variable hydrologic flow regimes. Regional Studies in Marine	1319
Science 29:100657. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rsma.2019.100657	1320
	1321
	1322
	1323
Peierls BL, Hall NS, Paerl HW (2012) Non-monotonic responses of phytoplankton	1324
biomass accumulation to hydrologic variability: A comparison of two coastal plain	1325
North Carolina estuaries. Estuaries and Coasts 35(6):1376–1392. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-012-9547-2	1326
	1327
	1328
	1329
	1330
Rebich RA, Houston NA, Mize SV, et al (2011) Sources and delivery of nutrients to	1331
the northwestern Gulf of Mexico from streams in the south-central United States.	1332
	1333
	1334

1335 JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association 47(5):1061–1086.
 1336 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2011.00583.x>
 1337
 1338
 1339 Robson BJ, Dourdet V (2015) Prediction of sediment, particulate nutrient and
 1340 dissolved nutrient concentrations in a dry tropical river to provide input to a mecha-
 1341 nistic coastal water quality model. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 63:97–108.
 1342 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2014.08.009>
 1343
 1344
 1345
 1346 Russell MJ, Montagna PA, Kalke RD (2006) The effect of freshwater inflow on net
 1347 ecosystem metabolism in Lavaca Bay, Texas. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*
 1348 68(1-2):231–244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2006.02.005>
 1349
 1350
 1351
 1352 Schramm M, Berthold A, Entwistle C, et al (2018) Lavaca River Watershed Protection
 1353 Plan. Technical Report TR-507, Texas Water Resources Institute, College Station,
 1354 Texas
 1355
 1356
 1357
 1358 Schramm M, Gitter A, Gregory L (2022) Total Maximum Daily Loads and *Escherichia*
 1359 *coli* trends in Texas freshwater streams. *Journal of Contemporary Water Research*
 1360 & Education (176):36–49. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-704X.2022.3374.x>
 1361
 1362
 1363
 1364 Shoda ME, Sprague LA, Murphy JC, et al (2019) Water-quality trends in U.S. rivers,
 1365 2002 to 2012: Relations to levels of concern. *Science of The Total Environment*
 1366 650:2314–2324. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.09.377>
 1367
 1368
 1369
 1370 Snelder T, McDowell R, Fraser C (2017) Estimation of catchment nutrient loads in
 1371 New Zealand using monthly water quality monitoring data. *JAWRA Journal of*
 1372 *the American Water Resources Association* 53(1):158–178. [https://doi.org/10.1111/](https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.12492)
 1373 [1752-1688.12492](https://doi.org/10.1111/1752-1688.12492)
 1374
 1375
 1376
 1377 Stackpoole S, Sabo R, Falcone J, et al (2021) Long-term Mississippi River
 1378 trends expose shifts in the river load response to watershed nutrient balances
 1379
 1380

between 1975 and 2017. *Water Resources Research* 57(11). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021WR030318>

Stets E, Lee C, Lytle D, et al (2018) Increasing chloride in rivers of the conterminous U.S. and linkages to potential corrosivity and lead action level exceedances in drinking water. *Science of The Total Environment* 613–614:1498–1509. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.07.119>

Tominack SA, Wetz MS (2022) Variability in phytoplankton biomass and community composition in Corpus Christi Bay, Texas. *Estuaries and Coasts* <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-022-01137-y>

Vecchia AV, Gilliom RJ, Sullivan DJ, et al (2009) Trends in concentrations and use of agricultural herbicides for Corn Belt Rivers, 1996–2006. *Environmental Science & Technology* 43(24):9096–9102. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es902122j>

Walker LM, Montagna PA, Hu X, et al (2021) Timescales and magnitude of water quality change in three Texas estuaries induced by passage of Hurricane Harvey. *Estuaries and Coasts* 44(4):960–971. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12237-020-00846-6>

Wang YG, Kuhnert P, Henderson B (2011) Load estimation with uncertainties from opportunistic sampling data – A semiparametric approach. *Journal of Hydrology* 396(1–2):148–157. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2010.11.003>

Wazniak CE, Hall MR, Carruthers TJB, et al (2007) Linking water quality to living resources in a Mid-Atlantic lagoon system, USA. *Ecological Applications* 17(sp5):S64–S78. <https://doi.org/10.1890/05-1554.1>

Wetz MS, Yoskowitz DW (2013) An ‘extreme’ future for estuaries? Effects of extreme climatic events on estuarine water quality and ecology. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 69(1–2):7–18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2013.01.020>

1427 Wetz MS, Hayes KC, Fisher KV, et al (2016) Water quality dynamics in an urbaniz-
 1428 ing subtropical estuary(Oso Bay, Texas). Marine Pollution Bulletin 104(1-2):44–53.
 1429 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2016.02.013>
 1430
 1431
 1432 Wetz MS, Cira EK, Sterba-Boatwright B, et al (2017) Exceptionally high organic
 1433 nitrogen concentrations in a semi-arid South Texas estuary susceptible to brown tide
 1434 blooms. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 188:27–37. [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2017.02.001)
 1435 [ecss.2017.02.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2017.02.001)
 1436
 1437
 1438
 1439
 1440 Wise DR, Anning DW, Miller OW (2019) Spatially referenced models of stream-
 1441 flow and nitrogen, phosphorus, and suspended-sediment transport in streams of
 1442 the southwestern United States. Scientific Investigations Report 2019-5106, U.S.
 1443 Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia
 1444
 1445
 1446
 1447 Wood SN (2006) On confidence intervals for generalized additive models based
 1448 on penalized regression splines. Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics
 1449 48(4):445–464. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-842X.2006.00450.x>
 1450
 1451
 1452
 1453 Wood SN (2011) Fast stable restricted maximum likelihood and marginal likelihood
 1454 estimation of semiparametric generalized linear models: Estimation of Semipara-
 1455 metric Generalized Linear Models. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series
 1456 B (Statistical Methodology) 73(1):3–36. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2010.](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2010.00749.x)
 1457 [00749.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2010.00749.x)
 1458
 1459
 1460
 1461
 1462 Zhang Q, Ball WP (2017) Improving riverine constituent concentration and flux esti-
 1463 mation by accounting for antecedent discharge conditions. Journal of Hydrology
 1464 547:387–402. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.12.052>
 1465
 1466
 1467
 1468
 1469
 1470
 1471
 1472