Hot and fresh: Pervasive climate stressors of seagrass in a large Gulf coast estuary
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## Abstract

## 1 Introduction

* Importance of seagrass as foundation species
* Tampa Bay context
* Climate change stressors
* Goals/objectives
  + Describe

Background: SST trends in Tampa Bay w/ EPC data, WFS, and deep GOM (Nickerson et al. 2023) showed that 1975 to 2022 trend for EPC was notable, but less so from 1998 to 2022. Also noted the trend was most pronounced in the winter, see Fig 3.

Heat stress combined with highlight accelerates decline of *E. acoroides*, used 36C (Zhang et al. 2023)

Widgeongrass colonization in Chesapeake Bay as an opportunistic, heat-tolerant species that has replaced Eelgrass, although former is sensitive to nutrient pulses. Paper provides an example of implications on climate change and nutrient management on foundation species and system resiliency (Hensel et al. 2023).

Focus on two time periods: full record and recent decline

Focus on two physical parameters: temperature and salinity

Temp background for TB: NOAA coastwatch trends

## 2 Methods

### 2.1 Study area

Tampa Bay is the largest open-water estuary in Florida covering 400 mi (1,036 km) and one of the largest in the Gulf of Mexico. The watershed covers an 2,200 mi (5,872 km) with the Hillsborough, Alafia, Manatee, and Little Manatee Rivers contributing a majority of freshwater inflow to the bay. Tampa Bay straddles the temperate and tropical boundary of central Florida characterized by warm, humid conditions and a distinct rainy season during the summer months. The watershed is heavily developed and includes over 3 million people with 42% of the land as urban or suburban contributing substantial inputs of wastewater and stormwater runoff that can stress bay resources (Beck et al. 2023). The geology of the watershed is rich in phosphates and mining activities have greatly altered the landscape, with notable spills and releases of wastewater that have affected water quality and biological resources (Garrett et al. 2011; Beck et al. 2022). Important subtidal habitats include seagrasses, hard bottom, tidal flats, and oyster reefs, where a majority of management effort has focused on restoring and maintaining seagrass cover (E. T. Sherwood et al. 2017). Additional native habitats include intertidal wetlands (mangroves, salt marshes, salt barriers) and pine forests, oak hammocks, and freshwater wetlands present in upland habitats (Robison et al. 2020). Losses of native uplands and potentially restorable habitats to development in the watershed from 1990 to 2020 have been estimated at 295 mi (763 km, Beck et al. 2023).

The Bay is divided into distinct sub-segments defined by physical and natural boundaries to assist with water quality management activities (Lewis III et al. 1985): Old Tampa Bay (OTB) in the northwest; Hillsborough Bay (HB) in the northeast; Middle Tampa Bay (MTB); and Lower Tampa Bay (LTB) that connects to the Gulf of Mexico. Old Tampa Bay and Hillsborough Bay have historically had the most degraded water quality conditions primarily from nutrient inputs from wastewater and stormwater (Greening et al. 2014). Hydrologic conditions vary between the two, such that Hillsborough Bay receives a majority of direct surface water inflow from the Hillsborough and Alafia Rivers, whereas Old Tampa Bay receives much less inflow with a majority from multiple small tributaries (Janicki Environmental, Inc. 2023). Notably, Old Tampa Bay has restricted circulation from multiple land bridges that traverse the bay (E. Sherwood et al. 2015; M.E. Luther, S.D. Meyers 2022). Recurring seasonal harmful algal blooms of the dinoflagellete *Pyrodinium bahamense* have contributed to exceedances of the chlorophyll-a regulatory standard in Old Tampa Bay (Cary B. Lopez et al. 2023). By comparison, water quality conditions in Middle Tampa Bay and Lower Tampa Bay are generally better than the upper two bay segments primarily from more frequent water exchanges with the Gulf of Mexico and lower nutrient loading (Janicki Environmental, Inc. 2023). All bay segments are relatively shallow, with a baywide mean depth of approximately 3 m. Light penetration typically reaches bottom habitats under current conditions, although seagrasses were historically limited by high phytoplankton production that affected light environments prior to wastewater regulation, particularly in Old Tampa Bay and Hillsborough Bay (Greening et al. 2014; Johansson and Janicki Environmental, Inc. 2015).

### 2.2 Seagrass monitoring and change

The long-term recovery of seagrass habitats in Tampa Bay is a nationally-recognized success story that demonstrates a successful management paradigm. From 1988 to 2016, seagrasses increased 79% (18,376) to a total of acres ()

Seagrass changes over time in [Figure 1](#fig-seagrasschg).

### 2.3 Water quality data

EPC, FIM, Pinellas

### 2.4 Trend analysis

### 2.5 Links to seagrass

Observed trends aggregated by year and bay segment across stations and months in [Figure 2](#fig-meteowqraw).

The conceptual stressor diagram [Figure 3](#fig-concept).

Salinity tolerance: Ruppia > Halodule> Thalassia > Syringodium

Halodule:

* Temp: 20-30 (range, Lewis III et al. (1985))
* Salinity: grows well in most salinity ranges (Lirman and Cropper 2003), like Syringodium but more tolerant (Lewis III et al. 1985), 10-35 (range) or < 10 (S. Scolaro)

Thalassia:

* Temp: 20-30 (range, Lewis III et al. (1985), Zieman (1975)), 30-31 (upper, from SS)
* Salinity: 25 (lower, Lewis III et al. (1985)); 30, lowest at 5 (lower, Lirman and Cropper (2003)), 33-38 (range, Phillips (1960)); 24-35 (range, Zieman (1975) citing Phillips (1960)); 15 (SS)

Syringodium:

* Temp: 20-30 (range, Lewis III et al. (1985)), 29 (upper from SS)
* Salinity: 20 (lower, Lewis III et al. (1985)), 25 (lower, Lirman and Cropper (2003)); 20

Lewis III et al. (1985) review of seagrass in Tampa Bay. Lirman and Cropper (2003) conducted exposure experiments to evaluate seagrass growth in response to a range of salinity conditions. McMillan and Moseley (1967) discusses growth of halodule, syringodium, thalassia, and ruppia in response to salinity increases (up to 75 psu), no info on lower limit. Cites Phillips (1960) for a salinity range of Thalassia in Florida of 33 - 38 psu. Zieman (1975) discusses seasonal variation of thalassia relative to temp and salinity

* Get FIM, Pinellas, Manatee data

All models excluded Lower Tampa Bay because of minimal seagrass change over time. Evaluated total fo, percent change between years, and

GLMs of percent change each year by Sal, Temp, with year and bay segment interactions. Attempted different windows of time from approximate seagrass sample date, 30 days to one year. The best model was one that included an effect of Salinity and an interaction with bay segment. Hillsborough Bay showed a strong response of increasing likelihood of seagrass loss with number of days when salinity was below the threshold.

Then GAMs were evaluated looking at total by Salinity, with interaction of year and bay segment. Also created a model looking at percent change vs Temp and year/bay segment interaction.

Show plots of both the glm and gams.

## 3 Results

For [Figure 2](#fig-meteowqraw), salinity shows much higher inter-annual variability, but lower intra-year variation among stations. Trends are similar for bottom vs top, temperature shows stronger trend than salinity.

Kendall test results are shown in [Figure 4](#fig-kendall).

An example of mixed effects models for two selected thresholds is shown in [Figure 5](#fig-mixeff).

NMS results in [Figure 6](#fig-nms) and seagrass decline results in [Figure 7](#fig-sgmod)

## 4 Discussion

Other areas showing seagrass loss - Florida Bay is different, less water flowing out of everglades and compounding SLR has elevated salinity and likely stress in other direction. Also, Biscayne Bay and IRL is a lot like OTB, poor flushing for example.

Viral/disease effects on seagrass change, (Van Bogaert et al. 2018) for TB and (Duffin et al. 2021) for Florida Bay.

Alternative nutrient pathways and role of macroalgae, competition for resources, shading, etc.

OTB seagrass loss and role of pyrodinium, optimal temperatures from 28-31 (Cary B. Lopez et al. 2021). For salinity, highest growth rates at 24 psu and above, with decline in growth rates at 20 psu (Usup, Kulis, and Anderson 1994), in Florida growth has occurred in psu 10-45, bloom concentrations observed above 15 psu (Phlips et al. 2006; Cary B. Lopez et al. 2021). Optimal salinity range between 20-32 psu (Cary B. Lopez et al. 2021).

## 5 Acknowledgments

## Figures

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 1: Seagrass changes over time in Tampa Bay for (a) areal coverage and (b) frequency occurrence of major species. Changes are shown for major bay segments. Note the different time scale between (a) and (b); coverage maps in (a) began in 1988 and seagrass transect monitoring in (b) began in 1998. Red lines in (a) show approximate capacity of seagrass coverage based on the baywide target of 40,000 acres. OTB: Old Tampa Bay, HB: Hillsborough Bay, MTB: Middle Tampa Bay, LTB: Lower Tampa Bay. |

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 2: Long-term air temperature, precipitation, hydrologic load, Standard Precipitation Index (SPI), water temperature, and salinity trends from 1975 to 2022. Points for salinity and water temperature are colored by sampling location in the water column and show the average (95% confidence interval) across all stations and sampling months for each year in each bay segment. OTB: Old Tampa Bay, HB: Hillsborough Bay, MTB: Middle Tampa Bay, LTB: Lower Tampa Bay. |

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 3: Conceptual stressor diagram |

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 4: Trends from 1975 to 2022 for temperature and salinity measurements at long-term monitoring stations in Tampa Bay. Results for (a) seasonal Kendall tests by station and monitoring location (top or bottom of the water column) are shown in (a) with color and shape corresponding to the estimated annual slope as change per year (yr-1). Summarized seasonal trends by month are shown for (b) top and (c) bottom measurements as the percent of stations in each bay segment with significant increasing (temperature) or decreasing (salinity) trends. Bay segment outlines are shown in (a); OTB (northwest): Old Tampa Bay, HB (northeast): Hillsborough Bay, MTB: Middle Tampa Bay, LTB: Lower Tampa Bay. |

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 5: Example of mixed effects models for the estimated number of days by year that temperature (red) or salinity (blue) were above or below thresholds of 30 degrees C or 25 psu, respectively. The bottom row (black) shows the number of days when both temperature and salinity were above or below the thresholds. The models included station as a random effect for each bay segment, with grey lines indicating individual station trends and thicker lines indicating the overall model fit. Slopes for significant models are shown in the bottom right of each facet. OTB: Old Tampa Bay, HB: Hillsborough Bay, MTB: Middle Tampa Bay, LTB: Lower Tampa Bay. |

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 6: Ordination plots of Nonmetric Multidimensional Scaling results for annual estimates in each bay segment for total seagrass frequency occurrence (Freq. Occ.), counts of days above the temperature threshold (Temp.), counts of days below the salinity threshold (Sal.), and counts of days above or below for both, respectively. The left plot excludes counts of days with both temperature and salinity above and below the threshods, whereas the right plot excludes the separate temperature and salinity metrics. Points are sized by seagrass frequency occurrence. 95% confidence ellipses are shown for observations in each major bay segment OTB: Old Tampa Bay, HB: Hillsborough Bay, MTB: Middle Tampa Bay. |

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 7: Predicted results from generalized linear models evaluating seagrass decline as (a) percent change between years and (b) probability of decline versus number of days when salinity was below the threshold. Models evaluated the response variable on the y-axes as a function of salinity days and interactions with year category (seagrass recovery prior to 2016, seagrass decline 2016 to present) and bay segment. Shaded areas are 95% confidence intervals. Colored lines in (b) as rug plots show instances of seagrass increase (blue) or decrease (red) by year. |

|  |
| --- |
| Figure 8: Relationship between water temperature and discharge in the Hillsborough River (USGS gage 02303000) over time. The relationship is shown for February (dry month) and August (wet month) grouped by historic (1975-1999) and contemporary (2000-2022) time periods. Regression lines with 95% confidence intervals for each temporal grouping are shown. |

## Tables

Summary of mixed-effects models evaluating increases in the number of days each year from 1975 to 2022 when temperature was above 30C, salinity was below 25ppt, or both temperature and salinity were above/below the thresholds. The start and end columns show the estimated number of days at the beginning and end of the period of record when temperature or salinity were above or below the thresholds. Values are the estimated mean number of days (plus standard error) from 1975 and 2022. \*\* p < 0.005, \* p < 0.05, - no model. OTB (northwest): Old Tampa Bay, HB (northeast): Hillsborough Bay, MTB: Middle Tampa Bay, LTB: Lower Tampa Bay.

| Bay Segment | Threshold | Slope | Start | End |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| OTB |  |  |  |  |
|  | Temperature > 30 | 1.04\*\* | 8 (3.3) | 56 (3.3) |
|  | Salinity < 25 | 1.96\*\* | 128 (13.2) | 219 (13.2) |
|  | Both | 0.81\*\* | 0 (2.8) | 37 (2.7) |
| HB |  |  |  |  |
|  | Temperature > 30 | 1.01\*\* | 8 (4.9) | 55 (4.8) |
|  | Salinity < 25 | 0.86\* | 131 (12.5) | 171 (11.8) |
|  | Both | 0.8\*\* | -2 (2.8) | 35 (2.7) |
| MTB |  |  |  |  |
|  | Temperature > 30 | 1.06\*\* | 9 (3.1) | 57 (3.1) |
|  | Salinity < 25 | 0.67\*\* | 51 (11) | 82 (11) |
|  | Both | 0.37\*\* | -1 (1.7) | 16 (1.7) |
| LTB |  |  |  |  |
|  | Temperature > 30 | 0.92\*\* | 21 (3.5) | 63 (3.5) |
|  | Salinity < 25 | -0.06 | 4 (1.3) | 1 (1.3) |
|  | Both | 0 | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
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