

Potential origin of the Stony coral tissue loss disease

Thomas Dobbelaere^{1,*}, Emmanuel Hanert^{1,a}

*^aInstitute of Mechanics, Materials and Civil Engineering (IMMC),
UCLouvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium*

Abstract

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Ut purus elit, vestibulum ut, placerat ac, adipiscing vitae, felis. Curabitur dictum gravida mauris. Nam arcu libero, nonummy eget, consectetur id, vulputate a, magna. Donec vehicula augue eu neque. Pellentesque habitant morbi tristique senectus et netus et malesuada fames ac turpis egestas. Mauris ut leo. Cras viverra metus rhoncus sem. Nulla et lectus vestibulum urna fringilla ultrices. Phasellus eu tellus sit amet tortor gravida placerat. Integer sapien est, iaculis in, pretium quis, viverra ac, nunc. Praesent eget sem vel leo ultrices bibendum. Aenean faucibus. Morbi dolor nulla, malesuada eu, pulvinar at, mollis ac, nulla. Curabitur auctor semper nulla. Donec varius orci eget risus. Duis nibh mi, congue eu, accumsan eleifend, sagittis quis, diam. Duis eget orci sit amet orci dignissim rutrum.

Nam dui ligula, fringilla a, euismod sodales, sollicitudin vel, wisi. Morbi auctor lorem non justo. Nam lacus libero, pretium at, lobortis vitae, ultricies et, tellus. Donec aliquet, tortor sed accumsan bibendum, erat ligula aliquet magna, vitae ornare odio metus a mi. Morbi ac orci et nisl hendrerit mollis. Suspendisse ut massa. Cras nec ante. Pellentesque a nulla. Cum sociis natoque penatibus et magnis dis parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus. Aliquam tincidunt urna. Nulla ullamcorper vestibulum turpis. Pellentesque

*Corresponding author

Email address: `thomas.dobbelaere@uclouvain.be` (Thomas Dobbelaere)

cursus luctus mauris.

Keywords: Stony coral tissue loss disease, sediments, Port of Miami, Coastal modeling,

1. Introduction

Coral diseases are a major threat to coral reef ecosystems and have led to significant declines in coral cover especially within the Caribbean region (Richardson et al., 1998; Sutherland et al., 2004; Aronson and Precht, 2001; Harvell et al., 2007; Brandt and McManus, 2009). One of the latest and the most damaging outbreak to date in Florida’s Coral Reef (FCR) is stony coral tissue loss disease (SCTLD) (NOAA, 2018). First observed off the coast of Miami in 2014 by Precht et al. (2016), the disease has since spread through the entirety of FCR (Muller et al., 2020; Dobbelaere et al., in press 2022) and has been observed in several territories of the Caribbean (Kramer et al., 2019; Meiling et al., 2021; Estrada-Saldívar et al., 2021; Heres et al., 2021). Although the causative agent of the disease remains unknown, hydrodynamics are likely to play an important role in its propagation as both modeling studies and ex situ experiments show evidence of waterborne disease transmission (Aeby et al., 2019; Dobbelaere et al., 2020; Eaton et al., 2021; Meiling et al., 2021). Furthermore, recent studies showed evidence that sediments act as vector for the SCTLD (Rosales et al., 2020; Studivan et al., 2022).

SCTLD was first observed by Precht et al. (2016) near Virginia Key in September 2014, during the monitoring of the deepening of the Port of Miami (PoM) shipping channel, that took place between November 20, 2013 and March 16, 2015. This monitoring was performed twice-weekly at 26 monitoring stations established within the Miami-Dade County, making it one of the most complete datasets related to a dredging project (Gintert et al., 2019). While operating in a conventional way, dredged materials were pumped from the dredge to a spider barge and then transported to the US Environmental Protection Agency designated Ocean Dredge Material

27 Disposal Site (ODMDS) located 4.7 nautical miles offshore. However, the
28 suction mechanism was turned off during non-conventional rock-chopping
29 activities in order to pre-treat very hard rock contained in the Anastasia and
30 Fort Thompson formations between December 2013 and May 2014. The Army
31 Corps commissioned a report that provides a back-of-the-envelope estimating
32 this practice could have resulted in up to 33 cm deposition over 874,121 m² of
33 reef surrounding the outer entrance channel (Jocelyn Karazsia, *pers. comm.*).
34 Additionally, several studies reported that the impact of the dredging was
35 widespread (Miller et al., 2016), causing the death of > 560,000 corals within
36 0.5 km of the channel (Cunning et al., 2019) and producing sediment plumes
37 covering up to 11 km² of coral area within 5-10 km of the dredge (Barnes
38 et al., 2015).

39 Sediments released by dredging can affect the biological functions of corals
40 in numerous ways (Erftemeijer et al., 2012; Jones et al., 2015). Increased
41 turbidity caused by the suspended sediments reduces the light available to
42 symbiotic zooxanthellae, leading to reduced coral cover and growth, while
43 increased sedimentation can cause smothering or burial of coral polyps (Erftemeijer et al., 2012). Furthermore, sedimentation and turbidity can significantly
44 reduce larval recruitment by inhibiting settlement and reducing larval survival
45 in the water column (Jones et al., 2015). These effects are stronger with
46 fine-grained sediments, as they cause a stronger light reduction (Fourney and
47 Figueiredo, 2017). Additionally, fine-grained sediments such as silts have
48 high nutrient contents, which can lead to an increased microbial activity, eventually causing anoxic conditions in the immediate vicinity of corals (Weber
49 et al., 2012). As they release finer sediments over significantly longer periods
50 than natural events such as hurricanes, dredging activities can thus be more
51 harmful to corals and reef habitat compared to other types of sedimentation
52 (Cunning et al., 2019).

53 Nonetheless, Gintert et al. (2019) argued that the reported coral mortality
54 during the dredging project was dominated by the regional outbreak of
55
56

57 SCTLD. Further, the study suggested that the onset of the disease might
 58 have been linked to a leaking discharge pipe of the Miami Central District
 59 Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plant located off Virginia Key. However,
 60 as sediments can act as vector for SCTLD (Studivan et al., 2022), there is
 61 also a possibility that the causative agents of the disease was transported to
 62 the monitoring site of Virginia Key on sediments released by the dredging.
 63 This possibility can be evaluated using a bio-physical model simulating the
 64 transport of sediments produced during the dredging project. As coastal
 65 reef ecosystems are characterized by the complex topography of the coastline
 66 and the presence of islands, reefs and artificial structures, such a model
 67 would require high spatial resolution to accurately represent the transport
 68 of sediments at reef-scale. In this context, unstructured-mesh models are
 69 best suited, as they can easily adapt to the topography (Fringer et al., 2019)
 70 and can capture small-scale circulation features around reefs and islands
 71 (Lambrechts et al., 2008; Figueiredo et al., 2013).

72 The goal of this study is therefore to simulate the trajectories of the
 73 sediments released during the entirety of the deepening of the PoM shipping
 74 channel using a high-resolution hydrodynamic model coupled with a sediment
 75 transport model. Specifically, we will attempt to answer the following ques-
 76 tions: (1) Which reefs were impacted by the dredging ? (2) Is the impact on
 77 these reefs consistent with the observed timing of the onset of SCTLD ?

78 **2. Methods**

79 The hydrodynamics over the entirety of FCR was modeled using the
 80 high resolution unstructured-mesh model SLIM¹, which has already been
 81 extensively validated in the area (Frys et al., 2020; Dobbelaere et al., 2020,
 82 in press 2022). SLIM uses an unstructured mesh whose resolution can
 83 be locally increased in order to accurately represent fine-scale flow features.

¹<https://www.slim-ocean.be>

84 The mesh used in this study was built following the same methodology as
85 Dobbelaere et al. (in press 2022), with a local refinement near PoM and
86 in the Bay of Biscayne to achieve a resolution of 100 m in the vicinity of
87 the dredged channel. It was made up of approximately 3.5×10^5 triangles
88 and was generated with the seamsh² Python library, which is based on the
89 the open-source mesh generator GMSH (Geuzaine and Remacle, 2009). The
90 model was run between October 15, 2013 and September 26, 2014 to cover
91 the whole dredging period prior to the first observation of SCTL D by Precht
92 et al. (2016).

93 The transport of sediments released from the channel was then modeled
94 using a Lagrangian particle tracking model, forced by SLIM velocity field.
95 The sediment model is inspired by the Particle Transport Model (PTM),
96 developed by the US Army Corps of Engineers (MacDonald et al., 2006). In
97 this model, particles undergo a combination of horizontal and vertical motions.
98 The vertical is mostly driven by gravity, with heavier particles sinking faster.
99 Once sedimented, particles can be resuspended when shear stress exceed the
100 critical Schields parameter, as parameterized by Soulsby et al. (1997). The
101 horizontal motion of the suspended particles is dervued from the 2D model
102 velocity by assuming a vertical log profile, following a quasi-3D approach.
103 When sediment particles enter the near-bed zone, their horizontal velocity is
104 greatly reduced and sediments are transported with the bedload.

105 As sediment dispersion is dependent on the grain size, we modeled the
106 dispersal of five classes of sediments to represent to impact of fine- to coarse-
107 grained particles: (i) 5-50 μm , (ii) 50-100 μm , (iii) 100-200 μm , (iv) 200-
108 300 μm , and (v) 300-400 μm . We performed a different simulation for
109 each class, with the grain size randomly drawn from a uniform distribution
110 over the corresponding size range. The density of each sediment particle
111 was derived from their size using the formula of Hamilton and Bachman

²<https://pypi.org/project/seamsh/>

112 (1982). Furthermore, all particles were differentiated based on the dredge
113 that produced them. Five types of dredge were considered in our modeling
114 study: (a) Texas cutterhead (TX), (b) non-conventional dredging, *i.e.* TX
115 with suction mechanism turned off (NonConv), (c) Spider Barge (SB), (d)
116 Terrapin Island hopper (TI), and (e) Dredge 55 clamshell (D55).

117 We had data about the date, location and type of all dredging operations
118 performed during expansion of PoM. In the absence of information about
119 the exact time of the dredging, sediment particles were released from the
120 dredging location during a whole day at a rate of 80 particles/hour in the
121 model. To account for the motion of spider barges between the dredging site
122 and ODMDS, particles were released every 500 m along a straight line joining
123 the dredging location to the ODMDS for every dredging operation labelled
124 as SB.

125 **TO DO: write about validation using presence-absence of plume ?**

126 To evaluate the impact of dredging at the monitoring sites, we counted
127 the number of sediment particles originating from each dredging that were
128 transported within 500 m of all monitoring site. This number was then
129 divided by the total number of sediment particles released by each type of
130 dredge. Larger values of this indicator would suggest a greater impact of a
131 given type of dredging at a given monitoring sites.

132 Furthermore, as previous studies showed evidence of waterborne trans-
133 mission of SCTLD (Aeby et al., 2019; Dobbelaere et al., 2020; Eaton et al.,
134 2021; Meiling et al., 2021), there is a possibility that the disease propagated
135 to Virginia Key from unknown reefs affected prior to September 2014. To
136 evaluate this possibility, we computed monthly disease connectivity matrices
137 following the methodology of Dobbelaere et al. (2020) during our simulated
138 period. These connectivity matrices can be interpreted as large graphs whose
139 vertices are reefs and whose edges represent disease connectivity pathways.
140 Evaluating the possibility of disease propagation from one reef to another is
141 therefore equivalent to evaluating the presence of paths connecting these two

reefs in the network. As computing all possible paths is not computationally tractable, we limited ourselves to the computation of shortest paths from any given reefs to the Virginia Key monitoring site. This was performed using the function `get_all_shortest_paths` of the Python `python-igraph` package (Csardi et al., 2006). Such function requires the definition of a weight w_{ij} for the edge connecting reef i to reef j . We chose $w_{ij} = 1 - \tilde{C}_{ij}$, where \tilde{C}_{ij} is the probability of disease propagation from reef i to reef j , so that "shorter" edges of the networks (*i.e.* connectivity pathways with smaller weights) correspond to connections with larger disease propagation probability. The probability of a given path was then defined as the mean connection probability of the edges composing this path.

3. Results

4. Discussion

5. Conclusion

References

- Aeby, G., Ushijima, B., Campbell, J.E., Jones, S., Williams, G., Meyer, J.L., Hase, C., Paul, V., 2019. Pathogenesis of a tissue loss disease affecting multiple species of corals along the Florida Reef Tract. *Frontiers in Marine Science* 6, 678.
- Aronson, R.B., Precht, W.m.F., 2001. White-band disease and the changing face of Caribbean coral reefs. The ecology and etiology of newly emerging marine diseases , 25–38.
- Barnes, B.B., Hu, C., Kovach, C., Silverstein, R.N., 2015. Sediment plumes induced by the Port of Miami dredging: Analysis and interpretation using Landsat and MODIS data. *Remote Sensing of Environment* 170, 328–339.

167 Brandt, M.E., McManus, J.W., 2009. Dynamics and impact of the coral
168 disease white plague: insights from a simulation model. *Diseases of aquatic*
169 *organisms* 87, 117–133.

170 Csardi, G., Nepusz, T., et al., 2006. The igraph software package for complex
171 network research. *InterJournal, complex systems* 1695, 1–9.

172 Cuning, R., Silverstein, R.N., Barnes, B.B., Baker, A.C., 2019. Extensive
173 coral mortality and critical habitat loss following dredging and their asso-
174 ciation with remotely-sensed sediment plumes. *Marine pollution bulletin*
175 145, 185–199.

176 Dobbelaere, T., Muller, E.M., Gramer, L.J., Holstein, D.M., Hanert, E., 2020.
177 Coupled epidemio-hydrodynamic modeling to understand the spread of a
178 deadly coral disease in Florida. *Frontiers in Marine Science* 7, 1016.

179 Dobbelaere, T., Muller, E.M., Gramer, L.J., Holstein, D.M., Hanert, E., in
180 press 2022. Connecting the dots: Transmission of stony coral tissue loss
181 disease from the marquesas to the Dry Tortugas. *Frontiers in Marine*
182 *Science* doi:10.3389/fmars.2022.778938.

183 Eaton, K.R., Landsberg, J.H., Kiryu, Y., Peters, E.C., Muller, E.M., 2021.
184 Measuring stony coral tissue loss disease induction and lesion progression
185 within two intermediately susceptible species, *Montastraea cavernosa* and
186 *Orbicella faveolata*. *Frontiers in Marine Science* , 1287.

187 Erftemeijer, P.L., Riegl, B., Hoeksema, B.W., Todd, P.A., 2012. Environ-
188 mental impacts of dredging and other sediment disturbances on corals: a
189 review. *Marine pollution bulletin* 64, 1737–1765.

190 Estrada-Saldívar, N., Quiroga-García, B.A., Pérez-Cervantes, E., Rivera-
191 Garibay, O.O., Alvarez-Filip, L., 2021. Effects of the stony coral tissue
192 loss disease outbreak on coral communities and the benthic composition of
193 cozumel reefs. *Frontiers in Marine Science* 8, 306.

194 Figueiredo, J., Baird, A.H., Connolly, S.R., 2013. Synthesizing larval com-
 195 petence dynamics and reef-scale retention reveals a high potential for
 196 self-recruitment in corals. *Ecology* 94, 650–659.

197 Fournay, F., Figueiredo, J., 2017. Additive negative effects of anthropogenic
 198 sedimentation and warming on the survival of coral recruits. *Scientific*
 199 *reports* 7, 1–8.

200 Fringer, O.B., Dawson, C.N., He, R., Ralston, D.K., Zhang, Y.J., 2019. The
 201 future of coastal and estuarine modeling: Findings from a workshop. *Ocean*
 202 *Modelling* 143, 101458.

203 Frys, C., Saint-Amand, A., Le Hénaff, M., Figueiredo, J., Kuba, A., Walker,
 204 B., Lambrechts, J., Vallaeys, V., Vincent, D., Hanert, E., 2020. Fine-scale
 205 coral connectivity pathways in the Florida Reef Tract: Implications for
 206 conservation and restoration. *Frontiers in Marine Science* 7, 312.

207 Geuzaine, C., Remacle, J.F., 2009. Gmsh: A 3-D finite element mesh generator
 208 with built-in pre-and post-processing facilities. *International journal for*
 209 *numerical methods in engineering* 79, 1309–1331.

210 Gintert, B.E., Precht, W.F., Fura, R., Rogers, K., Rice, M., Precht, L.L.,
 211 D’Alessandro, M., Croop, J., Vilmar, C., Robbart, M.L., 2019. Regional
 212 coral disease outbreak overwhelms impacts from a local dredge project.
 213 *Environmental monitoring and assessment* 191, 1–39.

214 Hamilton, E.L., Bachman, R.T., 1982. Sound velocity and related properties
 215 of marine sediments. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 72,
 216 1891–1904.

217 Harvell, D., Jordán-Dahlgren, E., Merkel, S., Rosenberg, E., Raymundo, L.,
 218 Smith, G., Weil, E., Willis, B., 2007. Coral disease, environmental drivers,
 219 and the balance between coral and microbial associates. *Oceanography* 20,
 220 172–195.

221 Heres, M.M., Farmer, B.H., Elmer, F., Hertler, H., 2021. Ecological conse-
 222 quences of stony coral tissue loss disease in the turks and caicos islands.
 223 Coral Reefs 40, 609–624.

224 Jones, R., Ricardo, G., Negri, A., 2015. Effects of sediments on the reproduc-
 225 tive cycle of corals. Marine Pollution Bulletin 100, 13–33.

226 Kramer, P., Roth, L., Lang, J., 2019. Map of stony coral tissue loss disease
 227 outbreak in the Caribbean. URL: www.agrra.org. ArcGis Online. (accessed
 228 June 12, 2020).

229 Lambrechts, J., Hanert, E., Deleersnijder, E., Bernard, P.E., Legat, V.,
 230 Remacle, J.F., Wolanski, E., 2008. A multi-scale model of the hydrodynam-
 231 ics of the whole Great Barrier Reef. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science
 232 79, 143–151.

233 MacDonald, N.J., Davies, M.H., Zundel, A.K., Howlett, J.D., Demirbilek,
 234 Z., Gailani, J.Z., Lackey, T.C., Smith, J., 2006. PTM: particle tracking
 235 model. Report 1: Model theory, implementation, and example applications.
 236 Technical Report. Engineer Research And Development Center Vicksburg
 237 MS Coastal And Hydraulics Lab.

238 Meiling, S.S., Muller, E.M., Lasseigne, D., Rossin, A., Veglia, A.J., MacKnight,
 239 N., Dimos, B., Huntley, N., Correa, A., Smith, T.B., et al., 2021. Variable
 240 species responses to experimental stony coral tissue loss disease (SCTLD)
 241 exposure. Frontiers in Marine Science 8, 464.

242 Miller, M.W., Karazsia, J., Groves, C.E., Griffin, S., Moore, T., Wilber, P.,
 243 Gregg, K., 2016. Detecting sedimentation impacts to coral reefs resulting
 244 from dredging the Port of Miami, Florida USA. PeerJ 4, e2711.

245 Muller, E.M., Sartor, C., Alcaraz, N.I., van Woesik, R., 2020. Spatial
 246 epidemiology of the stony-coral-tissue-loss disease in Florida. Frontiers in
 247 Marine Science 7, 163.

248 NOAA, 2018. Stony Coral Tissue Loss Disease
 249 Case Definition. URL: [https://nmsfloridakeys.](https://nmsfloridakeys.blob.core.windows.net/floridakeys-prod/media/docs/20181002-stony-coral-tissue-loss-disease-case-definition.pdf)
 250 [blob.core.windows.net/floridakeys-prod/media/docs/](https://nmsfloridakeys.blob.core.windows.net/floridakeys-prod/media/docs/20181002-stony-coral-tissue-loss-disease-case-definition.pdf)
 251 [20181002-stony-coral-tissue-loss-disease-case-definition.pdf](https://nmsfloridakeys.blob.core.windows.net/floridakeys-prod/media/docs/20181002-stony-coral-tissue-loss-disease-case-definition.pdf).
 252 Accessed on June 4, 2020.

253 Precht, W.F., Gintert, B.E., Robbart, M.L., Fura, R., Van Woesik, R., 2016.
 254 Unprecedented disease-related coral mortality in Southeastern Florida.
 255 Scientific reports 6, 1–11.

256 Richardson, L.L., Goldberg, W.M., Carlton, R.G., Halas, J.C., 1998. Coral
 257 disease outbreak in the Florida Keys: plague type II. Revista de Biología
 258 tropical , 187–198.

259 Rosales, S.M., Clark, A.S., Huebner, L.K., Ruzicka, R.R., Muller, E., 2020.
 260 Rhodobacterales and Rhizobiales are associated with stony coral tissue loss
 261 disease and its suspected sources of transmission. Frontiers in Microbiology
 262 11, 681.

263 Soulsby, R., Whitehouse, R., et al., 1997. Threshold of sediment motion in
 264 coastal environments, in: Pacific Coasts and Ports'97. Proceedings, pp.
 265 149–154.

266 Studivan, M.S., Rossin, A.M., Rubin, E., Soderberg, N., Holstein, D.M.,
 267 Enochs, I.C., 2022. Reef sediments can act as a stony coral tissue loss
 268 disease vector. Frontiers in Marine Science , 2046.

269 Sutherland, K.P., Porter, J.W., Torres, C., 2004. Disease and immunity in
 270 Caribbean and Indo-Pacific zooxanthellate corals. Marine ecology progress
 271 series 266, 273–302.

272 Weber, M., De Beer, D., Lott, C., Polerecky, L., Kohls, K., Abed, R.M.,
 273 Ferdelman, T.G., Fabricius, K.E., 2012. Mechanisms of damage to corals

274 exposed to sedimentation. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences
275 109, E1558–E1567.