Ponds Need Love Too



Tara Nye Lewis June 12, 2024 | SNEP Symposium

CAPE COD

Assessing the Status of Freshwater Ponds on Cape Cod













CAPE COD



CAPE COD COMMISSION

The Cape Cod Commission

...is the regional land use planning, economic development, and regulatory agency created in 1990 to serve the citizens and 15 towns of Barnstable County, Massachusetts



MISSION

...To protect the unique values and quality of life on Cape Cod by coordinating a balanced relationship between environmental protection and economic progress.



POND AREA 10,534 acres

CAPE COD PONDS AND LAKES

890 PONDS

171

395

10+ Acre Ponds

Named Ponds

LARGEST PONDS by area

- 1. Long Pond Brewster and Harwich
- 2. Mashpee-Wakeby Pond Mashpee and Sandwich
- 3. Wequaquet Lake Barnstable

27 🕬

Fish Stocked Ponds



Ponds with Public Access* 107 🖑

Ponds Adjacent to Cranberry Bogs



Protected Open Space within pond 300ft buffer

DEEPEST PONDS with data available

- 1. Cliff Pond Brewster
- 2. Hamblin Pond Barnstable
- 3. White Pond Chatham

22 🗭

Ponds that Cross Town Boundaries



Impervious Surfaces within pond 300ft buffer

*Includes public beaches, boat ramps, and launche

Properly Functioning Ponds and Lakes Play an Important Role in Cape Cod's Water Cycle

Ponds are credited with reducing up to 50% of the nitrogen that passes through them on the way to coastal embayments.

Inherent ecological value in their own right.

Ponds at Risk



Cape Cod Freshwater Initiative

A science-based, information-driven planning process that engages stakeholders and enables action to protect and restore Cape Cod's freshwater ponds



CAPE COD'S HISTORY OF POND MONITORING







┢	
F	Н
IE	

20+ years of pond monitoring

- = 125,000+ sample results
- = 200+ ponds
- = 100+ spreadsheets

Lack of Consistent and Consecutive Data Collection

Limited data prevents our ability to gather a clear understanding of pond health. Consistent and consecutive data collection, is needed to inform pond management/improvement strategies.

Ponds with Water Quality Data Ponds with Water Quality Data Ponds with Water Quality Data Ponds with Water Quality Data

Independent pond groups collect water quality data, but the ponds monitored changes year to year, and many are sampled without a Quality Assurance Project Plan (QAPP), complicating needed long-term and regional analysis.

Ponds Monitored by PALS

just **4%**

HAD SUFFICIENT RECENT WATER QUALITY DATA TO GRADE POND HEALTH IN 2021

OF CAPE COD'S PONDS AND LAKES





Ponds Monitored



Ponds Monitored



Regional Pond Monitoring Program

First season of monitoring - 2023

- **50 ponds** monitored from April to Oct
- **346 pond** visits by staff and volunteers

Monitoring efforts resumed March 2024

- Expanded in 2024 March through November to capture turn over events
- 118 pond visits through May 2024









- Developing pond data management and analysis tools, including:
 - Freshwater monitoring database
 - Processing scripts for trend analyses
 - Accessible user interface





Surface Water Temperature





Surface Water Temperature



Data Management and Analysis



Remote Sensing

Using satellite-derived imagery and existing pond water quality data to quantify changes in pond characteristics

- Connecting satellite imagery to pond water quality monitoring data
- Calibrating with Secchi Disk Depth (SDD) collected during satellite overpasses





Remote Sensing



- Satellite imagery well-suited to estimate water clarity at 193 Cape Cod ponds.
- Framework defined for routine, large-scale monitoring and change assessments.
- Long-term trends generally suggest improving water clarity since 1984
- Methods can assist stakeholders in resource management and prioritization.





REMOTE SENSING – NEXT STEPS















- o Assessed pond and watershed characteristics that may impact water quality
- Used GIS to query potential drivers of water quality degradation

Potential Stressors:

- Land cover / land use
- Septic system density
- Phosphorus loading

- Inlets / outlets
- Pond depth
- Pond volume



Cape Cod Pond Atlas



Cape Cod Pond Atlas





Stressors

Location

- \circ Adjacent to cranberry bog
- o Adjacent to golf course
- Pond Characteristics

 Depth
 - o Volume
 - \circ Retention time

Pond Management

 $\circ~$ Stocked with fish

- Watershed Characteristics

 % of Protected Open Space
 - o % of Impervious Cover
 - Septic/sewer
- Quantity & Quality of stormwater runoff (HRU)
 - o Phosphorus load
 - \circ Nitrogen load
 - Total Suspended Solids (TSS)

Pond Stressors Rank

(28%)	1-5	•
(44%)	6-10	
(24%)	11-15	
(4%)	16-20	

• Carlson Trophic Index:

- A biomass-related trophic state index.
- Indicates the degree of eutrophication within a pond.
- Useful for comparing ponds within a region and for assessing status changes over time.



Pond	Town	Stressor Score	СТІ
Long Pond	Yarmouth	20	42.2
Wequaquet Lake	Barnstable	20	42.1
Ashumet Pond	Mashpee	18	46.1
Long Pond	Brewster	17	41.4
Mashpee Pond	Mashpee	17	50.2
Wakeby Pond	Mashpee	17	45
Santuit Pond	Mashpee	16	61.1
Shubael Pond	Barnstable	15	36.4
Scargo Lake	Dennis	14	40.4
Cliff Pond	Brewster	12	40.6

Hydrologic Response Unit (HRU)

HRUs represent areas with similar physical characteristics that respond to precipitation in a similar way

> Unit – 10x10 m grid cells ~ 2 car garage

Soil – influences runoff and infiltration

Land use – determines pollutants

Land cover – influences runoff



HRU Output

Phosphorus Load Results





HRU Hot Spots

Phosphorus Loading along pond shores



POND STRATEGIES DATABASE

SCALE OF APPROACHES







IN POND

Sediment, nutrient, algae, and vegetation management approaches

POND SHORE

Vegetated buffers, fertilizer management, septic setbacks, I/A septic systems

WATERSHED

Comprehensive watershed planning, land use regulations, land protection, advanced wastewater treatment

THREATS ADDRESSED

Excess Nutrients



Pollutant Inputs



Algal Blooms



Erosion

Invasive/Nuisance Species

40 DRAFT STRATEGY FACT SHEETS



MANAGEMENT APPROACHES

- Planning & Regulations
- Nutrient Management
- Sediment Management
- Algae Management
- Vegetation Management
- Fisheries Management

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Stakeholder groups organized by groundwater lenses

Sagamore Lens

Bourne, Falmouth, Sandwich, Mashpee, Barnstable, Yarmouth



PILGRIM



Outer Cape Lenses

Eastham, Wellfleet, Truro, Provincetown

Thank you!

www.capecodcommission.org/freshwater

capecodcommission.org/our-work/cape-cod-freshwater-initiative/



CAPE COD

tara.lewis@capecodcommission.org



Investigating the Intersection of Trail Usage and Water Quality Impacts within the Big River Management Area

Prepared for: SNEP Symposium 2024

Prepared by:



Jessica Morrissey, GISP | 12 June 2024

Agenda

- Site Introduction
- Project Background
- Trail Analysis Methodology
 - Slope
 - ♦ Usage
 - Trail Density
 - Priority for Further Investigation
- Rapid Field Assessment Application using Survey 123

Site Introduction



Big River Management Area (BRMA)

West Greenwich and Coventry, Rhode Island

8,400 acres

30 miles of mapped streams

130 miles of trails

36 Stream Crossings


Project Background



EA created a method to look at potential water quality impacts using desktop analysis and a rapid field assessment tool.

We tested this method in BRMA since it is a potential future water supply area for the state, with significant recreational usage. Making this an important study area for impacts to water quality.



Trail Analysis : Slope

GIS Process:

- 1. Run slope percentage across whole site
- 2. Clip to trails to approximate slope along trails

What this tells us:

- Shows slope percentage across the trails
- Highlights what areas along the trail potentially have higher slope





Trail Analysis : Trail Density

GIS Process:

- 1. Create 100/100 yd square grid across site
- 2. Intersect with trail layer to get feet of trails per square
- Symbolize to highlight squares with highest density of trails

What this tells us:

 Shows us where there is a high concentration of trails





Trail Analysis : Trail Usage

GIS Process:

 Using Strava as a reference, extract out trails that are shown to have the most use based on heat maps

What this tells us:

- These trails are the most trafficked trails by hikers and mountain bikers
- Higher risk of erosion due to frequent use





Trail Analysis : Priority Trails for Further Investigation

GIS Process:

- 1. Intersect all trails with higher slope, high density and high usage
- 2. Intersect this output with wetlands and waterbodies

What this tells us:

- Trails that hit all three analysis plus water resources were ranked the **highest** for further investigation
- Trails that hit just the three analysis were ranked high
- Trails that were high usage and hit water resources were ranked medium
- Remaining trails we ranked low





Rapid Assessment Tool

	Trail Assessment	* =
Current Date and Time •		
🗎 Tuesday, June 4, 2024		\otimes
3 4:10 PM		8
Description of Location * us. Thill off of New London Tumpike F	inting	
Coordinates of Location * Coordinates should automatically III i		
Latitude * auto filed		
Longitude * autofiled		
Image(s) of Trail *		
Surface Slope *		
		~
Impact Rating *		v
Muck/Mud Index *		
		~
Trail Drainage *		



	nall Assessment	@• ==
ail Width *		
1011 FT19001		~
needing Vegetation *		
		\sim
ivots/Potholes*		
		~
ail Erosion *		
		~
anmade Feature or Obstacle *		
teck all that apply then continue to related quast	ion below.	
P ATV Tracks and Bike Ramps are chosen, fill ou None or Negligible ATV Tracks/Ruts ATV Trail. Jumps/Features Bike Ramps/Course Bike Jumps/Obstacles Bridge Stream/Wetland Crossing Other pe of Obstruction (ATV Tracks/Ruts)	n Type of Obstruction" for each.	
		~
pe of Obstruction (ATV Trail Jumps/	Features)	
		~
pe of Obstruction (Bike Ramps/Cou	irse)	
		\sim



Rapid Assessment Tool

6,		×	12 JUL			
Edit 🔗 Get directions 🕀 Z	bom to					
Current Date and Time		1 1/1/K				
apth of Erosion	17-32 in.	sole cart River	一、出版武(1)是)			
ribe		Jana P	Pond			
cription of Location	Trail off tarbox pond					
ption of Other Obstruction	Bike track erosion					
otholes	Pothole Area		1. Harrison			
d			Surface Slope 🔶	Impact Rating \$	Muck/Mud Index 👙	Trail D
ting	17-32 in,	「「				
Trail Modification		5 5 5 C (1 S)	0-6%	None or Negligible	None or Negligible	Well D
Vegetation	None or Negligible	100 8 2 1 1 / 1	21-40%	33-60 in.	None or Negligible	Well D
	41.63	Ca	0-6%	9-16 in.	Extremely Muddy	Satura
of ATV Track/Rut			21-40%	33-60 in.	None or Negligible	Well D
gf ATV Track/Rut			0-6%	Exposed Roots	None or Negligible	Well D
			21-40%	None or Negligible	None or Negligible	Well D
			21-40%	>60 in.	None or Negligible	Well D
			7-20%	17-32 in.	None or Negligible	Well D
			21-40%	17-32 in.	None or Negligible	Well Dr



Trail Impact Examples





Trail Impact Examples





Trail Impact Examples





Summary



- There are many factors to consider when reviewing trails and their impacts to water quality.
- Slope, Trail Usage, Trail Density and their intersection to surrounding watercourses are a few important ones to look at.
- The use of a Rapid Field Assessment tool can aid in assessing trail systems to identify trails in need of maintenance and monitoring.



Thank You!

Jessica Morrissey jmorrissey@eaest.com



Incorporating Climate Change into Flood Risk Mapping in the Housatonic River Watershed

James LeNoir Hydrologist, U.S. Geological Survey New England Water Science Center

science for a changing world

Hurricane Sandy flooding in Fairfield County, CT.

1



Today's Discussion

Future Flood Risk Project: Motivation

Current flood risk mapping practices and limitations

Future Flood Risk Project: Future Streamflows

How future streamflows are determined and results

Future Flood Risk Project: Floodplain Mapping

Going from streamflows to floodplains and displaying floodplains in interactive web application (in development)



Current Flood Risk Mapping

100-year Floodplain Flood Zones:

- Zone AE (new)
- Zone AE (re-delineated)
- Zone A
- Based on historical streamflow data
- Assumes stationarity



National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) displaying the effective flood hazard information in the vicinity of the Warwick Mall in Warwick, RI. (https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?)



Future Flood Risk Project

Project Overview

- Pilot project in Housatonic River watershed
- Assess how streamflow might change with anticipated changes in temperature and precipitation (RCP 8.5 emissions scenario)
- Use future flood flows to predict future floodplains
- Methods:
 - Estimate streamflows using Precipitation-Runoff Modeling System (PRMS)
 - Scaled precipitation and temperature inputs
 - Use model output to characterize changes in peak flow hydrology
 - Use future flood flows to generate future floodplains
 - Compare baseline conditions to changes in streamflow and floodplain extent associated with climate change









https://www.usgs.gov/centers/new-england-waterscience-center/science/characterizing-future-floodflows-flood-insurance



Future Flood Risk Project

Project Overview

Characterizing Future Flood Flow X +

https://cms.usgs.gov/centers/new-england-water-science-center/science/characterizing-ft	uture-flood-flows-flood-insurance	Ag
An official website of the United States government. Here's how you know ~		
20211		Latest Earthquakes 🗩 🗲
science for a changing world	SCIENCE PRODUCTS NEWS CONNECT ABOUT	<u> </u>

NEW ENGLAND WATER SCIENCE CENTER SCIENCE

Characterizing Future Flood Flows for Flood Insurance Studies

ACTIVE

By New England Water Science Center September 21, 2022

Overview Science Data Publications Partners

Current methods of flood-frequency analyses for flood insurance studies assume that the statistical distribution of data from past observations will continue unchanged in the future. This is known as the assumption of stationarity. This assumption allows scientists to estimate flood magnitude and frequency based on past records and the expectation that those estimates will represent current and future conditions. However, observed trends of increases in rainfall intensity and changes in seasonal snowmelt hydrology in the northeastern United States suggest that peak-flow stationarity may no longer be an appropriate assumption. To improve the information and mapping available for decision-making throughout New England in the face of a changing climate, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) is developing a series of potential flood map scenarios in a pilot watershed in New England for the years 2030, 2050 and 2100.

The National Hydrologic Model (NHM) is a deterministic hydrologic model for the conterminous United States and draws on topography, land cover, soils, geology, and hydrography parameters derived from a Geographic Information System (GIS). This investigation employed a Precipitation-Runoff Modeling System (PRMS) model extracted from the

Study Area



Contacts

Scott A Olson

Hydrologist New England Water Science Center Email: solson@usgs.gov Phone: 603-226-7815

Amanda Schoen

Future Flood Risk Project

Project Overview



https://www.usgs.gov/publications/characterizing-changes-1-percentannual-exceedance-probability-streamflows-climate



https://www.sciencebase.gov/catalog/item/63dc12acd34e9fa19a98a183



Characterizing Changes in the 1-Percent Annual Exceedance Probability Streamflows for Climate-Change Scenarios in the Housatonic River Watershed of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York

By Scott A. Olson

Abstract

Current methods for determining the 1-percent annual exceedance probability (AEP) for a streamflow assume stationarity (the assumption that the statistical distribution of data from past observations does not contain trends and will

maps (Federal Emergency Management Agency, undated), which delineate areas susceptible to flooding, including areas that have a 1-percent chance of flooding in any given year. Along rivers and streams, the mapped areas that have a 1-percent chance of flooding are based on streamflows with a 1-percent annual exceedance probability (AEP).

Current methods for completing flood-frequency analy

ScienceBase Catalog → USGS Data Release Products → Data for Characterizing Cha

Data for Characterizing Changes in the 1-percent Annual Exceedance View -Probability Streamflows for Climate Change Scenarios in the Housatonic River Watershed, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York

Dates

Publication Date : 2023-09-29 Start Date : 1949-10-01 End Date : 2015-09-30

Citation

Olson, S.A., 2023. Data for characterizing changes in the 1-percent annual exceedance probability streamflows for climate change scenarios in the Housatonic River watershed, Massachusetts and Connecticut: U.S. Geological Survey data release, https://doi.org/10.5068/P91CSH01

Summarv

The U.S. Geological Survey in cooperation with the Federal Emergency Management Agency has conducted a study to evaluate potential changes to 1-percent annual exceedance probability (AEP) streamflows. The study was conducted using the Precipitation Runoll Modeling System (PRMS). Climate inputs to the model of temperature and precipitation were scaled to anticipated changes that could occur in 2030, 2050, and 2100 based on global climate models. The output from the models were used to characterize the 1-percent AEP streamflows for the years 2030, 2050, and 2100



Map »



Communities

 USGS Data Release Products 衆 USGS New England Water Science Center

Future Flood Risk Project

Future Flows

- Characterize 1 % annual-exceedance probability (AEP) flood flows for years 2030, 2050, and 2100
- Simulate streamflows using PRMS
- Inputs of temperature and precipitation are scaled using estimates from General Circulation Models
- Baseline conditions compared to changes associated with climate change to develop scalar for years 2030, 2050, and 2100

Olson, S.A., 2023, Characterizing changes in the 1-percent annual exceedance probability streamflows for climate-change scenarios in the Housatonic River watershed of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2023–5090, 16 p., <u>https://doi.org/10.3133/sir20235090</u>



Visual representation of the process used in PRMS (https://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2012/1274/methods.html).



Future Flood Risk Project Future Flows

Table 3.Temperature and precipitation adjustments applied tothe climate datasets input to the Precipitation Runoff ModelingSystem models for the Housatonic River and surroundingwatersheds in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York.

[Data are from Olson (2023). The Precipitation Runoff Modeling System is from Leavesley and others (1983)]

Adjusted parameter	Adjustment applied to clima dataset						
	2030	2050	2100				
Temperature increase, in degrees Fahrenheit	2.8	4.9	10.2				
Precipitation increase, in percent	5.04	7.74	12.05				

Table 4.Percentage change in the 1-percent annualexceedance probability computed using the annual instantaneouspeak streamflows based on changes in precipitation andtemperature at streamgages with unregulated and regulatedstreamflows in Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York.

[Data are from Olson (2023). %, percent; °F, degree Fahrenheit]

Temperature		Precipita	ation change	
change	0%	5.04%	7.74%	12.05%
Strea	mgages wit	h unregulate	d streamflow	1
0 °F	0.0	8.8	13.3	20.7
2.8 °F	1.5	7.4	11.9	19.5
4.9 °F	-1.6	7.0	11.7	19.2
10.2 °F	3.1	5.3	9.9	17.3
Stre	amgages w	ith regulated	streamflow	
0 °F	0.0	9.1	13.7	21.3
2.8 °F	-1.7	7.0	11.5	18.8
4.9 °F	-2.0	7.0	11.7	18.9
10.2 °F	-3.1	5.5	10.3	17.8

Table 5.Percentage changes in the 1-percent annualexceedance probability streamflows for 2030, 2050, and 2100computed using the annual instantaneous peak streamflows inMassachusetts, Connecticut, and New York.

Parameter		Scenario	
Falanietei	2030	2050	2100
Unregulated streamflow	7.4	11.7	17.3
Regulated streamflow	7.0	11.7	17.8

Olson, S.A., 2023, Characterizing changes in the 1-percent annual exceedance probability streamflows for climate-change scenarios in the Housatonic River watershed of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New York: U.S. Geological Survey Scientific Investigations Report 2023–5090, 16 p., https://doi.org/10.3133/sir20235090



Future Flood Risk Project Future Flows to Generate Future Floodplains

Table 5.Percentage changes in the 1-percent annualexceedance probability streamflows for 2030, 2050, and 2100computed using the annual instantaneous peak streamflows inMassachusetts, Connecticut, and New York.

Parameter		Scenario	
Farameter	2030	2050	2100
Unregulated streamflow	7.4	11.7	17.3
Regulated streamflow	7.0	11.7	17.8



Non-regulatory product similar to NFHL map above



Future Flood Risk Project Generate Future Floodplains

- Generate future 100-year floodplains using anticipated future streamflows
- Method varies by model
 - New Zone AE and Zone A models:

FEMA

Take advantage of existing HEC-RAS models
 and API



science



1000	NS 307																	
Liney Die La	Ran View Q	ptions 60	STools Theip															
स्ट १८३ <u>२</u> स्टीमा	40.000	:	1124	18 3	e 🗸	20	1.131	61 (S)	n ne	202	Sec.							
truit.		1 . V DE	1.00		1.0	1.10	an New Yo			Shadowe in the								
nexts	Accession				DA.W	a langung sa sa sa	re New To	Index Diff	HIC AND A LA	Alex/mainte	4	-						
realized	111				0.000	and and a state of	re New Th	Index Diff	ROMAN IN	Pley'pastel.	<u></u>							
Manage Standy Do	a line				0.4.49	a la calendaria de la cale	re Shen Th	Ind. to Diff.	RC MARKED	Plentynairi.	31	-						
trictedy (lars.							-										
etca a Statistica	•							- 12	et: Kitchend	tel Graphi	de en					-		\mathbf{x}
file.wit	aldree(Lines)	0						1014	Bernin by Dale	u nakes		_						_
								Unio	e consulo									
								Contraction of the local sectors of the local secto	 Version 	The second second		20	5012.000					
								Tea 1	a Verley	permer file		Self Ter	a Dan Be	in a second				_
								A set	a nuna	2100								
								and the second	Net of the			_						_
								Long	D. MOT PAULO			_						
								P M	. Norrowne	roel draesdel	acc)							_
her - suitz, Juser	UNICTIVEST?.							- P	Address sharted a	er 100-000	0.000.000							
##5.5#\$##V8()	ove nee in								ing Constitution addited California	Second re-								
5.501.810.83									phred coorns	Sector Ve	the second second							
has Sender Jone	Distriction																	
Concertations (should be	Constalant's							- Par	aly Real Pro-	dation HW	DISCATE	anth 2010						
								- Pro-	hai Shekiy Ba	 Consider 								
10.0000200.2003F																		
	stands a bas			an the set	Loope Mile			- N	polation, h									
pairs and an bla																		
rety, mag, mg, bis		Lasputs				1.910.01			nal den Tale	100.40		Teritin	-					
raty, mag, mg, bla							Ú.		der Tab	vite Artenite		Terito	-					
nativ janog jang bio	Standard Salari	. taipter				1041134	,		esi dan Tah datar Cusanat da Tau Canas datar Cosas	wi.4 Arlim(M)		Text	- 0					
Fally, they, may bla Fally they are a black File Cyclers Sci. Table	standard table?						, 	Dana Seria Seria	tel der Trib Derre Gemen der Trib der Process	wia Arimita		Textile	9					
Falty Disg. maj bio Parte Scipal Science File Options Sci. Table	the sheet balance in the	()	##342X	No. 40		Kva. W	i Kalingan i		en die Tak derra versen op Fas Care plate 4 cons	rvi,4 ≜-Ben∰)		Territor	0					
Party of the set of th	standard taker a Locators The a Palle	C N		Real Apro	Lanet N. Der 1	Kon M	National State		ngi dhe Tuk denno usaat de Tuk Canas denno Canas	ration direkterigetti		Tedla	. E.0					
Fatty string, may be Partic Scipal Science The Options Sci. Science Read Row Sci. Anthropose Sci. Sci. Sci.	tended table 1 Locators The s Parks X _ 1989			Han April Carva (6)	LUL Der 1 PC	Kons M La Sher PYO Castron	Nel Dan H Ped Dan H Page		ng dia Tah dan cuaman da Tay Cana data Kacas	rek4 ≜-Ben∯Ci		Tedle					Pressure	
Petro diago di Adres Petro di Angoli Adres Tra Optioni del Talva Sendi Rom 20 Anterpresentari Accessiona de 201022 referencemento de 201022 referencemento de 201022	tendent tablet tendent tablet a Coations The a Palle 2 Palle			Hos Ap a Calva (6) 7	100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00	Kura K	Margan Margan Age Les		n i die Tok denne versie denne versie den Koons Sava	1.5 1.0	cost first						The	
Participant Line - Participant Line - The Options Sci. There Read Receipt Participant -	the deal below a boostone The a faile a faile	Q Tela M Other Status Visitus Visitus Mittos	**0.500 (**0.25) (**0.25) (**0.41) (**0.41) (**0.41) (**0.41) (**0.41) (**0.41) (**0.41)	- Carra - Carra - Carra 	200 000 90.00 90.00 90.00 90.00	K.vor. M L.S.Short (470) 0.00040 0.00040 0.00040 0.00040			n i die Tol Denne verset de Tol Committe Denne Comm	1.5 10	cost first		-0			_	200	
Party more thank to be a set of the set of t	standard tablet a Costors The costors The Costors The Costors Costors (Costors Costor (Costors Costor (C	References	**0.5000 (**0.25) (**0.25) (**0.41) (**	 Marco Agente Contracto Contra	REAL PROPERTY IN THE PROPERTY INTERPOPERTY IN THE PROPERTY INTERPOPERTY INTER	4 con 14 4 con 14 4 con 14 4 con 14 5 con	1900 - 19 2001 - 19 2000 - 19 2001 -		n i die Tol Denne versie denne versie versie denne versie versie denne versie denne versie denne versie denne	1.5 To 3.6	r a d'Arab	Tedi						
Reversion of the second s	a Autor a Contrart b Contrart a Autor a Autor b Contrart c Contrart			Hon Ap a Contra 7 7 8 Annes 9 UNAE	200 100 200 100 200 200 100 200 100	Koon M La Shee PAR Alariya Carrier Carrier Carrier Carrier Carrier Carrier	Maria Maria		Annual Annua	1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 -	r. na 1. first	Tedi			_			
Revention and the second	s Control and Cont			How Ap a C 4 W2 7 6 7 7 8 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9	100.00 100.00	5 000 - 10 10 000	Maria II Maria Maria Maria Maria Maria Maria Maria		An interaction Social desired contents of the Annual phile Annual Social Content Social Content Social Content Social	2.4 1400 2.4 1400 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4 2.4	e e e d'anal	-					(The second seco	
Party de la constante a la constante	a Control of March a Controls of March			Plan 24 a C 4 W23 7 7 7 7 8 Angel 9 C 4 C 2 1 C 4 C 4 C 2 1 C 4 C 4 C 4 C 2 1 C 4 C 4 C 4 C 4 C 4 C 4 C 4 C 4 C 4 C	100.00 100.00	Control M	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Anno Score Comp Comp Comp Comp Comp Comp Comp Comp	ni dar Suk dari Cusani Aris Cusani Aris Cusani dari Konsi Susa Susa Susa Susa Cusa Susa Susa Susa Susa Susa Susa Susa S	2.45 (A) (A) (A) (A) (A) (A) (A) (A) (A) (A)	e e d'hed	-					Tana	
Alexandro and a second and a se	a Content tablet a Content tablet a Content tablet a Content tablet b Content tablet c Content tablet		********* ***************************	Plan. 24 m C 4 W 2 7 7 7 8 Annual 9 C 4 C 2 1 C 4 C 4 C 4 C 4 C 4 C 4 C 4 C 4 C 4 C	100.00 100.00	Control M	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Anno Sonno Sonno Sonno Sonno Sonno A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A A	An other Task And Task Task And Task Task And Task A	2.0 1 00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3.00 3	e e d'hed						(The second s	
Alexandro and a second a second and a s	a Automatical Materia a Locations b Locations a Automatical b Automatical c Loss Automatical c			Hon Jan Controls 7 7 8 Amerika 9 Controls 9 Control	1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 100 1000 1000 1000 1000 10000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1	K 0000 M	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Anno Sonno S	Number Schutzerungen Charter Generation Charter Generation Provident Constant Con	2 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	e en al finsal		, Fa				(The	
Petro de tanya de Later Per de tanya de Later Per Options Suit July Rend Rend Rend Rend Rend Anterester Rend	Anded Aller 1 - Contrart The Contrart of March - Contrart The Contrart of March - Contrart of March - Contrel - Contrart of March - Contrart of Marc	C C C C C C C C C C C C C C		How Apple Carros (%) 7 (%) 7 (%) 8 Ano.25 9 (%) 9 (%) 9 (%) 9 (%) 9 (%) 9 (%) 9 (%) 9 (%) 8 (%)	1000 1000 1000 1000 1 1000 1000 1000 100 1000 1000 1000 1000 100000 1000 1000 1000 1000 100000	Control (1999) Control	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Anno Second Second Anno Second Anno Second	New York	2.5 1 (1) 2.6 1 (1) 2.6 1 (1) 2.6 1 2.6 10	e en trivel		, Fa				(
Reverting of the point of	do do di del y do do di del y a do la do do di te tecnologia del y do di te do di do di te do di te do di te do di		++5×400 +00	Carros	200 000 200 000 200 00 200 00 200 2	Control (1999) Control	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna Anna	An other Task Andres An	2.5 1 (1) 2.6 1 (1) 2.6 1 2.6	e e d'hed						[*****	
Party things and party and	the deal block Construct The Construct The Const			-Collectory (1997) - Collectory (1997) - Collecto	100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	Control of Contro	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2	Name Table Control Lances Control Lances Control Lances Control Contrel Control Control Control Control Control Control Contre	245,4 245,25	e a d'Asal						The second se	
Particular theory and particular theory of the term of term of the term of ter	to do d bit of control to d bit of control to d for in d for d for in d for d for	C 1028 P	end > 225 for (22) //2	Color Age Color Max	200 001 200 001 200 000 200 00 200 00 201 00 201 00 201 00 201 00 201 00 201 00 200 00 200 2		No. Composition Participant A.327 J.281 A.327 J.282 J.283 J.284 J.285	2 10 10 2 10 2 10 10 2 10	New Colors Color	2.5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	. n d feat						(Accel) - Accel	
Party shop size 2 and 2	the deal block construct The construct The const	Image M Image		Cold W23 (M) Cold W23 (M) Cold W23 Cold W23 Cold W23 Cold W23 Cold W23 Cold W24	200 10-11 200 10-11	Control M	40 op or 100 or 10 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 2	2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 200		2.4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	cont final		, E A				(marking)	
Particular data and a second an	data da di bile * a data data da di bile * a data data data data data data data da	IC IC CH <		Control (1997) Control	440 441 444	Kora, M La Sue Age Age Age Age Age Age Age Age Age Ag	140 (1 1 1 240 (1 1 1 240 (1 1 1 240 (1 2 1 240 (1 2 1 240 (1 2 1 240 (1 2 1 1 4 1 1	2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 200	2000 - 104 	2.5 2.5 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6	e e a l'head		, E D			776 J. 10		
Reverting of the second s	de de di di ** a Costore Tie a Costore <ti< td=""><td>IC IC IC <</td><td></td><td>Control (1997) Control (1997) Control</td><td>2000 0001 2000 0000 2000 0000 2000 000 2000 000 2000 00 2000 00 2000 2000 00 2000 00 2000 2000 00 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 200</td><td></td><td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td><td>2 mm 2 mm</td><td>2000 - Colores 2000 - Colores</td><td>2.5 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>27.0 1-1 1-1</td><td></td><td></td></ti<>	IC IC IC <		Control (1997) Control	2000 0001 2000 0000 2000 0000 2000 000 2000 000 2000 00 2000 00 2000 2000 00 2000 00 2000 2000 00 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 200		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 mm 2 mm	2000 - Colores 2000 - Colores	2.5 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6 2.6						27.0 1-1 1-1		
Party should have a solution of the solution o	Instantial Instantial Instantin Instantial <td< td=""><td>No. 2010 No. 2010 Status Mar. 2010</td><td>restance restance restance</td><td>Control Age Control Age Control Age Con</td><td>Control (Control (Contro) (Control (Contro) (Contro) (Contro) (Contro) (Contro) (Contro)</td><td>4 cm / 10 14 cm /</td><td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td><td>2000 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 20</td><td>2000 - 2010 2010 - 2010 2010 - 2010 2010 - 2010 2000 20</td><td>2.41 2.44 2.45 2.45 2.45 2.45 2.45 2.45 2.45</td><td>e en al freed</td><td></td><td>. E 0</td><td></td><td></td><td>576 1-16 1-16</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	No. 2010 No. 2010 Status Mar. 2010	restance	Control Age Control Age Control Age Con	Control (Control (Contro) (Control (Contro) (Contro) (Contro) (Contro) (Contro) (Contro)	4 cm / 10 14 cm /	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2000 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 20	2000 - 2010 2010 - 2010 2010 - 2010 2010 - 2010 2000 20	2.41 2.44 2.45 2.45 2.45 2.45 2.45 2.45 2.45	e en al freed		. E 0			576 1-16 1-16		
Reversion of the second s	Abs. Abs. J. Market Constants The last of the	Course		How Ar Control Anno 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 8 Anound 7 9 Control 100000 10 Control 10	4 AL 201 201 Ben 201 Ben 20	4 con 24 4 con 24 14	1 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 2000 200	Verona Verona	2	e e d'And					UP IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII		
Party and party	An Abold Market Constant In Constant In Constant In Constant In Constant In Constant In Constant In Constant Constant In Constant In Constant Constant <td< td=""><td>2 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10</td><td>restance restance restance</td><td>Convolution Convolution Convoluti</td><td>201 012 201 012 202 012 202 02 202 02 20 202 02 202 0 202 0 20</td><td>Koon, Ma Koon, Ma Kange Kang</td><td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td><td>2 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5</td><td>Total Control Con</td><td>19944 (1997) 244 244 244 244 244 244 244 244 244 24</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>UP Ann PAN Ann</td><td></td><td></td></td<>	2 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	restance	Convolution Convoluti	201 012 201 012 202 012 202 02 202 02 20 202 02 202 0 202 0 20	Koon, Ma Koon, Ma Kange Kang	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Total Control Con	19944 (1997) 244 244 244 244 244 244 244 244 244 24						UP Ann PAN Ann		
A low should be a set of the set	Abs Abs Abs Abs Construct He Abs Abs Abs	2 (102) (2 2 (10		Row 20 Carros Carros<	201 001 203 002 203 00 203 00 200	Koon, Ma Koon, Ma Kanada Kanada Canada	1 100 100 10 100 100 10 100 10 100 10	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Control C	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			, Fo			OP Las Juint		100 militari 100 militari 100 militari 100 militari 100 militari 100 militari
A Levis de Conjunt de La Conju	Instantial International Internatinal International International International Internation	2 () Total () ()	respective r	Rose Col Colored Col Col C	4.00 0/1 200,000 (200,000) 200,000 (200,000) 200,0000 (200,000) 200,0000 (200,000) 200,0000 (200,000) 200,0000 (200,000) 200,0000 (200,000) 200,0000 (200,000) 200,0000 (200,0	Kool, Market Kool, M	1 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 1	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Control of the second sec	24,4 4,4 4,4 4,4 4,4 4,4 4,4 4,4 4,4 4,4	r of hel		"Fo			cos Las pos ato		

Future Flood Risk Project Generate Future Floodplains

- Generate future 100-year floodplains using anticipated future streamflows
- Method varies by model
 - Redelineated Zone AE:
 - HEC-RAS model not available
 - Knowns: present water-surface elevations and flow values from Flood Insurance Study report
 - Utilize relationship between streamflow and water-surface elevation

$$future WSE = \left(\frac{\left(\frac{\log(500yr \, Q)}{\log(future \, Q)}\right)}{\log(500yr \, Q) - \log(100yr \, Q)}\right) * (500yr \, WSE - 100yr \, WSE) + 500yr \, WSE$$

where, future Q = 100yr Q * scalar + 100yr Q

TABLE I: SUMMARI OF DISCHARGES (CONTINUE	
DRAINAGE AREA PEAK DISCHARGES (FLOODING SOURCE AND LOCATION SO MULES 10-YEAR 50-YEAR 100-Y	(CFS) FAR 500-VEAR
BOODING SOURCE AND DOCATION OF MALES IN TEAM OF TEAM 100-1	LAR 500-1 BAR
CLAPBOARD OAK BROOK	
Mouth at Lake Lillinonah 2.4 330 690	920 1.725
1,900 Feet Upstream of Mouth 2.0 320 670	895 1.675
8,340 Feet Upstream of Mouth 0.8 275 355	395 505
Upstream Study Limit 0.4 160 210	235 295





Future Flood Risk Project

Future Floodplains Data Viewer





Future Flood Risk Project

Future Floodplains Data Viewer





Future Flood Risk Project Future Products

Anticipated Spring/Summer 2025 (with preliminary flood risk mapping products)

- Online web application to communicate expected difference in floodplain extent
- USGS Report discussing how the future floodplains were generated
- Data Release to support USGS Report and web application



Acknowledgements

Scott Olson, USGS New England Water Science Center Amanda Schoen, USGS New England Water Science Center Pamela Lombard, USGS New England Water Science Center Luke Sturtevant, USGS New England Water Science Center

Contact Information James LeNoir, USGS New England Water Science Center jlenoir@usgs.gov







Housatonic River at Falls Village, CT USGS gage during normal flows on March 30, 2017 (top image) and high flows following Hurricane Irene on August 29, 2011 (bottom image).

MassBays Ecohealth Tracking Tool:

A Regional Approach for Coastal Data Exploration

NEIWPCC NPS Conference April 11, 2024



MassBays Study Area: large, diverse, complex

- National Estuary Program since 1990
- Watershed area >7,000 sq. mi
- ~1650 sq. mi extending to Stellwagen Bank
- 1100 miles of shoreline (Salisbury to Provincetown)
- 50 communities, 1.7 million residents





- 1. Provide a gateway for **the public, scientists, and policy makers** to access data about coastal habitats and water quality in the MassBays region.
- 2. Establish a means for visualizing and comparing environmental conditions to ecological benchmarks for improvement.



Lobster existential crisis



3. National Estuary Programs are required by the Clean Water Act to provide regular **reporting on conditions and trends** in their study areas.





4. Increase regional use of Water Quality Exchange (WQX)

- One stop shopping for quality-assured data!
- Make data gaps apparent, to prompt expanded monitoring in MassBays region





- 5. Provide water quality / habitat data that is <u>available</u> and <u>comparable</u> for MassBays region
 - Compare apples to apples
 - Focus on data with good **region-wide availability**, not all possible parameters





Honorable Mention Apple vs. Orange Graphic

I keep the doctor away.

Your mom keeps the doctor away.



6. Provide data exploration format that is:



to use

to understand

to update



Keep it simple... just because you can doesn't mean you should



6. Provide data exploration format that is:



to use to understand

to update

- Users often leave web pages in **10–20 seconds**
- Pages with clear value to user can hold attention for much longer.
- To gain several minutes of user attention, you must clearly communicate value within 10 seconds.




Explore Coastal Habitats and Water Quality in the Massachusetts Bays Region

Start Exploring

The Ecohealth Tracking Tool is a gateway for the public, scientists, and policy makers to access information about coastal habitats, the water quality conditions that sustain healthy habitats, and the many benefits these habitats provide. You'll find data for the entire MassBays region, as well as your favorite beach, salt marsh, or estuary.

Dive in to learn more about efforts to maintain and restore healthy coastal habitats...and how you can help!



















Learn About...

L nH urbidity

alinity

O and Es

MassBays Habitat Goals

Summary

Using information about historical conditions, MassBays has developed goals for salt marshes, eelgrass meadows, and tidal flats for the 44 estuaries encompassed by Ipswich Bay, Massachusetts Bay, and Cape Cod Bay. These goals are stated in terms of both habitat condition ("healthy") and extent (acres or miles) with a target date of 2050. We encourage resource managers at the local, state, and federal level to use these goals for their own planning.

Background

Wellfle

21MABCH

Enteroco

-Jan

2014

All National Estuary Programs (NEPs) are required under the Federal Clean Water Act to prepare Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plans that describe long-term goals for improvement of coastal ecosystems, and how they will be achieved. To meet this mandate, MassBays chose to use an approach called the Biological Condition Gradient, and worked with a team of researchers to carry out the following tasks:

· Categorize MassBays' estuaries. MassBays' region is made up of three Bays, and encompasses 50 cities and towns from Salisbury to Provincetown. To facilitate planning, we identified 68 watersheds, or assessment units, including 44 embayments (find out more about this effort). Then, to simplify development of habitat goals while acknowledging local conditions, we grouped the 44 embayments into Stressor-Resource Categories (determined by the degree of human impacts and the habitats present) and Ecotypes (determined by physical characteristics).

Stressor-Resource Categories, with characteristics and examples Legend Category



Less rocky shore















Learn About...

Temp

DH

Turb

Water Quality Parameters

Total Nitrogen: Nitrogen is a nutrient important to all living things which is found naturally in saltwater and freshwater. Nitrogen is typically the most important nutrient determining the growth of algae and aquatic plants in coastal waters. When too much nitrogen enters the water, it can fuel excessive growth of algae which blocks sunlight needed for growth of submerged aquatic vegetation and reduces oxygen for fish and other organisms as it dies and decomposes. Studies indicate that nitrogen levels exceeding 0.35 mg/L are detrimental to eelgrass health.

Total Phosphorus: Like nitrogen, phosphorus is a nutrient important to all living things which is found naturally in saltwater and freshwater. Phosphorus is typically the most important nutrient determining the growth of algae and plants in freshwater, and water quality standards for this nutrient are typically based on freshwater environments. For healthy habitat conditions in freshwater streams, researchers have determined that total phosphorus levels should be below 30 ug/L.

Temperature: Water temperature can have an important impact on eelgrass habitat, fish, and other aquatic biota within coastal habitats. Climate change has resulted in long-term warming trends that have resulted in increased summer water temperatures in Massachusetts' bays. Studies indicate that summer water temperatures exceeding 77°F are detrimental to eelgrass health.

pH: pH is a measure of acidity based on the presence of hydrogen ions. A pH of 7.0 is neutral, while values below 7.0 indicate acidic conditions and values above 7.0 indicate basic conditions. Research [in Chesapeake Bay] shows that pH levels below 7.5 have negative impacts on shellfish growth and health, and pH levels below 7.0 will impact salt marsh health. The growth and wellbeing of most fish species is affected by long-term exposure to a pH less than 6.0 or over 9.5.

Turbidity: Turbidity is a measure of water clarity determined by how much the material suspended in the water column (including algae and suspended particles) decreases light penetration. Stormwater runoff (contributing sediments and nutrients that fuel algal productivity), wastewater discharge, dredging, boating, and natural disturbances such as storms, wave action, and bottom feeding animals, can increase turbidity. High turbidity

● E. coli Enterococcus alinity **Eelgrass Eelgrass Extent** All Assessment Areas 15k No goal established yet % of 2050 Eelgrass Goal 20 40 60 80 100+

Dissolved Oxygen

pН



Water Quality Data Analysis



Many data sources = many data formats=

- Units
- Naming
- Reporting Limits
- Depth Zones
- Etc.



WQ Data from Water Quality Data Portal (WQP)

NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx23_1 at CACO	41.8145	-69.9609 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920926419	Chlorophy Total	10.17	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx1_2 at CACO	41.675	-69.9432 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920920737	Chlorophy Total	4.3	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_SpF_10 at CACO	41.76044	-69.9829 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920937211	ChlorophyTotal	42.5	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx7_1 at CACO	41.73024	-69.9697 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920931266	ChlorophyTotal	12.3	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_LS_SP at CACO	41.83521	-69.9711 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920935663	Chlorophy Total	15.26	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx19_4 at CACO	41.7978	-69.9752 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920924449	ChlorophyTotal	13.47	ug/l	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx17_4 at CACO	41.78969	-69.9805 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920923279	Chlorophy Total	25.08	ug/l	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx11_6 at CACO	41.75815	-69.9523 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920921970	ChlorophyTotal	2.48	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_SpC_2 at CACO	41.79328	-69.9499 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920936477	Chlorophy Total	95.57	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx3_1 at CACO	41.70025	-69.9363 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920929250	ChlorophyTotal	6.37	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx18_1 at CACO	41.7995	-69.9769 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920923666	ChlorophyTotal	8.71	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx3_1 at CACO	41.69936	-69.9364 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920928892	ChlorophyTotal	3.1	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_SpA_2 at CACO	41.83421	-69.9719 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920935907	ChlorophyTotal	7.37	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_LS_NH at CACO	41.81919	-69.9582 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920932757	Chlorophy Total	10.44	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx27_11 at CACO	41.83176	-69.9678 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920927227	Chlorophy Total	9.63	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_LS_NH at CACO	41.8213	-69.9591 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920932203	Chlorophy Total	3.95	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx18_1 at CACO	41.7995	-69.9769 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920924218	Chlorophy Total	15.67	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_LS_PB at CACO	41.75226	-69.9578 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920934233	Chlorophy Total	3.53	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx16_4 at CACO	41.78829	-69.9854 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920923041	Chlorophy Total	40.34	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx11_6 at CACO	41.75716	-69.9511 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920921902	Chlorophy Total	2.5	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx28_2 at CACO	41.8334	-69.9653 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920927450	Chlorophy Total	1.67	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx3_1 at CACO	41.70041	-69.9356 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920929200	Chlorophy Total	4.2	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_SpG_12 at CACO	41.75539	-69.9702 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920937498	Chlorophy Total	6.3	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_LS_NH at CACO	41.82133	-69.9591 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920932023	Chlorophy Total	2.17	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx3_1 at CACO	41.70024	-69.9363 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920929292	Chlorophy Total	2.98	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_LS_PB at CACO	41.75229	-69.9578 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920933841	Chlorophy Total	4.6	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_LS_PB at CACO	41.75235	-69.9577 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920934365	Chlorophy Total	2.11	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx23_1 at CACO	41.81455	-69.9608 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920925812	Chlorophy Total	4.33	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_LS_NH at CACO	41.8213	-69.9591 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920932975	Chlorophy Total	7.95	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx10_4 at CACO	41.7522	-69.9581 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920921064	Chlorophy Total	16.81	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_LS_PB at CACO	41.75228	-69.9579 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920933232	ChlorophyTotal	5.89	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx3_1 at CACO	41.69987	-69.9363 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920929041	ChlorophyTotal	1.11	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx17_5 at CACO	41.79084	-69.9795 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920923304	ChlorophyTotal	13	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001 Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx28_2 at CACO	41.83334	-69.9656 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920927978	Chlorophy Total	6	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx2_4 at CACO	41.69289	-69.9433 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920924742	Chlorophy Total	1.63	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO_Hx22_5 at CACO	41.80309	-69.9734 NCBN_SO 11NPSWR NCBN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920925448	ChlorophyTotal	52	ug/I	Final	Actual
NCBN0001Estuarine NCBN	11NPSWR Monitoring Location CACO Hx11 6 at CACO	41 75753	-69 9507 NCRN_SO 11NPSWR NCRN SOF Once on s Water Bot STORET-920921239	Chlorophy Total	11.3	ιισ/I	Final	Actual

Parameter Units and Naming



ETT Parameter	WQP Characteristic Name	Exclude Units	Target Unit	s = Tracking To
Total Phosphorous	Phosphorus		ug/L	nacking re
Total Phosphorous	Total Phosphorus, mixed forms		ug/L	
Total Kjedldahl Nitrogen	Kjeldahl nitrogen (Organic N & NH3)		mg/L	
Total Kjedldahl Nitrogen	Kjeldahl nitrogen		mg/L	
Total Kjedldahl Nitrogen	Total Kjeldahl nitrogen		mg/L	
Nitrate + Nitrite	Inorganic nitrogen (nitrate and nitrite)		mg/L	TKN and Inorganic N not shown on ETTonly used
Nitrate + Nitrite	Nitrate + Nitrite		mg/L	to compute TN
Total Nitrogen	Nitrogen		mg/L	
Total Nitrogen	Nitrogen, mixed forms (NH3), (NH4), organic, (NO2) and (NO3)		mg/L	
Total Nitrogen	Total Nitrogen, mixed forms		mg/L	
Total Nitrogen	Total Nitrogen, mixed forms (NH3), (NH4), organic, (NO2) and (NO3)	mg/L	
Total Nitrogen	Nutrient-nitrogen		mg/L	
Total Nitrogen	Computed: [TKN] + [Nitrate + Nitrite]		mg/L	
Chlorophyll a	Chlorophyll a (probe)		ug/L	
Chlorophyll a	Chlorophyll a		ug/L	
Enterococcus	Enterococcus		#/100mL	Include MPN/100ml and ctu/100ml these are
E. coli	Escherichia coli		#/100mL	interchangeable
Temperature	Temperature, water		deg C	
pН	pH		std units	
Dissolved Oxygen	Dissolved oxygen (DO)	%	mg/L	
Salinity	Salinity		ppt	
Turbidity	Turbidity	NTRU, FNU, FTU, JTU	NTU	
Turbidity	Turbidity Field	NTRU, FNU, FTU, JTU	NTU	
NUTRIENTS UNIT CONVE	RSION (molar -> ppm)			
From uM to mg/L	To mg/L			
ТР	(uM x 30.97)/1000			
TN	(uM x 14.01)/1000			



Sample fractions

characteristic_name	result_sample_fraction_text	ı
Dissolved oxygen (DO)	None	38
Dissolved oxygen (DO)	Total	91
Dissolved oxygen (DO)	Unfiltered	333
Dissolved oxygen (DO)	NA	12418
Nitrogen	Dissolved	227
Nitrogen	Suspended	82
Nitrogen	Total	208
рН	None	338
рН	Total	353
рН	Unfiltered	330
рН	NA	9767
Phosphorus	Dissolved	610
Phosphorus	Total	1582
Temperature, water	None	407
Temperature, water	Total	91
Temperature, water	Unfiltered	22
Temperature, water	NA	17869

Units

characteristic_name	result_measure_measure_unit_code	n
Dissolved oxygen (DO)	%	564
Dissolved oxygen (DO)	mg/l	12450
Dissolved oxygen (DO)	ml/l	4
Dissolved oxygen (DO)	ppm	205
Nitrogen	mg/l	226
Nitrogen	umol	289
Nitrogen	NA	2
pH	None	10520
pН	std units	268
Phosphorus	mg/l	800
Phosphorus	mg/las P	1149
Phosphorus	ug/l	50
Phosphorus	umol	180
Phosphorus	NA	13
Temperature, water	deg C	17927
Temperature, water	deg F	661

Total P and N vs. Dissolved Fractions

Phosphorus

٠	organization_identifier	monitoring_location_identifier	activity_identifier 🏾 🛱	activity_start_date	activity_start_time_time	<pre>fresult_sample_fraction_text</pre>	result_measure_value
1	USGS-MA	USGS-01100823	nwisma.01.02000977	2020-06-08	18:35:00		0.037
2	USGS-MA	USGS-01100823	nwisma.01.02000977	2020-06-08	18:35:00	Dissolved	0.011
3	USGS-MA	USGS-01100823	nwisma.01.02000978	2020-06-08	18:10:00	Total	0.032
4	USGS-MA	USGS-01100823	nwisma.01.02000978	2020-06-08	18:10:00	Dissolved	0.015
5	USGS-MA	USGS-01100823	nwisma.01.02001296	2020-06-30	12:35:00		0.057
6	USGS-MA	USGS-01100823	nwisma.01.02001296	2020-06-30	12:35:00	Dissolved	0.011
7	USGS-MA	USGS-01100823	nwisma.01.02001297	2020-06-30	12:20:00	Total	0.049
8	USGS-MA	USGS-01100823	nwisma.01.02001297	2020-06-30	12:20:00	Dissolved	0.016
9	USGS-MA	USGS-01100823	nwisma.01.02001501	2020-07-28	11:25:00	Total	0.049
10	USGS-MA	USGS-01100823	nwisma.01.02001501	2020-07-28	11:25:00	Dissolved	0.023
11	USGS-MA	USGS-01100823	nwisma.01.02001502	2020-07-28	11:15:00	Total	0.054
12	USGS-MA	USGS-01100823	nwisma.01.02001502	2020-07-28	11:15:00	Dissolved	0.022
13	USGS-MA	USGS-01100823	nwisma.01.02002125	2020-09-01	13:25:00	Total	0.043
14	USGS-MA	USGS-01100823	nwisma.01.02002125	2020-09-01	13:25:00	Dissolved	0.027
15	USGS-MA	USG5-01100823	nwisma.01.02002126	2020-09-01	13:15:00		0.039
16	USGS-MA	USGS-01100823	nwisma.01.02002126	2020-09-01	13:15:00	Dissolved	0.029

Present TP and TN *...exclude dissolved fractions*

Nitrogen

	organization_identifier	monitoring_location_identifier	* activity_identifier *	activity_start_date ==	activity_start_time_time	* result_sample_fraction_text	* result_measure_value *
47	11NPSWRD_WQX	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19_20090508_W_0.2_F		08:00:00	Total	0.856
48	11NPSWRD_WQX	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19_20090508_W_0.2_E			Dissolved	0.92
49	11NPSWRD_WQX	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19_20090820_W_0.2_E			Total	1.41
50	11NPSWRD_WQX	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19_20090820_W_0.2_E				1.05
51	11NPSWRD_WQX	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19_20100524_W_0.2_E				1.03
51	11NPSWRD_WQX	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19_20100524_W_0.2_E				0.888
53	11NP5WRD_WQX	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19_20110523_W_0.2_E				0.96
- 54	11NPSWRD_WQX	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19_20110523_W_0.2_E				1.04
55	11NPSWRD_WQX	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19_20110824_W_0.2_E				0.931
56	11NPSWRD_WQX	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_19_20110824_W_0.2_E	2011-08-24			0.934
57	11NPSWRD_WQX	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_20	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_20_20080519_W_0.2_E				0.542
58	11NPSWRD_WQX	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_20	11NPSWRD_WQX-NETN_SAIR_20_20080519_W_0.2_E				0.946



Samples Below or Above Quantification Limit



Options

- Exclude (skews and limits data set)
- 0 (skews low, optimistic)
- at detection limit (skews high, conservative)
- at ½ detection limit

Other options require more complex statistical analysis (e.g., statistical distribution of data > limit)

Based on MassDEP CALM:

 Data < or > quantification limit will be shown <u>at the limit (e.g. < 10 ug/L shown as 10 ug/L)</u>

Result Detection Condition Text

				n	percent	valid_percent
	Det	tected Not Quan	tified	11	8.839957e-05	6.178387e-04
		Not De	tected	17724	1.424358e-01	9.955066e-01
		Not Re	ported	1	8.036324e-06	5.616715e-05
Present	Above	Quantification	Limit	2	1.607265e-05	1.123343e-04
Present	Below	Quantification	Limit	66	5.303974e-04	3.707032e-03
			<na></na>	106631	8.569213e-01	NA

Detection Quantitation Limit

٢	wq_param 🏾 🗘	result_measure_value	result_detection_condition_text	detection_quantitation_limit_measure_measure_value	detection_quantitat
1		N/4	Not Detected	0.004	mg/l as P
2		NA	Not Detected	0.008	mg/l as P
3		NA	Not Detected	0.050	mg/l as P
4		NA	Not Detected	0.008	mg/Las P
5	TP	NA	Not Detected	0.050	mg/l as P
6	DO	NA	Present Below Quantification Limit	0.200	mg/l
7	DO	NA	Present Below Quantification Limit	0.200	mg/l
8	DO	NA	Present Below Quantification Limit	0.200	mg/l
9	DO	NA	Present Below Quantification Limit	0.200	mg/l
10	DO	NA	Present Below Quantification Limit	0.200	mg/l

Sample Depth



- Only 3% at Surface
- Nearly 50% are unknown ("blank")
- Nearly 50% of all samples are "Midwater"
 - Vast majority of "midwater" samples are from EPA BEACH and MA DPH bacteria sampling, where protocol is to sample at 3 ft ...keep these!

> ett_wq_data	a\$activ	vity_relative_	_depth_name %>%
	n	percent	valid_percent
Bottom	1273	0.0101309140	0.0196350624
Midwater	59494	0.4734710119	0.9176499622
Near Bottom	16	0.0001273328	0.0002467879
Surface	4050	0.0322311090	0.0624681875
<na></na>	60822	0.4840396323	NA

Show data in ETT if...

- ActivityRelativeDepthName = blank (OR) "Surface" AND
- "ActivityDepthHeightMeasure/MeasureValue" <= 0.1 m (OR) is blank
- Midwater sample = EPA BEACH or MA DPH bacteria sample

Do not show data if...

- Bottom or Near Bottom sample
- Midwater sample depth = > 3 feet



Replicates



Same station, date, no depth info, different values

^	monitoring_location_identifier 🗧 🗘	activity_start_date 🗘	characteristic_name 🗘	activity_depth_height_measure_measure_value \uparrow	result_depth_height_measure_measure_value 🗧 🕈	result_measure_value 🗘	n ‡
1	11NPSWRD_WQX-CACO_DYER	1997-04-29	Phosphorus	0.50	NA	0.2000	2
2	11NPSWRD_WQX-CACO_DYER	1997-04-29	Phosphorus	0.50	NA	0.2700	2
3	11NPSWRD_WQX-CACO_DYER	1997-08-27	Phosphorus	0.50	NA	0.4500	3
4	11NPSWRD_WQX-CACO_DYER	1997-08-27	Phosphorus	0.50	NA	0.3600	3
5	11NPSWRD_WQX-CACO_DYER	1997-08-27	Phosphorus	0.50	NA	0.2200	3

Histograms of # results per site/date/param



When no other excluding data is present (e.g., depth), ETT **includes all data** as **points** on time series (not line graph)

50

Result status

characteristic_name	result_status_identifier	n
Dissolved oxygen (DO)	Final	13223
Nitrogen	Accepted	89
Nitrogen	Final	405
Nitrogen	Preliminary	23
pН	Accepted	97
pН	Final	10520
pН	Historical	116
рН	Preliminary	55
Phosphorus	Accepted	917
Phosphorus	Final	999
Phosphorus	Historical	161
Phosphorus	Preliminary	115
Temperature, water	Accepted	189
Temperature, water	Final	17476
Temperature, water	Historical	868
Temperature, water	Preliminary	55

Result value type

characteristic_name	result_value_type_name	n
Dissolved oxygen (DO)	Actual	12659
Dissolved oxygen (DO)	Calculated	564
Nitrogen	Actual	507
Nitrogen	Calculated	10
pН	Actual	10788
Phosphorus	Actual	2166
Phosphorus	Calculated	10
Phosphorus	Estimated	16
Temperature, water	Actual	18587
Temperature, water	Estimated	1







- How far back in time?
- Vertical profiles/varying depths?
- Multiple values per station/date/parameter?
- Remove outliers (TP=999)?
- Exclude stations with < N samples? (median ~= 10 samples/station)
- Unit conversion necessary for TN, TP, Temperature
- Exclude "preliminary" or "estimated" results?
- Exclude any ambiguous sample fractions?

ETT Phase 2...

Why is it important to monitor nitrogen?

- → Nitrogen is a key indicator of eel grass health
- → Eel grass supports multiple ecosystem services (e.g., recreational fishing, erosion control, etc.).



Habitat Potential Indices (HPIs)

Reflect the ability to <u>maintain or achieve</u> target extents of healthy habitat supporting all associated ecosystem services



... in progress

Explore Coastal Habitats and Water Quality in Southeast New England

The **Ecohealth Tracking Tool** is a gateway for exploring coastal habitats and water quality for the EPA Southeast New England Program (SNEP) region... or take a closer look data for your favorite beach, salt marsh, or estuary.

This took was developed based on the MassBays Ecohealth Tracking Tool which displays data for the Massachusetts Bay region.





...in progress







