

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

 I.1 THE MASSACHUSETTS ESTUARIES PROJECT APPROACH 5

 I.2 SITE DESCRIPTION 8

 I.3 NUTRIENT LOADING 10

 I.4 WATER QUALITY MODELING 11

 I.5 REPORT DESCRIPTION 12

II. PREVIOUS STUDIES RELATED TO NITROGEN MANAGEMENT 14

III. DELINEATION OF WATERSHEDS 19

 III.1 BACKGROUND 19

 III.2 MODEL DESCRIPTION 19

 III.3 CENTERVILLE RIVER/EAST BAY CONTRIBUTORY AREAS 21

**IV. WATERSHED NITROGEN LOADING TO EMBAYMENT: LAND USE, STREAM
 INPUTS, AND SEDIMENT NITROGEN RECYCLING 25**

 IV.1 WATERSHED LAND USE BASED NITROGEN LOADING ANALYSIS 25

 IV.1.1 Land Use and Water Use Database Preparation 27

 IV.1.2 Nitrogen Loading Input Factors 30

 IV.1.3 Calculating Nitrogen Loads 36

 IV.2 ATTENUATION OF NITROGEN IN SURFACE WATER TRANSPORT 44

 IV.2.1 Background and Purpose 44

 IV.2.2 Surface water Discharge and Attenuation of Watershed Nitrogen: Stream
 Discharge from Skunknett River to Estuarine Reach of Bumps River 47

 IV.2.3 Surface water Discharge and Attenuation of Watershed Nitrogen: Stream
 Discharge from Bumps River to Scudder Bay 51

 IV.2.4 Surface water Discharge and Attenuation of Watershed Nitrogen: Stream
 Discharge from Long Pond to Centerville River 54

 IV.2.5 Surface water Discharge and Attenuation of Watershed Nitrogen: Stream
 Discharge from Lake Elizabeth to Centerville River 57

 IV.3 BENTHIC REGENERATION OF NITROGEN IN BOTTOM SEDIMENTS 61

 IV.3.1 Sediment-Watercolumn Exchange of Nitrogen 61

 IV.3.2 Method for determining sediment-watercolumn nitrogen exchange 62

 IV.3.3 Rates of Summer Nitrogen Regeneration from Sediments 64

V. HYDRODYNAMIC MODELING 68

 V.1 INTRODUCTION 68

 V.2 GEOMORPHIC AND ANTHROPOGENIC EFFECTS TO THE ESTUARINE
 SYSTEM 70

 V.3 FIELD DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS 73

 V.3.1 Data Acquisition 73

 V.3.1.1 Water Elevation 73

 V.3.1.2 Bathymetry 76

 V.3.1.3 Current Measurements 77

 V.3.2 ADCP Data Processing Techniques 80

 V.3.3 Discussion of Results 81

 V.3.3.1 Tidal Harmonic Analysis 81

 V.3.3.2 Current Measurements 85

V.4 HYDRODYNAMIC MODELING	90
V.4.1 Model Theory	90
V.4.2 Model Setup	90
V.4.2.1 Grid Generation	91
V.4.2.2 Boundary Condition Specification	91
V.4.2.3 Calibration.....	92
V.4.2.4 Model Verification	98
V.4.2.5 Model Circulation Characteristics	101
V.4 FLUSHING CHARACTERISTICS	102
VI. WATER QUALITY MODELING	106
VI.1 DATA SOURCES FOR THE MODEL	106
VI.1.1 Hydrodynamics and Tidal Flushing in the Embayment	106
VI.1.2 Nitrogen Loading to the Embayment.....	106
VI.1.3 Measured Nitrogen Concentrations in the Embayment.....	106
VI.2 MODEL DESCRIPTION AND APPLICATION	107
VI.2.1 Model Formulation.....	108
VI.2.2 Water Quality Model Setup	109
VI.2.3 Boundary Condition Specification	109
VI.2.4 Model Calibration	110
VI.2.5 Model Salinity Verification	113
VI.2.6 Build-Out and No Anthropogenic Load Scenarios.....	114
VI.2.6.1 Build-Out.....	116
VI.2.6.2 No Anthropogenic Load	117
VII. ASSESSMENT OF EMBAYMENT NUTRIENT RELATED ECOLOGICAL HEALTH	121
VII.1 OVERVIEW OF BIOLOGICAL HEALTH INDICATORS.....	121
VII.2 BOTTOM WATER DISSOLVED OXYGEN.....	122
VII.3 EELGRASS DISTRIBUTION - TEMPORAL ANALYSIS.....	131
VII.4 BENTHIC INFAUNA ANALYSIS	135
VIII. CRITICAL NUTRIENT THRESHOLD DETERMINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF WATER QUALITY TARGETS	140
VIII.1. ASSESSMENT OF NITROGEN RELATED HABITAT QUALITY	140
VIII.2. THRESHOLD NITROGEN CONCENTRATIONS	143
VIII.3. DEVELOPMENT OF TARGET NITROGEN LOADS	146
IX. ALTERNATIVES TO IMPROVE WATER QUALITY.....	151
IX.1 PRESENT LOADING WITH SEWERING PORTIONS OF CENTERVILLE RIVER EAST WATERSHED AND INCREASING THE NATURAL NITROGEN ATTENUATION ALONG SKUNKNET RIVER	151
X. REFERENCES	154

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure I-1. Study region for the Massachusetts Estuaries Project analysis of the Centerville River Embayment System. Tidal waters enter the Bay through one inlet from Nantucket Sound. Freshwaters enter from the watershed primarily through 4 surface water discharges (Skunksnett River, Bumps River, a stream from Long Pond and a stream from Lake Elizabeth) and direct groundwater discharge.2

Figure I-2. Topographic Map of the Centerville River System depicting major geographic features.....3

Figure I-3. Massachusetts Estuaries Project Critical Nutrient Threshold Analytical Approach9

Figure II-1. Town of Barnstable Water Quality Monitoring Program. Estuarine water quality monitoring stations sampled by the Town and volunteers. Stream water quality stations sampled weekly by the MEP. Halls Creek along the eastern shore of Centerville Harbor will be assessed in a future MEP Technical Report on the Lewis Bay System.18

Figure III-1. Watershed and sub-watershed delineations for the Centerville River/East Bay estuary system. Approximate ten year time-of-travel delineations were produced for quality assurance purposes and are designated with a “10” in the watershed names (above). Sub-watersheds to embayments were selected based upon the functional estuarine sub-units in the water quality model (see section VI).22

Figure III-2. Comparison of 1998 Cape Cod Commission and current Centerville River/East Bay watershed and subwatershed delineations.....23

Figure IV-1. Land-use in the Centerville River/East Bay watershed. The watershed is completely contained within the Town of Barnstable. Land use classifications are based on assessors’ records provided by the town.28

Figure IV-2. Distribution of land-uses within the major subwatersheds and whole watershed to Centerville River/East Bay. Only percentages greater than or equal to 4% are shown.....29

Figure IV-3. Parcels, Parcelized Watersheds, and Developable Parcels in the Centerville River/East Bay watersheds.37

Figure IV-4 (a-c). Land use-specific unattenuated nitrogen load (by percent) to the (a) overall Centerville River/East Bay System watershed, (b) Centerville River East subwatershed, and (c) Scudder Bay/Bumps River subwatershed. “Overall Load” is the total nitrogen input within the watershed, while the “Local Control Load” represents only those nitrogen sources that could potentially be under local regulatory control.....40

Figure IV-4 (d-e). Land use-specific unattenuated nitrogen load (by percent) to the (d) Centerville River West subwatershed, and (e) East Bay subwatershed. “Overall Load” is the total nitrogen input within the watershed, while the “Local Control Load” represents only those nitrogen sources that could potentially be under local regulatory control.41

Figure IV-5. Location of Stream gage (red symbols) in the Centerville River/Harbor embayment system.46

Figure IV-6. Skunknett River discharge (solid blue line), nitrate+nitrite (yellow triangle) and total nitrogen (blue box) concentrations for determination of annual volumetric discharge and nitrogen load from the upper watershed to Scudder Bay (Table IV-7).....50

Figure IV-7. Bumps River discharge (solid blue line), nitrate+nitrite (yellow triangle) and total nitrogen (blue box) concentrations for determination of annual volumetric discharge and nitrogen load from the upper watershed to Scudder Bay (Table IV-7).53

Figure IV-8. Stream discharge from Long Pond(solid pink line), nitrate+nitrite (yellow triangle) and total nitrogen (blue box) concentrations for determination of annual volumetric discharge and nitrogen load from the upper watershed to Centerville River (Table IV-7).56

Figure IV-9. Stream discharge from Lake Elizabeth (solid blue line), nitrate+nitrite (yellow triangle) and total nitrogen (blue box) concentrations for determination of annual volumetric discharge and nitrogen load from the upper watershed to Centerville River (Table IV-7).59

Figure IV-10. Centerville River embayment system sediment sampling sites (red symbols) for determination of nitrogen regeneration rates. Numbers are for reference to station identifications listed above.....63

Figure IV-11. Conceptual diagram showing the seasonal variation in sediment N flux, with maximum positive flux (sediment output) occurring in the summer months, and maximum negative flux (sediment up-take) during the winter months.....65

Figure V-1. Map of the Centerville River estuary (from Massachusetts Office of Geographic and Environmental Information).....69

Figure V-2. Aerial photograph of the Centerville River.....71

Figure V-3. Historical maps of the Centerville River study area from (a) 1893 and (b) 1939.72

Figure V-4. Photographs of Dowses Beach looking to the east towards the jetty in (a) 1971 and (b) 2005.74

Figure V-5. Tide gage and ADCP transect locations in Centerville River C1 to C5 are tide gage locations. Yellow lines 1 and 2 are ADCP transect locations.75

Figure V-6. Tidal elevation observations for Nantucket Sound (C1 of Figure V-5), Town Landing (location C4), Craigville Beach Bridge (location C5), Scudder Bay (location C3), and East Bay (location C2).....76

Figure V-7. Bathymetry points collected within Centerville River. Color indicates water depth relative to the NAVD88 vertical datum.....77

Figure V-8. Bathymetric map of Centerville River. Color indicates water depth relative to the NAVD88 vertical datum.78

Figure V-9. Example of an observed astronomical tide as the sum of its primary constituents.83

Figure V-10. Water elevation variations for a 2-day period in the Centerville River estuary. Notice the reduced amplitude as well as the delay in times of high- and low- tide relative to offshore (Nantucket Sound) due to frictional damping through the estuary.....85

Figure V-11. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line A1 across the Centerville River inlet measured at 8:55 on October 24, 2003 during the flood tide. Positive along-channel currents (top panel) indicate the flow is moving into the estuary, while positive cross-channel velocities (middle panel) are oriented 90° clockwise of positive along-channel.....86

Figure V-12. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line A2 across Centerville River measured at 9:32 on October 24, 2003 during the flood tide. Positive along-channel currents (top panel) indicate the flow is moving into the estuary, while

positive cross-channel velocities (middle panel) are oriented 90° clockwise of positive along-channel.87

Figure V-13. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line A1 across Centerville River inlet measured at 14:27 on October 24, 2003 during the ebb tide. Positive along-channel currents (top panel) indicate the flow is moving into the estuary, while positive cross-channel velocities (middle panel) are oriented 90° clockwise of positive along-channel.88

Figure V-14. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line A2 across Centerville River measured at 15:33 on October 24, 2003 during the ebb tide. Positive along-channel currents (top panel) indicate the flow is moving into the estuary, while positive cross-channel velocities (middle panel) are oriented 90° clockwise of positive along-channel.89

Figure V-15. Plot of hydrodynamic model finite element mesh for the Centerville River system.92

Figure V-16. Hydrodynamic model grid material properties. Color patterns designate the different model material types used to vary model calibration parameters and compute flushing rates.94

Figure V-17. Comparison of model output and measured tides for the TDR location in East Bay. The bottom plot is a 72-hour sub-section of the total modeled time period, shown in the top plot.96

Figure V-18. Comparison of model output and measured tides for the TDR location in Scudder Bay. The bottom plot is a 72-hour sub-section of the total modeled time period, shown in the top plot.97

Figure V-19. Comparison of model output and measured tides for the TDR location at the Town Landing in Centerville River. The bottom plot is a 72-hour sub-section of the total modeled time period, shown in the top plot.97

Figure V-20. Comparison of model output and measured tides for the TDR location at the Craigville Beach Bridge in Centerville River. The bottom plot is a 72-hour sub-section of the total modeled time period, shown in the top plot.98

Figure V-21. Comparison of computed flow rates to ADCP Transect 1 across the entrance of East Bay. Model period shown corresponds to transition from high to low tide. Positive flow indicated flooding tide, while negative flow indicates ebbing tide.100

Figure V-22. Comparison of computed flow rates to the ADCP transect at Transect 2. Model period shown corresponds to transition from high to low tide. Positive flow indicated flooding tide, while negative flow indicates ebbing tide.100

Figure V-23. Example of hydrodynamic model output for a single time step where maximum flood velocities occur for this tide cycle. Color contours indicate velocity magnitude, and vectors indicate the direction of flow.102

Figure VI-1. Estuarine water quality monitoring station locations in the Centerville River System. Station labels correspond to those provided in Table VI-1.108

Figure VI-2. Map of Centerville River water quality model longitudinal dispersion coefficients. Color patterns designate the different areas used to vary model dispersion coefficient values.112

Figure VI-3. Comparison of measured total nitrogen concentrations and calibrated model output at stations in Centerville River System. For the left plot, station labels correspond with those provided in Table VI-1. Model output is presented as a range of values from minimum to maximum values

computed during the simulation period (triangle markers), along with the average computed concentration for the same period (square markers). Measured data are presented as the total yearly mean at each station (circle markers), together with ranges that indicate \pm one standard deviation of the entire dataset. For the plots to the right, model calibration target values are plotted against measured concentrations, together with the unity line. Computed correlation (R^2) and error (rms) for each model are also presented..... 112

Figure VI-4. Contour plots of average total nitrogen concentrations from results of the present conditions loading scenario, for Centerville River System. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Centerville River System (BC-T) is shown..... 113

Figure VI-5. Comparison of measured and calibrated model output at stations in Centerville River System. For the left plots, stations labels correspond with those provided in Table VI-1. Model output is presented as a range of values from minimum to maximum values computed during the simulation period (triangle markers), along with the average computed salinity for the same period (square markers). Measured data are presented as the total yearly mean at each station (circle markers), together with ranges that indicate \pm one standard deviation of the entire dataset. For the plots to the right, model calibration target values are plotted against measured concentrations, together with the unity line. Computed correlation (R^2) and error (rms) for each model are also presented. 114

Figure VI-6. Contour plots of modeled salinity (ppt) in Centerville River System..... 115

Figure VI-7. Contour plots of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Centerville River System, for projected build-out loading conditions, and bathymetry. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Centerville River System (BC-T) is shown. 118

Figure VI-8. Contour plots of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Centerville River System, for no anthropogenic loading conditions, and bathymetry. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Centerville River System (BC-T) is shown. 120

Figure VII-1. Average watercolumn respiration rates (micro-Molar/day) from water collected throughout the Popponesset Bay System (Schlezinger and Howes, unpublished data). Rates vary \sim 7 fold from winter to summer as a result of variations in temperature and organic matter availability..... 123

Figure VII-2. Aerial Photograph of the Centerville River embayment system in the Town of Barnstable showing locations of Dissolved Oxygen mooring deployments conducted in the summer of 2003..... 124

Figure VII-3. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen at the Centerville Town Landing station, summer 2003. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 127

Figure VII-4. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen in the Scudder Bay station, summer 2003. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 127

Figure VII-5. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen in the East Bay station, summer 2003. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 128

Figure VII-6. Bottom water record of Chlorophyll-a in the Centerville Town Landing station, summer 2003. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 130

Figure VII-7. Bottom water record of Chlorophyll-a in the Scudder Bay station, summer 2003. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 130

Figure VII-8. Bottom water record of Chlorophyll-a at the East Bay station, summer 2003. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 131

Figure VII-9. Eelgrass bed distribution within the Centerville Harbor System. The 1951 coverage is depicted by the green thatched outline inside of which circumscribes the eelgrass beds. The green (1995) and yellow (2001) areas were mapped by DEP. All data was provided by the DEP Eelgrass Mapping Program. 133

Figure VII-10. Eelgrass bed distribution within the Centerville Harbor System in addition to field verification points. The 1995 and 2001 coverage is depicted by the green and yellow thatched outlines inside of which circumscribes the eelgrass beds. The green (1995) and yellow (2001) areas were mapped by DEP. All data was provided by the DEP Eelgrass Mapping Program. 134

Figure VII-11. Aerial photograph of the Centerville River embayment system showing location of benthic infaunal sampling stations (green symbol). 138

Figure VIII-1. Contour plot of modeled average total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Centerville River estuary system, for threshold conditions (0.37 mg/L at water quality monitoring station BC-T, and 0.4-0.5 at water quality monitoring stations BC-3 and BC-7). The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Centerville River (BC-T) is shown. 147

Figure IX-1. Contour plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Phinney’s Harbor system, for present loading conditions with a 75-percent of the septic load removed from the Centerville River East watersheds and 20% increase to natural Nitrogen attenuation along Skunknet River. 153

LIST OF TABLES

Table III-1. Daily groundwater discharge from each of the sub-watersheds to the Centerville River/East Bay Estuary, as determined from the USGS groundwater model.....24

Table IV-1. Percentage of unattenuated nitrogen loads in less than 10-year time of travel subwatersheds to Centerville River/East Bay.....26

Table IV-2. Average Water Use in Centerville River/East Bay Watershed.33

Table IV-3. Primary Nitrogen Loading Factors used in the Centerville River/East Bay MEP analyses. General factors are from MEP modeling evaluation (Howes & Ramsey 2001). Site-specific factors are derived from Barnstable data. *Data from MEP lawn study in Falmouth, Mashpee & Barnstable 2001.36

Table IV-4. Centerville River/East Bay Nitrogen Loads. Attenuation of Centerville River/East Bay system nitrogen loads occurs as nitrogen moves through upgradient ponds and streams during transport to the estuary. All values are kg N yr⁻¹.....38

Table IV-5. Nitrogen attenuation by Freshwater Ponds in the Centerville River/East Bay watershed based upon 2001 through 2005 Cape Cod Pond and Lakes Stewardship (PALS) program sampling. These data were collected to provide a site-specific check on nitrogen attenuation by these systems. The MEP Linked N Model for Centerville River/East Bay uses a standard value of 50% for the pond systems.43

Table IV-6. Comparison of water flow and nitrogen discharges from Rivers and Streams (freshwater) discharging to estuarine reach of Centerville River. The “Stream” data is from the MEP stream gauging effort. Watershed data is based upon the MEP watershed modeling effort by USGS.49

Table IV-7. Summary of annual volumetric discharge and nitrogen load from the Rivers and Streams (freshwater) discharging to the Centerville River based upon the data presented in Figures IV-6 through IV-9 and Table IV-6.60

Table IV-8. Rates of net nitrogen return from sediments to the overlying waters of the Centerville River Estuarine System. These values are combined with the basin areas to determine total nitrogen mass in the water quality model (see Chapter VI). Measurements represent July -August rates.67

Table V-1. Tide datums computed from 29-day records collected in Centerville River in April/May 2004. Datum elevations are given relative to NAVD 88.....82

Table V-2. Tidal Constituents, Centerville River, April-May 2004.83

Table V-3. M₂ Tidal Attenuation, Centerville River, April-May 2004 (Delay in minutes relative to Offshore).83

Table V-4. Percentages of Tidal versus Non-Tidal Energy, Centerville River, April to May 2004.....84

Table V-5. Manning’s Roughness coefficients used in model simulations. These delineations correspond to the material type areas shown in Figure V-16.....94

Table V-6. Tidal constituents for measured water level data and calibrated model output for Centerville River.99

Table V-7. Least square error results on the flow analysis for Centerville River..... 101

Table V-8. Embayment mean volumes and average tidal prism during simulation period. 104

Table V-9.	Computed System and Local residence times for embayments in the Centerville River system.....	104
Table VI-1.	Pond-Watcher measured data, and modeled Nitrogen concentrations for the Centerville River System used in the model calibration plots of Figure VI-2. All concentrations are given in mg/L N. "Data mean" values are calculated as the average of the separate yearly means.	107
Table VI-2.	Sub-embayment loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Centerville River System, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. These loads represent present loading conditions	110
Table VI-3.	Values of longitudinal dispersion coefficient, E, used in calibrated RMA4 model runs of salinity and nitrogen concentration for Centerville River System.	111
Table VI-4.	Comparison of sub-embayment watershed loads used for modeling of present, build-out, and no-anthropogenic ("no-load") loading scenarios of the Centerville River System. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms.	115
Table VI-5.	Build-out sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Centerville River System, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux.	116
Table VI-6.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the build-out scenario, with percent change, for the Centerville River System. Sentinel threshold stations are in bold print.	117
Table VI-7.	"No anthropogenic loading" ("no load") sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of Centerville River System, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux.....	118
Table VI-8.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the no anthropogenic ("no load") scenario, with percent change, for the Centerville River System. Loads are based on atmospheric deposition and a scaled N benthic flux (scaled from present conditions). Sentinel threshold stations are in bold print.	119
Table VII-1a.	Number of days during deployment of in situ sensors that bottomwater oxygen was below various benchmark levels.....	125
Table VII-1b.	Frequency distribution from Water Quality Monitoring grab sampling of bottom water oxygen. Number represent the number of field dates that oxygen was observed within the noted range (<2 mg L ⁻¹ , 2-3 mg L ⁻¹ , etc.).....	125
Table VII-2.	Duration (number of days during deployment period) that chlorophyll a levels exceed various benchmark levels within the embayment system. "Mean" represents the average duration of each event over the benchmark level and "S.D." its standard deviation. Data collected by the Coastal Systems Program, SMAST. The mean in the final column is the average level over the deployment.	126
Table VII-3.	Changes in eelgrass coverage in the Centerville River portion of the Centerville Harbor system within the Town of Barnstable over the past half century (C. Costello).....	135
Table VII-4.	Benthic infaunal community data for the Centerville River Estuarine System. Estimates of the number of species adjusted to the number of individuals and community diversity (H') and Evenness (E) to allow comparison between locations (sample surface area, 0.0625 m ²). Station I.D.'s with a "D" represent a second grab sample from the same general location.	139

Table VIII-1.	Summary of Nutrient Related Habitat Health within the Centerville River Estuary on Nantucket Sound within the Town of Barnstable, MA., based upon assessment data presented in Chapter VII. The upper estuarine reach of the Centerville River is presently a tidal salt marsh. The Centerville River mid reach (from the bridge at Craigville Beach to the mouth Bumps River) and lower reach (Bumps River mouth to East Bay) and East Bay are sub-embayments, while the Bumps River and Scudder Bay support significant salt marsh areas.....	144
Table VIII-2.	Comparison of sub-embayment watershed septic loads (attenuated) used for modeling of present and threshold loading scenarios of the Centerville River estuary system. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface), benthic flux, runoff, or fertilizer loading terms.	148
Table VIII-3.	Comparison of sub-embayment total attenuated watershed loads (including septic, runoff, and fertilizer) used for modeling of present and threshold loading scenarios of the Centerville River estuary system. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms.....	148
Table VIII-4.	Threshold sub-embayment loads and attenuated surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Centerville River estuary system, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux.....	149
Table VIII-5.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the modeled threshold scenario, with percent change, for the Centerville River estuary system. Sentinel threshold stations are in bold print.	150
Table IX-1.	Comparison of sub-embayment watershed septic loads (attenuated) used for modeling present loading conditions with a 75-percent of the septic load removed from the Centerville River East watersheds and 20% increase to natural Nitrogen attenuation along Skunknet River. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface), benthic flux, runoff, or fertilizer loading terms.	151
Table IX-2.	Comparison of sub-embayment total attenuated watershed loads (including septic, runoff, and fertilizer) used for modeling of present conditions in Centerville River with present loading conditions with a 75-percent of the septic load removed from the Centerville River East watersheds and 20% increase to natural Nitrogen attenuation along Skunknet River. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms.	152
Table IX -3.	Sub-embayment loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Centerville River system for present loading scenario with present loading conditions with a 75-percent of the septic load removed from the Centerville River East watersheds and 20% increase to natural Nitrogen attenuation along Skunknet River, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux.	152
Table IX-4.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading scenarios (with and without the reduction of septic loads Centerville River East watershed and 20% increase to natural Nitrogen attenuation along Skunknet River), with percent change, for the Centerville River system. The threshold station is shown in bold print.....	153