

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

 I.1 THE MASSACHUSETTS ESTUARIES PROJECT APPROACH 5

 I.2 SITE DESCRIPTION 8

 I.3 NUTRIENT LOADING 11

 I.4 WATER QUALITY MODELING 12

 I.5 REPORT DESCRIPTION 13

II. PREVIOUS STUDIES RELATED TO NITROGEN MANAGEMENT 14

III. DELINEATION OF WATERSHEDS 19

 III.1 BACKGROUND 19

 III.2 EDGARTOWN GREAT POND CONTRIBUTORY AREAS 19

IV. WATERSHED NITROGEN LOADING TO EMBAYMENT: LAND USE, STREAM INPUTS, AND SEDIMENT NITROGEN RECYCLING 23

 IV.1 WATERSHED LAND USE BASED NITROGEN LOADING ANALYSIS 23

 IV.1.1 Land Use and Water Use Database Preparation 24

 IV.1.2 Nitrogen Loading Input Factors 26

 IV.1.3 Calculating Nitrogen Loads 33

 IV.2 ATTENUATION OF NITROGEN IN SURFACE WATER TRANSPORT 35

 IV.2.1 Background and Purpose 35

 IV.3 BENTHIC REGENERATION OF NITROGEN IN BOTTOM SEDIMENTS 35

 IV.3.1 Sediment-Watercolumn Exchange of Nitrogen 39

 IV.3.2 Method for Determining Sediment-Watercolumn Nitrogen Exchange 40

 IV.3.3 Rates of Summer Nitrogen Regeneration from Sediments 41

V. HYDRODYNAMIC MODELING 48

 V.1 INTRODUCTION 48

 V.1.1 System Physical Setting 48

 V.1.2 System Hydrodynamic Setting 49

 V.2 GEOMORPHIC AND ANTHROPOGENIC EFFECTS TO THE SYSTEM 50

 V.2.1 Pond Management Practices 50

 V.2.2 Shoreline Change Analysis 50

 V.3 HYDRODYNAMIC FIELD DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS 53

 V.3.1. Bathymetry 53

 V.3.2 Tide Data 54

 V.4 HYDRODYNAMIC MODEL DEVELOPMENT 55

 V.4.1 Modeling flow through a breach 55

 V.4.3 RMA2 Model Theory 59

 V.4.4 RMA2 Model Development 60

 V.5. FLUSHING CHARACTERISTICS 60

VI. WATER QUALITY MODELING 63

 VI.1 DATA SOURCES FOR THE MODEL 63

 VI.1.1 Hydrodynamics and Tidal Flushing in the Embayments 63

 VI.1.2 Nitrogen Loading to the Embayments 63

 VI.1.3 Measured Nitrogen Concentrations in the Embayments 64

 VI.2 MODEL DESCRIPTION AND APPLICATION 64

VI.2.1 Model Formulation.....	66
VI.2.1.1 Dispersion Model	66
VI.2.1.2 Mass Balance Model	67
VI.2.2 Boundary Condition Specification	67
VI.2.3 Development of Present Conditions Model	68
VI.2.4 Total Nitrogen Model Development.....	73
VI.2.5 Present 2007 Load Scenarios	75
VI.2.6 2007, Build-Out and No Anthropogenic Load Scenarios.....	75
VI.2.6.1 2007 Loading	76
VI.2.6.2 Build-Out.....	77
VI.2.6.3 No Anthropogenic Load	77
VII. ASSESSMENT OF EMBAYMENT NUTRIENT RELATED ECOLOGICAL HEALTH	79
VII.1 OVERVIEW OF BIOLOGICAL HEALTH INDICATORS.....	79
VII.2 BOTTOM WATER DISSOLVED OXYGEN.....	80
VII.3 EELGRASS DISTRIBUTION - TEMPORAL ANALYSIS	89
VII.4 BENTHIC INFAUNA ANALYSIS	92
VIII. CRITICAL NUTRIENT THRESHOLD DETERMINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF WATER QUALITY TARGETS	97
VIII.1 ASSESSMENT OF NITROGEN RELATED HABITAT QUALITY	97
VIII.2 THRESHOLD NITROGEN CONCENTRATIONS	101
VIII.3 DEVELOPMENT OF TARGET NITROGEN LOADS	102
IX. REFERENCES	106

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure I-1. Location of the Edgartown Great Pond system, Island of Martha’s Vineyard, Town of Edgartown, Massachusetts. Edgartown Great Pond is a great salt pond, maintained by periodic breaching of the barrier beach to allow exchange with Atlantic Ocean waters. 1

Figure I-2. Study region for the Massachusetts Estuaries Project analysis of the Edgartown Great Pond Embayment System. Tidal waters enter the Pond through periodic breaching of the barrier beach and flow in from the Atlantic Ocean. Freshwaters enter from the watershed primarily through direct groundwater discharge. 3

Figure I-3. Massachusetts Estuaries Project Critical Nutrient Threshold Analytical Approach 10

Figure III-1. Watershed and sub-watershed delineations for the Edgartown Great Pond estuary system. Sub-watersheds to embayments were selected based upon the functional estuarine sub-units in the water quality model (see section VI). 22

Figure IV-1. Land-use in the Edgartown Great Pond watershed. Most of the watershed is within the Town of Edgartown; a small portion extends into West Tisbury. Land use classifications are based on assessors’ records provided by the town. 25

Figure IV-2. Distribution of land-uses within the sub-watersheds and whole watershed to Edgartown Great Pond. Only percentages greater than or equal to 5% are shown. 27

Figure IV-3. Effluent flow and total nitrogen-loading data from Town of Edgartown Wastewater Treatment Facility (2001-06). 32

Figure IV-4. Parcels, Parcelized Watersheds, and Developable Parcels in the Edgartown Great Pond system watershed and sub-watersheds..... 36

Figure IV-5. Land use-specific unattenuated nitrogen load (by percent) to the overall Edgartown Great Pond System watershed. “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. 38

Figure IV-6. Edgartown Great Pond System locations (red diamonds) of sediment sample collection for determination of nitrogen regeneration rates. Numbers are for reference in Table IV-3..... 42

Figure IV-7. 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..... 44

Figure IV-8. Change in total nitrogen during summer 2003, the rate of change was confirmed by similar data from 2000-2004 (N=4). Increase in nitrogen results from inputs from watershed+atmosphere+sediments and outputs through flows through the barrier beach and weir at Cracktuxet Cove. Salinity and water elevation data was used to assess these latter losses and groundwater inflow during this period (Chapter VI). 47

Figure V-1. Location of Edgartown Great Pond on Martha’s Vineyard, Massachusetts. 49

Figure V-2. Historic water levels in Edgartown Great Pond between 1995 and 2005 from observations made by John MacKenty (adjusted to MLLW datum). 51

Figure V-3.	Histogram illustrating the duration of openings for Edgartown Great Pond between 1995 and 2007. Data provided by Paul Bagnall (Edgartown Shellfish Department) and Bill Wilcox (Martha's Vineyard Commission).	51
Figure V-4.	Historical shoreline change rates (1897-2003) in the area of Edgartown Great Pond.	53
Figure V-5.	Historical shoreline change rates (1955-2003) in the area of Edgartown Great Pond.	54
Figure V-6.	Bathymetry survey lines (yellow) followed by the boat in Edgartown Great Pond.	56
Figure V-7.	Tide gage locations within Edgartown Great Pond.	57
Figure V-8.	Tide gage signals measured offshore at the MVCO and within Edgartown Great Pond. The figure represents a subset of the four-month dataset focused on the November 24, 2004 breach event. Elevations are referenced to MLLW.	58
Figure V-9.	A comparison of the broad-crested weir model results with the recorded pond elevations during the breach event at Edgartown Great Pond.	59
Figure V-10.	Interpolated bathymetric contours (feet) of the final RMA2 computational mesh of Edgartown Great Pond. Depth contours are relative to the MLLW.	61
Figure VI-1.	USGS topographic map showing monitoring station locations in Edgartown Great Pond that were used in the water quality analysis.	65
Figure VI-2.	Comparison of measured and modeled salinities for successful Edgartown Great Pond breachings that occurred in July 2005, April 2006 and October 2006. RMA-4 salinity dispersion model output is compared to measured salinities at the close of each breach. For these opening events, the inlet allowed tidal exchange with the Atlantic Ocean.	70
Figure VI-3.	Model salinity target values are plotted against measured concentrations, together with the unity line, for the simulation period from July through September 2003. RMS error for this model verification run is 0.20 ppt and the R ² correlation coefficient is 0.99.	70
Figure VI-4.	Comparison of measured (red line with circles) and modeled (black line) salinities through the summer of 2003, from after the June breaching of an inlet to the Atlantic Ocean. This period through the summer was simulated using the mass balance model. Results of the sensitivity analysis are also presented, showing model output using recharge rate reported by the Cape Cod Commission (CCC) and the rate determined using only the measured surface elevation increase of the pond during this same period.	71
Figure VI-5.	Model pond elevation target values are plotted against measured elevations, together with the unity line, for the simulation period from July through September 2003. RMS error for this model verification run is 0.02 ppt and the R ² correlation coefficient is 0.99.	71
Figure VI-6.	Comparison of measured (red line with circle markers) and modeled (black line) pond elevations through the summer of 2003, from after the June breaching of an inlet to the Atlantic Ocean. This period through the summer was simulated using the mass balance model. Results of the sensitivity analysis are also presented, showing model output using recharge rate reported by the Cape Cod Commission (CCC) and the rate determined using only the measured surface elevation increase of the pond during this same period.	72

Figure VI-7. RMA-4 model output for Edgartown Great Pond showing how pond averaged salinities vary as a function of initial salinity concentration (here for 10, 15 and 20 ppt) and number of days open for the breach. Model results based on minimum recharge rate of 11.0 ft³/sec with 1.5 ft³/sec flow through. Model results also assume a fully open breach for the complete simulation period.....73

Figure VI-8. Model pond TN target values are plotted against measured concentrations, together with the unity line, for the simulation period from July through September 2003. RMS error for this model verification run is 0.01 mg/L and the R² correlation coefficient is 0.99.74

Figure VI-9. Comparison of measured (black line) and modeled (red line with circle markers) TN concentrations through the summer of 2003, from after the June breaching of an inlet to the Atlantic Ocean. This period through the summer was simulated using the mass balance model. Results of the sensitivity analysis are also presented, showing model output using recharge rate reported by the Cape Cod Commission (CCC) and the rate determined using only the measured surface elevation increase of the pond during this same period.74

Figure VI-10. RMA-4 model output for Edgartown Great Pond present (2003) loading conditions (Table VI-1), showing how pond averaged TN concentrations vary as a function of initial TN concentration (here for 0.80, 0.60 and 0.40 mg/L) and number of days open for the breach. Model results based on minimum recharge rate of 11.0 ft³/sec with 1.5 ft³/sec flow through. Model results also assume a fully open breach for the complete simulation period.75

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 ~7 fold from winter to summer as a result of variations in temperature and organic matter availability.....81

Figure VII-2. Aerial Photograph of the Edgartown Great Pond system on Martha’s Vineyard showing locations of Dissolved Oxygen mooring deployments conducted in the Summer of 2002.84

Figure VII-3. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen at the Edgartown Great Pond - Wintucket station, Summer 2002.....85

Figure VII-4. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen at the Edgartown Great Pond Swan Neck station, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots.85

Figure VII-5. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen at the Edgartown Great Pond – West End station, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots.....86

Figure VII-6. Bottom water record of Chlorophyll-a at the Edgartown Great Pond - Wintucket station, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots.....86

Figure VII-7. Bottom water record of Chlorophyll-a at the Edgartown Great Pond – Swan Neck station, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots.87

Figure VII-8. Bottom water record of Chlorophyll-a at the Edgartown Great Pond – West End station, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots.....87

Figure VII-9. Eelgrass distribution within the Edgartown Great Pond Embayment System. The 1951 coverage is depicted by the orange outline (hatched

area), which circumscribes the 30.2 acres of eelgrass beds. Very sparse eelgrass patches were observed in 2002-04 by the MEP Technical Team in the region of the 1951 bed and in the western-most region of the lower basin, south of the entrance to Jobs Neck Cove. The separate salt pond to the west is Jobs Neck Pond. The 1951 analysis was provided by the MassDEP Eelgrass Mapping Program.....91

Figure VII-10. Aerial photograph of the Edgartown Great Pond system showing location of benthic infaunal sampling stations (red symbol).....95

Figure VIII-1. Comparison of modeled pond-averaged TN concentrations for case where the pond is breached only in the early summer (thick black dot-dashed line) and also when it is breached an additional time mid-summer. 104

Figure VIII-2. Comparison of modeled pond-averaged salinities for case where the pond is breached only in the early summer (thick black dot-dashed line) and also when it is breached an additional time mid-summer..... 105

LIST OF TABLES

Table III-1. Daily groundwater discharge from each of the sub-watersheds to the Edgartown Great Pond Estuary.....21

Table IV-1. Primary Nitrogen Loading Factors used in the Edgartown Great Pond MEP analyses. General factors are from MEP modeling evaluation (Howes and Ramsey 2001). Site-specific factors are derived from Edgartown or Martha’s Vineyard data. *Data from 1999 Martha’s Vineyard lawn analysis.....33

Table IV-2. Edgartown Great Pond Nitrogen Loads. Presents nitrogen loads based on current conditions including import of nitrogen into the watershed by the Edgartown WWTF. Buildout loads include septic, fertilizer, and impervious surface additions from developable properties, as well as increased flows to the WWTF. All values are kg N yr⁻¹.....37

Table IV-3. Rates of net nitrogen return from sediments to the overlying waters of the Edgartown Great Pond Embayment 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.....46

Table V-1. Estimates of Potential Error Associated with Shoreline Position Surveys.....52

Table VI-1. Measured nitrogen concentrations and salinities for Edgartown Great Pond. “Data mean” values are calculated as the average of the separate yearly means. TN data represented in this table were collected in 2003 through 2006 in Great Pond and 2002 through 2004 for salinity. The offshore Atlantic Ocean data (offshore Pleasant Bay Inlet) are from the summer of 2005.64

Table VI-2. Embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of Edgartown Great Pond, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. These loads represent 2003 present loading conditions for the listed sub-embayments.68

Table VI-3. Breach dates and starting and ending salinities used in the calibration of the RMA-4 dispersion model of Edgartown Great Pond.....69

Table VI-4. Comparison of measured data and model output for summer 2003 mass balance model calibration-verification period.72

Table VI-5. Sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of Edgartown Great Pond, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. These loads represent 2007 present loading conditions for the listed sub-embayments (lower load results from newer WWTF Plume).....75

Table VI-6. Comparison of sub-embayment watershed loads used for modeling of present (2003), present 2007, build-out, and no-anthropogenic (“no-load”) loading scenarios of Edgartown Great Pond. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms.....76

Table VI-7. Sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of Edgartown Great Pond, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. These loads represent 2007 present loading conditions for the listed sub-embayments (Loading in 2007 less than 2003 due to “new” WWTF Plume.).....76

Table VI-8.	Build-out scenario sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Edgartown Great Pond system, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux.....	77
Table VI-9.	“No anthropogenic loading” (“no load”) sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Great Pond system, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux.....	77
Table VII-3.	Changes in eelgrass coverage in the Edgartown Great Pond Embayment System within the Town of Edgartown over the past half century.....	92
Table VII-5.	Benthic infaunal community data for the Edgartown Great Pond system. Estimates of the number of species adjusted to the number of individuals and diversity (H’) and Evenness (E) of the community allow comparison between locations (Samples represent surface area of 0.0625 m2). Stations refer to map in Figure VII-10, (N) is the number of samples per site.....	96
Table VIII-1.	Summary of Nutrient Related Habitat Health within the Edgartown Great Pond Embayment System (Town of Edgartown, MA.), based upon assessment data presented in Chapter VII. The main basin of Edgartown Great Pond and its major tributary sub-embayments (Coves) experience only periodic tidal exchange with ocean waters during managed breaching of the barrier beach. Some basins were approximated using monitoring data coupled to instrument mooring data.....	100
Table VIII-2.	Comparison of sub-embayment septic loads used for modeling of present 2003-06 and modeled threshold loading scenarios of Edgartown Great Pond. Septic loads are from existing residential and commercial properties. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms.....	103
Table VIII-3.	Comparison of sub-embayment watershed loads used for modeling of present 2007 and modeled threshold loading scenarios of Edgartown Great Pond. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms. The threshold level reflects the lowered septic loading (threshold) in Table VIII-2 and the “new” WWTF nitrogen load (2007). (Loading in 2007 less than 2003 due to “new” WWTF Plume.).....	104
Table VIII-4.	Sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of threshold conditions for Edgartown Great Pond, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux.....	104