

# Massachusetts Estuaries Project

## Linked Watershed-Embayment Model to Determine Critical Nitrogen Loading Thresholds for Great/Perch Pond, Green Pond and Bournes Pond, Falmouth, Massachusetts


FINAL REPORT – APRIL 2005



Brian Howes  
Roland Samimy  
David Schlezinger



John Ramsey  
Sean Kelley



**CAPE COD  
COMMISSION**

Ed Eichner

Contributors:

***US Geological Survey***

Don Walters and John Masterson

***Applied Coastal Research and Engineering, Inc.***

Elizabeth Hunt and Trey Ruthven

***Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection***

Charles Costello and Brian Dudley (DEP project manager)

***SMAST Coastal Systems Program***

George Hampson, Sara Sampieri, Jen Antosca, and Michael Bartlett

***Cape Cod Commission***

Brian DuPont

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The Massachusetts Estuaries Project Technical Team would like to acknowledge the contributions of the many individuals who have worked tirelessly for the restoration and protection of the critical coastal resources of the Great/Perch Pond, Green Pond, and Bourne Pond Embayment Systems. Without these stewards and their efforts, this project would not have been possible.

First and foremost is the significant time and effort in data collection and discussion spent by members of the Falmouth PondWatch Water Quality Monitoring Program. These individuals gave of their time to collect water quality samples from this system from 1987 – 2003. Without this information the present analysis would not have been possible. Similarly, many in the Town of Falmouth worked diligently on this effort, specifically, the Town of Falmouth Planning Department, the Town of Falmouth Nutrient Management Committee, and the Falmouth Board of Selectman. The MEP Technical Team would like to specifically acknowledge the efforts of George Calise, Brian Currie, and Amy Lowell for helping to coordinate the Falmouth efforts on multiple fronts. The MEP Technical Team would also like to acknowledge the efforts of the Air Force Center on Environmental Excellence (AFCEE) for detailed information regarding the Ashumet Valley Wastewater Plume.

In addition to local contributions, technical, policy and regulatory support has been freely and graciously provided by Tom Camberari and Margo Fenn of the Cape Cod Commission; David Webster, Bruce Rosinoff, Art Clark and Nora Conlon of the USEPA; and our MADEP colleagues: Andrew Gottlieb, Arleen O'Donnell, Art Screpetis, Rick Dunn, Steve Halterman, Russ Issac, Alan Slater, Glenn Haas, Sharon Pelosi, and Ron Lyberger. We are also thankful for the long hours in the field and laboratory spent by the many interns and students within the Coastal Systems Program at SMAST-UMD.

Support for this project was provided by the Town of Falmouth, Barnstable County, MADEP, and the USEPA.

## **SUGGESTED CITATION**

Howes B., J.S. Ramsey, S.W. Kelley, R. Samimy, D. Schlezinger, E. Eichner (2004). Linked Watershed-Embayment Model to Determine Critical Nitrogen Loading Thresholds for Great/Perch Pond, Green Pond, and Bourne Pond, Falmouth, Massachusetts. Massachusetts Estuaries Project, Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection. Boston, MA., 205 pp. + Executive Summary, 11 pp.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1**

    I.1 THE MASSACHUSETTS ESTUARIES PROJECT APPROACH ..... 5

    I.2 SITE DESCRIPTION ..... 8

    I.3 NITROGEN LOADING ..... 14

    I.4 WATER QUALITY MODELING ..... 15

    I.5 REPORT DESCRIPTION ..... 16

**II. PREVIOUS STUDIES RELATED TO NITROGEN MANAGEMENT ..... 17**

**III. DELINEATION OF WATERSHEDS ..... 21**

    III.1 BACKGROUND ..... 21

    III.2 MODEL DESCRIPTION ..... 22

    III.3 GREAT POND, GREEN POND, AND BOURNES POND CONTRIBUTORY AREAS .... 23

**IV. WATERSHED NITROGEN LOADING TO EMBAYMENT: LAND USE, STREAM INPUTS, AND SEDIMENT NITROGEN RECYCLING ..... 28**

    IV.1 WATERSHED LAND USE BASED NITROGEN LOADING ANALYSIS ..... 28

        IV.1.1 Land Use and Database Preparation ..... 30

        IV.1.2 Nitrogen Loading Input Factors ..... 33

        IV.1.3 Calculating Nitrogen Loads ..... 35

    IV.2 ATTENUATION OF NITROGEN IN SURFACE WATER TRANSPORT ..... 42

        IV.2.1 Background and Purpose ..... 42

        IV.2.2 Surface water Discharge and Attenuation of Watershed Nitrogen: Coonamessett River to Great Pond (upper) ..... 46

        IV.2.3 Freshwater Discharge and Attenuation of Watershed Nitrogen: Backus Brook from Mill Pond to Green Pond (upper) ..... 50

        IV.2.4 Freshwater Discharge and Attenuation of Watershed Nitrogen: Bournes Brook, Creek from Cranberry Bog to Bournes Pond (upper) ..... 52

    IV.3 BENTHIC REGENERATION OF NITROGEN IN BOTTOM SEDIMENTS ..... 55

        IV.3.1 Sediment-Watercolumn Exchange of Nitrogen ..... 55

        IV.3.2 Method for determining sediment-watercolumn nitrogen exchange ..... 56

        IV.3.3 Rates of Summer Nitrogen Regeneration from Sediments ..... 60

**V. HYDRODYNAMIC MODELING ..... 64**

    V.1 INTRODUCTION ..... 64

    V.2 GEOMORPHIC AND ANTHROPOGENIC EFFECTS TO THE SYSTEM ..... 66

        V.2.1 Coastal Processes and Inlet Stability ..... 67

        V.2.2 Shoreline Change Analysis ..... 71

        V.2.3 Inlet Management Implications ..... 77

    V.3 FIELD DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS ..... 78

        V.3.1 Bathymetry ..... 78

        V.3.2 Water Elevation Measurements and Analysis ..... 80

        V.3.2 Field Data Analysis ..... 82

    V.4. HYDRODYNAMIC MODELING ..... 90

        V.4.1 Model Theory ..... 90

        V.4.2 Model Setup ..... 91

            V.4.2.1 Grid Generation ..... 91

V.4.2.2	Boundary Condition Specification .....	93
V.4.2.3	Calibration.....	93
V.4.2.3.1	Friction Coefficients .....	94
V.4.2.3.2	Turbulent Exchange Coefficients.....	94
V.4.2.3.3	Marsh Porosity Processes .....	94
V.4.2.3.4	Comparison of Modeled Tides and Measured Tide Data .....	95
V.4.2.4	Model Verification Using Horizontal ADCP Measurements .....	99
V.4.2.5	Model Circulation Characteristics .....	102
V.5.	FLUSHING CHARACTERISTICS .....	103
<b>VI.</b>	<b>WATER QUALITY MODELING .....</b>	<b>110</b>
VI.1	DATA SOURCES FOR THE MODEL .....	110
VI.1.1	Hydrodynamics and Tidal Flushing in the Embayments .....	110
VI.1.2	Nitrogen Loading to the Embayments.....	110
VI.1.3	Measured Nitrogen Concentrations in the Embayments.....	110
VI.2	MODEL DESCRIPTION AND APPLICATION .....	111
VI.2.1	Model Formulation.....	112
VI.2.2	Water Quality Model Setup .....	113
VI.2.3	Boundary Condition Specification .....	113
VI.2.4	Model Calibration .....	114
VI.2.5	Model Salinity Verification .....	120
VI.2.6	Build-Out and No Anthropogenic Load Scenarios.....	124
VI.2.6.1	Build-Out.....	125
VI.2.6.2	No Anthropogenic Load .....	129
<b>VII.</b>	<b>ASSESSMENT OF EMBAYMENT NUTRIENT RELATED ECOLOGICAL HEALTH .....</b>	<b>134</b>
VII.1	OVERVIEW OF BIOLOGICAL HEALTH INDICATORS.....	134
VII.2	BOTTOM WATER DISSOLVED OXYGEN.....	135
VII.3	EELGRASS DISTRIBUTION - TEMPORAL ANALYSIS.....	149
VII.4	BENTHIC INFAUNA ANALYSIS .....	156
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>CRITICAL NUTRIENT THRESHOLD DETERMINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF WATER QUALITY TARGETS.....</b>	<b>164</b>
VIII.1.	ASSESSMENT OF NITROGEN RELATED HABITAT QUALITY .....	164
VIII.2.	THRESHOLD NITROGEN CONCENTRATIONS .....	169
VIII.3.	DEVELOPMENT OF TARGET NITROGEN LOADS .....	175
<b>IX.</b>	<b>ALTERNATIVES TO IMPROVE TIDAL FLUSHING AND WATER QUALITY.....</b>	<b>179</b>
IX.1	SEWERING ALTERNATIVES DEVELOPED BY THE TOWN.....	179
IX.2	FLUSHING IMPROVEMENTS TO BOURNES POND BY MODIFICATIONS TO THE INLET .....	197
<b>X.</b>	<b>LIST OF REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>202</b>

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
Figure I-1a.	
Green Pond and Bournes Pond embayment systems along the southern shore of the Town of Falmouth, MA. Tidal waters enter the salt ponds through fixed tidal inlets to Vineyard Sound. Freshwaters enter from the watershed primarily through 2 surface water discharges (creek from Mill Pond to Green Pond) via the Backus River and (a creek from an upgradient cranberry bog to Bournes Pond) via Bournes Brook and direct groundwater discharge.....	2
Figure I-1b.	
The Great/Perch Pond Embayment System along the southern shore of the Town of Falmouth, MA. Perch Pond is a drowned kettle pond communicating through a narrow tidal channel with Great Pond. Tidal waters enter Great Pond from Vineyard Sound through a fixed inlet. Freshwaters enter from the watershed primarily through 1 surface water discharge, the Coonamesset River, and through direct groundwater discharge.....	3
Figure I-2.	
Massachusetts Estuaries Project Critical Nutrient Threshold Analytical Approach.....	9
Figure I-3.	
Partitioning of each embayment system relative to basin boundary volumes and general regions of nitrogen related habitat quality.....	11
Figure III-1.	
Watershed and sub-watershed delineations for Great Pond, Green Pond and Bournes Pond. Approximate ten year time-of-travel delineations were produced for quality assurance purposes and are designated with a “10” in the figure legend (above at left). Sub-watersheds to embayments were selected based upon the functional estuarine sub-units in the water quality model (see section VI). .....	24
Figure III-2.	
Comparison of previous and current Great Pond, Green Pond, and Bournes Pond watershed and subwatershed delineations.....	26
Figure IV-1.	
Land-use coverage in the Great Pond, Green Pond, and Bournes Pond watersheds. Watershed data encompasses portions of the Town of Falmouth and the Massachusetts Military Reservation, MA (northern portion of Great Pond watershed). .....	31
Figure IV-2.	
Distribution of land-uses within the major subwatersheds and whole watersheds to Great Pond, Green Pond, and Bournes Pond.....	32
Figure IV-3.	
Parcels, Parcelized Watersheds, and Developable Parcels in the Great Pond, Green Pond, and Bournes Pond watersheds. ....	36
Figure IV-4 (a-c).	
Land use-specific unattenuated nitrogen load (by percent) to the (a) Great Pond System, (b) Green Pond System, and (c) Bournes Pond System. “Overall Load” is the total nitrogen input to the aquifer or aquatic surfaces, while the “Local Control Load” represents only those nitrogen sources that stem only from activities within the watershed itself (i.e. no atmospheric deposition). .....	39
Figure IV-6.	
Coonamessett River discharge (solid blue line), nitrate+nitrite (blue boxes) and total nitrogen (yellow triangles) concentrations for determination of annual volumetric discharge and nitrogen load from the upper watershed to the Great Pond Estuary (Table IV-6). .....	49
Figure IV-7.	
Backus Brook freshwater discharge (solid blue line), nitrate+nitrite (blue boxes) and total nitrogen (yellow triangles) concentrations for	

determination of annual volumetric discharge and nitrogen load from the upper watershed to the Green Pond Estuary (Table IV-6). .....51

Figure IV-8. Bournes Brook freshwater discharge (solid blue line), nitrate+nitrite (blue boxes) and total nitrogen (yellow triangles) concentrations for determination of annual volumetric discharge and nitrogen load from the upper watershed to the Bournes Pond Estuary (Table IV-6). .....54

Figure IV-9. Great/Perch Pond embayment system sediment sampling sites (red symbols) for determination of nitrogen regeneration rates. Numbers are for reference in Table IV-8. ....58

Figure IV-10. Green Pond and Bournes Pond embayment system sediment sampling sites (red symbols) for determination of nitrogen regeneration rates. Numbers are for reference in Table IV-8. ....59

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. ....61

Figure V-1. Map of Greater Ashumet Valley watershed (from United States Geological Survey topographic map). .....65

Figure V-2. A portion of the U.S.G.S. 1893 map showing Great, Green, and Bowen’s (Bournes) Ponds. This map depicts the condition of these inlets prior to the installation of jetties. ....68

Figure V-3. Photograph of the Wellsmere Inn in Maravista immediately after the 1944 Hurricane. Note the wood bulkheads and concrete seawall utilized to armor the shoreline. ....69

Figure V-4. Photograph of Menauhant Road in Maravista immediately after the 1944 Hurricane. Note the stone revetment armoring the roadway. ....69

Figure V-5. Photograph of the shoreline west of Menauhant Beach taken in 2004 showing remnants of a timber bulkhead and groin, as well as more recent stone structures. ....70

Figure V-6. Photograph of the old Great Pond bridge immediately after the 1944 Hurricane. The photograph shows that storm overwash eroded the roadway and approach ramps to the bridge. Note the Great Pond jetty at the left side of the photograph. ....70

Figure V-7. The 2001 aerial photograph showing the extent of the Falmouth shoreline surveyed by Differential GPS in 2004. ....74

Figure V-8. The 2001 aerial photograph showing scaled transects that indicate computed shoreline change rates between 1938 and 2004. ....76

Figure V-9. Shoreline change data distribution calculated along the south coast of Falmouth (Falmouth Harbor to Menauhant Beach) between 1938 and 2004. ....76

Figure V-10. Shoreline change data distribution calculated along the south coast of Falmouth (Falmouth Harbor to Menauhant Beach) between 1938 and 2004, excluding areas identified as erosion “hot-spots”. ....77

Figure V-11. Depth contour plots of the numerical grid for the hydrodynamic model at 0.5-foot contour intervals relative to NGVD29. ....79

Figure V-12. Map of the study region identifying locations of the tide gauges used to measure water level variations throughout the system. Nine (9) gauges were deployed for one month between January and February, 1999. Each black square represents the approximate locations of the tide gauges. ....80

Figure V-13.	Water elevation variations as measured at the four locations within the Great Pond. ....	81
Figure V-14.	Water elevation variations as measured at the four locations within the Green Pond. ....	82
Figure V-15.	Water elevation variations as measured at the four locations within the Bournes Pond. ....	83
Figure V-16.	Observations of water surface elevation variations in the Falmouth finger pond systems. Each plot shows the Nantucket Sound measurements overlaid with measurements obtained in each pond. The range of variation was approximately 3.5-4 feet during the deployment period January 12 through February 10, 1999; however, the average daily fluctuation was only about 1.5 feet. ....	85
Figure V-17.	View of water elevation variations for a four-day period during the deployment. Each plot depicts the Nantucket Sound signal overlaid with measurements obtained in the pond interiors. Note the reduced amplitude as well as the delay in times of high- and low tide relative to Nantucket Sound due to frictional damping through the pond systems. ....	87
Figure V-18.	Residual signal (middle plot) in Nantucket Sound and north Great Pond can be as great as 2 feet. The large gradient observed on February 3, 1999 coincided with strong (approximately 20 kts) southeast winds. These winds produced a 'piling up' of water along the southern shore of Falmouth; the elevation changes propagated into Great Pond. The bottom plot depicts the harmonic tides calculated from the harmonic analysis and shows the tidal range in the study area to be approximately 2.75 feet on January 29, 1999. ....	89
Figure V-19.	Plot of numerical grids (black) used for hydrodynamic modeling for Great, Green, and Bournes Ponds, with shoreline (yellow). ....	92
Figure V-20.	Observed vs. computed water level elevations for tide gauges in Great Pond. ....	96
Figure V-21.	Observed vs. computed water level elevations for tide gauges in Green Pond. ....	97
Figure V-22.	Observed vs. computed water level elevations for tide gauges in Bournes Pond. ....	97
Figure V-23.	Current velocity measurements collected during peak flood conditions on May 5 at 23:15 in the entrance to Great Pond. For comparison, the scale of 1 ft/s is shown in the upper right: The maximum speed was 3.8 ft/s. ....	101
Figure V-24.	Current velocity measurements collected during peak ebb conditions on May 7 at 08:14 in the entrance to Great Pond. For comparison, the scale of 1 ft/s is shown in the upper right: The maximum speed was 2.8 ft/s. ....	101
Figure V-25.	Top plot depicts the Great Pond H-ADCP current measurement (thin black line) comparison with hydrodynamic model output (thick blue line). Coefficient of determination, $R^2=0.74$ ; rms error, $E_{rms}=12.0\%$ . The bottom plot presents the measured offshore tide (Vineyard Sound) for the same period. ....	102
Figure V-26.	Example of hydrodynamic model output for a single time step where maximum flood velocities occur for this tide cycle within Great Pond. Color contours indicate velocity magnitude, and vectors indicate the direction of flow. ....	104
Figure V-27.	Example of hydrodynamic model output for a single time step where maximum flood velocities occur for this tide cycle within Green Pond.	

	Color contours indicate velocity magnitude, and vectors indicate the direction of flow. ....	105
Figure V-28.	Example of hydrodynamic model output for a single time step where maximum flood velocities occur for this tide cycle within Bourne Pond. Color contours indicate velocity magnitude, and vectors indicate the direction of flow. ....	106
Figure V-29.	Basins used to compute residence times for the system. ....	109
Figure VI-1.	Estuarine water quality monitoring station locations in the Ashumet Valley estuary systems. Station labels correspond to those provided in Table VI-1. ....	112
Figure VI-2.	Comparison of measured total nitrogen concentrations and calibrated model output at stations in the Ashumet Valley systems. For the left plots, 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. ....	116
Figure VI-3.	Contour plot of average total nitrogen concentrations from results of the present conditions loading scenario, for Great Pond. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Great Pond (GT5) is shown. ....	117
Figure VI-4.	Contour plot of average total nitrogen concentrations from results of the present conditions loading scenario, for Green Pond. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Green Pond (G4) is shown. ....	118
Figure VI-5.	Contour plot of average total nitrogen concentrations from results of the present conditions loading scenario, for Bourne Pond. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Bourne Pond (B3) is shown. ....	119
Figure VI-6.	Comparison of measured and calibrated model output at stations in the Great Pond. 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. ....	121
Figure VI-7.	Contour Plot of modeled salinity (ppt) in Great Pond. ....	122
Figure VI-8.	Contour Plot of modeled salinity (ppt) in Green Pond. ....	123
Figure VI-9.	Contour Plot of modeled salinity (ppt) in Bourne Pond. ....	124
Figure VI-10.	Contour plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Great Pond, for projected build-out loading conditions. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Great Pond (GT5) is shown. ....	127
Figure VI-11.	Contour plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Green Pond, for projected build out loading conditions. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Green Pond (G4) is shown. ....	128

Figure VI-12. Contour plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Bournes Pond, for projected build-out loading conditions. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Bournes Pond (B3) is shown..... 129

Figure VI-13. Contour plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Great Pond, for no anthropogenic loading conditions. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Great Pond (GT5) is shown..... 131

Figure VI-14. Contour plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Green Pond, for no anthropogenic loading conditions. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Green Pond (G4) is shown..... 132

Figure VI-15. Contour plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Bournes Pond, for no anthropogenic loading conditions. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Bournes Pond (B3) is shown..... 133

Figure VII-1. Average watercolumn respiration rates 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..... 136

Figure VII-2a. Aerial Photograph of the Great / Perch Pond embayment system in Falmouth showing locations of Dissolved Oxygen mooring deployments conducted in Summer 2002. .... 137

Figure VII-2b. Aerial Photograph of the Green and Bournes Pond systems in Falmouth showing locations of Dissolved Oxygen mooring deployments conducted in Summer 2002. .... 138

Figure VII-3. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen at Great Pond Upper station, Falmouth, MA., Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots..... 141

Figure VII-4. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen at Great Pond Lower station, Falmouth, MA., Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots..... 141

Figure VII-5. Bottom water record of chlorophyll-a at Great Pond Upper station, Falmouth, MA., Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots..... 142

Figure VII-6. Bottom water record of chlorophyll-a at Great Pond Lower station, Falmouth, MA., Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots..... 142

Figure VII-7. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen at the Green Pond Upper station, Falmouth, MA., Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots..... 143

Figure VII-8. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen at the Green Pond Middle station, Falmouth, MA., Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots..... 143

Figure VII-9. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen at the Green Pond Lower station, Falmouth, MA., Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots..... 144

Figure VII-10. Bottom water record of chlorophyll-a at the Green Pond Upper station, Falmouth, MA., Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots..... 144

Figure VII-11. Bottom water record of chlorophyll-a at the Green Pond Middle station, Falmouth, MA., Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots..... 145

Figure VII-12. Bottom water record of chlorophyll-a at the Green Pond Lower station, Falmouth, MA., Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots..... 145

Figure VII-13. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen at the Bournes Pond Upper station, Falmouth, MA., Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots..... 146

Figure VII-14. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen at the Bournes Pond Middle station, within the upper estuarine reach, Falmouth, MA., Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots..... 146

Figure VII-15. Bottom water record of chlorophyll-a at the Bournes Pond Upper station, Falmouth, MA., Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots..... 147

Figure VII-16. Map of Great/Perch Pond System, Falmouth, MA 1992 (Conover 1958). (Left) Map of topography, environmental zones, area boundaries, sections and locations of hydrographic stations. (Right) Map of + = eelgrass (*Zostera marina*) and o = widgeon grass (*Ruppia maritima*), from on-site surveys in 1952. .... 152

Figure VII-17. Map of eelgrass distribution in 1979 survey of sites A-R from Environmental Impact Statement by Weston and Sampson related to the new inlet/bridge which was installed in 1986. Eelgrass density is shown as: (+) no eelgrass, (open circles) sparse eelgrass, (hatched circle) moderate density eelgrass, and (full circle) dense eelgrass..... 153

Figure VII-18a. Eelgrass bed distribution within Great and Green Ponds. The 1951 coverage is depicted by the yellow outline inside of which circumscribes the eelgrass beds. The blue (1995) and purple (2001) areas were mapped and ground-truthed by DEP..... 154

Figure VII-18b. Eelgrass bed distribution within Bournes Pond. The 1951 coverage is depicted by the yellow outline inside of which circumscribes the eelgrass beds. The blue (1995) and purple (2001) areas were mapped and ground-truthed by DEP..... 155

Figure VII-19a. Aerial photograph of Great / Perch Pond showing location of benthic infaunal sampling stations (red symbol). Lines represent horizontal transects sampled. .... 159

Figure VII-19b. Aerial photograph of Green and Bournes Ponds showing location of benthic infaunal sampling stations (red symbol). Lines represent horizontal transects sampled..... 160

Figure VIII-1. Contour plot of modeled average total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Great Pond system, for threshold conditions (0.40 mg/L at water quality monitoring station GT5). The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Great Pond (GT5) is shown. .... 170

Figure VIII-2. Contour plot of modeled average total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Green Pond system, for threshold conditions (0.42 mg/L at water quality monitoring station G4, with average concentrations less than 0.70 mg/L within the entire system). The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Green Pond (G4) is shown. .... 172

Figure VIII-3. Contour plot of modeled average total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Bournes Pond system, for threshold conditions (0.45 mg/L at water quality monitoring station B3). The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Bournes Pond (B3) is shown. .... 174

Figure IX-1. Sewer areas used to evaluate alternative nitrogen loading scenarios in the Great Pond, Green Pond, and Bournes Pond watersheds..... 180

Figure IX-2.	Sewer areas and effluent discharge locations used to evaluate alternative nitrogen loading scenarios in the Great Pond, Green Pond, and Bourne Pond watersheds.....	182
Figure IX-3.	Contour plot of average total nitrogen concentrations from results of the Scenario 1 loading conditions for Great Pond. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Great Pond (GT5) is shown.....	185
Figure IX-4.	Contour plot of average total nitrogen concentrations from results of the Scenario 2 loading condition for Great Pond. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Great Pond (GT5) is shown.....	188
Figure IX-5.	Contour plot of average total nitrogen concentrations from results of the Scenario 2 loading condition for Green Pond. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Green Pond (G4) is shown.....	189
Figure IX-6.	Contour plot of average total nitrogen concentrations from results of the Scenario 2 loading condition, for Bourne Pond. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Bourne Pond (B3) is shown.....	190
Figure IX-7.	Contour plot of average total nitrogen concentrations from results of the Scenario 3 loading condition, for Great Pond. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Great Pond (GT5) is shown.....	194
Figure IX-8.	Contour plot of average total nitrogen concentrations from results of the Scenario 3 loading condition, for Green Pond. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Green Pond (G4) is shown.....	195
Figure IX-9.	Contour plot of average total nitrogen concentrations from results of the Scenario 3 loading condition, for Bourne Pond. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Bourne Pond (B3) is shown.....	196
Figure IX-10.	Plots showing a comparison of typical tides for modeled existing conditions (top plot) and proposed improved 100 ft-wide inlet (bottom plot) to Bourne Pond.....	198
Figure IX-11.	Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Bourne Pond, for present loading conditions, and widened inlet channel (100 ft). The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Bourne Pond (B3) is shown. ....	200
Figure IX-12.	Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Bourne Pond, for Scenario 2 (lower watershed) loading conditions, and widened inlet channel (100 ft). The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Bourne Pond (B3) is shown. ....	201

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table	Page
Table III-1. Daily groundwater discharge to the major streams and to the estuarine waters of Great Pond, Green Pond, and Bournes Pond Systems and their major tributary basins, as determined from the refined USGS groundwater model watershed outputs. Discharge values represents long-term average flows. ....	25
Table III-2. Percent difference in delineated embayment watershed areas between old and newly revised delineations.....	27
Table IV-1. Percentage of unattenuated nitrogen loads in less than 10 time of travel subwatersheds to Great Pond, Green Pond, and Bournes Pond.....	29
Table IV-2. Average Water Use in Great Pond, Green Pond, and Bournes Pond Watersheds. ....	34
Table IV-3. Primary Nitrogen Loading Factors used in Great Pond, Green Pond, and Bournes Pond MEP analysis. General factors are from MEP modeling evaluation (Howes & Ramsey 2001). Site-specific factors are derived from Falmouth data. *Data from MEP lawn study in Falmouth, Mashpee & Barnstable 2001. ....	37
Table IV-4. Great Pond, Green Pond, and Bournes Pond Nitrogen Loads. Attenuation of system nitrogen loads occurs as nitrogen moves through freshwater ponds, marshes and stream systems during transport the estuaries.....	38
Table IV-5. Nitrogen attenuation by Freshwater Ponds in the Great Pond, Green Pond, and Bournes Pond watersheds based upon late summer 2001 and 2002 Cape Cod Pond and Lakes Stewardship (PALS) program sampling and Massachusetts Military Reservation (MMR)-associated monitoring. These data were collected to provide a site specific check on nitrogen attenuation by these systems. The MEP Linked N Model for Great Pond, Green Pond, and Bournes Pond uses a value of 50% for the non-stream discharge systems.....	42
Table IV-6. Comparison of water flow and nitrogen discharges from Coonamessett River to Great Pond, Backus Brook from Mill Pond discharging to Green Pond and Bournes Brook discharging from the cranberry bog upgradient of Route 28 to Bournes Pond. The “Stream” data is from the MEP stream gauging effort. Watershed data is based upon the MEP watershed modeling effort by USGS.....	48
Table IV-7. Summary of annual volumetric discharge and nitrogen load from the Coonamessett River discharging to the head of Great Pond, Backus Brook to the head of Green Pond and Bournes Brook to the head of Bournes Pond based upon the data presented in Figures IV-6, 7, 8 and Table IV-6. ....	55
Table IV-8. Rates of net nitrogen return from sediments to the overlying waters of the Great, Green and Bournes Pond embayment systems. 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. ....	63
Table V-1. Estimates of potential error associated with shoreline position surveys.....	74
Table V-2. Tidal Constituents for Falmouth Ponds 1999. ....	84

Table V-3.	Tide datums computed from 38-day records collected offshore, in Vineyard Sound, and in Great, Green and Bourne Ponds of Falmouth. Datum elevations are given relative to NGVD 29. ....	86
Table V-4.	M <sub>2</sub> Phase delays from Nantucket Sound. ....	86
Table V-5.	Percentages of Tidal versus Non-Tidal Energy (units of ft <sup>2</sup> -sec). ....	88
Table V-6.	Manning’s Roughness coefficients used in simulations of modeled embayments. These embayment delineations correspond to the material type areas. ....	94
Table V-7.	Tidal Constituent Calibration for Lower Great Pond. ....	98
Table V-8.	Tidal Constituent Calibration for Upper Great Pond. ....	98
Table V-9.	Tidal Constituent Calibration for Perch Pond. ....	98
Table V-11.	Tidal Constituent Calibration for Upper Green Pond. ....	99
Table V-12.	Tidal Constituent Calibration for Lower Bourne Pond. ....	99
Table V-13.	Tidal Constituent Calibration for Upper Bourne Pond. ....	99
Table V-14.	Embayment mean volumes and average tidal prism during simulation period. ....	108
Table V-15.	Computed System and Local residence times for embayments in the system. ....	108
Table VI-1.	Pond-Watcher measured data, and modeled Nitrogen concentrations for the Ashumet Valley systems 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. ....	111
Table VI-2.	Sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Ashumet Valley pond systems, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. These loads represent <b>present loading conditions</b> for the listed sub-embayments. ....	114
Table VI-3.	Values of longitudinal dispersion coefficient, E, used in calibrated RMA4 model runs of salinity and nitrogen concentration for the Ashumet Valley estuary systems. ....	115
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 Ashumet Valley systems. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms. ....	125
Table VI-5.	Build-out sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Ashumet Valley systems, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. ....	126
Table VI-6.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the build-out scenario, with percent change, for the Ashumet Valley systems. Sentinel threshold stations are in bold print. ....	126
Table VI-7.	“No anthropogenic loading” (“no load”) sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Ashumet Valley systems, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. ....	130
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 Ashumet Valley systems. Loads are based on atmospheric deposition and a scaled N benthic flux (scaled from present conditions). Sentinel threshold stations are in bold print. ....	130
Table VII-1.	Percent of time during deployment that bottom water oxygen levels recorded by the <i>in situ</i> sensors were below various benchmark oxygen levels. ....	147

Table VII-2.	Duration (% of deployment time) that chlorophyll a levels exceed various benchmark levels within the Great / Perch, Green and Bournes Pond embayment systems. “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. ....	148
Table VII-3.	Changes in eelgrass coverage in the Great, Green and Bournes Ponds systems within the Town of Falmouth over the past half century (C. Costello). ....	156
Table VII-4a.	Benthic infaunal data for the Great/Perch Pond Estuarine System collected in 2003. 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 collect sediment area of 0.0625 m2. Individual values and mean and standard error (S.E.) of major estuarine regions are presented. ....	161
Table VII-4b.	Benthic infaunal data for the Green Pond Estuarine System collected in 2003. 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 collect sediment area of 0.0625 m <sup>2</sup> . Individual values and mean and standard error (S.E.) of major estuarine regions are presented. ....	162
Table VII-4c.	Benthic infaunal data for the Bournes Pond Estuarine System collected in 2003. 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 collect sediment area of 0.0625 m2. Individual values and mean and standard error (S.E) of major estuarine regions are presented. ....	163
Table VIII-1.	Summary of Nutrient Related Habitat Health within the Great Pond, Green Pond and Bournes Pond Estuaries on the south shore of Falmouth, MA., based upon assessment data presented in Chapter VII. ....	164
Table VIII-2.	Comparison of sub-embayment watershed <b>septic loads</b> (attenuated) used for modeling of present and threshold loading scenarios of the Ashumet Valley systems. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface), benthic flux, runoff, or fertilizer loading terms. ....	176
Table VIII-3.	Comparison of sub-embayment <b>total attenuated watershed loads</b> (including septic, runoff, and fertilizer) used for modeling of present and threshold loading scenarios of the Ashumet Valley systems. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms. ....	177
Table VIII-4.	Threshold sub-embayment loads and attenuated surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Ashumet Valley systems, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. ....	177
Table VIII-5.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the modeled threshold scenario, with percent change, for the Ashumet Valley systems. Sentinel threshold stations are in bold print. ....	178
Table IX-1.	Alternative Scenarios for Great, Green, and Bournes Pond. ....	181
Table IX-2.	Net changes in unattenuated nitrogen loads in Great, Green, and Bournes Ponds subwatersheds resulting from alternative scenario analyses. ....	183
Table IX-3.	Comparison of sub-embayment watershed <b>septic total nitrogen loads</b> (attenuated) used for modeling of present and Scenario 1 loading	

conditions of the Ashumet Valley systems (Maravista, Great Pond). These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface), benthic flux, runoff, or fertilizer loading terms. .... 183

Table IX-4. Comparison of sub-embayment **total nitrogen watershed loads** (including septic, runoff, and fertilizer) used for modeling of present and Scenario 1 loading conditions of the Ashumet Valley systems. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms. .... 184

Table IX-5. Scenario 1 sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Ashumet Valley systems, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. .... 184

Table IX-6. Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the modeled Scenario 1, with percent change, for the Great Pond system. The sentinel threshold station is in bold print. .... 184

Table IX-7. Comparison of sub-embayment watershed **septic total nitrogen loads** (attenuated) used for modeling of present and Scenario 2 (lower watersheds) loading conditions of the Ashumet Valley systems. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface), benthic flux, runoff, or fertilizer loading terms. .... 186

Table IX-8. Comparison of sub-embayment **total nitrogen watershed loads** (including septic, runoff, and fertilizer) used for modeling of present and Scenario 2 (lower watersheds) loading conditions of the Ashumet Valley systems. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms. .... 186

Table IX-9. Scenario 2 (lower watersheds) sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Ashumet Valley systems, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. .... 186

Table IX-10. Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the modeled Scenario 2 (lower watersheds) scenario, with percent change, for the Ashumet Valley systems. Sentinel threshold stations are in bold print. .... 187

Table IX-11. Comparison of sub-embayment watershed **septic total nitrogen loads** (attenuated) used for modeling of present and Scenario 3 (upper and lower watersheds) loading conditions of the Ashumet Valley systems. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface), benthic flux, runoff, or fertilizer loading terms. .... 191

Table IX-12. Comparison of sub-embayment **total nitrogen watershed loads** (including septic, runoff, and fertilizer) used for modeling of present and Scenario 3 (upper and lower watersheds) loading conditions of the Ashumet Valley systems. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms. .... 191

Table IX-13. Scenario 3 (upper and lower watersheds) sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Ashumet Valley systems, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. .... 192

Table IX-14. Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the modeled Scenario 3 (upper and lower watersheds), with percent change, for the Ashumet Valley systems. Sentinel threshold stations are in bold print. .... 193

Table IX-15. Average high, mid and low tide volumes, with mean tide prism for Bournes Pond, for existing inlet conditions, and for the proposed 100 ft-wide inlet modification. ....198

Table IX-16. Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the widened inlet channel (100 ft) scenario with present loading, with percent change, for the Ashumet Valley systems. ....199

Table IX-17. Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the modeled Scenario 2 (lower watershed) with widened inlet channel (100 ft) scenario, with percent change, for the Ashumet Valley systems. ....200