


# Massachusetts Estuaries Project

## Linked Watershed-Embayment Model to Determine Critical Nitrogen Loading Thresholds for the Little Pond System, Falmouth, Massachusetts



University of Massachusetts Dartmouth  
School of Marine Science and Technology



Massachusetts Department of  
Environmental Protection

*FINAL REPORT – JANUARY 2006*

# Massachusetts Estuaries Project

## Linked Watershed-Embayment Model to Determine Critical Nitrogen Loading Thresholds for the Little Pond System, Falmouth, Massachusetts

FINAL REPORT – January 2006



Brian Howes  
Roland Samimy  
David Schlezinger



Trey Ruthven  
John Ramsey  
Sean Kelly



Ed Eichner

Contributors:

### ***US Geological Survey***

Don Walters and John Masterson

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

Elizabeth Hunt

### ***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***

Xiaotong Wu

## 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 Little Pond System. 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, particularly Barbara Peri and Paul Affsa. These individuals gave of their time to collect nutrient samples from this system over many years and without this information, the present analysis would not have been possible. In addition, over the years, the Town of Falmouth Departments of Engineering and Planning have worked tirelessly with SMAST Coastal Systems Staff and engineers from Applied Coastal Research and Engineering towards the development of a restoration and management strategy for this system. This partnership has resulted in the reconstruction of the tidal inlet and phase I of the maintenance dredging of the tidal channel. These Town Departments along with the DPW have also provided important support to the present MEP effort. The technical team would like to specifically acknowledge the efforts of A. Lowell, B. Currie and G. Calise for helping to coordinate the Falmouth efforts with the MEP.

In addition to local contributions, technical, policy and regulatory support has been freely and graciously provided by Tom Cambareri and Margo Fenn of the Cape Cod Commission; MaryJo Feurbach, Art Clark and Nora Conlon of the USEPA; and our MADEP colleagues: Andrew Gottlieb (now at ODC), Arleen O'Donnell, Art Screpetis, Rick Dunn, Steve Halterman, and Russ Issacs. We are also thankful for the long hours in the field and laboratory spent by the technical staff, interns and students within the Coastal Systems Program at SMAST-UMD.

Support for this project was provided by the Town of Falmouth (Engineering and Sewer Departments), Barnstable County, MADEP, and the USEPA.

## SUGGESTED CITATION

Howes B.L., J. Ramsey, E.M. Eichner, R.I. Samimy, S. W. Kelley, D.R. Schlezinger (2006). Linked Watershed-Embayment Model to Determine Critical Nitrogen Loading Thresholds for the Little Pond System, Falmouth, MA. SMAST/DEP Massachusetts Estuaries Project, Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection. Boston, MA.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

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

    I.1 THE MASSACHUSETTS ESTUARIES PROJECT APPROACH ..... 4

    I.2 SITE DESCRIPTION ..... 8

    I.3 NITROGEN 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 ..... 17**

    III.1 BACKGROUND ..... 17

    III.2 MODEL DESCRIPTION ..... 17

    III.3 LITTLE POND CONTRIBUTORY AREAS ..... 18

**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 Database Preparation ..... 24

        IV.1.2 Nitrogen Loading Input Factors ..... 28

        IV.1.3 Calculating Nitrogen Loads ..... 32

    IV.2 ATTENUATION OF NITROGEN IN SURFACE WATER TRANSPORT ..... 38

        IV.2.1 Background and Purpose ..... 38

        IV.2.2 Surface Water Discharge and Attenuation of Watershed Nitrogen: Stream  
            Discharge to the Upper Estuarine Reach of Little Pond ..... 41

    IV.3 BENTHIC REGENERATION OF NITROGEN IN BOTTOM SEDIMENTS ..... 44

        IV.3.1 Sediment-Watercolumn Exchange of Nitrogen ..... 45

        IV.3.2 Method for determining sediment-watercolumn nitrogen exchange ..... 46

        IV.3.3 Rates of Summer Nitrogen Regeneration from Sediments ..... 48

        Little Pond Estuary ..... 50

**V. HYDRODYNAMIC MODELING ..... 51**

    V.1 INTRODUCTION ..... 51

    V.2 GEOMORPHIC AND ANTHROPOGENIC EFFECTS TO THE SYSTEM ..... 52

        V.2.1 Coastal Processes and Inlet Stability ..... 56

        V.2.2 Shoreline Change Analysis ..... 59

        V.2.3 Inlet Management Implications ..... 63

    V.3 FIELD DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS ..... 65

        V.3.1 Bathymetry ..... 65

        V.3.2 Water Elevation Measurements and Analysis ..... 66

    V.4 HYDRODYNAMIC MODELING ..... 71

        V.4.1 Model Theory ..... 71

        V.4.2 Model Setup ..... 72

            V.4.2.1 Grid Generation ..... 72

            V.4.2.2 Boundary Condition Specification ..... 73

            V.4.2.3 Calibration ..... 74

                V.4.2.3.1 Friction Coefficients ..... 74

                V.4.2.3.2 Turbulent Exchange Coefficients ..... 75

                V.4.2.3.3 Comparison of Modeled Tides and Measured Tide Data ..... 76

V.4.2.4 Model Circulation Characteristics .....	78
V.5 FLUSHING CHARACTERISTICS .....	80
<b>VI. WATER QUALITY MODELING .....</b>	<b>83</b>
VI.1 DATA SOURCES FOR THE MODEL .....	83
VI.1.1 Hydrodynamics and Tidal Flushing in the Embayment .....	83
VI.1.2 Nitrogen Loading to the Embayment.....	83
VI.1.3 Measured Nitrogen Concentrations in the Embayment.....	83
VI.2 MODEL DESCRIPTION AND APPLICATION .....	86
VI.2.1 Model Formulation.....	86
VI.2.2 Water Quality Model Setup .....	87
VI.2.3 Boundary Condition Specification .....	87
VI.2.4 Model Calibration .....	88
VI.2.5 Model Salinity Verification .....	89
VI.2.6 Build-Out and No Anthropogenic Load Scenarios.....	92
VI.2.6.1 Build-Out.....	93
VI.2.6.2 No Anthropogenic Load .....	94
<b>VII. ASSESSMENT OF EMBAYMENT NUTRIENT RELATED ECOLOGICAL HEALTH .....</b>	<b>97</b>
VII.1 OVERVIEW OF BIOLOGICAL HEALTH INDICATORS.....	97
VII.2 BOTTOM WATER DISSOLVED OXYGEN.....	98
VII.3 EELGRASS DISTRIBUTION - TEMPORAL ANALYSIS.....	105
VII.4 BENTHIC INFAUNA ANALYSIS .....	109
<b>VIII. CRITICAL NUTRIENT THRESHOLD DETERMINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF     WATER QUALITY TARGETS .....</b>	<b>112</b>
VIII.1 ASSESSMENT OF NITROGEN RELATED HABITAT QUALITY .....	112
VIII.2 THRESHOLD NITROGEN CONCENTRATIONS .....	113
VIII.3 DEVELOPMENT OF TARGET NITROGEN LOADS .....	116
<b>IX. ALTERNATIVES TO IMPROVE TIDAL FLUSHING AND WATER QUALITY.....</b>	<b>120</b>
IX.1 FLUSHING IMPROVEMENTS TO LITTLE POND BY MODIFICATIONS TO THE INLET .....	120
<b>X. LIST OF REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>125</b>

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure I-1. Study region proximal to the Little Pond embayment system for the Massachusetts Estuaries Project nutrient analysis. Tidal waters enter the salt pond through one inlet to Vineyard Sound. Freshwaters enter from the watershed primarily through 1 surface water discharge (stream to the head of Little Pond) and direct groundwater discharge. ....2

Figure I-2. Massachusetts Estuaries Project Critical Nutrient Threshold Analytical Approach. Section numbers refer to sections in this MEP report where the specified information is provided. ....7

Figure I-3. Partitioning of the Little Pond embayment system relative to basin boundary volumes. ....10

Figure III-1. Watershed and sub-watershed delineations for the Little Pond 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). Morse Pond watershed is included in this figure to clarify the shape of the Little Pond watershed but flows to a separate system. ....20

Figure III-2. Comparison of previous and current Little Pond watershed and subwatershed delineations. ....21

Figure IV-1. Land-use coverage in the Little Pond watershed. Watershed data encompasses portions of the Town of Falmouth and land use classifications are based on Town of Falmouth Planning Department records. ....26

Figure IV-2. Distribution of land-uses within the major sub-watersheds to Little Pond. ....27

Figure IV-3. Parcels, Parcelized Watersheds, and Developable Parcels in the Little Pond watersheds. Note the limited area remaining for new development. ....34

Figure IV-4 (a-c). Land use-specific unattenuated nitrogen load (by percent) to the (a) Little Pond Salt sub-watershed, (b) Little Pond Stream sub-watershed, and (c) Jones Pond. “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 (i.e. no atmospheric deposition). ....36

Figure IV-5. Location of Stream gauge (red triangle) in the Little Pond embayment system. ....41

Figure IV-6. Predicted stream discharge (solid pink line) to Little Pond, nitrate+nitrite (blue diamonds) and total nitrogen (yellow triangles) concentrations for determination of annual volumetric discharge and nitrogen load from the upper watershed to the Little Pond Estuary (Table IV-5). ....43

Figure IV-7. Little Pond embayment system sediment sampling sites (red symbols) for determination of nitrogen regeneration rates. Numbers are for reference in Table IV-7. ....47

Figure IV-8. 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. ....49

Figure V-1. Aerial photograph of the Little Pond and adjacent embayments of Great Pond and Falmouth Harbor, Falmouth, MA. ....52

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. ....	54
Figure V-3.	Shoaling of the Little Pond entrance channel in 2004, where littoral drift caused beach sediment from the east side of the inlet to partially block the channel. ....	55
Figure V-4.	Typical dredging required to maintain the Little Pond entrance channel. ....	55
Figure V-5.	Photograph of the Wellsmere Inn in Maravista immediately after the 1944 Hurricane, which had the largest storm surge in the region of Little Pond of 20 <sup>th</sup> century storms. Note the wood bulkheads and concrete seawall that were utilized to armor the shoreline. ....	57
Figure V-6.	Photograph of Menauhant Road in Maravista immediately after the 1944 Hurricane. Note the stone revetment armoring the roadway. ....	57
Figure V-7.	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. ....	58
Figure V-8.	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 western jetty at the left side of the photograph. ....	58
Figure V-9.	The 2001 aerial photograph showing the extent of the Falmouth shoreline surveyed by Differential GPS in 2004. ....	62
Figure V-10.	The 2001 aerial photograph showing scaled transects that indicate computed shoreline change rates between 1938 and 2004. ....	64
Figure V-11.	Shoreline change data distribution calculated along the south coast of Falmouth (Falmouth Harbor to Menauhant Beach) between 1938 and 2004. ....	64
Figure V-12.	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". ....	65
Figure V-13.	Little Pond with tide gauge locations labeled as W1 (forcing tide) and W2 (Little Pond tide) ....	66
Figure V-14.	Little Pond bathymetry showing depth contours of the numerical grid for the Little Pond embayment at 0.25-foot contour intervals relative to NGVD29. ....	67
Figure V-15.	Tidal elevation observations offshore Little Pond relative to the Little Pond embayment. (Upper) location W1 and (Lower) location W2 within Little Pond. Locations are shown in Figure V-13. ....	68
Figure V-16.	Comparison of water surface elevation observations for Vineyard Sound (offshore), and in Little Pond. Damping effects are seen as a decrease in the tidal amplitude, as well as a lag in the time of high and low tides from Vineyard Sound. ....	70
Figure V-17.	Hydrodynamic model grid mesh for Little Pond. ....	73
Figure V-18.	Hydrodynamic model grid material properties. Color patterns designate the different model material types used to vary model calibration parameters and compute flushing rates. ....	75
Figure V-19.	Comparison of model output and measured tides for the gauge site in Little Pond. Differences between the observed (solid line) and modeled (dashed line) tidal elevation are generally imperceptible. ....	77
Figure V-20.	Comparison of model output and measured tides for the gauge site in Little Pond. ....	78

Figure V-21. 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.....79

Figure V-22. Example of hydrodynamic model output for a single time step where maximum ebb velocities occur for this tide cycle. Color contours indicate velocity magnitude, and vectors indicate the direction of flow.....79

Figure V-23. Time variation of computed flow rate for inlet to Little Pond. Model period shown corresponds to spring tide conditions, where the tide range is the largest, and resulting flow rates are correspondingly large compared to neap tide conditions. Plotted time period represents three tide cycles (12.42 h cycle). Positive flow indicated flooding tide, while negative flow indicates ebbing tide.....80

Figure VI-1. Estuarine water quality monitoring station locations in the Little Pond system. Station labels correspond to those provided in Table VI-1.....85

Figure VI-2. Comparison of measured total nitrogen concentrations and calibrated model output at stations in Little Pond. For the left plot, station labels correspond with those provided in Table VI-1 and Figure 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 July-August mean (1997-2004) 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.....89

Figure VI-3. Contour plots of average total nitrogen concentrations from results of the present conditions loading scenario (left) and the bathymetry (right), for Little Pond. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Little Pond (LP2) is shown.....90

Figure VI-4. Comparison of measured and calibrated model output at stations in Little Pond. For the left plots, stations labels correspond with those provided in Table VI-1 and Figure 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 July-August mean (1997-2004) 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.....91

Figure VI-5. Contour plots of modeled salinity (ppt) and bathymetry in Little Pond. ....92

Figure VI-6. Contour plots of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Little Pond, for projected build-out loading conditions, and bathymetry. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Little Pond (LP2) is shown. ....94

Figure VI-7. Contour plots of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Little Pond, for no anthropogenic loading conditions, and bathymetry. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Little Pond (LP2) is shown. ....96

Figure VII-1. Average watercolumn respiration rates (micro-Molar/day) from water collected throughout the Popponeset 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.....99

Figure VII-2. Aerial Photograph of the Little Pond system in Falmouth showing locations of Dissolved Oxygen mooring deployments conducted in the Summer of 2002. The sentinel station is located about mid way between the mooring sites. .... 101

Figure VII-3. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen at Little Pond Upper station, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. .... 102

Figure VII-4. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen in Little Pond Low station, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. .... 102

Figure VII-5. Bottom water record of Chlorophyll-a at Little Pond Upper station, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. .... 103

Figure VII-6. Bottom water record of Chlorophyll-a in Little Pond Low station, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. .... 103

Figure VII-7. Eelgrass bed distribution within the Little Pond System. The 1995 coverage is depicted by the green outline inside of which circumscribes the eelgrass beds. The yellow (2001) areas were mapped by DEP. All data was provided by the DEP Eelgrass Mapping Program..... 107

Figure VII-8. Eelgrass bed distribution within the Little Pond System. The 1951 coverage is depicted by the dark green outline (hatched area) inside of which circumscribes the eelgrass beds. In the composite photograph, the light green outline depicts the 1995 eelgrass coverage and the yellow outlined areas circumscribe the eelgrass coverage in 2001. The 1995 and 2001 areas were mapped by DEP. All data was provided by the DEP Eelgrass Mapping Program..... 108

Figure VII-9. Aerial photograph of the Little Pond system showing location of benthic infaunal sampling stations (red symbol). .... 111

Figure VIII-1. Contour plot of modeled average total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Little Pond system, for threshold conditions (0.45 mg/L at water quality monitoring station LP2). The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Little Pond (LP2) is shown. .... 115

Figure IX-1. Plots showing a comparison of typical tides for modeled existing conditions (top plot) and proposed improved 20 ft-wide inlet (bottom plot) to Little Pond. .... 121

Figure IX-2. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Little Pond, for present loading conditions, and widened inlet channel (20 ft). The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Little Pond (LP2) is shown..... 122

Figure IX-3. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Little Pond, for widened inlet threshold scenario (lower watershed) loading conditions, and widened inlet channel (20 ft). The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Little Pond (LP2) is shown..... 124

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table III-1. Daily groundwater discharge from each of the sub-watersheds to the Little Pond Estuary, as determined from the USGS groundwater model.....22

Table IV-1. Percentage of unattenuated nitrogen loads in less than 10 time of travel sub-watersheds to Little Pond. Note that within the >10 yr time of travel sub-watershed, the average age of homes is 43 years.....24

Table IV-2. Average Water Use in Little Pond Watershed.....30

Table IV-3. Primary Nitrogen Loading Factors used in Little 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.....32

Table IV-4. Nitrogen loads discharged to the watershed of the Little Pond Estuarine System and for the direct groundwater discharge watershed to the estuarine reach (Little Pond Salt) and the Little Pond Stream. Attenuation of system nitrogen loads occurs as nitrogen moves through Jones Pond and the Little Pond stream during transport to the estuary. Build-out nitrogen loads are based upon amount of developable land, zoning and projections of development. Septic refers to on-site septic system treatment of wastewater from residential and commercial properties. Atmospheric deposition to water bodies is comprised of 46 kg yr<sup>-1</sup> to freshwater ponds and 213 kg yr<sup>-1</sup> directly to the estuarine waters of Little Pond.....35

Table IV-5. Comparison of water flow and nitrogen discharge from stream discharging to the head of Little Pond. The “Stream” data is from the MEP stream gauging effort. Watershed flow data is based upon the MEP watershed modeling effort by USGS.....44

Table IV-6. Summary of annual volumetric discharge and nitrogen load from the stream discharging to the head of Little Pond based upon the data presented in Figures IV-6 and Table IV-5.....45

Table IV-7. Rates of net nitrogen return from sediments to overlying waters of the Little Pond embayment system. These values are combined with basin areas to determine total nitrogen mass in the water quality model (see Chapter VI). Measurements represent July-August rates. The spatial variability in rates tends to follow the depositional environment and bathymetry of the basins (i.e. distribution of organic deposition).....50

Table V-1. Estimates of potential error associated with shoreline position surveys.....62

Table V-2. Tidal Constituents, Little Pond July-September 2003.....69

Table V-3. M<sub>2</sub> Tidal Attenuation, July-September 2003 (Delay in minutes relative to Vineyard Sound).....69

Table V-4. Percentages of Tidal versus Non-Tidal Energy, Little Pond, 2003.....71

Table V-5. Manning’s Roughness coefficients used in simulations of modeled embayments. These embayment delineations correspond to the material type areas shown in Figure V-18.....75

Table V-6. Tidal constituents for measured water level data and calibrated model output for Little Pond. ....76

Table V-7. Tidal constituents for measured water level data and verified model output for Little Pond. ....77

Table V-8. Embayment mean volume and average tidal prism during simulation period. ....82

Table V-9.	Computed residence times for Little Pond system. ....	82
Table VI-1.	PondWatcher measured data, and modeled Total Nitrogen concentrations for the Little Pond system used in the model calibration plots of Figure VI-2. All concentrations are given in mg N/L. “Data mean” values are calculated as the average of the separate yearly means. ....	84
Table VI-2.	Sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Little Pond, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. These loads represent <b>present loading conditions</b> . ....	88
Table VI-3.	Values of longitudinal dispersion coefficient, E, used in calibrated RMA4 model runs of salinity and nitrogen concentration for Little Pond estuary system. ....	88
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 Little Pond system. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms. ....	92
Table VI-5.	Build-out sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Little Pond, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. ....	93
Table VI-6.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the build-out scenario, with percent change, for the Little Pond system. Sentinel threshold stations are in bold print. ....	94
Table VI-7.	“No anthropogenic loading” (“no load”) sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of Little Pond, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. ....	95
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 Little Pond system. Loads are based on atmospheric deposition and a scaled N benthic flux (scaled from present conditions). Sentinel threshold stations are in bold print. ....	95
Table VII-1.	Percent of time during deployment of in situ sensors that bottom water oxygen levels were below various benchmark oxygen levels. Even short term oxygen declines below 3 mg/L result in a high level of stress to communities. ....	104
Table VII-2.	Duration (% of deployment time) 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. ....	104
Table VII-3.	Changes in eelgrass coverage in the Little Pond Embayment System within the Town of Falmouth over the past half century (C. Costello). Note that the 1995 and 2001 areas do not represent significant eelgrass beds, but rather enclose the zone of sparsely distributed surviving eelgrass. ....	109
Table VII-4.	Benthic infaunal community data for the Little Pond embayment 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 0.018 m <sup>2</sup> ). ....	110
Table VIII-1.	Summary of Nutrient Related Habitat Health within the Little Pond, Estuary on the south shore of Falmouth, MA., based upon assessment data presented in Chapter VII. ....	113

Table VIII-2.	Comparison of sub-embayment watershed <b>septic loads</b> (attenuated) used for modeling of present and threshold loading scenarios of the Little Pond system. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface), benthic flux, runoff, or fertilizer loading terms.....	117
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 Little Pond system. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms.....	118
Table VIII-4.	Threshold sub-embayment loads and attenuated surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Little Pond system, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux.....	118
Table VIII-5.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the modeled threshold scenario, with percent change, for the Little Pond system. Sentinel threshold stations are in bold print. ....	119
Table IX-1.	Average high, mid and low tide volumes, with mean tide prism for Little Pond, for existing inlet conditions, and for the proposed 20 ft-wide inlet modification. ....	121
Table IX-2.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the widened inlet channel (20 ft) scenario with present loading, with percent change.....	121
Table IX-3.	Comparison of sub-embayment watershed <b>septic loads</b> (attenuated) used for modeling of present and threshold loading for the widened inlet threshold scenario of Little Pond. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface), benthic flux, runoff, or fertilizer loading terms.....	123
Table IX-4.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the modeled widened inlet threshold scenario (lower watershed) with widened inlet channel (20 ft) scenario, with percent change.....	123