

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

 I.1 THE MASSACHUSETTS ESTUARIES PROJECT APPROACH 6

 I.2 SITE DESCRIPTION 10

 I.3 NITROGEN LOADING 12

 I.4 WATER QUALITY MODELING 13

 I.5 REPORT DESCRIPTION 14

II. PREVIOUS STUDIES RELATED TO NITROGEN MANAGEMENT 15

III. DELINEATION OF WATERSHEDS 18

 III.1 BACKGROUND 18

 III.2 MODEL DESCRIPTION 19

 III.3 PHINNEYS HARBOR, EEL POND AND BACK RIVER CONTRIBUTORY AREAS 20

IV. WATERSHED NITROGEN LOADING TO EMBAYMENT: LAND USE, STREAM INPUTS, AND SEDIMENT NITROGEN RECYCLING 24

 IV.1 WATERSHED LAND USE BASED NITROGEN LOADING ANALYSIS 24

 IV.1.1 Land Use and Water Use Database Preparation 27

 IV.1.2 Nitrogen Loading Input Factors 29

 IV.1.3 Calculating Nitrogen Loads 34

 IV.2 ATTENUATION OF NITROGEN IN SURFACE WATER TRANSPORT 40

 IV.2.1 Background and Purpose 40

 IV.2.2 Surface water Discharge and Attenuation of Watershed Nitrogen: Stream Discharge to Back River portion of Phinneys Harbor System 44

 IV.3 BENTHIC REGENERATION OF NITROGEN IN BOTTOM SEDIMENTS 48

 IV.3.1 Sediment-Watercolumn Exchange of Nitrogen 48

 IV.3.2 Method for determining sediment-watercolumn nitrogen exchange 49

 IV.3.3 Rates of Summer Nitrogen Regeneration from Sediments 53

V. HYDRODYNAMIC MODELING 57

 V.1 INTRODUCTION 57

 V.2 GEOMORPHIC AND ANTHROPOGENIC EFFECTS TO THE SYSTEM 59

 V.2 DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS 64

 V.2.1 Bathymetry Data 64

 V.2.2 Tide Data Collection and Analysis 66

 V.3 HYDRODYNAMIC MODELING 71

 V.3.1 Model Theory 71

 V.3.2 Model Setup 72

 V.3.2.1 Grid generation 72

 V.3.2.2 Boundary condition specification 74

 V.3.2.3 Calibration 74

 V.3.2.4 Model Circulation Characteristics 78

 V.4 FLUSHING CHARACTERISTICS 80

VI. WATER QUALITY MODELING 84

 VI.1 DATA SOURCES FOR THE MODEL 84

 VI.1.1 Hydrodynamics and Tidal Flushing in the Embayment 84

 VI.1.2 Nitrogen Loading to the Embayment 84

VI.1.3 Measured Nitrogen Concentrations in the Embayment.....	84
VI.2 MODEL DESCRIPTION AND APPLICATION	85
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	90
VI.2.6 Build-Out and No Anthropogenic Load Scenarios.....	92
VI.2.6.1 Build-Out.....	92
VI.2.6.2 No Anthropogenic Load	93
VII. ASSESSMENT OF EMBAYMENT NUTRIENT RELATED ECOLOGICAL HEALTH.....	96
VII.1 OVERVIEW OF BIOLOGICAL HEALTH INDICATORS.....	96
VII.2 BOTTOM WATER DISSOLVED OXYGEN.....	97
VII.3 EELGRASS DISTRIBUTION - TEMPORAL ANALYSIS.....	104
VII.4 BENTHIC INFAUNA ANALYSIS	107
VIII. CRITICAL NUTRIENT THRESHOLD DETERMINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF WATER QUALITY TARGETS	113
VIII.1. ASSESSMENT OF NITROGEN RELATED HABITAT QUALITY	113
VIII.2. THRESHOLD NITROGEN CONCENTRATIONS	117
VIII.3. DEVELOPMENT OF TARGET NITROGEN LOADS	118
VIII.4. EELGRASS NITROGEN THRESHOLD FOR PHINNEYS HARBOR	121
IX. ALTERNATIVES TO IMPROVE WATER QUALITY.....	124
IX.1 PRESENT LOADING WITH SEWERING OF EEL POND, INNER BACK RIVER, OUTER BACK RIVER, AND THE POND WATERSHEDS	124
IX.2 DEEPING THE INLET CHANNEL TO EEL POND WITH PRESENT LOADING CONDITIONS.....	126
X. LIST OF REFERENCES	128

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
Figure I-1	2
Figure I-2.	9
Figure III-1.	21
Figure III-2.	22
Figure IV-1.	26
Figure IV-2.	28
Figure IV-3.	36
Figure IV-4 (a-c).	38
Figure IV-5.	43
Figure IV-6.	46
Figure IV-7.	51

Figure IV-8. Eel Pond and Back River portion of the Phinneys Harbor embayment system sediment sampling sites (green symbols) for determination of nitrogen regeneration rates. Numbers are for reference in Table IV-7.....52

Figure IV-9. 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.....54

Figure V-1. Topographic map of the northern extent of Buzzards Bay, with an outline designating the study area of the Back River system.....57

Figure V-2. Wind rose for the BUZM3 Station located near the southern entrance to Buzzards Bay. Wind data is for the time 20-year time period between 1985 and 2004.60

Figure V-3. 2001 aerial photograph showing Phinneys Point and the two bridges across the inlet to the Eel Pond/Back River system.61

Figure V-4. A portion of the NOAA 1931 nautical chart showing the former dredged channel for the Cape Cod Canal. As indicated on the figure, this channel passed to the east of Mashnee Island.....62

Figure V-5. Flood levels at various locations in Buzzards Bay resulting from the September 21, 1938 Hurricane (USACE, 1939).....63

Figure V-6. The Buzzards Bay railroad station the September 21, 1938 Hurricane illustrating the level of storm surge.64

Figure V-7. Transects from the August 2001 bathymetry survey of the Back River system. Yellow markers show the locations of the three tide recorders deployed for this study.65

Figure V-8. Bathymetry data interpolated to the finite element mesh used with the RMA-2 hydrodynamic model. Contours represent the bottom elevation relative to NAVD 88. Data sources are the August 2001 survey of the Back River system, and the NOAA GEODAS database for Phinneys Harbor.66

Figure V-9. Plots of observed tides for the Back River system, for the 38-day period between August 3 and September 10, 2001. The top plot shows tides for Back River Inlet, at Phinneys Harbor. The middle plot shows tides recorded in the upper portion of Back River, and the bottom plot shows tides recorded at the southern portion of Eel Pond. All water levels are referenced to the North American Vertical Datum (NAVD 88).67

Figure V-10. Two-day tide plot showing tides in the Back River system plotted together. Demonstrated in this plot is the frictional damping effect caused by flow restrictions at the two bridges over Back River, and the additional damping caused by the inlet channel to Eel Pond. The damping effects are seen as a reduction in tidal amplitude, as well as the lag in time of high and low tides from Phinneys Harbor.....69

Figure V-11. Example of an observed astronomical tide as the sum of its primary constituents.70

Figure V-12. Plot of hydrodynamic model grid mesh for the Back River system. Color patterns designate the different model material types used to vary model calibration parameters and compute flushing rates.....73

Figure V-13. Comparison of model output and measured tides for the TDR location in Eel Pond. The top plot is a 50-hour sub-section of the total modeled time period, shown in the bottom plot.77

Figure V-14. Comparison of model output and measured tides for the TDR location in Eel Pond. The top plot is a 50-hour sub-section of the total modeled time period, shown in the bottom plot. 77

Figure V-15. 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-16. Time variation of computed flow rates for three transects in the Back River system. 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 Phinney’s Harbor and Back River systems. Station labels correspond to those provided in Table VI-1. Solid symbol adjacent EP-1 label indicates a nutrient monitoring station while the outline symbol adjacent the EP-1 label denotes a dissolved oxygen station. 86

Figure VI-2. Comparison of measured total nitrogen concentrations and calibrated model output at stations in Phinney’s Harbor 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 ± 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 and the bathymetry, for Phinney’s Harbor system. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Phinney’s Harbor estuary system (PH4) is shown. 90

Figure VI-4. Comparison of measured and calibrated model output at stations in Phinney’s Harbor 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 ± 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 Phinney’s Harbor system. 91

Figure VI-6. Contour plots of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Phinney’s Harbor estuary system, for projected build-out loading conditions, and bathymetry. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Phinney’s Harbor estuary system (PH4) is shown. 94

Figure VI-7. Contour plots of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Phinney’s Harbor estuary system, for no anthropogenic loading conditions, and bathymetry. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Phinney’s Harbor estuary system (PH4) is shown.....95

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.....98

Figure VII-2. Aerial Photograph of the Phinneys Harbor, Eel Pond and Back River system in Bourne showing locations of Dissolved Oxygen mooring deployments conducted in the Summer of 2005. 100

Figure VII-3. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen at the Back River station, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 101

Figure VII-4. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen at the Eel Pond station, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 101

Figure VII-5. Bottom water record of Chlorophyll-a at the Back River station, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 102

Figure VII-6. Bottom water record of Chlorophyll-a at the Eel Pond station, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 102

Figure VII-7. Eelgrass bed distribution within the Phinneys Harbor / Eel Pond / Back River 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 MASSDEP. All data was provided by the MASSDEP Eelgrass Mapping Program..... 106

Figure VII-8. Aerial photograph of the Eel Pond and Back River sub-embayments to Phinneys Harbor showing location of benthic infaunal sampling stations (red symbol). 110

Figure VII-9. Aerial photograph of the Phinneys Harbor 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 Phinney’s Harbor estuary system, for threshold conditions (0.35 mg/L at water quality monitoring. 120

Figure IX-1. Contour plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Phinney’s Harbor system, for present loading conditions with a 100-percent of the septic load removed from the Eel Pond and Back River watersheds. 126

LIST OF TABLES

Figure	Page
Table III-1. Daily groundwater discharge from each of the sub-watersheds to the Phinneys Harbor Estuary, as determined from the USGS groundwater model.....	23
Table IV-1. Percentage of unattenuated nitrogen loads in less than 10 year time of travel subwatersheds to Phinneys Harbor.....	25
Table IV-2. Average Water Use in Phinneys Harbor Watershed.....	32
Table IV-3. Primary Nitrogen Loading Factors used in the Phinneys Harbor MEP analyses. General factors are from MEP modeling evaluation (Howes & Ramsey 2001). Site-specific factors are derived from Bourne data. *Data from MEP lawn study in Falmouth, Mashpee & Barnstable 2001.	34
Table IV-4. Phinneys Harbor Nitrogen Loads. Attenuation of Phinneys Harbor system nitrogen loads occurs as nitrogen moves through upgradient ponds and streams during transport to the estuary. All values are kg N yr ⁻¹	37
Table IV-5. Comparison of water flow and nitrogen discharges from Back River (freshwater) discharging to estuarine reach of Back River. The “Stream” data is from the MEP stream gauging effort. Watershed data is based upon the MEP watershed modeling effort by USGS.	45
Table IV-6. Summary of annual volumetric discharge and nitrogen load (nitrate+nitrite and total nitrogen) from the Back River (freshwater) discharging to the head of the estuarine reach of Back River based upon the data presented in Figures IV-6 and Table IV-5.	48
Table IV-7. Rates of net nitrogen return from sediments to the overlying waters of the Phinneys Harbor / Eel Pond / Back River 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.....	56
Table V-1. Tide datums computed from 38-day records collected at Phinneys Harbor, Upper Back, R., and Eel Pond in August/September 2001. Datum elevations are given relative to NAVD 88.	68
Table V-2. Tidal Constituents, Back River sub-embayments, August to September 2001.	70
Table V-3. Percentages of Tidal versus Non-Tidal Energy for Back River embayments, August to September 2001.....	71
Table V-4. Manning’s Roughness coefficients used in simulations of modeled embayments. These embayment delineations correspond to the material type areas shown in V-7.....	75
Table V-5. Tidal constituents for measured water level data and calibrated model output for northern embayments.	78
Table V-6. Embayment mean volumes and average tidal prism during simulation period.	82
Table V-7. Computed System and Local residence times for embayments in the Phinneys Harbor/Back River system.....	82
Table VI-1. Pond-Watcher measured data, and modeled Nitrogen concentrations for the Phinney’s Harbor and the Back 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.....85

Table VI-2. Sub-embayment loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Phinney’s Harbor and Back River, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. These loads represent **present loading conditions**.88

Table VI-3. Values of longitudinal dispersion coefficient, E, used in calibrated RMA4 model runs of salinity and nitrogen concentration for Phinney’s Harbor estuary system.89

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 Phinney’s Harbor estuary 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 Phinney’s Harbor estuary system, 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 Phinney’s Harbor estuary system. Sentinel threshold stations are in bold print.93

Table VI-7. “No anthropogenic loading” (“no load”) sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of Phinney’s Harbor estuary system, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux.....94

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 Phinney’s Harbor estuary 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. Number of days during deployment of in situ sensors that bottom water oxygen levels were below various benchmark oxygen levels. 103

Table VII-2. Duration (number of deployment days) 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. 103

Table VII-3. Changes in eelgrass coverage in the Phinneys Harbor / Eel Pond / Back River System within the Town of Bourne over the past half century (MASSDEP Mapping Program, C. Costello). 107

Table VII-4. Benthic infaunal community data for the Phinneys Harbor Estuary by component sub-embayment (Phinneys Harbor, Eel Pond, Back River). 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). Station ID’s refer to Figures VII-9, VII-10..... 112

Table VIII-1. Summary of Nutrient Related Habitat Health within the Phinneys Harbor Estuary on the eastern coast of Buzzards Bay within the Town of Bourne, MA., based upon assessment data presented in Chapter VII. The estuarine reach of the Back River is presently a tidal salt marsh receiving freshwater discharge from the upper Back River. Eel Pond is a drowned kettle pond and Phinneys Harbor forms the lower estuary, which was

formed in the 1930's by the construction of causeways to Mashnee Island to the north and Tobys Island to the south. 114

Table VIII-2. Comparison of sub-embayment watershed **septic loads** (attenuated) used for modeling of present and threshold loading scenarios of the Phinney's Harbor and Back River system. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface), benthic flux, runoff, or fertilizer loading terms. 119

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 Phinney's Harbor and Back River system. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms. 119

Table VIII-4. Threshold sub-embayment loads and attenuated surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Phinney's Harbor and Back River system, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. 120

Table VIII-5. Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the modeled threshold scenario, with percent change, for the Phinney's Harbor and Back River system. Sentinel threshold station are in bold print. 121

Table IX-1. Comparison of sub-embayment watershed **septic loads** (attenuated) used for modeling of present conditions in Phinney's Harbor with septic loads removed from Eel Pond, Inner back River, Outer Back River, and the Pond Watersheds. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface), benthic flux, runoff, or fertilizer loading terms. 124

Table IX-2. Comparison of sub-embayment **total attenuated watershed loads** (including septic, runoff, and fertilizer) used for modeling of present conditions in Phinney's Harbor with septic loads removed from Eel Pond, Inner back River, Outer Back River, and the Pond Watersheds. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms. 124

Table IX -3. Sub-embayment loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Phinney's Harbor system for present loading scenario with septic loads removed from Eel Pond, Inner back River, Outer Back River, and the Pond Watersheds, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. 125

Table IX-4. Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading scenarios (with and without the septic loads removed from Eel Pond, Inner back River, Outer Back River, and the Pond Watersheds), with percent change, for the Phinney's Harbor system. The threshold station is shown in bold print. 125

Table IX-5. Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading scenarios (with and without the dredged inlet to Eel Pond), with percent change, for the Phinney's Harbor system. The threshold station is shown in bold print. 127