

## **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 Rushy Marsh Pond Estuary. Without these stewards and their efforts, this project would not have been possible.

First and foremost, we would like to recognize the significant time and effort in data collection and discussion spent by members of the Three Bays/Rushy Marsh Water Quality Monitoring Program and SMAST “volunteers”. These individuals gave generously of their time to collect nutrient samples from this system, without which the present analysis would not have been possible. Of particular note are Lindsey Counsell of Three Bays Preservation, Coordinator of the Monitoring Program, and John Jacobsen of the Town of Barnstable, Coordinator of the Town-wide Monitoring Program. Similarly, many in the Town of Barnstable helped in this effort, the Barnstable Department of Public Works, the Barnstable Conservation Division and the Barnstable Nutrient Management Committee. The technical team would like to specifically acknowledge the efforts of Three Bays Preservation and the Friends of Rushy Marsh for their energy and perseverance in the stewardship of this coastal resource.

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; 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, Glenn Haas, and Ron Lyberger. We are also thankful for the long hours in the field and laboratory spent by the many technical staff (Jennifer Antosca, Michael Bartlett, and David White), interns and students within the Coastal Systems Program at SMAST-UMD.

Support for this project was provided by the Town of Barnstable, Friends of Rushy Marsh, Barnstable County, MADEP, and the USEPA, with in-kind support from Three Bays Preservation Inc.

## **SUGGESTED CITATION**

Howes B., H. Ruthven, J. Ramsey, R. Samimy, D. Schlezinger, E. Eichner (2005). Linked Watershed-Embayment Model to Determine Critical Nitrogen Loading Thresholds for Rushy Marsh Pond, Barnstable, Massachusetts. 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 ..... 6

    I.3 NUTRIENT LOADING ..... 9

    I.4 WATER QUALITY MODELING ..... 11

    I.5 REPORT DESCRIPTION ..... 12

**II. PREVIOUS STUDIES RELATED TO NITROGEN MANAGEMENT ..... 13**

**III. DELINEATION OF WATERSHEDS ..... 15**

    III.1 BACKGROUND ..... 15

    III.2 MODEL DESCRIPTION ..... 16

    III.3 RUSHY MARSH POND CONTRIBUTORY AREA ..... 17

**IV. WATERSHED NITROGEN LOADING TO EMBAYMENT: LAND USE, STREAM  
    INPUTS, AND SEDIMENT NITROGEN RECYCLING ..... 19**

    IV.1 WATERSHED LAND USE BASED NITROGEN LOADING ANALYSIS ..... 19

        IV.1.1 Land Use and Water Use Database Preparation ..... 21

        IV.1.2 Nitrogen Loading Input Factors ..... 23

        IV.1.3 Calculating Nitrogen Loads ..... 27

    IV.2 ATTENUATION OF NITROGEN IN SURFACE WATER TRANSPORT ..... 30

        IV.2.1 Background and Purpose ..... 30

    IV.3 BENTHIC REGENERATION OF NITROGEN IN BOTTOM SEDIMENTS ..... 31

        IV.3.1 Sediment-Watercolumn Exchange of Nitrogen ..... 31

        IV.3.2 Method for Determining Sediment-Watercolumn Nitrogen Exchange ..... 32

        IV.3.3 Rates of Summer Nitrogen Regeneration from Sediments ..... 34

**V. HYDRODYNAMIC MODELING ..... 38**

    V.1 INTRODUCTION ..... 38

    V.2 GEOMORPHIC AND ANTHROPOGENIC EFFECTS TO THE ESTUARINE  
        SYSTEM ..... 39

        V.2.1 Natural Coastal Processes ..... 40

        V.2.2 Anthropogenic Changes Influencing Rushy Marsh Pond ..... 41

    V.3 FIELD DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS ..... 50

        V.3.1 Bathymetry ..... 50

        V.3.2 Water Elevation Measurements and Analysis ..... 51

    V.4 HYDRODYNAMIC MODELING ..... 55

        V.4.1 Model Theory ..... 55

        V.4.2 Model Setup ..... 55

            V.4.2.1 Grid Generation ..... 56

            V.4.2.2 Boundary Condition Specification ..... 56

            V.4.2.3 Calibration ..... 57

            V.4.2.4 Model Circulation Characteristics ..... 60

    V.5 FLUSHING CHARACTERISTICS ..... 61

**VI. WATER QUALITY MODELING ..... 64**

    VI.1 DATA SOURCES FOR THE MODEL ..... 64

        VI.1.1 Hydrodynamics and Tidal Flushing in the Embayment ..... 64

VI.1.2 Nitrogen Loading to the Embayment.....	64
VI.1.3 Measured Nitrogen Concentrations in the Embayment.....	64
<b>VI.2 MODEL DESCRIPTION AND APPLICATION .....</b>	<b>64</b>
VI.2.1 Model Formulation.....	67
VI.2.2 Water Quality Model Setup .....	67
VI.2.3 Boundary Condition Specification .....	68
VI.2.4 Model Calibration .....	68
VI.2.5 Model Salinity Verification .....	71
VI.2.6 Build-Out and No Anthropogenic Load Scenarios.....	72
VI.2.6.1 Build-Out.....	72
VI.2.6.2 No Anthropogenic Load .....	74
<b>VII. ASSESSMENT OF EMBAYMENT NUTRIENT RELATED ECOLOGICAL HEALTH .....</b>	<b>76</b>
VII.1 OVERVIEW OF BIOLOGICAL HEALTH INDICATORS.....	76
VII.2 BOTTOM WATER DISSOLVED OXYGEN.....	77
VII.3 EELGRASS DISTRIBUTION - TEMPORAL ANALYSIS.....	82
VII.4 BENTHIC INFAUNA ANALYSIS .....	82
<b>VIII. CRITICAL NUTRIENT THRESHOLD DETERMINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF WATER QUALITY TARGETS.....</b>	<b>86</b>
VIII.1 ASSESSMENT OF NITROGEN RELATED HABITAT QUALITY .....	86
VIII.2 THRESHOLD NITROGEN CONCENTRATIONS .....	87
VIII.3 DEVELOPMENT OF TARGET NITROGEN LOADS .....	88
<b>IX. ALTERNATIVES TO IMPROVE TIDAL FLUSHING AND WATER QUALITY.....</b>	<b>91</b>
IX.1 FLUSHING IMPROVEMENTS TO RUSHY MARSH BY RECONSTRUCTION OF THE INLET.....	91
<b>X. REFERENCES .....</b>	<b>96</b>

**LIST OF FIGURES**

Figure	Page
Figure I-1. Study region for the Massachusetts Estuaries Project analysis of the Rushy Marsh Pond System. Tidal waters enter the Pond from Nantucket Sound. Freshwaters enter from the watershed primarily through direct groundwater discharge and direct precipitation. Note the small brackish pond in the barrier beach. ....	2
Figure I-2. Massachusetts Estuaries Project Critical Nutrient Threshold Analytical Approach .....	8
Figure III-1. Watershed delineation for the Rushy Marsh Estuary. All recharge reaches the estuary within ten years. A single watershed to the embayment was selected based upon the functional estuarine unit in the water quality model (see Chapter VI). The Popponesset Bay watershed is to the west. ....	18
Figure IV-1. Land-use coverage in the Rushy Marsh watershed. Land use classifications are based on assessors' records provided by the Town of Barnstable. Note the shoreline overlaying the water of Nantucket Sound represents the shoreline of 19XX, while the present barrier beach shoreline is shown to the west (white/blue interface). The small pond in the barrier beach is all that remains today of the larger cove created by the spit .....	20
Figure IV-2. Distribution of land-uses within the Rushy Marsh watershed. Single family residential parcels make up 97% of the residential land-use.....	22
Figure IV-3. Parcels, Parcelized Watersheds, and Developable Parcels in the Rushy Marsh watershed.....	28
Figure IV-4. Land use-specific unattenuated nitrogen load (by percent) to the Rushy Marsh watershed. "Overall Load" is the total nitrogen input within the watershed, while the "Local Control Load" represents only those nitrogen sources that could potentially be under local regulatory control (e.g. excludes atmospheric deposition to estuarine surface).....	29
Figure IV-5. Rushy Marsh System locations (red diamonds) of sediment sample collection for determination of nitrogen regeneration rates. Numbers are for reference in Table IV-3.....	33
Figure IV-6. 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.....	35
Figure V-1. Aerial photograph of Rushy Marsh in 2001, showing the location of the existing 12-inch culvert, as well as the 1956 flume location. Culvert is in location of natural inlet that existed prior to 1896.....	39
Figure V-2. Portion of the 1893 USGS topographic map (Cotuit Quadrangle) showing the position of the inlet at a similar location as the present inlet. ....	42
Figure V-3. Portion of the 1943 USGS topographic map (Cotuit Quadrangle) showing the elongation of Popponesset Beach and closed inlet conditions at Rushy Marsh. ....	43
Figure V-4. Outlines of vertical aerial photographs illustrating stages of shoreline evolution in the Popponesset Spit region between 1951 and 1965 (from Aubrey and Goud, 1983). ....	44

Figure V-5.	Outlines of vertical aerial photographs illustrating stages of shoreline evolution in the Popponeset Spit region between 1971 and 1981 (from Aubrey and Goud, 1983).	45
Figure V-6.	A schematic description of barrier spit evolution in the vicinity of Popponeset Bay and Rushy Marsh Pond (Coast & Harbor Institute and Robert L. Fultz Associates, 2002).	46
Figure V-7.	Observed shoreline change from 1938 to 2001/2005 for the shoreline area in the vicinity of Rushy Marsh Pond and Three Bays in Barnstable.	46
Figure V-8.	Locations of beach transect monitoring stations along Oregon Beach.	47
Figure V-9.	Inter-annual changes to beach profile at Station OB#1 shown in Figure V-7.	48
Figure V-10.	Inter-annual changes to beach profile at Station OB#3 shown in Figure V-7.	48
Figure V-11.	The 1956 wood flume built to hydraulically connect Rushy Marsh Pond to Nantucket Sound (Coast & Harbor Institute and Robert L. Fultz Associates, 2002).	49
Figure V-12.	Rushy Marsh with tide gauge locations labeled as W1 (forcing tide) and W2 (Rushy Marsh tide).	50
Figure V-13.	Bathymetry showing depth contours of the numerical grid for the Rushy Marsh embayment at 0.5-foot contour intervals relative to NGVD29.	52
Figure V-14.	Tidal elevation observations offshore Rushy Marsh relative to the Rushy Marsh embayment. (Upper) location W1 and (Lower) location W2 within Rushy Marsh. Locations are shown in Figure V-12.	52
Figure V-15.	Hydrodynamic model grid mesh for Rushy Marsh.	57
Figure V-16.	Hydrodynamic model grid material properties. Color patterns designate the different model material types used to vary model calibration parameters and compute flushing rates.	59
Figure V-17.	Comparison of model output and measured tides for the gauge site in Rush Marsh. Differences between the observed (solid line) and modeled (dashed line) tidal elevation are generally imperceptible.	60
Figure V-18.	Time variation of computed flow rate for inlet to Rushy Marsh. Model period shown corresponds to spring tide conditions, where the tide range is the largest. Positive flow indicated ebbing tide, while negative flow indicates flooding tide.	61
Figure VI-1.	Estuarine water quality monitoring station locations in the Rushy Marsh system. Station labels correspond to those provided in Table VI-1.	66
Figure VI-2.	Comparison of measured total nitrogen concentrations and calibrated model output at stations in Rushy Marsh. For the left plot, station labels correspond with those provided in Table VI-1. Model output is presented as a range of values from minimum to maximum values computed during the simulation period (triangle markers), along with the average computed concentration for the same period (square markers). Measured data are presented as the total yearly mean at each station (circle markers), together with ranges that indicate $\pm$ one standard deviation of the entire dataset. For the plots to the right, model calibration target values are plotted against measured concentrations, together with the unity line. Computed correlation ( $R^2$ ) and error (rms) for each model are also presented.	70
Figure VI-3.	Contour plots of average total nitrogen concentrations from results of the present conditions loading scenario and the bathymetry, for Rushy Marsh.	

The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Rushy Marsh (RM2) is shown..... 70

Figure VI-4. Comparison of measured and calibrated model output at stations in Rushy Marsh. 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..... 71

Figure VI-5. Contour plots of modeled salinity (ppt) and bathymetry in Rushy Marsh. .... 72

Figure VI-6. Contour plots of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Rushy Marsh, for projected build-out loading conditions, and bathymetry. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Rushy Marsh (RM2) is shown. .... 74

Figure VI-7. Contour plots of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Rushy Marsh, for no anthropogenic loading conditions, and bathymetry. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Rushy Marsh (RM2) is shown. .... 75

Figure VII-1. Average watercolumn respiration rates (micro-Molar/day) from water collected throughout the Popponesset Bay System (Schlezinger and Howes, unpublished data). Rates vary ~7 fold from winter to summer as a result of variations in temperature and organic matter availability..... 78

Figure VII-2. Aerial Photograph of the Rushy Marsh embayment system in the Town of Barnstable showing locations of the Dissolved Oxygen mooring deployment conducted in the Summer of 2004..... 79

Figure VII-3. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen in the Rushy Marsh Pond station, Summer 2004. Calibration samples represented as red dots..... 80

Figure VII-4. Bottom water record of Chlorophyll-a in the Rushy Marsh Pond station, Summer 2004. Calibration samples represented as red dots ..... 80

Figure VII-5. Aerial photograph of the Rushy Marsh embayment system showing location of benthic infaunal sampling stations (green symbol). .... 84

Figure IX-1. Plots showing a comparison of typical tides for modeled existing conditions (top plot), proposed reconstructed 4 ft-wide inlet (middle plot), and proposed reconstructed 10 ft-wide inlet (bottom plot) to Rushy Marsh. .... 92

Figure IX-2. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Rushy Marsh, for present loading conditions, and reconstructed inlet channel (4 ft), with existing culvert. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Rushy Marsh (RM2) is shown..... 94

Figure IX-3. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in Rushy Marsh, for present loading conditions, and reconstructed inlet channel (10 ft), with existing culvert. The approximate location of the sentinel threshold station for Rushy Marsh (RM2) is shown..... 95

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table	Page
Table IV-1. Primary Nitrogen Loading Factors used in the Rushy Marsh MEP analysis. General factors are from MEP modeling evaluation (Howes and Ramsey 2001). Site-specific factors are derived from Town of Barnstable data. *Data from MEP lawn study in Falmouth, Mashpee & Barnstable 2001. ....	27
Table IV-2. Nitrogen Loads to the Rushy Marsh Pond Estuary. There is negligible attenuation during transport to Rushy Marsh Pond and groundwater travel times are less than 10 years throughout the watershed. Wastewater represents on-site septic treatment and disposal from residential dwellings.....	29
Table IV-3. Rates of net nitrogen return from sediments to the overlying waters of the Rushy Marsh 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 Summer rates. Note that the net nitrogen uptake by the central basin (drown kettle).....	37
Table V-1. Tidal Constituents, Rushy Marsh, April-May 2004 .....	53
Table V-2. Percentages of Tidal versus Non-Tidal Energy, Rushy Marsh, 2004.....	54
Table V-3. Tide datums computed from tide record collected in Nantucket Sound. Datum elevations are given relative to NGVD 27.....	54
Table V-4. Manning’s Roughness coefficients used in simulations of modeled embayments. These embayment delineations correspond to the material type areas shown in Figure V-16.....	58
Table V-6. Embayment mean volume and average tidal prism during simulation period. ....	62
Table V-7. Computed residence times for Rushy Marsh system. ....	62
Table VI-1. Water Quality Monitoring Pond-Watcher measured data, and modeled Nitrogen concentrations for the Rushy Marsh 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.....	65
Table VI-2. Sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Rushy Marsh, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. These loads represent <b>present loading conditions</b> .....	68
Table VI-3. Values of longitudinal dispersion coefficient, E, used in calibrated RMA4 model runs of salinity and nitrogen concentration for Rushy Marsh estuary system. ....	69
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 Rushy Marsh system. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms. ....	72
Table VI-5. Build-out sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Rushy Marsh, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. ....	73
Table VI-6. Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the build-out scenario, with percent change, for the Rushy Marsh system. Sentinel threshold stations are in bold print. ....	73

Table VI-7.	“No anthropogenic loading” (“no load”) sub-embayment and surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of Rushy Marsh, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux.....	74
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 Rushy Marsh system. Loads are based on atmospheric deposition and a scaled N benthic flux (scaled from present conditions). Sentinel threshold stations are in bold print.....	75
Table VII-1.	Bottom water dissolved oxygen levels within the principal sub-embayments to the Rushy Marsh Estuary. Percent of time during deployment of in situ sensors that bottom water oxygen levels were below various benchmark oxygen levels during July – September 2004. ....	81
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. The mean in the final column is the average level over the deployment.....	81
Table VII-3.	Benthic infaunal community data for the Rushy Marsh 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 0.0625 m <sup>2</sup> ). ....	85
Table VIII-1.	Summary of Nutrient Related Habitat Health within the Rushy Marsh Pond Estuary on the south shore of Barnstable, MA., based upon assessment data presented in Chapter VII. ....	87
Table VIII-2.	Comparison of sub-embayment watershed <b>septic loads</b> (attenuated) used for modeling of present and threshold loading scenarios of the Rushy Marsh system. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface), benthic flux, runoff, or fertilizer loading terms. ....	89
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 Rushy Marsh system. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms.....	89
Table VIII-4.	Threshold sub-embayment loads and attenuated surface water loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Rushy Marsh system, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux.....	89
Table VIII-5.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the modeled potential threshold scenario, with percent change, for the Rushy Marsh system. This threshold scenario (100% of septic, Table VIII-2) failed to meet the infaunal threshold (<0.5 mg N/L) at the sentinel station (bold print) .....	90
Table IX-1.	Average mean tide volumes, mean tide prism, and residence times for Rushy Marsh, for existing inlet conditions, and for the proposed inlet configurations.....	92
Table IX-2.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the reconstructed 4 ft-wide inlet scenario with present loading, with percent change.....	93

Table IX-3. Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the reconstructed 10 ft-wide inlet scenario with present loading, with percent change.....93