Statistical Modeling and Trends in Freshwater Derived Nutrient Loads, Lavaca Bay, Texas

2022 AWRA Annual Water Conference

Michael Schramm - michael.schramm@ag.tamu.edu

Texas Water Resources Institute, Texas A&M AgriLife Research

11/8/22



Acknowledgements

Stakeholder advisory committee:

Dr. Mike Wetz - Harte Institute, TAMU-CC

Bill Balboa - Matagorda Bay Foundation

Janet Weaver - Lavaca Bay Foundation

Chad Kinsfather - Lavaca-Navidad River Authority

Brian Koch - Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board

Jason Pinchback - Texas General Land Office

RJ Shelly - Texas Sea Grant

Graduate Students:

Shubham Jain - Ph.D Candidate TAMU Biological and Agricultural Engineering

This project was funded by a Texas Coastal Management Program grant approved by the Texas Land Commissioner, providing financial assistance under the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended, awarded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Office for Coastal Management, pursuant to NOAA Award No. NA21NOS4190136. The views expressed herein are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of NOAA, the U.S. Department of Commerce, or any of their subagencies.

Background

Lavaca Bay Watershed

- 3,146 $miles^2$
- 50% Pasture and rangeland
- 20% Cultivated cropland (cotton, soy, corn, sorghum)
- 5% Suburban, urban

Background

Marine Pollution Bulletin 152 (2020) 110903

ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Marine Pollution Bulletin

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/marpolbul

Water quality trends in Texas estuaries

Kalman Bugica[a], Blair Sterba-Boatwright[b], Michael S. Wetz[a,*]

[a] Harte Research Institute for Gulf of Mexico Studies, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, 6300 Ocean Dr., Corpus Christi, TX 78412, USA

[b] Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi, 6300 Ocean Dr., Corpus Christi, TX 78412, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Water quality
Texas
Estuary
Eutrophication
Climate
Salinity

ABSTRACT

Coastal watersheds in Texas have experienced significant human population growth over the past several decades, yet there have been no comprehensive assessments of water quality trends in Texas estuaries. Here, analysis of historical estuarine water quality data indicates regional "hot spots" of change. Galveston Bay and Oso Bay, which have highly urbanized watersheds, currently exhibit symptoms of eutrophication. Symptoms of eutrophication were also found in the Baffin Bay-Upper Laguna Madre complex, which has a sparsely populated but agriculturally-intensive watershed. Increasing salinity was observed in estuaries of the central Texas coast and are attributed to long-term decreases in freshwater inflow. Another artifact of decreasing freshwater inflow is a reduction in the delivery of carbonate minerals to estuaries, which manifests as decreases in pH. With findings from this study, targeted studies can now be directed at the estuaries that are experiencing water quality degradation in order to guide future management efforts.

- Possible concerns for Total Phosphorus at some FW sites.
- Texas does not currently have nutrient standards for streams.
- Long-term quarterly monitoring, no historical storm or flow-biased data to this point.

- Bugica, Sterba-Boatwright, and Wetz (2020) identify eutrophication risk in Lavaca Bay due to ⬆ TP and ⬆ Chlorophyll-a concentrations.

Project Objectives

- 1. Develop estimates of NO_3-N and TP loading from Lavaca and Navidad Rivers
- 2. Link nutrient loads and river discharge to changes in nutrient concentration in Lavaca Bay

Methods

- Loading estimates:
  - **Specify Concentration Regression Model** - Generalized Additive Models (Kuhnert et al. 2012; Robson and Dourdet 2015; McDowell et al. 2021)
    - model error structure and specify link function
    - predictor variables can be smooth functions allowing non-linear responses.
  - **Model performance** - Repeated 5-fold cross-validation
  - **Predict daily loads** - Point estimates with uncertainty



5-fold CV procedure. Image from Boehmke & Greenwell 2020 (https://bradleyboehmke.github.io/HOML/)

Methods

$$Y = s(ddate) + s(yday) + s(\log1p(Flow)) + s(ma) + s(fa)$$

- *Y* = NO_3 or TP concentration;
- *s()* = smoothing function;
- *ddate* = decimal date;
- *yday* = numeric day of year;
- *Flow* = mean daily discharge (or inflow);
- *ma* = exponential moving average (Kuhnert et al. 2012; Zhang and Ball 2017).
- *fa* = short- or long-term flow anomaly (stfa, ltfa) (Vecchia et al. 2009; Zhang and Ball 2017);
- Gamma family with log-link



Methods

Loading estimates:

- Prediction of **daily loads** from GAM models at each site
  - predicted concentrations $\times$ mean daily streamflow
  - aggregated to monthly and annual totals
- Report **model uncertainty**
  - **95% credible intervals** developed from 1000 draws of parameter estimates from the multivariate normal posterior distribution of model parameters provided by `mgcv::gam` function in R.
- Account for variance in mean daily discharge
  - **Flow-normalized estimates** calculated similar to WRTDS, assume daily flow variables are random occurrence from all possible values on that day of year.

Methods

Do variations in Flow and Load explain Bay nutrient concentration?

Temporal Model

$$Y = s(Day) + s(Date) + ti(Day, Date)$$

Flow Model

$$Y = s(Day) + s(Date) + ti(Day, Date) + s(Flow)$$

Full Model

$$Y = s(Day) + s(Date) + ti(Day, Date) + s(Flow) + s(Load)$$

- *Flow* is seasonally adjusted (residuals from *Q = s(Day)*)
- *Load* is flow adjusted (residuals from *Load = s(Flow)*)
- Simplified methodology following Murphy et al. (2019) and Murphy et al. (2022).
- Compare AIC and other model metrics

Results

Lavaca River

NO_3-N

Metric	Median (IQR)
NSE	0.758 (0.714, 0.765)
R^2	0.761 (0.728, 0.771)
Percent Bias	-7.80 (-9.02, -4.15)



TP

Metric	Median (IQR)
NSE	0.77 (0.71, 0.81)
R^2	0.77 (0.72, 0.82)
Percent Bias	-7.45 (-9.10, -6.35)



Results

Navidad River/Palmetto Bend Dam

NO_3-N

Metric	Median (IQR)
NSE	0.42 (0.34, 0.46)
R^2	0.60 (0.52, 0.66)
Percent Bias	-43 (-47, -38)



TP

Metric	Median (IQR)
NSE	0.877 (0.862, 0.911)
R^2	0.961 (0.956, 0.975)
Percent Bias	-17.6 (-21.1, -12.7)



Results



Total NO_3-N Loadings
Predicted Monthly NO_3-N Load [kg]
400,000
300,000
200,000
100,000
0
2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024
Predicted Annual NO_3-N Load [kg]
750,000
500,000
250,000
0
2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020
Proportion of Annual NO_3-N Load
1.00
0.75
0.50
0.25
0.00
Mean = 26% (Lavaca)
Mean = 74% (Navidad)
2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020
Annual Discharge [Millon Gallons]
6e+05
4e+05
2e+05
0e+00
2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020
Lavaca River
Navidad River

Results



Total TP Loadings
Predicted Monthly TP Load [kg]
300,000
200,000
100,000
0
1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025
Predicted Annual TP Load [kg]
750,000
500,000
250,000
0
2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020
Proportion of Annual TP Load
1.00
0.75
0.50
0.25
0.00
Mean = 40% (Lavaca)
Mean = 60% (Navidad)
2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020
Annual Discharge [Millon Gallons]
8e+05
6e+05
4e+05
2e+05
0e+00
2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020
Lavaca River
Navidad River

Regional Study Comparison

Parameter	Reported Yield (kg/km^2/yr)	Approach	Time Period	Reference
TP	42.9 (34.4, 54.0)	GAM	2000-2020	Current study
TP	45.2	SPARROW	2012	Wise, Anning, and Miller (2019)
TP	42	SWAT	1977-2005	Omani, Srinivasan, and Lee (2014)
TP	20.81-91.58	SPARROW	2002	Rebich et al. (2011)
TP	28.9	LOADEST	1972-1993	Dunn (1996)

What About Trends?

- High variability in actual loads that reflect total discharge
- Flow-normalized loads:

Flow-Normalized NO_3-N Load, Lavaca River



Flow-Normalized NO_3-N Load, Navidad River



Flow-Normalized TP Load, Lavaca River



Flow-Normalized TP Load, Navidad River



Estuary Models

Example: Site 13563 TP

	df	AIC	adj.r.sq	dev.expl
Temporal Model	9.735954	-222.5104	0.1492214	0.2597455
Flow Model	8.479287	-241.3721	0.3383421	0.4107901
Flow and Load Model	14.272933	-252.4411	0.4755137	0.5754284



Estuary Models

Example: Site 13563 TP – Partial Effects of TP Load and Flow on TP concentration





Estuary Models

Example: Site 13563 TP – Partial effect of load, flow, and day of year in 2020



Conclusions

- GAMs
  - Useful framework for statistical load estimation and exploratory analysis of estuarine water quality.
- Nutrient Loading
  - High variance in actual loads.
  - Shifts in riverine sources during drought conditions.
  - Changes in watershed loads explains some variation in estuary nutrient concentration.

Further work

- Comparison of above lake and below lake loads;
- Develop/fund supplemental flow-biased monitoring to identify significant changes and trends;
- Continue work on estuary water quality responses…

Thank You!

Michael Schramm - michael.schramm@ag.tamu.edu

Texas Water Resources Institute

Texas A&M AgriLife Research

References

Bugica, Kalman, Blair Sterba-Boatwright, and Michael S. Wetz. 2020. “Water Quality Trends in Texas Estuaries.” *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 152 (March): 110903. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2020.110903.

Dunn, David. 1996. “Trends in Nutrient Inflows to the Gulf of Mexico from Streams Draining the Conterminous United States, 1972-93.” Water-Resources Investigations Report 96-4113. Austin, Texas: USGS. https://doi.org/10.3133/wri964113.

Kuhnert, Petra M., Brent L. Henderson, Stephen E. Lewis, Zoe T. Bainbridge, Scott N. Wilkinson, and Jon E. Brodie. 2012. “Quantifying Total Suspended Sediment Export from the Burdekin River Catchment Using the Loads Regression Estimator Tool: REGRESSION ESTIMATOR TOOL FOR POLLUTANT LOADS.” *Water Resources Research* 48 (4). https://doi.org/10.1029/2011WR011080.

McDowell, R. W., Z. P. Simpson, A. G. Ausseil, Z. Etheridge, and R. Law. 2021. “The Implications of Lag Times Between Nitrate Leaching Losses and Riverine Loads for Water Quality Policy.” *Scientific Reports* 11 (1): 16450. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-95302-1.

Murphy, Rebecca R., Jennifer Keisman, Jon Harcum, Renee R. Karrh, Mike Lane, Elgin S. Perry, and Qian Zhang. 2022. “Nutrient Improvements in Chesapeake Bay: Direct Effect of Load Reductions and Implications for Coastal Management.” *Environmental Science & Technology* 56 (1): 260–70. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.1c05388.

Murphy, Rebecca R., Elgin Perry, Jon Harcum, and Jennifer Keisman. 2019. “A Generalized Additive Model Approach to Evaluating Water Quality: Chesapeake Bay Case Study.” *Environmental Modelling & Software* 118 (August): 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2019.03.027.

Omani, N., R. Srinivasan, and T. Lee. 2014. “Estimation of Sediment and Nutrient Loads to Bays from Gauged and Ungauged Watersheds.” *Applied Engineering in Agriculture*, December, 869–87. https://doi.org/10.13031/aea.30.10162.

Rebich, Richard A., Natalie A. Houston, Scott V. Mize, Daniel K. Pearson, Patricia B. Ging, and C. Evan Hornig. 2011. “Sources and Delivery of Nutrients to the Northwestern Gulf of Mexico from Streams in the South-Central United States1: Sources and Delivery of Nutrients to the Northwestern Gulf of Mexico From Streams in the South-Central United States.” *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 47 (5): 1061–86. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-1688.2011.00583.x.

Robson, Barbara J., and Vincent Dourdet. 2015. “Prediction of Sediment, Particulate Nutrient and Dissolved Nutrient Concentrations in a Dry Tropical River to Provide Input to a Mechanistic Coastal Water Quality Model.” *Environmental Modelling & Software* 63 (January): 97–108. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2014.08.009.

Vecchia, Aldo V., Robert J. Gilliom, Daniel J. Sullivan, David L. Lorenz, and Jeffrey D. Martin. 2009. “Trends in Concentrations and Use of Agricultural Herbicides for Corn Belt Rivers, 1996−2006.” *Environmental Science & Technology* 43 (24): 9096–9102. https://doi.org/10.1021/es902122j.

Wise, D. R., D. W. Anning, and O. W. Miller. 2019. “Spatially Referenced Models of Streamflow and Nitrogen, Phosphorus, and Suspended-Sediment Transport in Streams of the Southwestern United States.” Scientific Investigations Report 2019-5106. Reston, Virginia: U.S. Geological Survey. https://doi.org/10.3133/sir20195106.

Zhang, Qian, and William P. Ball. 2017. “Improving Riverine Constituent Concentration and Flux Estimation by Accounting for Antecedent Discharge Conditions.” *Journal of Hydrology* 547 (April): 387–402. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhydrol.2016.12.052.

Lavaca Bay Watersheds



- 1.3 million acre-feet per year
- 65% from Lavaca/Navidad watershed
  - 61% from Navidad at Palmetto Bend Dam
  - 32% from Lavaca near City of Edna
  - 7% ungaged downstream runoff