# Potential causes for a system-wide change in trophic status of the greater Albemarle Sound ecosystem

Nathan Hall, UNC-IMS, 29 March 2019





Blooms dominated by the potentially toxigenic N-fixing cyanobacteria *Dolichospermum*, a.k.a. *Anabaena sp*.



Are blooms indicative of larger-scale pattern of changing trophic status?



#### NC DEQ Ambient Monitoring System stations

#### Long-term Trend Analyses Using Seasonal Kendal Tests



#### Chowan R. near mouth





# Summary Map of Trend Slopes for Phytoplankton Biomass as Chlorophyll *a*



# Summary Map of Trend Slopes for Total N



# Summary Map of Trend Slopes for Total P



### <u>Recap</u>

Blooms: Recent but recurrent and awful!

Chl-a: 6 of 10 DEQ stations have increasing chl-a

TN: 10 of 10 station have increasing TN

TP: 2 of 10 stations have increasing TP

What's driving these changes?

Where are the nutrients coming from?

Experiments and Ambient Nutrients Indicate N-limitation of Phytoplankton Production



Felix Evans, Fall 2018

#### No major changes in nutrient loads from the major rivers



### Some increase in TN in a Chowan River tributary, Potecasi Creek





### Atmospheric N deposition is an unlikely culprit

## Swamp forest loss as potential nutrient source







Clear cut swamp forest on Roanoke R.

### Estimating Potential Impact of Swamp Forest Clearcutting

Load Increase = Clear Cut Area (ha) × Yield Increase (kg/ha/y)

<u>Clear Cut Area</u> NRDC estimates 13,000 ha harvested in NE North Carolina in past three years (NRDC 2015)

Yield IncreaseTP: 0.12 - 0.36 kg P/ha/yTN: 2.1 - 2.2 kg N/ha/ypine silviculture (Lebo and Herrmann 1998)TP: 0.2 kg P/ha/yTN: 51 kg N/ha/ydrained hardwood swamp forest (Grace 2004)Load IncreaseTP:  $0.12 - 0.36 \text{ kg P/ha/y} \times 13,000 \text{ ha} = 1560 - 4680 \text{ kg P/y}$ TN:  $2.1 - 51 \text{ kg/ha/y} \times 13,000 \text{ ha} = 27300 - 660000 \text{ kg N/y}$ 

## Increases in Biomass of N-fixing Cyanobacteria



#### Stimulation of N fixing cyanobacteria can circumvent N limitation



#### **Estimating Potential Increase of Internal N Load from N-Fixers**

N Load Increase = N fixing biomass increase \* N fixation rate Biomass Increase  $50 \times 15$   $50 \times 15$   $50 \times 10^{9}$   $50 \times 10^{9}$  $50 \times 1$ 

#### **N-fixation Rate**

Assume growth rate of 0.3/d and cellular Chla to N ratio of 1 mmol N per 1 mg Chla  $25 \times 10^9$  mmol N \* 0.3/d = 7.2 ×  $10^9$  mmol N/d  $7.2 \times 10^9$  mmol N/d \* 180 d/v \*14 ×  $10^{-6}$  kg/mmol = 18 ×  $10^6$  kg N/v

 $7.2 \times 10^9$  mmol N/d \* 180 d/y \*14 × 10<sup>-6</sup> kg/mmol = 18 × 10<sup>6</sup> kg N/y

Estimated Internal Load Increase:  $18 \times 10^6$  kg N/y

#### Estimated Load Increase Relative to Roanoke River Load



<u>TP</u>	
Major Rivers:	0%
Potecasi Cr.:	0%
Swamp Forest Loss:	0.4-1.2%

<u>TN</u>

Major Rivers:	5-15%
Potecasi Cr.:	1%
Atmospheric Deposition	0%
Swamp Forest Loss:	0.7-17%
Nitrogen Fixation	450%

#### **Conclusions So Far**

1) Albemarle Sound is experiencing a system-wide change in trophic status

2) Small TN increases in rivers, creeks deserve more attention

3) Nutrient loads due to swamp forest loss are probably minor but deserve more study

4) Nitrogen fixation is a possible explanation for increases in TN and chlorophyll *a* – we need actual measurements of N fixation to see if they are actively fixing N

5) Factors underlying the shift toward higher proportions of N-fixing cyanobacteria are not clear

6) Though uncertainty abounds, increases in either N or P are likely to stimulate productivity in this low salinity estuary