

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

Mid-Atlantic Integrated Assessment (MAIA) Estuaries 1997-98

Summary Report

Environmental Conditions in the Mid-Atlantic Estuaries

Compiled and Edited by:

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Research and Development
National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory
Atlantic Ecology Division (AED)
27 Tarzwell Drive
Narragansett, RI 02882

and

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region III
1650 Arch Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2029



Notice

The information in this report was funded in part by the United States Protection Agency (Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program, Office of Research and Development) through the Atlantic Ecology Division. This report was subject to EPA's peer and administrative review and external review, and has received approval for publication as an EPA document. Mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute endorsement or approval for use.

The suggested citation for this report is: USEPA 2002. Mid-Atlantic Integrated Assessment 1997-98 Summary Report, EPA/620/R-02/003. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Atlantic Ecology Division, Narragansett, RI.

Key Words: Mid-Atlantic Integrated Assessment; MAIA; Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program; EMAP; Delaware Estuary; Chesapeake Bay; Maryland and Virginia coastal bays; Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine System; APES; probabilistic sampling design; estuarine condition; eutrophication; sediment contamination; impairment to biological communities; total nitrogen; total phosphorus; chlorophyll *a*; total organic carbon; Secchi depth; dissolved oxygen; metal and organic ERL and ERM exceedances; sediment toxicity; benthic community index; fish species diversity; fish abnormalities; fish and shellfish tissue contamination; Index of Environmental Integrity; environmental report card.

Abstract

During the summers of 1997-98, a consortium of federal and state environmental agencies conducted the Mid-Atlantic Integrated Assessment Estuaries (MAIA-E) program to characterize the environmental condition of the four major estuaries in the mid-Atlantic region of the United States. The assessed estuaries were the Delaware Estuary, Chesapeake Bay, the coastal bays in Maryland and Virginia, and the Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine System. Twelve smaller estuaries were also monitored to focus attention on systems at the local scale. Over 800 stations were selected at random and key properties were measured in three estuarine components – the water column, the sediments, and the biological community. This summary report examines thirteen measured or calculated parameters that serve as indicators of estuarine conditions. Three important environmental issues are emphasized: eutrophication, contamination of the sediments, and the impairment of the biological communities in the estuaries.

Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Notice, Abstract | ii |
| Figures | v |
| Tables | vi |
| Acknowledgments | vii |
| 1. Executive Summary | 1 |
| Eutrophication | 1 |
| Sediment Contamination | 2 |
| Condition of the Living Resources | 2 |
| Changes Over Time | 2 |
| 2. Introduction | 5 |
| About Estuaries | 5 |
| Mid-Atlantic Estuaries | 6 |
| The MAIA Program..... | 7 |
| Report Organization | 8 |
| 3. Methodology | 11 |
| Background | 11 |
| Field Activities in 1997 and 1998 | 11 |
| MAIA Indicators | 13 |
| 4. Eutrophication | 17 |
| Background | 17 |
| Eutrophication Indicators | 18 |
| Total Nitrogen in Surface Water | 18 |
| Total Phosphorus in Surface Water | 22 |
| Chlorophyll <i>a</i> in Surface Water | 25 |
| Total Organic Carbon in Sediments | 28 |
| Water Clarity (Secchi Depth) | 29 |
| Dissolved Oxygen in Bottom Water | 32 |
| Summary: Eutrophication | 38 |

Contents (con't)

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 5. Sediment Contamination | 41 |
| Background | 41 |
| Metal Contaminants in Sediments | 41 |
| Organic Contaminants in Sediments | 45 |
| Sediment Toxicity (Amphipod Survival) | 48 |
| Summary: Sediment Contamination | 51 |
| 6. Condition of Living Resources | 53 |
| Background | 53 |
| Condition of the Benthic Community (Benthic Index) | 53 |
| Number of Fish Species | 56 |
| Fish Abnormalities | 57 |
| Contamination of Fish and Shellfish Tissue | 57 |
| Summary: Conditions of the Living Resources | 60 |
| 7. Summary of Conditions | 63 |
| Environmental Report Card | 63 |
| Change in Conditions: 1990-93 to 1997 | 65 |
| Appendices | 67 |
| A. Sample Site Selection Design for MAIA Estuaries 1997-98..... | 67 |
| B. Methods and Indicators for MAIA Estuaries 1997-98 | 75 |
| C. Criteria for Presenting Indicator Data | 79 |
| D. Values of Indicator Parameters | 83 |
| E. Tabulation of Condition Estimates | 89 |
| F. Statistical Correlation Coefficients Among Selected Indicators | 93 |
| G. Values of Condition Estimates in Common MAIA and EMAP Indicators..... | 97 |
| H. Index of Environmental Integrity for MAIA Estuaries 1997 | 99 |
| I. Recommendations for Monitoring Program Design for Mid-Atlantic Estuaries | 105 |
| J. MAIA Estuaries Partners | 109 |
| References | 111 |

Figures

| | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Figure 3-1 | MAIA Stations Sampled During Summer 1997 in the MAIA Program..... | 12 |
| Figure 3-2 | MAIA Stations Sampled During Summer 1998 in the MAIA Program..... | 14 |
| Figure 4-1 | Concentration of Total Nitrogen in Surface Water | 20 |
| Figure 4-2 | Concentration of Total Nitrogen in Intensively-Sampled Systems | 21 |
| Figure 4-3 | Concentration of Total Phosphorus in Surface Water | 23 |
| Figure 4-4 | Concentration of Total Phosphorus in Intensively-Sampled Systems | 24 |
| Figure 4-5 | Concentration of Chlorophyll <i>a</i> in Surface Water | 26 |
| Figure 4-6 | Concentration of Chlorophyll <i>a</i> in Intensively-Sampled Systems | 27 |
| Figure 4-7 | Concentration of Total Organic Carbon in Surface Water | 30 |
| Figure 4-8 | Concentration of Total Organic Carbon in Intensively-Sampled Systems | 31 |
| Figure 4-9 | Secchi Depths as a Measure of Water Clarity | 33 |
| Figure 4-10 | Secchi Depth (Water Clarity) in Intensively-Sampled Systems | 34 |
| Figure 4-11 | Concentration of Dissolved Oxygen in Bottom Water | 36 |
| Figure 4-12 | Concentration of Dissolved Oxygen in Intensively-Sampled Systems | 37 |
| Figure 4-13 | Summary of Eutrophication Indicators | 39 |
| Figure 5-1 | ERL and ERM Exceedances for Metals in Sediments | 43 |
| Figure 5-2 | ERL and ERM Exceedances for Metals in Intensively-Sampled Systems | 44 |
| Figure 5-3 | ERL and ERM Exceedances for Organic Compounds in Sediments | 46 |
| Figure 5-4 | ERL and ERM Exceedances for Organics in Intensively-Sampled Systems | 47 |
| Figure 5-5 | Survival Rate of <i>Ampelisca abdita</i> Exposed to Sediments | 49 |
| Figure 5-6 | Survival Rate of <i>Ampelisca abdita</i> in Intensively-Sampled Systems | 50 |
| Figure 5-7 | Summary of Sediment Contamination Indicators | 52 |
| Figure 6-1 | Index of Benthic Community Condition (Benthic Index) | 54 |
| Figure 6-2 | Index of Benthic Community Condition in Intensively-Sampled Systems | 55 |
| Figure 6-3 | Number of Fish Species | 58 |
| Figure 6-4 | Occurrence of Abnormalities in Fish | 59 |
| Figure 6-5 | Contaminant Exceedances in Fish and Shellfish Tissue | 61 |
| Figure 7-1 | Environmental Report Card | 64 |
| Figure 7-2 | Changes in Environmental Conditions: 1990-93 to 1997 | 66 |
| Figure H-1 | Environmental Report Card for Mid-Atlantic Estuaries | 103 |

Tables

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Table 2-1 | Mid-Atlantic Estuaries Highlighted in the MAIA Program and This Report | 6 |
| Table 2-2 | Indicator Ranges Used to Define Assessment Categories | 9 |
| Table 3-1 | Federal and State Partners in the Monitoring of Mid-Atlantic Estuaries | 11 |
| Table 3-2 | Estuarine Systems Selected for Spatial Intensification of Sampling | 13 |
| Table 3-3 | Suite of Indicators Measured by Partners in MAIA Estuaries in 1997-98 | 15 |
| Table 5-1 | ERL and ERM Limits for Metals | 42 |
| Table 5-2 | ERL and ERM Values for Organics | 45 |
| Table 6-1 | USEPA Chemical Analytes and Consumption Limits for Issuing Fish Advisories | 60 |
| Table A-1 | Initial Strata Used in Selection of Sampling Sites for MAIA Estuaries 1997-98 | 70 |
| Table A-2 | Combinations of Strata Used to Produce Estimates for Geographic Areas | 71 |
| Table A-3 | Design Specifics for MAIA Intensively-Sampled Small Estuarine Systems | 72 |
| Table A-4 | Design Specifics for MAIA Randomly-Selected Small Estuarine Systems | 72 |
| Table A-5 | Design Specifics for Delaware Estuary (River and Bay) | 73 |
| Table A-6 | Design Specifics for Chesapeake Bay Mainstem | 73 |
| Table A-7 | Design Specifics for Tributaries and Subsystems | 74 |
| Table A-8 | Design Specifics for Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine System | 74 |
| Table D-1 | Values of Indicator Parameters Representing Eutrophication | 84 |
| Table D-2 | Concentrations of Metals in Sediments | 85 |
| Table D-3 | Concentrations of Organic Toxicants in Sediments | 86 |
| Table D-4 | Values of Indicator Parameters | 87 |
| Table E-1 | Percent Estuarine Area Falling in the Condition Categories Used on the Maps in This Report | 90 |
| Table F-1 | Pearson Correlation Factors Among Indicated Indicators | 94 |
| Table G-1 | Changes in Environmental Conditions Measured Between the 1990-1993 EMAP-VP and 1997 MAIA-E Studies | 97 |
| Table H-1 | Assignment of Scores to Geographic Areas for Each Indicator Based Upon Percent Area | 100 |
| Table H-2 | Values for Index of Environmental Integrity for MAIA Estuaries Geographic Areas | 101 |
| Table I-1 | Progression of EMAP Probability Sampling Designs in the Northeast | 108 |

Acknowledgements

This report was prepared by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory, Atlantic Ecology Division. The primary authors were John Kiddon, John Paul, Charles Strobel and Barbara Brown from the Atlantic Ecology Division (AED), and Harry Buffum and Jane Copeland of Computer Sciences Corporation (CSC). Significant efforts in the design, implementation, and analysis stages of the program were also provided by Melissa Hughes, Patricia Martel, and Patricia DeCastro of CSC, and Patricia Bradley, Don Cobb, Stephen Hale, Brian Melzian and Hal Walker of EPA/AED. Tony Olsen and Kevin Summers were instrumental in developing the sampling design of the MAIA Estuaries program.

Juanita Soto of Technology Planning and Management Corporation (TPMC) was responsible for formatting and painstakingly assembling this report.

Invaluable assistance in setting the direction of the report and in the interpreting and reviewing the report was provided by the following individuals of the MAIA partner agencies: Rich Batiuk of the Chesapeake Bay Program; Kent Price of the Delaware Center for the Inland Bays; Ben Anderson of the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control; Ed Santoro of the Delaware River Basin Commission; Carol Cain of the Maryland Coastal Bay Project; Rob Magnien and Bruce Michael of the Maryland Department of Natural Resources; Jawed Hameedi, Jeff Hyland, and Andy Robertson from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; Brian Sturgis of the National Park Service; Ed Ambrogio, Charles App, Diana Esher, George Gibson, Rick Kutz, Tom DeMoss and Tom Pheiffer of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Eric Walbeck of TPMC; and Rick Hoffman, Donald Smith, and Alex Barrow of the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. Cover photo courtesy of Eric Walbeck, TPMC.

The authors wish to acknowledge the comprehensive peer reviews provided by Fred Holland of the Marine Resources Research Institute, Candace Oviatt of the University of Rhode Island, and Dennis Suszkowski of the Hudson River Foundation. Additional reviews by Dan Campbell, Peg Pelletier, and Jerry Pesch of the USEPA/AED are also gratefully appreciated.

Finally, we wish to acknowledge the tremendous effort of the field crews who braved long days, inclement weather, and sea sickness to collect the thousands of samples for the MAIA program. Without their dedication this report would not be possible.

1. Executive Summary

Welcome to the Summary Report on the Mid-Atlantic Integrated Assessment Estuaries (MAIA-E). In this report we present a summation of data collected in the environmental assessment of mid-Atlantic estuaries conducted during the summers of 1997-98. Over a dozen state and federal environmental organizations participated in the assessment and in the preparation of this report. We hope this collaboration has helped produce a summary that is relevant and useful.

The main objective of this report is to present environmental data measured in the MAIA-E program. We focus on several issues of wide-spread interest: How prevalent is eutrophication in mid-Atlantic estuaries? How contaminated are the sediments? Are estuarine communities in the sediments and water column disrupted by human practices? Are the fish and shellfish we eat contaminated?

The summary was written with three distinct audiences in mind: (1) environmental managers who are responsible for identifying and fixing problems in estuaries; (2) concerned citizens who are curious how estuaries operate and are concerned how “their” estuary compares with neighboring systems; and (3) researchers who wish to know what type of data are available from the MAIA program. Thus, a second objective of the report is to present the MAIA assessment information in a manner useful to all readers.

The mid-Atlantic estuaries fall naturally into four geographical regions: the Delaware Estuary; the Chesapeake Bay; the coastal bays in Maryland and Virginia; and the Albemarle-Pamlico Estuarine System (APES). In addition, twelve smaller estuaries were monitored more intensively to focus attention on a local scale. Following are the main conclusions regarding the environmental conditions in the mid-Atlantic estuaries.

Eutrophication

There are ample signs of eutrophication in the mid-Atlantic estuaries. In the region overall, about 15-20% of estuarine area is affected by high concentrations of nutrients, organic-rich sediments, and oxygen-depleted waters. A third of the estuarine area shows elevated concentrations of chlorophyll *a*, and water visibility is less than arm’s length in half of the estuaries. These symptoms of eutrophication vary widely among estuaries.

In the Delaware Estuary, the urban Delaware, Schuylkill, and Salem Rivers have high levels of nutrients that are two to three times greater than elsewhere in the mid-Atlantic region. High levels of chlorophyll *a* are evident in parts of the Delaware and Salem Rivers. But the pigment is generally low in Schuylkill River and much of Delaware Bay, perhaps because of limited light availability. Oxygen depletion is not a major issue in the Delaware Estuary.

In Chesapeake Bay, nutrient concentrations are high in the Patuxent, Potomac, Severn, and South Rivers. Most estuaries in Chesapeake Bay show elevated levels of chlorophyll *a*, an indication of extensive algal blooms. Chesapeake Bay also displays the highest incidence of oxygen depletion in the mid-Atlantic region — over half of the area in the mainstem and Severn, South, and Patuxent Rivers report oxygen values below 5 mg/L (in many places, below 2 mg/L).

Other eutrophication “hot spots” include Sinepuxent Bay and parts of the Neuse River, where elevated levels of nutrients and organic matter are evident. The coastal bays are nutrient-rich and especially turbid, but signs of organic enrichment are generally absent. Otherwise, estuarine systems with easy access to the sea, e.g., Delaware Bay, the lower Chesapeake mainstem,

and open parts of Albemarle-Pamlico Sounds, are relatively less affected by the symptoms of eutrophication.

Sediment Contamination

Most of the mid-Atlantic estuaries have sediments that are contaminated with metals and toxic organic compounds. In the MAIA region overall, 30 to 40% of estuarine area exceeds effects range-low (ERL) or effects range-median (ERM) limits (ecologically-based guidelines) for metals and organic toxicants.

The Delaware, Schuylkill, and Salem Rivers, the upper Chesapeake mainstem, and the Severn and South Rivers are especially polluted by metals. Arsenic, nickel, mercury and zinc are the metals most often exceeding ERL or ERM limits. Mercury contamination is evident in Chowan River and other parts of the APES.

Harmful concentrations of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs), pesticides, DDT, and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) are present in regions of the Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers, the upper Chesapeake mainstem, and the Severn and South Rivers. The organic toxicants are less pervasive than metals throughout the region.

Only 1% of the region's sediments are characterized as toxic, based on the survivability of sediment organisms exposed to the sediments. Toxicity is noted in the heavily contaminated Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers, and in the moderately polluted Chowan River. Other highly contaminated systems, such as the Severn and South Rivers are not characterized as toxic by this test.

Condition of the Living Resources

The MAIA program places particular emphasis on the condition of communities in the water and sediments — the living resources. A “benthic community index”, based on the diversity of organisms and abundance of pollution tolerant organisms in sediments, is used to evaluate the condition of estuaries. The index rated as “poor” several of the estuaries that also show extensive signs of eutrophication and sediment contamination, including Schuylkill, Severn, South, and Potomac Rivers. But the list also includes estuaries which show low or moderate environmental degradation.

Over 3000 fish from 76 sites were examined for signs of pathology. Only five abnormalities are noted. However, when the edible portions of fish and shellfish from the same sites were analyzed for concentrations of metals and organic toxicants, 65% of the tests revealed levels large enough to present risk to human consumers. Arsenic and PCBs were the only toxicants found in harmful amounts.

Changes Over Time

The Environmental Monitoring and Assessment Program (EMAP) conducted a similar environmental study in the Virginian Province (VP) in the summers of 1990-93. This study region included part of the region surveyed by the MAIA program in 1997-98. For estuaries assessed in both the EMAP and MAIA studies, it is therefore possible to look for changes that occurred between 1990-93 and 1997-98. In most cases, the uncertainty in the respective measurements is too large to permit drawing clear conclusions. However, the following conclusive changes are evident:

Organic contamination in the Delaware River sediments worsened. The percentage of estuarine area failing any organic ERM criteria increased from $2 \pm 11\%$ in 1990-93 to $34 \pm 10\%$ in 1997. It is not certain whether this increase represents recent contamination or the dispersal of prior contamination over additional area.

Metal contamination in the Chesapeake Bay sediments worsened. The percentage of estuarine area failing any ERM criteria increased from $5 \pm 3\%$ in 1990-93 to $22 \pm 5\%$ in 1997. Similar changes occurred in the Chesapeake mainstem and Potomac River.

The benthic community in the Chesapeake Bay sediments showed increased degradation. The percentage of estuarine area with a benthic index < 0 (an indication of degradation) increased from $23 \pm 5\%$ in 1990-93 to $37 \pm 5\%$ in 1997.

Sediment toxicity diminished slightly in the Chesapeake Bay. The percentage of estuarine area failing the amphipod survival assay decreased from $6 \pm 3\%$ in 1990-93 to $0.3 \pm 0.3\%$ in 1997. Similar changes are noted in the Chesapeake mainstem.