

Eelgrass Monitoring in the Peconic Estuary: Historic distribution and current trends

Stephen Schott Cornell Cooperative Extension Marine Program



Overview

1) Historic Distribution of Eelgrass (Zostera marina L.) in the Peconic Estuary Methodology **Historic versus Current Distribution** 2) PEP Long-term Eelgrass Monitoring Program Background Methodology Trends



Historic Distribution

Methodology

- Locate and Obtain Historical Aerial Photographs
- Scan aerial photographs and register in a GIS format
- Delineate Potential Eelgrass Beds from Photographs
- Baymen and citizens corroborate delineations





Historic Distribution

Historic vs. Current: Peconic Estuary





Historic vs. Current: Peconic River to North Sea Harbor





Historic vs. Current: North Sea Harbor to Sag Harbor





Historic vs. Current: Sag Harbor to Napeague Harbor





Historic vs. Current: Napeague Harbor to Montauk Point



Historic vs. Current: Shelter Island





Historic vs. Current: Southold Bay to Orient Point





Events that have attributed to eelgrass loss

<u>1933-34</u>

• "Wasting Disease" results in up to 90% loss of the eelgrass population in the Atlantic Ocean

<u>1938</u>

- "Hurricane of '38" resulted in severe erosion/sedimentation of near-shore habitat <u>1944</u>
- "Great Atlantic Hurricane"

<u>1954</u>

• "Hurricane Carol"

<u>1959</u>

- Dredging of creeks begins in Southold Town (Southold Town LWRP)
 <u>1960</u>
- "Hurricane Donna"

<u>1985</u>

- First Brown Tide event
- "Hurricane Gloria"

<u>1990</u>

Second Brown Tide Event



Summary

- The Peconic Estuary contained 8,720 acres of eelgrass in 1930 (This is a conservative estimate and does not include 1,990 acres of unconfirmed beds).
- The Tiner report (2003) calculated 1,552 total acres of eelgrass based on 2000 aerials, though that number is likely low as undocumented beds have since been identified and the areal extents of some beds were underestimated.
- This represents a loss of over 80% in a 70 year period (~100 acres/year).



Background

- The PEP contracted Cornell Cooperative Extension, Marine Program to develop and conduct long-term eelgrass monitoring in 1997
- The Program includes 6 reference beds from around the Estuary



Eelgrass Monitoring Program

Methodology

- 6 reference sites (beds), each with 6 monitoring stations
- Eelgrass shoot density is collected from 10 randomly placed 0.10 m² quadrats (Total of 60 quadrats per bed) at each station
- Percent cover of macroalgae, macroalgae species, and animals observed are recorded



Eelgrass Monitoring Program

Trend Analysis

1) Eelgrass shoot densities have been on a decline (Ave. rate of ~30% since 2000)

2) 2002-2004 saw significant losses to several beds (75% and 78% for OH and TMH, respectively)

Eelgrass Shoot Density





Trend Analysis

- 3) Most sites have seen a net decrease in macroalgae % cover
- 4) Macroalgae % cover is highly variable between sites and years

Macroalgae Cover





Conclusions

- Eelgrass Shoot Decline Causes?
 - Poor water quality (?)
 - Disease (?)
 - Disturbance events (e.g.
 ice scour/anchor ice,
 bioturbation, human
 activities)





Eelgrass Monitoring Program

Conclusions

- Alternative Hypotheses
 - Increased water clarity resulting in alleviation of stress response (*i.e.*, reduction in shoot density)



Conclusions

- Macroalgal Competition?
 - Minimal with good water quality; High nitrogen favors macroalgae
 - Possibly prevent recolonization to areas of loss (especially Codium)



Summary

- The major trend evident in the eelgrass data is the almost constant decline of eelgrass shoot densities in the six monitoring beds. Although this trend is alarming, it may be that this is a natural response to increasingly better water quality (e.g., clarity) as the eelgrass plants become less stressed.
- Major declines in Bullhead Bay, Orient Harbor and Three Mile Harbor may be linked with the severe winters from 2002 through 2004. The extremely cold conditions froze the Estuary and resulted in ice scour in shallow areas and removal of eelgrass.
- Macroalgae, though abundant in most beds, has not been found to be significantly impacting any of the eelgrass beds at this time. Nutrient enrichment of the water column favors seaweeds over eelgrass. Species like Codium and Spyridia may prevent re-establishment of eelgrass to areas of loss.



Acknowledgements

- Peconic Estuary Program
- Fred Mushacke and Dave Fallon, NYSDEC
- USDA (FSA and NRCS, Suffolk County)
- Suffolk County Planning Department
- James Pim, Suffolk County Health Department, Water Resources
- Jeanie Barnaba, Cornell University Center for Environment
- Wayne Grothe, Nature Conservancy
- Southampton, Southold and Easthampton Baymen's Associations
- John Semlear, John Costello, Ed Kruszeski, Ed Clark, Howard Pickerell, Ed Warner Jr., Don Fredricks, and others.
- Chris Pickerell, Sandy Dumais, and Kim Petersen, CCE