


Massachusetts Estuaries Project

Linked Watershed-Embayment Model
to Determine Critical Nitrogen Loading
Thresholds for Stage Harbor, Sulphur Springs,
Taylors Pond, Bassing Harbor, and Muddy Creek,
Chatham, Massachusetts



FINAL REPORT – December 2003



Massachusetts Department of
Environmental Protection



University of Massachusetts Dartmouth
School of Marine Science and Technology

Massachusetts Estuaries Project

Linked Watershed-Embayment Model to Determine Critical Nitrogen Loading Thresholds for Stage Harbor, Sulphur Springs, Taylors Pond, Bassing Harbor, and Muddy Creek, Chatham, Massachusetts

FINAL REPORT – DECEMBER 2003



Brian Howes
Roland Samimy
David Schlezinger



Sean Kelley
John Ramsey



Ed Eichner

Contributors:

US Geological Survey

Don Walters, Ann Whealen, and John Masterson

Applied Coastal Research and Engineering, Inc.

Elizabeth Hunt, Jessica Côté, and Jon Wood

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection

Charles Costello and Brian Dudley (DEP project manager)

SMAST Coastal Systems Program

Paul Henderson, George Hampson, and Aimee O'Neil

Cape Cod Commission

Brian DuPont

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 critical coastal resources within the Town of Chatham, MA. Without these stewards and their efforts, this project would not have been possible.

First and foremost is the significant time and effort in data collection and discussion spent by members of the Chatham Technical and Citizens Advisory Committees, and particularly the contributions of Bob Duncanson, Bill Redfield, Margaret Swanson, Ted Keon, and Fred Jensen. Similarly, critical data to support this assessment and synthesis was provided by the citizens who have given generously of their time to collect needed nutrient samples over the past 4 summers through the Chatham WaterWatchers and the Pleasant Bay Alliance Water Quality Monitoring Program.

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; David Webster, Bruce Rosinoff, 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, Alan Slater, Glenn Haas, Sharon Pelosi, Ron Lyberger, Mike Rapacz, and Tabitha Zierzow. We are also thankful for the long hours in the field and laboratory spent by the many interns and students within the Coastal Systems Program at SMAST-UMD.

Support for this project was provided by the Town of Chatham, Barnstable County, MADEP, and the USEPA.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

 I.1 THE MASSACHUSETTS ESTUARIES PROJECT APPROACH..... 1

 I.2 SITE DESCRIPTION 5

 I.3 NITROGEN LOADING..... 7

 I.4 WATER QUALITY MODELING 9

 I.5 REPORT DESCRIPTION 9

II. PREVIOUS NITROGEN MANAGEMENT STUDIES..... 11

III. DELINEATION OF WATERSHEDS..... 15

 III.1 BACKGROUND..... 15

 III.2 MODEL DESCRIPTION 16

 III.3 CHATHAM CONTRIBUTORY AREAS..... 16

 III.3.1 Well Pumping Effects: Taylors Pond / Mill Creek Watershed..... 21

IV. WATERSHED NITROGEN LOADING TO EMBAYMENTS: LAND USE, STREAM INPUTS, NITROGEN SEDIMENT FLUX AND RECYCLING 24

 IV.1 WATERSHED LAND USE BASED NITROGEN LOADING ANALYSIS 24

 IV.1.1 Land Use and Database Preparation 25

 IV.1.2 Nitrogen Loading Input Factors 25

 IV.1.3 Calculating Nitrogen Loads 33

 IV.2 ATTENUATION OF NITROGEN IN SURFACE WATER TRANSPORT..... 47

 IV.2.1 Background and Purpose..... 47

 IV.2.2 Surface water Discharge and Attenuation of Watershed Nitrogen: Lovers Lake to Stillwater Pond to Ryder Cove 52

 IV.2.3 Freshwater Discharge and Attenuation of Watershed Nitrogen: Frost Fish Creek 57

 IV.2.4 Confirmation of Watershed Nitrogen Discharge: Town-wide. 65

 IV.3 BENTHIC REGENERATION OF NITROGEN IN BOTTOM SEDIMENTS 67

 IV.3.1 Sediment-Watercolumn Exchange of Nitrogen..... 67

 IV.3.2 Method for determining sediment-watercolumn nitrogen exchange..... 68

 IV.3.3 Determination of Summer Nitrogen Regeneration from Sediments 68

V. HYDRODYNAMIC MODELING..... 74

 V.1. INTRODUCTION..... 74

 V.2. GEOMORPHIC AND ANTHROPOGENIC EFFECTS TO THE ESTUARINE SYSTEM.. 77

 V.2.1 Stage Harbor..... 78

 V.2.2 South Coast Embayments..... 82

 V.2.3 Pleasant Bay Region..... 82

 V.2.3.1 Bassing Harbor, Ryder Cove, and Crows Pond..... 87

 V.2.3.2 Muddy Creek and Frost Fish Creek..... 87

 V.3 FIELD DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS 88

 V.3.1 Data Acquisition 88

 V.3.1.1 Water Elevation 88

 V.3.1.2 Bathymetry 95

 V.3.1.2.1 Stage Harbor and South Coast Embayments 95

 V.3.1.2.2 Pleasant Bay Region 98

 V.3.1.3 Current Measurements..... 100

 V.3.1.3.1 Description of Survey Technique..... 101

V.3.1.3.2 Data Processing Techniques.....	102
V.3.2 Discussion of Results.....	104
V.3.2.1 Stage Harbor System and South Coast Embayments	104
V.3.2.1.1 Tidal Harmonic Analysis	104
V.3.2.1.2 Current Measurements.....	108
V.3.2.2 Pleasant Bay Region.....	116
V.3.2.2.1 Tidal Harmonic Analysis	116
V.3.2.2.2 Current Measurements.....	117
V.4 HYDRODYNAMIC MODELING	125
V.4.1 Model Theory.....	125
V.4.2 Model Setup.....	125
V.4.2.1 Grid generation	126
V.4.2.2 Boundary condition specification	130
V.4.2.3 Calibration.....	131
V.4.2.3.1 Friction coefficients.....	131
V.4.2.3.2 Turbulent exchange coefficients.....	132
V.4.2.3.3 Wetting and Drying/marsh porosity processes.....	132
V.4.2.3.4 Comparison of modeled tides and measured tide data.....	134
V.4.3 Model Verification Using ADCP Measurements	140
V.4.3.1 Stage Harbor.....	141
V.4.3.2 Bassing Harbor	144
V.5 FLUSHING CHARACTERISTICS.....	148
V.5.1 Residence Times	148
V.5.2 Pre-Breach Conditions	151
V.6 ALTERNATIVES TO IMPROVE TIDAL FLUSHING	156
V.6.1 Muddy Creek.....	157
V.6.1.1 Alternative M1 – Muddy Creek as a Freshwater System	157
V.6.1.2 Alternative M2 – Muddy Creek as a Partial Freshwater System	157
V.6.1.3 Alternatives M3 and M4 – Increase Size of Route 28 Culverts	159
V.6.2 Frost Fish Creek	160
V.6.3 Environmental Effects of Flushing Improvement Strategies.....	161
V.7. SUMMARY.....	162
V.7.1 Conclusions	162
VI. WATER QUALITY MODELING.....	165
VI.1 DATA SOURCES FOR THE MODEL.....	165
VI.1.1 Hydrodynamics and Tidal Flushing in the Embayments	165
VI.1.2 Nitrogen Loading to the Embayments	165
VI.1.3 Measured Nitrogen Concentrations in the Embayments.....	165
VI.2 MODEL DESCRIPTION AND APPLICATION	167
VI.2.1 Model Formulation	168
VI.2.2 Water Quality Model Setup	169
VI.2.3 Boundary Condition Specification.....	170
VI.2.4 Model Calibration	171
VI.2.5 Build-Out and No Anthropogenic Load Scenarios	180
VII. ASSESSMENT OF EMBAYMENT NUTRIENT RELATED ECOLOGICAL HEALTH	193
VII.1 OVERVIEW OF BIOLOGICAL HEALTH INDICATORS.....	193
VII.2 BOTTOM WATER DISSOLVED OXYGEN.....	194
VII.3 EELGRASS ANALYSIS.....	211
VII.4 BENTHIC INFAUNA ANALYSIS.....	219

VIII. CRITICAL NUTRIENT THRESHOLD DETERMINATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF WATER QUALITY TARGETS224

VIII.1. ASSESSMENT OF NITROGEN RELATED HABITAT QUALITY224

VIII.2. THRESHOLD NITROGEN CONCENTRATIONS227

VIII.3. DEVELOPMENT OF TARGET NITROGEN LOADS229

IX. ALTERNATIVES TO IMPROVE TIDAL FLUSHING AND WATER QUALITY238

IX.1 MUDDY CREEK HYDRODYNAMIC ALTERNATIVES238

IX.1.1 Alternative 1 – Muddy Creek as a Freshwater System238

IX.1.2 Alternative 2 – Muddy Creek as a Partial Freshwater System239

IX.1.3 Alternatives 3 and 4 – Increase Size of Route 28 Culverts240

IX.2 MUDDY CREEK NITROGEN LOADING ALTERNATIVES241

X. REFERENCES248

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure I-1. Study region for the tidal flushing study including the estuarine systems in the Stage Harbor System (outlined in red), the South Coast Embayments (outlined in yellow), and the Pleasant Bay Region (outlined in blue)..... 2

Figure I-2. Massachusetts Estuaries Project Critical Nutrient Threshold Analytical Approach 6

Figure III-1. USGS Cape Cod Groundwater Model revised Town of Chatham embayment watershed delineations..... 18

Figure III-2. Watershed and sub-watershed delineations for each of the five major embayment systems within the Town of Chatham, MA. Approximate ten year time-of-travel delineations were produced for quality assurance purposes and are designated with a “10” in the figure legend (left). Sub-watersheds to embayments were selected based upon the functional estuarine sub-units in the water quality model (see section VI). 20

Figure III-3. USGS Cape Cod Model watershed outputs illustrating winter and summer pumping conditions relative to average conditions. 23

Figure IV-1. Land-use by parcel for the 5 embayment systems. Watershed data encompasses parts of the Towns of Chatham and Harwich, MA..... 26

Figure IV-2. Distribution of land-uses within the watersheds to the 5 embayment systems and their freshwater ponds..... 27

Figure IV-3. Annual Precipitation Chatham, Massachusetts. 29

Figure IV-4. CGW138 Hydrograph. Trace indicates the water table elevation at the well site from 1980-2002. 30

Figure IV-5. Water Supply relative to Precipitation Amounts (annual)..... 31

Figure IV-6. Parcel distribution within the watersheds to the 5 embayment systems. 35

Figure IV-7a. Land use specific unattenuated watershed based nitrogen load (by percent) to Bassing Harbor embayment system..... 41

Figure IV-7b. Land use specific unattenuated watershed based nitrogen load (by percent) to Muddy Creek embayment system..... 42

Figure IV-7c. Land use specific unattenuated watershed based nitrogen load (by percent) to Taylors Pond embayment system. 43

Figure IV-7d. Land use specific unattenuated watershed based nitrogen load (by percent) to Sulphur Springs embayment system. 44

Figure IV-7e. Land use specific unattenuated watershed based nitrogen load (by percent) to Stage Harbor embayment system. 45

Figure IV-8. Distribution of present parcels which are potentially developable within the watersheds to the 5 embayment systems. 48

Figure IV-9. Spatial coverage of existing zoning and special overlay districts (DCPC, WRPD) in Harwich and Chatham, MA..... 49

Figure IV-10. Location of Stream gages and benthic coring locations in the Ryder Cove / Bassing Harbor System. 51

Figure IV-11. Annual composite developed from a stream gauge maintained in the outflow stream from Lovers Lake discharging to Stillwater Pond. Nutrient samples were collected approximately weekly and analyzed for inorganic and organic nitrogen species. These data were used to determine both annual flow and total nitrogen transport for determining nitrogen attenuation (see Table IV-5)..... 55

Figure IV-12. Annual composite developed from a stream gauge maintained in the outflow stream from Stillwater Pond discharging to Ryders Cove. Nutrient

samples were collected approximately weekly and analyzed for inorganic and organic nitrogen species. These data were used to determine both annual flow and total nitrogen transport for determining nitrogen attenuation (see Table IV-5)..... 56

Figure IV-13a. Frost Fish Creek Tidal Study 1 (July 21, 2002). Comparison of measured and modeled tidal flow and measured tidal elevation. 60

Figure IV-13b. Frost Fish Creek Tidal Study 2 (August 8, 2002). Comparison of measured and modeled tidal flow and measured tidal elevation..... 61

Figure IV-13c. Frost Fish Creek Tidal Study 3 (August 20, 2002). Comparison of measured and modeled tidal flow and measured tidal elevation..... 62

Figure IV-13d. Frost Fish Creek Tidal Study 4 (September 5, 2002). Comparison of measured and modeled tidal flow and measured tidal elevation..... 63

Figure IV-14. Map of freshwater discharge (blue squares) and estuarine (red circles) water quality monitoring stations. CM-E & H are the outflow from Stillwater Pond and Lovers Lake, respectively. 66

Figure IV-15. Chatham shoreline with locations of sediment core sampling stations shown as red filled circles. Some locations are sites of more than one sample. All sites were assayed in 2000 with Bassing Harbor having additional data collected in 2001. 69

Figure IV-16. 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..... 71

Figure IV-17. Sediment carbon vs. sediment nitrogen content for core samples taken from Chatham subembayments. 73

Figure V-1. Study region for the tidal flushing study including the estuarine systems in the Stage Harbor System (outlined in red), the South Coast Embayments (outlined in yellow), and the Pleasant Bay Region (outlined in blue)..... 75

Figure V-2. Historical changes in the Nauset Beach-Monomoy barrier system illustrated by generalized 20-year diagrams from 1770-1790 to 1950-1970 (from Geise, 1987). 79

Figure V-3. Topographic map from 1893 showing the old Stage Harbor inlet location and a roadway to Morris Island/Amos Point. 80

Figure V-4. Topographic map from 1917 showing the region of overwash between Stage and Chatham Harbors. 80

Figure V-5. Topographic map from 1943 showing the hydraulic connection between Stage and Chatham Harbors. 81

Figure V-6. Aerial photograph from 1994 showing the present system and the location of historic inlet features. 81

Figure V-7. Topographic map from 1943 showing the Taylors Pond, Cockle Cove Creek (designated as Bucks Creek on this map), Sulphur Springs, and the sand spit forming Cockle Cove..... 83

Figure V-8. Aerial photograph from the 1950's showing the shore parallel bars along Cockle Cove Beach and the location of the inlet servicing the Sulphur Springs/Buck's Creek/Cockle Cove Creek system. 84

Figure V-9. Oblique aerial photograph from 1979 showing the Taylors Pond and Mill Creek system, with the groin field established updrift of the Mill Creek entrance..... 85

Figure V-10. Oblique aerial photograph from 1979 showing the inlet to Cockle Cove Creek, as well as the barrier separating the Buck's Creek and Cockle Cove Creek systems. 85

Figure V-11. Oblique aerial photograph from 1979 showing the inlet to Buck’s Creek, as well as the barrier separating the Buck’s Creek and Cockle Cove Creek systems. 86

Figure V-12. Aerial photograph from 1994 showing the Taylors Pond, Cockle Cove Creek, and Sulphur Springs estuarine systems as they exist today..... 86

Figure V-13. Topographic map indicating the location of the Muddy Creek and Frost Fish Creek culverts inhibiting tidal exchange with the Pleasant Bay estuary..... 88

Figure V-14. Tide gage and ADCP transect locations in the Stage Harbor region (C1-C6 are tide gage locations and heavy red lines 1-3 are ADCP transects) 90

Figure V-15. Tide gage and ADCP transect locations in the Pleasant Bay region (P1-P5 are tide gage locations and heavy red lines 1-3 are ADCP transects)..... 91

Figure V-16. Tidal elevation observations for offshore Cockle Cove Beach (location C1 of Figure V-14), Little Mill Pond (location C2), and Mill Pond (location C3)..... 92

Figure V-17. Tidal elevation observations for Oyster Pond (location C4 of Figure V-14), Sulphur Springs (location C5), and Taylors Pond (location C6)..... 93

Figure V-18. Tidal elevation observations for Chatham Yacht Club (location P1 of Figure V-15), Crows Pond (location P2), Ryder Cove (location P3), Frost Fish Creek (location P4), Muddy Creek (location P5)..... 94

Figure V-19. Depth contour plots of the numerical grid for the Stage Harbor system at 2-foot contour intervals relative to NGVD29 (August 2000 survey, supplemented with 1956 NOAA data in the upper reaches). 95

Figure V-20. Depth contour plots of the numerical grid for Oyster Pond (Stage Harbor system) region at 2-foot contour intervals relative to NGVD29 (August 2000 survey, supplemented with 1956 NOAA data)..... 96

Figure V-21. Depth contour plot of the numerical grid for Taylors Pond and Mill Creek at 0.5 foot contour intervals relative to NGVD29 (August 2000 survey). The yellow to light green indicates marsh plain elevation, and the darker blues to indigo indicate the depth of the creeks and pond basin..... 96

Figure V-22. Depth contour plot of the numerical grid for Sulphur Springs, Bucks Creek, and Cockle Cove Creek at 0.5-foot contour intervals relative to NGVD29 (August 2000 survey). The light green indicates marsh plain elevation, and the darker blues to indigo indicate the depth of the pond basin and creeks..... 97

Figure V-23. Depth contour plot of the numerical grid for Bassing Harbor, Ryder Cove, Crows Pond, and Frost Fish Creek at 2-foot contour intervals relative to NGVD29 (September 2000 survey)..... 98

Figure V-24. Depth contour plot of the numerical grid for Frost Fish Creek at 0.5 foot contour intervals relative to NGVD29 (September 2000 survey). 99

Figure V-25. Depth contour plot of the numerical grid for Muddy Creek at 0.5 foot contour intervals relative to NGVD29 (September 2000 survey). 100

Figure V-26. Example of observed astronomical tide as the sum of its primary constituents. Constituents for offshore Cockle Cove Beach were used in this example..... 105

Figure V-27. Water elevation variations for a 3-day period in the Stage Harbor, Sulphur Springs, and Taylors Pond systems. Each plot depicts the Nantucket sound signal (offshore) overlaid with measurements obtained in the inland estuaries. Notice the reduced amplitude as well as the delay in times of high- and low- tide relative to offshore due to frictional damping through the systems..... 107

Figure V-28. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line 1 run northwest-to-southeast across the Stage Harbor inlet measured at 11:47 on August 16, 2000 during the flood tide. Positive along-channel currents (top panel) indicate the flow is moving into the estuary, while positive cross-channel velocities (middle panel) are oriented 90° clockwise of positive along-channel. 110

Figure V-29. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line 1 run northwest-to-southeast across the Stage Harbor inlet measured at 16:49 on August 16, 2000 during the ebb tide. Positive along-channel currents (top panel) indicate the flow is moving into the estuary, while positive cross-channel velocities (middle panel) are oriented 90° clockwise of positive along-channel. 111

Figure V-30. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line 2 run south-to-north across the Oyster Pond River inlet measured at 11:01 on August 16, 2000 during the flood tide. Positive along-channel currents (top panel) indicate the flow is moving into the estuary, while positive cross-channel velocities (middle panel) are oriented 90° clockwise of positive along-channel. 112

Figure V-31. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line 2 run south-to-north across the Oyster Pond River inlet measured at 17:02 on August 16, 2000 during the ebb tide. Positive along-channel currents (top panel) indicate the flow is moving into the estuary, while positive cross-channel velocities (middle panel) are oriented 90° clockwise of positive along-channel. 113

Figure V-32. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line 3 run southwest-to-northeast across the south side of Mill Pond bridge measured at 10:24 on August 16, 2000 during the flood tide. The location of the bridge is indicated by a heavy black line at 0 ft depth from 210 to 350 feet along the transect in the top and middle panels, and a yellow line in the lower left panel. 114

Figure V-33. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line 3 run southwest-to-northeast across the south side of Mill Pond bridge measured at 17:28 on August 16, 2000 during the ebb tide. The location of the bridge is indicated by a heavy black line at 0 ft depth from 210 to 350 feet along the transect in the top and middle panels, and a yellow line in the lower left panel. 115

Figure V-34. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line run south-to-north across the Bassing Harbor inlet measured at 13:33 on September 1, 2000 during the flood tide. Positive along-channel currents (top panel) indicate the flow is moving into the estuary, while positive cross-channel velocities (middle panel) are oriented 90° clockwise of positive along-channel. 119

Figure V-35. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line run south-to-north across the Bassing Harbor inlet measured at 18:43 on September 1, 2000 during the ebb tide. Positive along-channel currents (top panel) indicate the flow is moving into the estuary, while positive cross-channel velocities (middle panel) are oriented 90° clockwise of positive along-channel. 120

Figure V-36. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line run east-to-west across the mouth of Ryder Cove measured at 13:41 on September 1, 2000 during the flood tide.

Positive along-channel currents (top panel) indicate the flow is moving into the estuary, while positive cross-channel velocities (middle panel) are oriented 90° clockwise of positive along-channel. 121

Figure V-37. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line run east-to-west across the mouth of Ryder Cove measured at 18:49 on September 1, 2000 during the ebb tide. Positive along-channel currents (top panel) indicate the flow is moving into the estuary, while positive cross-channel velocities (middle panel) are oriented 90° clockwise of positive along-channel. 122

Figure V-38. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line run south-to-north across the mouth of Crows Pond measured at 13:46 on September 1, 2000 during the flood tide. Positive along-channel currents (top panel) indicate the flow is moving into the estuary, while positive cross-channel velocities (middle panel) are oriented 90° clockwise of positive along-channel. 123

Figure V-39. Color contour plots of along-channel and cross-channel velocity components for transect line run south-to-north across the mouth of Crows Pond measured at 18:54 on September 1, 2000 during the ebb tide. Positive along-channel currents (top panel) indicate the flow is moving into the estuary, while positive cross-channel velocities (middle panel) are oriented 90° clockwise of positive along-channel. 124

Figure V-40. Plot of numerical grid used for hydrodynamic modeling of Stage Harbor system. Colored divisions indicate boundaries of different grid material types, as well as volumes used to compute flushing rates for individual embayments. 127

Figure V-41. Plot of numerical grid used for hydrodynamic modeling of Taylors Pond/Mill Creek system. Colored divisions indicate boundaries of different grid material types, as well as volumes used to compute flushing rates for individual embayments..... 128

Figure V-42. Plot of numerical grid used for hydrodynamic modeling of Muddy Creek system. Colored divisions indicate boundaries of different grid material types, as well as volumes used to compute flushing rates for the system. 128

Figure V-43. Rotated view of numerical grid used for hydrodynamic modeling of Stage Harbor system. Colored divisions indicate boundaries of different grid material types, as well as volumes used to compute flushing rates for individual embayments..... 129

Figure V-44. Plot of numerical grid used for hydrodynamic modeling of Bassing Harbor system. Colored divisions indicate boundaries of different grid material types, as well as volumes used to compute flushing rates for individual embayments. 130

Figure V-45. Stage Harbor model at the inception of a flood tide, with white areas indicating dry elements. 134

Figure V-46. Observed and computed water surface elevations during calibration time period, for Mill Pond. 135

Figure V-47. Observed and computed water surface elevations during calibration time period, for Little Mill Pond..... 135

Figure V-48. Observed and computed water surface elevations during calibration time period, for Oyster Pond. 136

Figure V-49. Observed and computed water surface elevations during calibration time period, for Sulphur Springs. 136

Figure V-50. Observed and computed water surface elevations during calibration time period, for Taylors Pond..... 137

Figure V-51. Observed and computed water surface elevations during calibration time period, for Crows Pond. 137

Figure V-52. Observed and computed water surface elevations during calibration time period, for Ryder Cove..... 138

Figure V-53. Observed and computed water surface elevations during calibration time period, for Frost Fish Creek. 138

Figure V-54. Observed and computed water surface elevations during calibration time period, for Muddy Creek..... 139

Figure V-55. Comparison of measured volume flow rates versus modeled flow rates through the Stage Harbor Inlet over a tidal cycle on August 16, 2000. Flood flows into the harbor are positive (+), and ebb flows out of the harbor are negative (-). 142

Figure V-56. Comparison of measured volume flow rates versus modeled flow rates through the mouth of Oyster Pond River over a tidal cycle on August 16, 2000. Flood flows into the river are positive (+), and ebb flows out of the river are negative (-)..... 143

Figure V-57. Comparison of measured volume flow rates versus modeled flow rates through the Mill Pond Bridge over a tidal cycle on August 16, 2000. Flood flows into the pond are positive (+), and ebb flows out of the pond are negative (-)..... 144

Figure V-58. Comparison of measured volume flow rates versus modeled flow rates through the Bassing Harbor Inlet over a tidal cycle on September 1, 2000. Flood flows into the harbor are positive (+), and ebb flows out of the harbor are negative (-). 145

Figure V-59. Comparison of measured volume flow rates versus modeled flow rates through the entrance to Ryder Cove/Frost Fish Creek over a tidal cycle on September 1, 2000. Flood flows into the cove are positive (+), and ebb flows out of the cove are negative (-). 146

Figure V-60. Comparison of measured volume flow rates versus modeled flow rates through the mouth of Crows Pond over a tidal cycle on September 1, 2000. Flood flows into the pond are positive (+), and ebb flows out of the pond are negative (-)..... 147

Figure V-61. Topographic map from the 1970's indicating the pre-breach inlet between Morris Island and Nauset Beach. 153

Figure V-62. Recent nautical chart indicating the location of New Inlet at the breach in Nauset Beach 154

Figure V-63. Plot of two tide cycles of model run results for pre-breach conditions at Muddy creek and Bassing Harbor sub-embayments. 154

Figure V-64. Muddy Creek Alternative M2 illustrating the approximate position of the dike separating the freshwater and brackish regions..... 158

Figure V-65. Modeled tide range for Alternative M2 compared with present conditions. 159

Figure V-66. Modeled tide range for Alternatives M3 and M4 compared with present conditions..... 160

Figure V-67. Modeled tide range for Alternatives F1 and F2 compared with present conditions..... 162

Figure VI-1. CTD cast salinity profiles for Crows Pond (Bassing Harbor), Taylors Pond, and Little Mill Pond (Stage Harbor). Cast data were recorded at 0.66 ft increments (0.2 m), during July 18 (Crows Pond), July 19 (Taylors Pond), and July 20 (Little Mill Pond) of 2000. 168

Figure VI-2. CTD cast temperature profiles for Crows Pond (Bassing Harbor), Taylors Pond, and Little Mill Pond (Stage Harbor). Cast data were recorded at 0.66 ft increments (0.2 m), during July 18 (Crows Pond), July 19 (Taylors Pond), and July 20 (Little Mill Pond) of 2000. 169

Figure VI-3. Comparison of measured bio-active nitrogen (PON+DIN) concentrations (means for individual years and means of all data together) and calibrated model output at stations in the Bassing Harbor system (with Frost Fish Creek, FF Cr.). 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). The background concentration (0.12 mg/L) in Pleasant Bay is indicated using a solid line. 174

Figure VI-4. Comparison of measured total nitrogen (PON+DIN+DON) concentrations (means for individual years and means of all data together) and calibrated model output at stations in the Bassing Harbor system. 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). The background concentration (0.48 mg/L) in Pleasant Bay is indicated using a solid line. 175

Figure VI-5. Comparison of measured total nitrogen concentrations (means for individual years and means of all data together) and calibrated model output at stations in the Muddy Creek system. 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). The background concentration (0.50 mg/L) in Pleasant Bay is indicated using a solid line. 175

Figure VI-6. Comparison of measured total nitrogen concentrations (means for individual years and means of all data together) and calibrated model output at stations in the Stage Harbor system. 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). The background concentration (0.29 mg/L) in Nantucket Sound is indicated using a solid line. 176

Figure VI-7. Comparison of measured total nitrogen concentrations (means for individual years and means of all data together) and calibrated model output at stations in the Sulphur Springs system, with Cackle Cove Creek (CCC). 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). The background concentration (0.29 mg/L) in Nantucket Sound is indicated using a solid line. 176

Figure VI-8. Comparison of measured total nitrogen concentrations (means for individual years and means of all data together) and calibrated model output at stations in the Taylors Pond system, with Mill Creek. 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). The background concentration (0.29 mg/L) in Nantucket Sound is indicated using a solid line. 177

Figure VI-9. Contour plot of average total nitrogen concentrations from results of the present conditions loading scenario, for the Stage Harbor system. 177

Figure VI-10. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Sulphur Springs/Cockle Cove Creek system, for present loading conditions..... 178

Figure VI-11. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Taylors Pond/Mill Creek system, for present loading conditions..... 178

Figure VI-12. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Bassing Harbor system, for present loading conditions, and present background N concentration at the entrance to Pleasant Bay (0.48 mg/L). 179

Figure VI-13. Contour plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations in Muddy Creek, for present loading conditions, and present total nitrogen concentration in Pleasant Bay (0.50 mg/L)..... 179

Figure VI-14. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Stage Harbor system, for projected build out loading conditions. 183

Figure VI-15. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Sulphur Springs/Cockle Cove Creek system, for projected build out loading conditions 184

Figure VI-16. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Taylors Pond/Mill Creek system, for projected build out loading conditions..... 184

Figure VI-17. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Bassing Harbor system, for projected build out loading conditions, and present background N concentration at the entrance to Pleasant Bay (0.48 mg/L). 185

Figure VI-18. Contour plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations in Muddy Creek, for projected build out loading conditions, and present total nitrogen concentration in Pleasant Bay (0.50 mg/L)..... 186

Figure VI-19. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Stage Harbor system, for no anthropogenic loading conditions. 189

Figure VI-20. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Sulphur Springs/Cockle Cove Creek system, for no anthropogenic loading conditions..... 190

Figure VI-21. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Taylors Pond/Mill Creek system, for no anthropogenic loading conditions. 190

Figure VI-22. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Bassing Harbor system, for no anthropogenic loading conditions, and present background N concentration at the entrance to Pleasant Bay (0.48 mg/L). 191

Figure VI-23. Contour plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations in Muddy Creek, for no anthropogenic loading conditions, and present total nitrogen concentration in Pleasant Bay (0.50 mg/L)..... 192

Figure VII-1a. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen (top panel) and chlorophyll-a (bottom panel) in Upper Muddy Creek, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 196

Figure VII-1b. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen (top panel) and chlorophyll-a (bottom panel) in Lower Muddy Creek, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 197

Figure VII-2. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen (top panel) and chlorophyll-a (bottom panel) in Mill Pond (Stage Harbor System), Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 198

Figure VII-3. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen (top panel) and chlorophyll-a (bottom panel) in Oyster Pond (Stage Harbor System), Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 199

Figure VII-4. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen (top panel) and chlorophyll-a (bottom panel) in Stage Harbor (Stage Harbor System), Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 200

Figure VII-5. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen (top panel) and chlorophyll-a (bottom panel) in Taylors Pond, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 201

Figure VII-6. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen (top panel) and chlorophyll-a (bottom panel) in Sulphur Springs, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 202

Figure VII-7. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen (top panel) and chlorophyll-a (bottom panel) in Upper Ryder Cove (Bassing Harbor System), Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 203

Figure VII-8. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen (top panel) and chlorophyll-a (bottom panel) in Lower Ryder Cove (Bassing Harbor System), Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 204

Figure VII-9. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen (top panel) and chlorophyll-a (bottom panel) in Crows Pond (Bassing Harbor System), Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 205

Figure VII-10. Bottom water record of dissolved oxygen (top panel) and chlorophyll-a (bottom panel) in Bassing Harbor, Summer 2002. Calibration samples represented as red dots. 206

Figure VII-11. Map of Stage Harbor eelgrass distribution as observed in 2000..... 212

Figure VII-12. Map of Bassing Harbor eelgrass distribution as observed in 2000. 213

Figure VII-13. Map of Taylors Pond and Sulphur Springs area eelgrass distribution (green shaded area) as determined by Massachusetts DEP in 1994 by analysis of aerial photographs. White circles indicate sites where eel grass coverage was field-confirmed. 213

Figure VII-14. Map of Stage Harbor area eelgrass distribution (green shaded area) as determined by Massachusetts DEP in 1994 by analysis of aerial photographs. White circles indicate sites where eel grass coverage was field-confirmed. 214

Figure VII-15. Historical eelgrass coverages with the Stage Harbor System. The 1951 coverage is depicted by the orange outline inside of which is the eelgrass beds. The green solid and blue hatched areas depict the bed areas in 1995 and 2000, respectively. 215

Figure VII-16. Historical eelgrass coverages with the Bassing Harbor System. The 1951 coverage is depicted by the orange outline inside of which is the eelgrass beds. The green solid and blue hatched areas depict the bed areas in 1995 and 2000, respectively. 216

Figure VII-17. Aerial photograph of Chatham showing location of benthic infaunal sampling stations (yellow circles). 221

Figure VIII-1. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Stage Harbor system, for threshold loading conditions (0.38 mg/L in both Mill Pond and Oyster Pond)..... 233

Figure VIII-2. Same results as for figure above, but shown with finer contour increments for emphasis. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Stage Harbor system, for threshold loading conditions (0.38 mg/L in both Mill Pond and Oyster Pond). 233

Figure VIII-3. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Sulphur Springs/Cockle Cove Creek system, for threshold loading conditions (0.38 mg/L in Sulphur Springs)..... 234

Figure VIII-4. Same results as for figure above, but shown with finer contour increments for emphasis. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Sulphur Springs/Cockle Cove Creek system, for threshold loading conditions (0.38 mg/L in Sulphur Springs). 234

Figure VIII-5. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Taylors Pond/Mill Creek system, for threshold loading conditions (0.38 mg/L in Taylors Pond)..... 235

Figure VIII-6. Same results as for figure above, but shown with finer contour increments for emphasis. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Taylors Pond/Mill Creek system, for threshold loading conditions (0.38 mg/L in Taylors Pond). 235

Figure VIII-7. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Bassing Harbor system, for threshold loading conditions (0.55 mg/L in Ryder Cove), and present background N concentration at the entrance to Pleasant Bay (0.48 mg/L)..... 236

Figure VIII-8. Same results as for figure above, but shown with finer contour increments for emphasis. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Bassing Harbor system, for threshold loading conditions (0.55 mg/L in Ryder Cove), and present background N concentration at the entrance to Pleasant Bay (0.48 mg/L). 236

Figure VIII-9. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Muddy Creek system, for threshold loading conditions (0.55 mg/L in lower Muddy Creek), and present background N concentration at the entrance to Pleasant Bay (0.50 mg/L)..... 237

Figure VIII-10. Same results as for figure above, but shown with finer contour increments for emphasis. Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Muddy Creek system, for threshold loading conditions (0.55 mg/L in lower Muddy Creek), and present background N concentration at the entrance to Pleasant Bay (0.50 mg/L). 237

Figure IX-1. Muddy Creek Alternative 2 illustrating the approximate position of the dike separating the freshwater and brackish regions. 240

Figure IX-2. Close up of the lower portion of Muddy Creek showing total nitrogen concentration contours for modeled present conditions..... 242

Figure IX-3. Muddy Creek total nitrogen concentration contours for Flushing Alternative 2, where the upper portion of the creek is turned into a freshwater system by the construction of a dike approximately ½ mile upstream of the route 28 roadway embankment. 242

Figure IX-4. Contour plot of modeled present conditions for Muddy Creek, showing total nitrogen concentrations. 243

Figure IX-5. Contour plot of total nitrogen concentrations for Muddy Creek flushing Alternative 3, an 8 ft wide box culvert replacement for the existing Route 28 culverts. 243

Figure IX-6. Contour plot of total nitrogen concentrations for Muddy Creek flushing Alternative 4, a 16 ft wide box culvert replacement for the existing Route 28 culverts. 243

Figure IX-7. Scenario A: Contour plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations in Muddy Creek, for present loading conditions, and present total nitrogen concentration in Pleasant Bay (0.50 mg/L)..... 246

Figure IX-8. Scenario E: Contour plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations in Muddy Creek, for present loading conditions, with 3000 kg/yr reduction in the load to the upper creek watershed, and present total nitrogen concentration in Pleasant Bay (0.50 mg/L)..... 246

Figure IX-9. Scenario H: Contour plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations in Muddy Creek, for present loading conditions, and alternate fresh water configuration of the upper creek (alternative 2), with present total nitrogen concentration in Pleasant Bay (0.50 mg/L)..... 247

Figure IX-10. Scenario N: Contour Plot of modeled total nitrogen concentrations (mg/L) in the Muddy Creek system, for threshold loading conditions (0.55 mg/L in lower Muddy Creek), and present background N concentration at the entrance to Pleasant Bay (0.50 mg/L). 50% watershed load reduction is required to achieve target N concentration in lower Muddy Creek..... 247

LIST OF TABLES

Table III-1. Percent difference in delineated embayment watershed areas between old and newly revised delineations..... 19

Table III-2. Daily groundwater discharge to each of the major sub-embayments to the five major embayments within the Town of Chatham, MA, as determined from the groundwater model. 21

Table IV-1. Water Use in Town of Chatham 28

Table IV-2. Primary Nitrogen Loading Factors used in Chatham MEP analysis. General factors are from the MEP modeling evaluation (Howes & Ramsey 2001). Site-specific factors are derived from Chatham data. *Data from MEP lawn study in Falmouth, Mashpee & Barnstable 2001. 33

Table IV-3a. Oyster Pond/Stage Harbor System Nitrogen Loads. 36

Table IV-3b. Sulphur Springs/Bucks Creek/Cockle Cove System Nitrogen Loads..... 37

Table IV-3c. Taylors Pond/Mill Creek System Nitrogen Loads. 38

Table IV-3d. Muddy Creek System Nitrogen Loads..... 39

Table IV-3e. Ryder Cove/Bassing Harbor System Nitrogen Loads..... 40

Table IV-4. Nitrogen attenuation by Chatham Freshwater Ponds based upon late summer 2001 Cape Cod Pond and Lakes Stewardship (PALS) program sampling. These data were collected to provide a site specific check on nitrogen attenuation by these systems. Stillwater Pond and Lovers Lake had annual nitrogen and discharge measurements to determine attenuation; only Lovers Lake has full discharge through surface water flow, which yielded an attenuation of 52% (Table IV-5). The MEP Linked N Model uses a value of 40% for the non-stream discharge systems..... 46

Table IV-5. Comparison of water flow and nitrogen discharges to Ryder Cove and from School House Pond, Lovers Lake and Stillwater Pond watershed through Stillwater Pond Stream. The “Stream” data is from previous SMAST studies with the Town of Chatham and the MEP stream gauging effort. Watershed data is based upon the MEP watershed modeling effort by USGS..... 58

Table IV-6. Measurement of nitrogen attenuation, flow and water quality constituents within Frost Fish Creek during summer 2002. The total freshwater discharge to Frost Fish Creek from the watershed as determined from the USGS groundwater model (Section III) was 1274 m³ per day based upon the annual average, compared to the 1097 m³ per day determined by the RMA-2 model (Section V) and the 1054 m³ per day from the 4 Tidal Studies. Nitrogen attenuation is calculated as the difference in measured nitrogen mass in tidal outflow from Frost Fish Creek to Ryder Cove versus the nitrogen load entering from the watershed and within the inflowing tidal waters. 64

Table IV-7. Rates of net nitrogen return from sediments to overlying waters based on sub-embayment area coverage and core flux measurements. 73

Table V-1. Tidal Constituents, Stage Harbor and South Coast Embayments of Chatham, July-August 2000..... 105

Table V-2. M₂ Tidal Attenuation Stage Harbor and South Coast Embayments, Chatham, July-August 2000 (Delay in minutes relative to offshore of Cockle Cove Beach). 106

Table V-3. Percentages of Tidal versus Non-Tidal Energy, Stage Harbor and South Coast Embayments, July to August 2000..... 108

Table V-4.	Tidal constituents for Bassing Harbor/Muddy Creek, Chatham, August-September 2000	116
Table V-5.	M ₂ Tidal Attenuation Bassing Harbor/Muddy Creek systems August-September 2000 (Delay in minutes relative to Chatham Yacht Club).....	117
Table V-6.	Percentages of tidal versus non-tidal energy Bassing Harbor/Muddy Creek August-September 2000.....	117
Table V-7.	Characteristics of numerical grids developed for hydrodynamic analyses.	127
Table V-8.	Manning’s Roughness coefficients used in simulations of modeled embayments.	133
Table V-9.	Tidal constituents for measured water level data and calibrated model output for northern embayments.	139
Table V-10.	Tidal constituents for measured water level data and calibrated model output for Stage Harbor and South Coast Embayments.....	140
Table V-11.	Embayment mean volumes and average tidal prism during simulation period.....	150
Table V-12.	System and Local residence times (flushing rates) for Chatham sub-embayments.	151
Table V-13.	Embayment mean volumes and average tidal prism during simulation period for modeled pre-breach conditions in Pleasant Bay.....	155
Table V-14.	System and Local residence times (flushing rates) for Pleasant Bay sub-embayments for modeled pre-breach conditions.....	155
Table V-15.	Percent change in residence times from present conditions for Pleasant Bay sub-embayments for modeled pre-breach conditions.....	155
Table V-16.	Comparison of tide datums and mean tide levels for pre- and post-breach conditions, for Inner Ryder Cove. Elevations are relative to NGVD 29. Datums for present conditions were computed using TDR data collected in August and September 2000 in Ryder Cove.	156
Table V-17.	Comparison of system volume, tide prism, and residence times for Muddy Creek for alternatives M2, M3, and M4.	159
Table V-18.	Comparison of system volume, tide prism, and residence times for Frost Fish Creek for alternatives F1 and F2.	161
Table VI-1a.	Measured and modeled Nitrogen concentrations for Bassing Harbor and Muddy Creek, used in the model calibration plots of Figures VI-3 (Bassing Harbor total N),VI-4 (Bassing Harbor bio-active N), and VI-5 (Muddy Creek). All concentrations are given in mg/L N. “Data mean” values are calculated as the average of the separate yearly means.....	166
Table VI-1b.	Measured and modeled Nitrogen concentrations for Stage Harbor, Sulphur Springs, and Taylors Pond, used in the model calibration plots of Figures VI-6 (Stage Harbor total N),VI-7 (Sulphur Springs), and VI-8 (Taylors Pond). All concentrations are given in mg/L N. “Data mean” values are calculated as the average of the separate yearly means.	167
Table VI-2.	Sub-embayment loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Stage Harbor and South Coastal embayment systems, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. These load represent present loading conditions for the listed sub-embayments.	171
Table VI-3.	Sub-embayment loads used for total nitrogen modeling of the Bassing Harbor and Muddy Creek systems of Pleasant Bay, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. These load represent present loading conditions for the listed sub-embayments.	172

Table VI-4.	Values of longitudinal dispersion coefficient, E, used in calibrated RMA4 model runs of salinity and nitrogen concentration for the South Coastal embayments and Stage Harbor.	172
Table VI-5.	Values of longitudinal dispersion coefficient, E, used in calibrated RMA4 model runs of salinity and nitrogen concentration for Bassing Harbor and Muddy Creek.	173
Table VI-6.	Comparison of sub-embayment watershed loads used for modeling of present, build out, and no-anthropogenic (“no-load”) loading scenarios of the Stage Harbor and South Coastal embayment systems. These loads do not include direct atmospheric deposition (onto the sub-embayment surface) or benthic flux loading terms.....	180
Table VI-7.	Comparison of sub-embayment watershed loads used for modeling of present, build out, and no-anthropogenic (“no-load”) loading scenarios of the Pleasant Bay embayment systems. These loads do not include atmospheric deposition and benthic flux loading terms.	181
Table VI-8.	Sub-embayment loads used for modeling of buildout out scenarios in the Bassing Harbor and Muddy Creek systems of Pleasant Bay, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux.	181
Table VI-9.	Sub-embayment loads used for modeling of build out scenarios of the Stage Harbor and South Coastal embayment systems, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux.	182
Table VI-10.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and build out scenario, with percent change, for South Coastal embayments and Stage Harbor.	182
Table VI-11.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and build out scenario, with percent change, for Pleasant Bay embayment systems.	183
Table VI-12.	Sub-embayment loads used for modeling of no-anthropogenic loading scenarios of the Stage Harbor and South Coastal embayment systems, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux.....	187
Table VI-13.	Sub-embayment loads used for modeling of no-anthropogenic loading scenarios in the Bassing Harbor and Muddy Creek systems of Pleasant Bay, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux.	187
Table VI-14.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the no anthropogenic (“no load”) scenario, with percent change, for South Coastal embayments and Stage Harbor. Loads are based on atmospheric deposition and a scaled N benthic flux (scaled from present conditions).....	188
Table VI-15.	Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and the no anthropogenic (“no load”) scenario, with percent change, for Pleasant Bay embayment systems. Loads are based on atmospheric deposition and a scaled N benthic flux (scaled from present conditions).	188
Table VII-1.	Percent of time during deployment that bottomwater oxygen levels recorded by the in situ sensors were below various benchmark oxygen levels.	207
Table VII-2.	Frequency (number of events during deployment) and duration (total number of days over deployment) of chlorophyll a levels above various benchmark levels within the 5 embayment systems.....	208

Table VII-3. Eelgrass coverage in Chatham embayments in 2000 assayed by visual transect surveys. This approach can record the distribution of eelgrass at low density. Therefore the values represent maximum areal coverage. 217

Table VII-4. Changes in eelgrass coverage in the 2 major embayment systems within the Town of Chatham over the past half century (C. Costello). Note: data from Table VII-3 collected by different approach not included. 218

Table VII-5. Benthic Infaunal Community Assessment for Chatham Embayments. Samples collected Summer and Fall of 2000. All data is represented as per 1/25 m2. Indicator assessment based upon life history information (G.R. Hampson, SMAST)..... 222

Table VII-6. Benthic infaunal community data for the 5 embayment systems. 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. 223

Table VIII-1. Assessment of nitrogen related habitat quality within the embayments of the Town of Chatham. Water quality stations and benthic stations were in the same basin, but not in the exact same locations. Data for this comparison is from 2000, when the eelgrass mapping and benthic infauna were assayed. Note that the 1998-2002 water quality data was used in the validation of the water quality model and that the moored instrumentation captured a greater range of dissolved oxygen and chlorophyll a than the water quality sampling programs. Ecological Assessment Classification (SMAST) attempts to integrate water quality and habitat indicators, as well as any temporal trends which have been identified. No data is represented by "-- --". 225

Table VIII-2. Comparison of sub-embayment watershed septic loads used for modeling of present and threshold loading scenarios of the South Coastal embayments and Stage Harbor systems. These loads represent groundwater load contribution from septic systems only, and do not include runoff, fertilizer, atmospheric deposition and benthic flux loading terms..... 230

Table VIII-3. Comparison of sub-embayment watershed septic loads used for modeling of present and threshold loading scenarios of the Pleasant Bay embayment systems. These loads represent groundwater load contribution from septic systems only, and do not include runoff, fertilizer, atmospheric deposition and benthic flux loading terms. 231

Table VIII-4. Comparison of sub-embayment watershed loads (including septic, runoff, and fertilizer) used for modeling of present and threshold loading scenarios of the South Coastal embayments and Stage Harbor systems. These loads do not include atmospheric deposition and benthic flux loading terms. Note that this is but one of many approaches for reaching the "target" N value. 231

Table VIII-5. Comparison of sub-embayment watershed loads (including septic, runoff, and fertilizer) used for modeling of present and threshold loading scenarios of the Pleasant Bay embayment systems. These loads do not include atmospheric deposition and benthic flux loading terms. 232

Table VIII-6. Sub-embayment loads used for nitrogen threshold scenarios run for the Stage Harbor and South Coastal embayment systems, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. 232

Table VIII-7. Sub-embayment loads used for nitrogen threshold scenarios run for the Bassing Harbor and Muddy Creek systems of Pleasant Bay, with total watershed N loads, atmospheric N loads, and benthic flux. 232

Table IX-1. Alternative water quality scenarios run for the Muddy Creek system, including scenarios which modify the hydrodynamics of the system (g, h, l) for present loading conditions, and others that demonstrate the relative impact of load reductions in different areas of the system (i.e., lower creek vs. upper creek, as in e and f). 244

Table IX-2. Comparison of model average total N concentrations from present loading and build out scenario, with percent change, for Muddy Creek water quality alternative scenarios shown in Table IX-1. 245