Wriggle

coastalmanagement

Fortrose (Toetoes) Estuary

Macroalgal Monitoring 2010/11

Prepared for
Environment Southland
July 2011

Cover Photo: ***Ulva*** **(*Enteromorpha)* and *Gracilaria* in the Lower Estuary.**

Ulva (Enteromorpha) **growing along the eastern shoreline adjacent to Fortrose.**

Fortrose (Toetoes) Estuary

Macroalgal Monitoring 2010/11

Prepared for
Environment Southland

By

Leigh Stevens and Barry Robertson

Wriggle Limited, PO Box 1622, Nelson 7040, NZ. Ph 03 545 6315, 021 417 936, or 03 546 1550, 0275 417 935, www.wriggle.co.nz

Contents

1. Introduction and Methods 1

2. Results, Rating and Management 2

3. References 5

List of Figures

Figure 1. Map of macroalgal cover - Fortrose (Toetoes) Estuary, February 2011. 3

List of Tables

Table 1. Summary of macroalgal percentage cover results, February 2011 2

Table 2. Summary of macroalgal condition rating and results, 2009-2011. 2

1. INTRODUCTION AND METHODS

INTRODUCTION

Macroalgae is an important feature of estuaries, contributing to their high productivity and biodiversity. However, when high nutrient inputs combine with suitable growing conditions, nuisance blooms of rapidly growing algae e.g. *Ulva* (sea lettuce), *Gracilaria*, can occur. At nuisance levels such growths can deprive seagrass of light causing its eventual decline, while decaying macroalgae can accumulate on shorelines causing localised depletion of sediment oxygen, and nuisance odours. When high macroalgal cover coincides with soft muddy sediments, conditions for animal life in the sediments are generally very poor due to toxic sulphides, elevated nutrients, and depleted oxygen.

This brief report summarises the third year of macroalgal monitoring in Fortrose Estuary, one of the key estuaries in the Environment Southland's long term estuary monitoring programme. The report describes intertidal macroalgal cover - a broad scale indicator of estuary eutrophication - using a macroalgal coefficient (described below) developed for Southland's estuaries to rate the condition of the estuary, and recommends monitoring and management actions. These actions need to be considered in conjunction with the fine scale monitoring results - see Robertson and Stevens (2009).

METHODS

Broad scale mapping of the percentage cover of macroalgae throughout all the intertidal habitat of Fortrose Estuary was undertaken in February 2011 using a combination of aerial photography, ground-truthing, and ArcMap 9.3 GIS-based digital mapping. The procedure, originally described for use in NZ estuaries by Robertson et al. (2002), has subsequently been modified and successfully applied to various estuaries to develop a separate GIS macroalgal layer (e.g. Stevens and Robertson 2007, 08, 09, 10).

Rectified aerial photographs (~0.3 metre per pixel, scale 1:10,000) of the estuary, flown in February 2008 were used as base maps. Experienced coastal scientists then recorded the percentage cover of macroalgae directly onto laminated photos during field assessment of macroalgal cover. The field maps were then used to create a GIS layer from which the percentage cover information was subsequently calculated.

The report outputs are used to both identify and classify macroalgal cover, and to show changes in macroalgal cover over time by comparisons with previous surveys (annually if a problem, 5 yearly if not). The current report presents the 2011 percentage cover of macroalgae within the estuary, and a summary of the dominant species and percentage cover classes (Table 1).

SOUTHLAND ESTUARIES: MACROALGAE CONDITION RATING

The primary fine scale indicators of eutrophication are grain size, RPD boundary, sediment organic matter, nitrogen and phosphorus concentrations, and the community structure of certain sediment-dwelling animals. The broad scale indicators are the percentages of the estuary covered by macroalgae and soft muds. For short residence time estuaries like Fortrose, highly eutrophic conditions only occur when sediments from large ares of the estuary exhibit all of the following symptoms; high macroalgal growth (>50% cover), are soft and muddy, have a shallow RPD, elevated nutrient and TOC concentrations, and very high invertebrate organic enrichment tolerance ratings.

A two part macroalgae condition rating has been developed: 1. for the whole estuary, and 2. for hotspots within the estuary. Whole estuary macroalgal condition is rated using a continuous index (the macroalgae coefficient - MC) based on the percentage cover of macroalgae in defined categories throughout the estuary. The equation used is: ***MC=((0 x %macroalgal cover <1%)+(0.5 x %cover 1-5%)+(1 x %cover 5-10%)+(3 x %cover 10-20%)+(4.5 x %cover 20-50%)+(6 x %cover 50-80%)+(7.5 x %cover >80%))/100.*** The hotspot rating targets areas of heavy growth and is applied where EITHER the percentage cover of intertidal macroalgal exceeds 50%, OR if nuisance conditions are judged as being significantly adverse. The highest rating calculated is applied to determine recommended responses.

MACROALGAE CONDITION RATING

ESTUARY RATING	DEFINITION	MC	RECOMMENDED RESPONSE
Very Good	Very Low	0.0 - 0.2	Monitor at 5 year intervals after baseline established
Good	Low	0.2 - 0.8	Monitor at 5 year intervals after baseline established
	Low Low-Moderate	0.8 - 1.5	Monitor at 5 year intervals after baseline established
Fair	Low-Moderate	1.5 - 2.2	Monitor yearly. Initiate Evaluation & Response Plan
	Moderate	2.2 - 4.5	Monitor yearly. Initiate Evaluation & Response Plan
Poor	High	4.5 - 7.0	Monitor yearly. Initiate Evaluation & Response Plan
	Very High	>7.0	Monitor yearly. Initiate Evaluation & Response Plan
Early Warning Trigger	Trend of increasing Macroalgae Coefficient		Initiate Evaluation and Response Plan
HOTSPOT RATING	**>50% COVER OVER:**	**NUISANCE CONDITIONS**	**RECOMMENDED RESPONSE**
Good	<5% of estuary	Low	Monitor at 5 year intervals after baseline established
Fair	5-10% of estuary	Moderate	Monitor yearly. Initiate Evaluation & Response Plan
Poor	10-30% of estuary	High	Monitor yearly. Initiate Evaluation & Response Plan
Very Poor	>30% of estuary	Very High	Monitor yearly. Initiate Evaluation & Response Plan

2. RESULTS, RATING AND MANAGEMENT

RESULTS



Gracilaria on the eastern flats of Fortrose Estuary.

2011 MACROALGAL COVER CONDITION RATING

FAIR

Figure 1 and Table 1 summarise the results of the 2011 macroalgal mapping of Fortrose Estuary. Across the vast majority of the estuary (202Ha, 94%), macroalgal cover was below 50%, with the highest densities of macroalgae growing predominantly in the well flushed lower intertidal reaches of the Central Basin and Eastern Flats. Nuisance conditions of anoxic muds and sulphide odours were uncommon and largely restricted to localised areas in the estuary where wind and current-deposited macroalgae accumulates (predominantly along the eastern shoreline). Broad scale mapping (Robertson et al. 2003) reported only 3% of the estuary was dominated by soft mud, with no significant macroalgal growth observed in these areas in 2011. Consequently, there were no areas exhibiting gross nuisance conditions.

In 2009 and 2010, the green alga *Ulva (Enteromorpha) intestinalis* was the most common macroalgal species in the estuary. While still dominant over the red alga *Gracilaria* in all areas of the estuary, including subtidally in 2011, it was generally less prevalent compared to the previous two years of monitoring, particularly on the northern flats. The most extensive macroalgal growths remained located in subtidal areas wherever substrate allowed macroalgae to gain a foothold, with *Ulva* most common intertidally along the edge of the river channel margins.

Table 1. Summary of macroalgal percentage cover results, February 2011.

MACROALGAE	Fortrose (Toetoes) Estuary		
Percentage Cover	Ha	%	Dominant species
<1%	74.3	34.7	-
1-5%	112.5	52.5	*Ulva intestinalis, Gracilaria*
5-10%	0.6	0.3	*Ulva intestinalis, Gracilaria*
10-20%	14.4	6.7	*Ulva intestinalis, Gracilaria*
20-50%	0.7	0.3	*Ulva intestinalis, Gracilaria*
50-80%	3.9	1.8	*Gracilaria, Ulva intestinalis*
>80%	7.9	3.7	*Ulva intestinalis, Gracilaria*
TOTAL	**214**	**100**	

Note: *Enteromorpha intestinalis* (reported as *Enteromorpha* in Stevens and Robertson 2009, 2010) has recently been re-classified as *Ulva intestinalis* which is used in the current report.

Table 2. Summary of macroalgal condition rating and results, 2009-2011.

Year	MC Rating	Hotspot Rating	Result
2009	1.8	FAIR	Widespread growth in central basin and eastern side of estuary. Little growth in the west and across lower estuary, but localised concentrations of windblown algae.
2010	1.2	FAIR	Most macroalgal growth and localised concentrations of windblown algae located on the Eastern Flats. Little growth across the north, west or lower estuary flats.
2011	0.9	FAIR	Most extensive as windblown deposits on the Eastern Flats. Little growth across the north, west or lower estuary flats. Reduced cover in central basin.

Table 2 summarises the Condition Rating and Macroalgal Coefficient (MC) results for the 2009-2011 period. The Condition Rating was revised in 2011 following a review of the extensive data set compiled for Southland since 2007. Macroalgal cover has continued to decrease in the Central Basin and in the lower intertidal sections of the Northern and Eastern Flats from Feb. 2009-Feb. 2011, with the Macroalgae Coefficient (MC) reducing from 1.8 to 0.9. The reduction in the MC related to a decrease in the amount of the estuary with >80% cover, as well as an increase in areas with <5% cover. The condition rating remained "FAIR" because of >50% cover over >5% of the estuary.

2. Results, Rating and Management (Continued)



Figure 1. Map of macroalgal cover - Fortrose (Toetoes) Estuary, February 2011.

2. Results, Rating and Management (Continued)

RESULTS	The continued decrease in the unusually high macroalgal growth observed in Fortrose Estuary during summer 2008/09, and the general absence of nuisance conditions in 2011 is a positive sign. However, extensive growths of macroalgae in subtidal areas, which contribute to localised impacts where shoreline accumulations occur, require monitoring and management action. This extensive subtidal growth present in the estuary is driven by the high nutrient loads entering the estuary (estimated N load 2,450 tonnes N $year^{-1}$ based on NIWA's CLUES model). Because the estuary is relatively small in comparison to the very large freshwater inflow (mean flow 76$m^3.s^{-1}$), most of the N inflow is rapidly flushed out to sea. However, the high N inputs support excessive growths of nuisance macroalgae in areas close to the main channel (i.e. areas exposed to elevated nutrient concentrations and low salinity conditions). The nuisance macroalgae is usually *Ulva (Enteromorpha),* which is very tolerant of low salinity, and these growths can break away and be transported to other areas of the estuary through wind and current action. At present, extensive growths of macroalgae in subtidal areas of Fortrose Estuary reflect the estuary's response to high nutrient inputs. Consequently, setting limits on nutrient inputs, and the identification and management of nutrient sources is considered a priority. However, because the estuary is currently in a low to moderate state of enrichment, the estuary doesn't have the same high urgency as New River or Jacobs River estuaries.
CONCLUSION	2011 macroalgal cover had a condition rating of "FAIR", with the highest densities of macroalgae in subtidal channels, and in the central basin and eastern side of the estuary. Nuisance conditions of anoxic muds and sulphide odours were uncommon away from localised areas associated with high cover or windblown accumulations of macroalgae.
RECOMMENDED MONITORING AND MANAGEMENT	The condition rating triggers annual monitoring (next scheduled for February 2012) to allow for any deterioration of sediment quality to be assessed. In addition, the following management is recommended: **Set Limits on Nutrient Inputs** • Nutrient inputs to Fortrose Estuary are high, are strongly related to eutrophication symptoms (Robertson and Stevens 2008), and macroalgal growth had recently accelerated and was widespread throughout the central basin and eastern side of the estuary in 2009. Inputs need to be reduced below current levels to achieve a more moderately enriched estuary and to protect it from further degradation. **Identify and Manage Major Nutrient Sources** • The identification of nutrient sources to the estuary is seen as a priority given the very significant nature of both point and non-point discharges. Once identified, a plan should be developed to priortise and reduce the key inputs.

Macroalgae on the eastern shoreline, Fortrose Estuary.

3. REFERENCES

Robertson, B.M., Gillespie, P.A., Asher, R.A., Frisk, S., Keeley, N.B., Hopkins, G.A., Thompson, S.J., Tuckey, B.J. 2002. Estuarine Environmental Assessment and Monitoring: A National Protocol. Part A. Development, Part B. Appendices, and Part C. Application. Prepared for supporting Councils and the Ministry for the Environment, Sustainable Management Fund Contract No. 5096. Part A. 93p. Part B. 159p. Part C. 40p plus field sheets.

Robertson, B.M. and Stevens, L.M. 2009. Fortrose (Toetoes) Estuary Fine Scale Monitoring 2008/09. Report prepared by Wriggle Coastal Management for Environment Southland. 18p.

Robertson, B.M. and Stevens, L.M. 2008. Southland Coast - Te Waewae Bay to the Catlins, habitat mapping, risk assessment and monitoring recommendations. Report prepared for Environment Southland. 165p.

Robertson B.M., Tuckey B.J., and Robertson B. 2003. Broadscale mapping of Fortrose Estuary intertidal habitats. Prepared for Environment Southland.

Stevens, L.M. and Robertson, B.M. 2010. Fortrose (Toetoes) Estuary. Macroalgal Monitoring 2009/10. Report prepared by Wriggle Coastal Management for Environment Southland. 6p.

Stevens, L.M. and Robertson, B.M. 2009. Fortrose (Toetoes) Estuary. Macroalgal Monitoring 2008/09. Report prepared by Wriggle Coastal Management for Environment Southland. 5p.