

2009

# Climatic Controls on Phytoplankton Biomass in a Sub-tropical Estuary, Florida Bay, USA

Henry O. Briceño

*Southeast Environmental Research Center, Florida International University, bricenoh@fiu.edu*

Joseph N. Boyer

*Southeast Environmental Research Center, Florida International University, boyerj@fiu.edu*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/fce\\_lter\\_journal\\_articles](http://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/fce_lter_journal_articles)

---

## Recommended Citation

Briceno, H.O., J.N. Boyer. 2010. Climatic Controls on Phytoplankton Biomass in a Sub-tropical Estuary, Florida Bay, USA. *Estuaries and Coasts* 33(2): 541-553.

This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation through the Florida Coastal Everglades Long-Term Ecological Research program under Cooperative Agreements #DBI-0620409 and #DEB-9910514. Any opinions, findings, conclusions, or recommendations expressed in the material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

This work is brought to you for free and open access by the FCE LTER at FIU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in FCE LTER Journal Articles by an authorized administrator of FIU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [dcc@fiu.edu](mailto:dcc@fiu.edu), [jkrefft@fiu.edu](mailto:jkrefft@fiu.edu).

1 Climatic controls on phytoplankton biomass in a sub-tropical estuary, Florida Bay, USA.

2

3 Henry O. Briceño and Joseph N. Boyer

4

5 Southeast Environmental Research Center, OE-148, Florida International University,

6 11200 SW 8<sup>th</sup> St

7 Miami, FL 33199

8

9 Corresponding Author

10 Henry O. Briceño

11 [bricenoh@fiu.edu](mailto:bricenoh@fiu.edu)

12 Tel: (305) 348 1269

13 Fax: (305) 348 4096

## 1 **ABSTRACT**

2       The extraction of climatic signals from time-series of biogeochemical data is further  
3 complicated in estuarine regions because of the dynamic interaction of land, ocean and  
4 atmosphere. We explored the behavior of potential global and regional climatic  
5 stressors to isolate specific shifts or trends, which could have a forcing role on the  
6 behavior of biogeochemical descriptors of water quality and phytoplankton biomass  
7 from Florida Bay, as an example of a sub-tropical estuary. We performed statistical  
8 analysis and subdivided the bay into six zones having unique biogeochemical  
9 characteristics. Significant shifts in the drivers were identified in all the chlorophyll a  
10 time-series. Chlorophyll a concentrations closely follow global forcing and display a  
11 generalized declining trend on which seasonal oscillations are superimposed, and it is  
12 only interrupted by events of sudden increase triggered by storms which are followed by  
13 a relatively rapid return to pre-event conditions trailing again the long-term trend.

14

15 **KEY WORDS:** Florida Bay; chlorophyll a; time-series; climate signal; CUSUM;

16 hurricane impact

17

## 18 **INTRODUCTION**

19       Two of the most important challenges of global change ecological research are to be  
20 able to detect ecosystem changes while they are happening and to directly tie these  
21 changes to the pertinent environmental drivers. This is especially true when dealing  
22 with phytoplankton, as individuals and populations vary over weeks while communities  
23 vary over seasonal and annual cycles. Understanding the temporal variability in

1 phytoplankton community composition and biomass has been a central focus in marine  
2 ecology for many years (Steele and Henderson 1981). That domination of an individual  
3 species or community type lasts only a few weeks and occurs at specific times of the  
4 year suggests that they are regulated by changing endogenous and exogenous factors  
5 (Belgrano et al. 2004).

6 Most data sets generated during surveys and monitoring programs to establish  
7 temporal and/or spatial variations and trends are usually interpreted by analyzing time-  
8 series, where one of the axes is either time or distance. Due to the intrinsic  
9 characteristics of natural phenomena, data are strongly affected by sturdy serial  
10 correlation and wide variations which may mask the underlying pattern components  
11 (trends, shifts, cycles and seasonal variations). A battery of statistical techniques to  
12 study time-series has been developed in the field of electrical signal analysis,  
13 economics and quality control (Box et al. 1994; Chatfield 1996; Manson and Lind 1996;  
14 Emery and Thomson 2001). However, one difference in time-series between  
15 engineering and environmental sciences is that, in the latter, observations are rarely  
16 collected at regular spacing, either in time or space. Hence, it is normally necessary to  
17 perform a pre-treatment of the data sequence before attempting more orthodox  
18 statistical tests (Sturges 1983; Box et al. 1994; Chatfield 1996; Emery and Thompson  
19 2001). Another problem is that climate-related time series usually contain combinations  
20 of variables measured at different time scales and at disparate locations. That the  
21 effects variables may be measured far from the forcing variables is a problem to be  
22 resolved (Mann et al. 1999).

1 In the present study we attempt to establish links between biogeochemical  
2 descriptors of water quality to external drivers, natural and anthropogenic, by  
3 contrasting time-series of data. First, using Florida Bay as an example of a sub-tropical  
4 estuary, we perform statistical analysis to subdivide the bay into zones having similar  
5 biogeochemical characteristics and then compare them to highlight their defining and  
6 unique properties in space and time. Finally, we compare their evolution since 1989  
7 with those of the potential global and regional climatic stressors such as North Atlantic  
8 Oscillation (NAO), Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO), precipitation rate, storms,  
9 Accumulated Cyclone Energy (ACE), natural and managed freshwater supply from the  
10 Everglades, and responses from the system, especially chlorophyll *a* (CHLA) as an  
11 indicator of phytoplankton biomass.

12

## 13 **METHODS**

### 14 **Site Description**

15 Florida Bay is a large (2000 km<sup>2</sup>) and shallow (average 1.5 m), estuarine lagoon  
16 located at the southern end of the Florida Peninsula (ca. 25° 05'N, 80° 45'W), between  
17 the Everglades swamps and marshes to the north and the Florida Keys to the south and  
18 east; westwards it is open to the Gulf of Mexico (Fig. 1). Florida Bay includes shallow  
19 basins separated by grassy mud banks and except along its western portion, tides have  
20 little effect on the water levels of the bay because these mud banks restrict water flow  
21 (Fourqurean and Robblee 1999; Nuttle et al. 2000). About 90% of the freshwater input  
22 to the bay comes from direct precipitation (average 98 cm y<sup>-1</sup>); the remaining 10% is by  
23 runoff from the Everglades region and mostly from managed canal discharges (Nuttle et

1 al. 2000). About 75% of the precipitation occurs in the wet season (Schomer and Drew  
2 1982) from May to October. Mean annual water temperature is 24.5 °C; mean monthly  
3 low temperature is 20 °C in January and a mean monthly high temperature of 28 °C in  
4 August. Tropical storms and hurricanes regularly impact the bay by modifying its  
5 geomorphology, suddenly decreasing salinity, remobilizing and redistributing bottom  
6 sediments, destroying vegetation cover and changing the water nutrient concentrations.

## 7 8 **Data Collection**

9 A network of water quality monitoring stations was established by Florida  
10 International University (FIU) for Florida Bay beginning in 1989 (Fig. 1), where  
11 measurements and samples were collected every other month from July 1989 to  
12 December 1990 and then monthly from March 1991 to the present (Boyer and Briceño  
13 2007).

14 Briefly, monitoring included field measurements of surface and bottom salinity  
15 (practical salinity scale), temperature (°C), dissolved oxygen (DO, mg l<sup>-1</sup>), and turbidity  
16 (NTU). Duplicate, unfiltered water samples were collected from 10 cm below the  
17 surface using sample rinsed 120 ml HDPE bottles and kept at ambient temperature in  
18 the dark during transport. Duplicate water samples for dissolved nutrient analysis were  
19 collected using sample rinsed 150 ml syringes. Water samples were filtered onto 25  
20 mm glass fiber filters (Whatman GF/F), which were placed in 2 ml plastic centrifuge  
21 tubes to which 1.5 ml of 90% acetone was added. Filters for CHLA were allowed to  
22 extract for a minimum of 2 days at -20° C before analysis. Extracts were analyzed  
23 using a Gilford Fluoro IV Spectrofluorometer (excitation = 435 nm, emission = 667 nm),

1 compared to a standard curve of pure CHLA (Sigma) and reported in  $\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ . Details of  
2 sampling methodology and laboratory analysis have been described elsewhere (Boyer  
3 and Fourqurean 1999; Boyer and Briceño, 2007).

4

## 5 **Data Handling**

### 6 Factor analysis and clustering.

7 Boyer et al. (1997) used water quality monitoring data from 1989-1996 to subdivide  
8 Florida Bay into three spatial zones having similar characteristics. They applied  
9 principal component analysis coupled with a K-means cluster analysis and named such  
10 zones “zones of similar influence” (ZSI). We reassessed their subdivisions using the  
11 now longer water quality data set extending to 2007 by applying factor analysis and  
12 hierarchical clustering as statistical tools. From the total period of record (POR)  
13 extending from 1989 to 2007, we selected only data points for which all parameters had  
14 been reported from March 1991 to December 2007, and included 13 biogeochemical  
15 variables in the model: TOC, TN, TON, TP, CHLA, SRP,  $\text{NO}_2^-$ ,  $\text{NO}_3^-$ ,  $\text{NH}_4^+$ , salinity,  
16 turbidity, temperature, and DO.

17 After applying factor analysis with VARIMAX rotation of axes (StatView<sup>®</sup>), we tried  
18 combinations of mean, standard deviation, variance, median, inter quartile range (IQR),  
19 and median absolute deviation (MAD) of the scores for each sampling site as input for  
20 the cluster routines. We compared hierarchical and K-means clustering using  
21 Euclidean distance as metrics and either single linkage (nearest neighbor) or Ward  
22 minimum variance methods using SYSTAT<sup>®</sup>. After detailed analysis of results, given  
23 the consistency of the associations of sampling stations, their geographical distribution

1 and their geomorphologic setting, we adopted the hierarchical cluster analysis method  
2 to define clusters or ZSI. Input for the hierarchical cluster routine was two parametric  
3 indexes (means and standard deviation) and two non-parametric indexes (median and  
4 MAD).

5 To summarize descriptive statistics for each ZSI we used box-and-whisker plots,  
6 where the horizontal line at the center of the box is the median of the data and the notch  
7 covers the 95% confidence interval of the median. The top and bottom of the box are  
8 the first and third quartiles and the ends of the whiskers are the 5<sup>th</sup> and 95<sup>th</sup> percentiles.  
9 Non-parametric Mann-Whitney tests were used to compare biogeochemical variables  
10 among ZSI and also between wet and dry seasons.

11

## 12 Normalized Cumulative Sum Charts

13 After subdividing FB into ZSI, most of our work relied on the analysis and  
14 comparison of time-series of data. In these data sets as in most time-series of  
15 ecological variables, values are not normally distributed, have variable means, contain  
16 gaps and potential regime shifts and incomplete cycles of diverse amplitude and  
17 wavelength. Hence, we explored first the structure of the times series with simple but  
18 robust methods such as cumulative sum charts (Johnson 1961; Manly and MacKenzie  
19 2000) before attempting to transform the time-series. A Cumulative Sum (CUSUM)  
20 chart is a plot of the cumulative sum of deviations ( $S_n = \sum [x_i - T]$  for  $i=1 \dots n$ ) from a target  
21 specification (T) against n, the sample number (Ewan, 1963; Woodall and Adams  
22 1993). For our analysis we use a variant of CUSUM, where original values ( $x_i$ ) were  
23 replaced by their Z-scores ( $z_i = (x_i - m)/s$  where  $m$ =mean and  $s$ =standard deviation),



1 converting the series to a mean of zero and unit standard deviation before calculating  
2 the running sum (Taylor et al. 2002). CUSUM and Z-CUSUM produce similar charts  
3 and are well known in the field of industrial control (Ewan 1963; Duncan 1974; Grant  
4 and Leavenworth 1980). In practice CUSUM is a low-pass filter (Manly and McKenzie  
5 2000) which removes high frequency noise and smoothes the data. This direct and  
6 easy connection between CUSUM and process performance has recently driven  
7 increasing applications of these charts to the earth sciences, especially for the analysis  
8 of time-series in oceanography, geology and ecology (Ibanez et al. 1993; Briceño and  
9 Callejon 2000; Manly and MacKenzie 2000; Adrian et al. 2006; Molinero et al. 2008).

10 The advantage of Z-CUSUM diagrams over conventional CUSUM charts is that in  
11 the former, values are expressed as multiple of standard deviation, allowing an expedite  
12 transformation into original units. A segment with a positive slope in the Z-CUSUM line  
13 graph represents a period where the values in the series are above-average. Similarly,  
14 segments with negative slopes indicate below-average values, while horizontal  
15 segments in the Z-CUSUM represent average conditions. A cup-shaped Z-CUSUM  
16 chart indicates a secular increasing trend, while a dome-shaped curve describes an  
17 overall declining trend. Once suspected shifts were identified in the Z-CUSUM charts,  
18 the original data set was analyzed for breaks (Change-point Analyzer®, Taylor 2000a).  
19 The procedure uses an iterative combination of CUSUM charts and bootstrapping to  
20 detect breaks in the slope (Hinkley 1971; Hinkley and Schechtman 1987) and provides  
21 both confidence levels and confidence intervals for each change. As the z-scores are  
22 standardized values, the plots enable direct comparison of the date of change for  
23 different variables, irrespective of their absolute values. Differences between the sub-

1 periods before and after a significant shift in the cumulative z-score plots were  
2 independently tested for significance using the nonparametric Mann–Whitney test.

3

## 4 **RESULTS**

### 5 **Subdivision of FB by PC-Cluster analysis**

6 Our factor analysis rendered 6 main factors (F1 to F6;  $p < 0.05$ ) which explain 79.1%  
7 of the variance. Varimax rotation allowed direct link of these factors to specific water  
8 quality parameters controlling their structure as shown in Table 2. F1 is mostly a  
9 function of TN, TON and TOC; F2 is mostly composed of inorganic N species,  $\text{NO}_2^-$ ,  
10  $\text{NO}_3^-$  and  $\text{NH}_4^+$ ; F3 main loadings were TP, CHLA and turbidity; F4 principally included  
11 temperature and DO; F5 is highly correlated with SRP; and F6 is an exclusive function  
12 of salinity. There is a striking similarity between these factors and the principal  
13 components derived by Boyer et al. (1997) for Florida Bay, except that SRP now  
14 defines a new factor. This similarity in results suggests a highly robust and long-lasting  
15 relationship among variables.

16 We calculated the mean, standard deviation, median and median absolute deviation  
17 (MAD) for the factor scores for each one of the sampling sites and used those statistics  
18 as input for the hierarchical clustering routine (SYSTAT®). Euclidean distances were  
19 the metrics and either single linkage (nearest neighbor) or Ward minimum variance  
20 methods were used to define clusters or ZSI. Preliminary results indicated that including  
21 sampling sites from small bays along the northern margin of FB biased the analysis  
22 leading to the formation of clusters whose samples were geographically dispersed.  
23 Hence, we excluded those samples from further cluster analysis and kept them as a

1 separate group. Finally, we selected two parametric indexes (mean and standard  
2 deviation) and two non-parametric indexes (median and MAD) as input for hierarchical  
3 clustering, and Ward minimum variance to define clusters (Fig. 1). This selection  
4 rendered consistency in the associations of sampling stations, and coherence in their  
5 geographical distribution and geomorphologic setting, as compared to those obtained  
6 when using single linkage methods.

7 The combination of results from our factor analysis and clustering methods  
8 subdivide Florida Bay into five discrete zones (Fig. 1): Florida Bay East (FBE), Florida  
9 Bay East-Central (FBEC), Florida Bay Central (FBC), Florida Bay South (FBS) and  
10 Florida Bay West (FBW). Finally, we incorporated the Northern Bays (NB) as an  
11 additional group. As expected, the statistical subdivision obtained with combined factor  
12 analysis and clustering reflects two water mixing gradients, east-west and north-south,  
13 between fresh water draining from the Everglades and either Gulf waters to the west or  
14 Atlantic waters to the south. These clusters mimic very closely the divisions of Florida  
15 Bay defined by benthic plant communities (Zieman et al. 1989; Fourqurean and  
16 Robblee 1999) and by phytoplankton communities (Phlips et al. 1999)

17

## 18 **Zone Characteristics**

### 19 Northern Bays

20 The NB includes the three relatively isolated bays (Long Sound, Joe Bay, and Little  
21 Madeira Bay) in the northeast region of Florida Bay, which are not significantly affected  
22 by tides or the influence of marine waters. Salinity and nutrient concentrations react  
23 quickly to rainfall and inflow from creeks draining Taylor Slough and C-111 canal

1 overflow across the panhandle by experiencing sharp freshening during high flows and  
2 developing a steep salinity gradient with more saline waters to the south and southwest  
3 (Cosby et al. 2005). During drought periods hypersalinity up to 54 may develop.

4 NB has been a traditionally bloom-free zone, with the lowest median CHLA  
5 concentration in Florida Bay (median=0.64  $\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ; Table 3). Low incidence of blooms is  
6 the result of extreme P limitation caused by low P contribution from the Everglades  
7 combined with Ca-rich sediments that immobilize the already scant P supply (Boyer et  
8 al. 1997; Fourqurean and Robblee 1999). Calculated climatology for CHLA (Fig. 3) and  
9 Mann-Whitney test indicate that CHLA in NB is significantly lower in the wet season  
10 (May-Oct) than in the dry season ( $p < 0.005$ ). Results also suggest that CHLA  
11 distribution is bimodal during the dry season, with one peak occurring in November-  
12 December and a second one in March. The lack of information on the species  
13 composition and dynamics of zooplankton communities in NB hinders further insight on  
14 its cause.

15

#### 16 Eastern Florida Bay

17 FBE, located at the extreme northeast portion of FB (Fig. 1), is mostly unaffected by  
18 tides or influenced by marine waters due to the damping effect of mud banks to the west  
19 and the Florida Keys to the south. Most interaction is with NB to the north and FBEC to  
20 the west, so residence times are long. The major contribution to its freshwater budget  
21 comes from rain and mixing with NB. CHLA is very low (median=0.49  $\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ) in FBE and  
22 concentrations are significantly higher in the wet season (median=0.56  $\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ) than in the  
23 dry season (0.39  $\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ), but the range is greater during the latter (Fig. 2).

1 Phytoplankton blooms were practically absent in FBE until the anomalous hurricane  
2 season of 2005, when an extensive cyanobacterial bloom developed (Rudnick et al.  
3 2006, 2007). The phytoplankton communities in the eastern bay are principally  
4 composed of centric diatoms (e.g., *Thalassiosira* sp.), dinoflagellates (e.g.,  
5 *Protoperidium* spp., *Ceratium* sp., *Prorocentrum micans*), and small cyanobacteria  
6 making the major fraction of cellular biovolume (Phlips and Badylak, 1996; Hunt and  
7 Nuttle 2007). An interesting observation is that of Steidinger et al. (2001), who reported  
8 a change in predominant phytoplankton taxa in eastern FB from dinoflagellates during  
9 fall 1994 to early summer 1995 to cyanobacteria prevailing from late 1996 to spring  
10 1997.

11

## 12 East Central Florida Bay

13 FBEC is located north of Key Largo (Fig. 1) between 80° 30' and 80° 40' west.  
14 Freshwater from the Everglades is supplied by Taylor River, Mud Creek, East Creek  
15 and mostly by Trout Creek (up to 32 m<sup>3</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>) along its northern boundary. CHLA  
16 (median=0.33 µg l<sup>-1</sup>) is the lowest for FB especially during the wet season (Table 3; Fig.  
17 3). Its median TN:TP ratio of 99.7 is the highest bay wide, confirming the strong P  
18 limitation for seston previously reported for this portion of FB (Boyer et al. 1997;  
19 Fourqurean and Robblee 1999). FBEC covers the same area as the “East Zone” of  
20 phytoplankton communities described by Phlips et al. (1999), who observed  
21 *Synechococcus* biovolumes of less than 1.0 X 10<sup>5</sup> µm<sup>3</sup> ml<sup>-1</sup> from August 1993 to  
22 October 1997. Their analyses indicate that phytoplankton assemblage in FBEC is  
23 made up of cyanobacteria, dinoflagellates, diatoms, and microflagellates in different

1 proportions but with cyanobacteria as the minor component. According to Hunt and  
2 Nuttle (2007) and Hitchcock et al. (2007) this area had been practically bloom-free for  
3 the period 1988-2003, with a maximum CHLA concentration of  $5 \mu\text{g l}^{-1}$  (Phlips and  
4 Badylak, 1996; Boyer et al. 1999)

5

### 6 Central Florida Bay

7 FBC covers the north central portion of FB (Fig. 1), as a rather isolated basin where  
8 scarce freshwater run-off from the Everglades is supplied mostly by McCormick Creek  
9 towards its NE end and Alligator Creek to the NW, developing an internal north-south  
10 salinity gradient within FBC. Timing and volumes of precipitation and run-off play a  
11 significant role on FBC conditions, where hypersalinity occurs periodically reaching up  
12 to 70 during periods of low rainfall and high evaporation (Boyer 2004; Robblee et al.  
13 2001). Besides having the highest nutrient concentrations FBC also displays the widest  
14 nutrient concentration range and a median TN:TP ratio of 53 which is intermediate  
15 between the highest value in FBEC (99) and the minimum of FBW (24). As a probable  
16 consequence of nutrient enrichment, median CHLA ( $1.53 \mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ) is the highest and also  
17 affected by a wide range of concentrations ( $35.5 \mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ). This character is evident in its  
18 well developed seasonality for CHLA with maximum bloom activity from July to January  
19 (Fig. 3). The reported P limitation in FBEC to the east (TN:TP=99 and DIN:SRP=78)  
20 and N limitation in FBW to the west (TN:TP=24 and DIN:SRP=11) places FBC in a  
21 special location where Redfield ratios will be reached, contributing to enhanced  
22 productivity (Fourqurean et al. 1993; Fourqurean and Robblee 1999; Hitchcock et al.  
23 2007).

1 FBC coincides with the “North Central” zone of phytoplankton communities of Phlips  
2 et al. (1999), where the picoplanktonic cyanobacterium *Synechococcus* cf. *elongatus*,  
3 was the dominant bloom forming algae exceeding  $1.0 \times 10^7 \mu\text{m}^3 \text{ml}^{-1}$ , with other  
4 cyanobacteria, diatoms and dinoflagellates in a secondary role. Nevertheless, Tomas  
5 et al. (1999) indicated that diatoms are the major component, especially at Rankin Lake,  
6 where addition of silica readily stimulates productivity. The persistence of blooms in  
7 FBC may well be a consequence of the described characteristics and location of this  
8 zone, but according to Phlips et al. (1999) is also due to the special ecophysiological  
9 characteristics of the *Synechococcus* cf. *elongatus*. Among them, its tolerance to a  
10 wide salinity range (5–50; Phlips and Badylak, 1996; Richardson, 2001)., improved  
11 efficiency to compete for P at low concentrations, here underscored by the largest  
12 alkaline phosphatase activity level (median APA= $1.14 \mu\text{M h}^{-1}$ ); capacity to regulate  
13 buoyancy, ability to take up organic N, and resistance to grazing losses (Hitchcock et al.  
14 2007)

15

#### 16 Southern Florida Bay

17 FBS occupies the south central portion of FB, coinciding with Phlips et al (1999)  
18 “South Central” zone of phytoplankton communities. Besides rainfall contributions, FBS  
19 waters are affected by currents moving from FBC and the exchange along the passes in  
20 the Florida Keys to the south. TN:TP median ratio is 77 indicating P limitation for seston  
21 and CHLA is moderate ( $0.54 \mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ) with maximum values in the dry season (Fig. 3).  
22 Biovolume studies (Phlips et al. 1999) indicate that phytoplankton assemblages are  
23 dominated almost exclusively by *Synechococcus* cf. *elongatus* with blooms occurring

1 from October to January as a consequence of wind-driven circulation moving  
2 phytoplankton-rich waters south from FBC (Hitchcock et al 2007).

3

#### 4 Western Florida Bay

5 FBW covers the highly dynamic western extreme of FB with an open boundary with  
6 the Gulf of Mexico but isolated from direct overland freshwater sources. Tidal regime  
7 affects FBW significantly (Wang et al. 1994) and causes short residence time and  
8 salinities close to marine levels in its waters. FBW median TN:TP ratio of 25 is slightly  
9 above Redfield ratio, but not reflecting a major N limitation, and median CHLA ( $1.30 \mu\text{g}$   
10  $\text{l}^{-1}$ ) is relatively high. Contrasting with the rest of FB, blooms in FBW are dominated by  
11 diatoms and mainly composed of *Rhizosolenia* spp., and subdued proportions of  
12 *Chaetoceros* spp. and resuspended pennates from the bottom (Hitchcock et al 2007).  
13 These blooms seem to develop on the shelf responding to high flows from the Shark  
14 River, to be advected into the bay around Cape Sable (Tomas et al. 1999; Philips et al.  
15 1999; Hitchcock et al. 2007). CHLA climatology (Fig. 3) suggests a bimodal distribution  
16 for blooms with a mode in October-November and a second one in January.

17

#### 18 **Exogenous Drivers**

19 Potential external climatic drivers were explored for the last 40 years to isolate  
20 specific shifts or trends, which could have a forcing role on water quality and  
21 phytoplankton biomass. The focus was on the North Atlantic Oscillation (NAO), the  
22 Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO) index and tropical cyclone activity as they relate  
23 to regional and local phenomena such as precipitation over the bay, managed flows



1 from the Everglades, and hurricane impacts. With that objective we explored the  
2 structure of time-series using Z-CUSUM charts, which provided direct visual comparison  
3 among time-series.

4 The NAO time-series from 1970 to 2008 was downloaded directly from the National  
5 Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Climate Prediction Center  
6 webpage (<http://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov>), and the Z-CUSUM was constructed without  
7 any prior data treatment. The trend exhibits substantial interseasonal and interannual  
8 variability with the negative phase of the NAO, which prevailed from the mid-1950's to  
9 early 1979 (Hurrell 1995), with a below average rainfall period extending in the Z-  
10 CUSUM chart from 1970 to mid-1982 (Fig. 4). In mid 1982 NAO values shifted towards  
11 above average levels displaying two cycles of about 3.5 years each. Then, in 1989 a  
12 highly positive NAO phase began (steep positive slope) which persisted until mid 1995.  
13 Finally, a return to strong negative phases began in late 1995 which with some abrupt  
14 oscillations in 1998-2000 persisted until August 2008. Strong positive NAO phases  
15 (positive slopes) result in warmer temperatures and higher precipitation in eastern  
16 United States with negative phases producing opposite results (Hurrell 1995).  
17 Statistically significant change-points were detected in December 1988, April 1995 and  
18 April 2008 with 93%, 100% and 91% confidence level (CL) respectively. The sharp  
19 break in 1995 would be associated to a multidecadal change from cool-dry to warm-wet  
20 climate.

21 The Atlantic multidecadal oscillation (AMO) which expresses the variability of the  
22 North Atlantic sea surface temperature (SST) field (Kerr 2000), has been considered a  
23 major climate driver over the Atlantic tropical region (Delworth and Mann 2000), with

1 cool-dry and warm-wet climate linked to AMO negative and positive phases respectively  
2 The AMO data set was downloaded directly from NOAA's Earth System Research  
3 Laboratory webpage (<http://www.cpc.ncep.noaa.gov>). An AMO cool phase for the North  
4 Atlantic basin was in effect during 1970-1990 (Kerr 2000; Enfield et al. 2001) and has  
5 been increasing since then. The Z-CUSUM for the AMO time-series displayed the  
6 opposite of the NAO (Fig. 4) but shared a common and drastic change in late 1994  
7 (confidence limit (CL)=96%), suggesting a shift to higher SST and higher precipitation  
8 rates.

9 In keeping with the aforementioned trends, the period from 1970 to 1994  
10 experienced low tropical cyclone activity, in terms of number, frequency, and strength of  
11 hurricanes (Category  $\geq 3$  in the Saffir-Simpson scale) (Landsea et al. 1999; Goldenberg  
12 et al. 2001). This interlude was immediately followed by the record breaking period of  
13 high cyclone activity and precipitation rate from 1995 to 2005. Figure 4 also shows the  
14 Z-CUSUM charts for number of hurricanes and the Accumulated Cyclone Energy (ACE)  
15 for the period 1970-2006. The ACE is an index that combines the numbers of storm  
16 systems, how long they exist, and how intense they became. These multi decadal scale  
17 fluctuations in hurricane activity and ACE are related to fluctuations in SST (Goldenberg  
18 et al. 2001) and have a positive correlation with AMO.

19

## 20 **Endogenous Drivers**

21 Rainfall data for our analysis in the FB region come from stations located at the  
22 Florida Coastal Everglades LTER, Key West, and Flamingo (Fig. 1). Time-series were  
23 obtained from the South Florida Water Management District DBHYDRO database, and

1 the average monthly precipitation was calculated for each station to construct  
2 cumulative curves. These data sets have similar Z-CUSUM patterns and display high  
3 frequency seasonality, partial tendencies and cycles of diverse span and amplitude. We  
4 explored the consistency of these patterns in the region and there is a clear coincidence  
5 in rainfall tendency that extends further north to other stations at Tamiami, Miami  
6 Airport, and West Palm Beach stations. Hence, we used the Everglades LTER station  
7 as representative of rainfall in the study area. From 1970 to May 1990, precipitation was  
8 generally below average except for a short increase in 1982-1984 (Fig. 5). Besides  
9 seasonality, shown as a high frequency signal, there were some short 4-6 year cycles  
10 present. From mid 1990 to April 1995 precipitation was slightly above average; and  
11 since May 1995 to October 2003 precipitation was well above average, with an  
12 apparent decline after 2003. The rainfall time-series has several data gaps and is  
13 affected by seasonality and autocorrelation, so it was linearly interpolated and corrected  
14 for seasonality before performing change-point tests. The most significant changes  
15 occurred in January 1991 (100% CL), November 1997 (99% CL) and January 2004  
16 (86% CL).

17 Freshwater flow volumes delivered by the South Florida Management District  
18 (SFWMD) to the Shark River Slough in the Everglades National Park to finally convey  
19 into FB are closely tied to precipitation rate (Fig. 5). The flow volume signal mimics that  
20 of precipitation, except for events of extremely high flows delivered before major storms  
21 which would cause sudden drops in salinity and nutrient load unbalance causing major  
22 disturbances in the bay. Additional information to substantiate further the shift in the  
23 early 1990s, comes from stage and flow measurements from 1978 to 1999 in the Taylor

1 River Basin (station NP-TSB; latitude 252406, longitude 803624; DBHYDRO), which  
2 shows a substantial shift from below average to above average level for both stage and  
3 flow, centered around 1992-1994. In summary, the major signal shifts of global climatic  
4 stressors (NAO, AMO) seem to be imprinted on precipitation and water flow to FB,  
5 hence, in final water availability in the bay (rain plus canal flows). On one hand, water  
6 management has a limited effect on freshwater flows to the bay; however, the difference  
7 it can make in the water budget of Florida Bay is large, especially during seasonal  
8 extremes.

9

## 10 **Climate and Phytoplankton Biomass**

11 Besides affecting salinity dynamics, the amount, intensity, and distribution of  
12 precipitation should have additional impacts on FB. Tropical storms and hurricanes  
13 regularly impact the bay and modify its geomorphology, and hence, its circulation and  
14 salinity patterns. Nutrient concentration changes are imposed suddenly as sediments  
15 are resuspended and redistributed, not to mention destruction of sub-aquatic vegetation  
16 and making bottom sediments more prone to erosion. This new set of conditions  
17 imposed by hurricanes on the ecosystem drive significant responses from planktonic  
18 organisms, especially as changes in CHLA in the water column.

19 A common feature of all zones of the bay is the dome-shaped pattern of the CHLA  
20 Z-CUSUM charts (Fig. 6), indicating a generalized decline in CHLA across the bay, at  
21 least until 2005. Vertical dashed lines in Figure 6 indicate the approximate location of  
22 the major regime shift (SS) in global drivers and precipitation rate discussed above, and  
23 also the occurrence of hurricanes during the monitoring period. This shift is centered

1 around 1994-1995. As observed, hurricane impacts reveal themselves as sudden  
2 increases in CHLA. The regime system shift (SS) is best displayed in FBE and FBEC  
3 by drastic decreases in CHLA concentration of 57% and 70% respectively, while in FBC  
4 we observe a milder decline (26%) in 1994 and a stronger one in 1995 (46%). In FBS  
5 the shift occurs in March-April 1995 representing a 60% decline in CHLA. In NB it is  
6 more difficult to define a break directly connected to the SS, but it seems to occur in late  
7 1993, preceding the changes in other ZSI and coupling more closely with the shift in  
8 SST towards a positive phase on the summer of 1994 (Enfield et al. 2001). Finally, in  
9 FBW the shift to lower CHLA in 1994 is not present.

10 Hurricanes Mitch (M) and Georges (G) impacted Florida Bay in 1998 and their  
11 effects were mostly felt in FBC, FBW and FBS causing their CHLA level to increase,  
12 especially in FBC (Fig 6). Before the ecosystem recovered from the 1998 disturbance  
13 the bay was hit again by tropical storm Harvey (H) and Hurricane Irene (I) in 1999, with  
14 major impact to the central and western portions of FB. Harvey and Irene initiated the  
15 largest and most sustained bloom in the record for the central and western portions of  
16 FB (Boyer and Briceño 2007). In NB and FBEC the impact on CHLA was relatively  
17 smaller while in FBE it was relatively minor. The disturbance caused by hurricanes  
18 Katrina, Rita and Wilma (KRW) the summer/fall of 2005 was the largest recorded for NB  
19 and FBE, areas traditionally known by their very low CHLA levels (Figs. 2 and 6). In  
20 FBEC and FBC the impact of KRW was relatively minor and in FBS and FBW was even  
21 milder.

22

23 **DISCUSSION**

1 Deterioration of water quality in FB in the late 1980s leading to increasing frequency  
2 and magnitude of phytoplankton blooms and the onset of massive seagrass die-offs in  
3 1988 have been blamed on salinity increases due to reduced freshwater delivery from  
4 the Everglades (Robblee et al. 1991; Fourqurean et al. 2003; Hunt and Nuttle 2007).  
5 Apparently opposed to that generalized perspective is the blame put on anomalous  
6 pulses of freshwater from the Everglades imposed by water management schedules  
7 departing from natural cycles (Brand 2001). The lack of pre-seagrass die-off  
8 information hinders the definitive allocation of causes and/or responsibilities. For the  
9 monitored period 1989-2007 we attempted to establish a link between potential drivers  
10 and ecosystem response to explain those changes occurring in water quality and the  
11 disparity of those responses in a geographical context.

12 FB is physically compartmentalized and our results indicate that it may be  
13 subdivided into six zones where not only water quality, circulation dynamics and mixing,  
14 benthic and phytoplankton communities are distinct (Hunt and Nuttle 2007), but also the  
15 responses to meteorological, hydrological, and climatic stressors are different among  
16 zones. Our analyses were performed in a space-time framework by studying the  
17 evolution of stressors and how their variability is expressed in CHLA as indicator of  
18 phytoplankton biomass.

19 Strong positive NAO phases engender warmer temperatures and higher  
20 precipitation rate in eastern United States, while negative phases produce dryer  
21 conditions and drought (Hurrell 1995). Following a highly variable period from 1970 to  
22 1988 (Fig. 4), statistically significant change-points were detected in the NAO time-  
23 series during December 1988 (93%,CL), April 1995 (100% CL) and April 2008 (91%

1 CL). These may have resulted in lower precipitation during 1988-1995 and increasing  
2 rain for 1995-2008. On the other hand, the Atlantic Multidecadal Oscillation (AMO)  
3 which fundamentally expresses the variability of the North Atlantic sea surface  
4 temperature field (Kerr 2000) has been considered a major climate driver over the  
5 tropical Atlantic region (Delworth and Mann 2000). The effects of AMO have been  
6 specifically demonstrated in central and south Florida (Enfield et al. 2001), where  
7 rainfall has significant positive correlations for both AMO phases. Hence, drought  
8 periods correspond to the cool phase (negative), and rainfall is more copious when the  
9 Atlantic is in its warm phase (positive). AMO and NAO time-series experienced drastic  
10 shifts in June 1994 and April 1995 respectively, reinforcing their individual driving  
11 mechanisms and enhancing the system shift. In summary, these globally linked  
12 indexes, NAO, AMO, ACE, and hurricane development have a common and significant  
13 pattern regime shift in 1994-1995. Additionally, the well developed shift from prevailing  
14 negative to positive phases of NAO in the late 1980s (91% CL) was also observed (Fig  
15 4).

16 A causal chain of meteorological, hydrological and ecological processes linked to  
17 NAO, AMO and ACE and storm and hurricane frequency was attempted with CHLA as  
18 a proxy for phytoplankton biomass. Similar proxies using CUSUM methodologies have  
19 been proposed for phenological changes in copepod communities in the Ligurian Sea  
20 (Molinero et al 2005) and for phenological changes in Lake Mügeelsee, Germany  
21 (Adrian et al. 2006). A drastic drop in CHLA concentration occurred in the summer of  
22 1994 (Fig. 6), especially in FBE, FBEC and NB. Since 1994, the common time series  
23 feature has been a lower baseline and greater amplitude of departures from the median.

1 Except for the departures, this pattern closely follows those observed for NAO, AMO,  
2 ACE, and hurricane frequency. The decadal or multidecadal cycles associated with  
3 these indexes also correspond to cycles in Atlantic atmospheric circulation and SST.  
4 Hence, we interpret this sudden decline in CHLA as the ecosystem response to the  
5 regime shifts in global drivers (NAO, AMO, ACE) and local drivers (precipitation and  
6 storms) centered around 1994.

7 The differential magnitude of disturbance (amplitude of deviation in Z-CUSUM  
8 charts, Fig. 6) caused by the combined impact of tropical storm Harvey and Hurricane  
9 Irene (higher on FBC, FBS and FBW) as compared to the one produced by Katrina, Rita  
10 and Wilma (higher on NB and FBE) may be explained by their spatial occurrence and  
11 precipitation totals. Terrestrial runoff from tropical storm Harvey and Hurricane Irene  
12 conveyed 60% of the annual freshwater input to FB within a 4-week period and supplied  
13 65% of the annual TN and TP loads (Davis et al 2004; Williams et al. 2008). Taylor  
14 Slough (just upstream from FBC) and the Shark Slough experienced a two-fold increase  
15 in their  $\text{NH}_4^+$  and SRP levels. Shark River estuary waters developed a plume into the  
16 Gulf of Mexico which circulated around Cape Sable to finally mix with FBW and FBS  
17 waters (Hitchcock et al. 2007) fueling a major phytoplankton bloom. The effect of these  
18 runoff events in 1999 was also felt in eastern FB but the magnitude was smaller.

19 The impact of Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, and Wilma in 2005 was concentrated in  
20 eastern FB. Rudnick et al. (2007) support the hypothesis that this bloom was the  
21 system response to both natural and anthropogenic drivers which unfortunately  
22 coincided in space and time. Previous to Katrina, construction work associated to the  
23 widening of US Highway 1 included mangrove forest clearing, in situ mulching, and



1 mixing with soil, all of which increased TP leached into the adjacent waters.  
2 Additionally, canal discharges were increased considerably as a prior flood control  
3 measure to mitigate Katrina impact. Combined water input from discharge and Katrina  
4 increased to over 30 million m<sup>3</sup> in August. The sudden freshening caused massive SAV  
5 die-off whose detritus, combined with benthic flux from sediment resuspension  
6 produced by hurricane winds, increased TP and TOC concentrations and after Rita  
7 (September) initiated a cyanobacterial bloom which reached regional extension in  
8 November 2005 (Rudnick et al. 2007). Since then, the bloom has been sustained by  
9 the long water residence time of the basins and further SAV mortality due to increased  
10 turbidity. As of April 2008, CHLA in FBE had not yet returned to levels prevailing before  
11 the 2005 hurricane season.

12 The disparity of ecosystem response (i.e. CHLA) to hurricane stress is apparently  
13 due to proximity of track, magnitude of the event (i.e. precipitation, wind strength) and  
14 environmental conditions pre-event and post event (Williams et al. 2008). Hurricane  
15 Irene made landfall on western FB and discharged record precipitation (over 60 mm) on  
16 FB. Previous to Katrina elevated discharge from canals was conveyed to FBE where  
17 an additional source of nutrients was available from road construction and has remained  
18 as such after the impacts of KRW. We believe that these added anthropogenic impacts  
19 in NB and especially in FBE, not present in the central and western portions of FB, are  
20 the final cause of the extended bloom that still persists in FBE.

21 The conflicting hypothesis as to the cause of ecological degradation of FB since the  
22 late 1980s (i.e. seagrass die-off and bloom persistence), with some authors blaming  
23 high salinity due to lower water supply from the Everglades (Robblee et al. 1991;

1 Fourqurean et al. 2003; Hunt and Nuttle 2007) and others holding responsible lower  
2 salinity and increased nutrient supply from the Everglades (Brand 2001), may in fact  
3 both be correct. We could conceive FB as a system that is steadily responding to  
4 decadal or multidecadal forcing that dictate the baseline of response. On that baseline  
5 phenological dynamics outlines the seasonal variability, and short-lived events  
6 (hurricanes and/or canal discharges), departing from “normality” are imposed on the  
7 system to later (a few months) return to pre-event conditions. The behavior of CHLA  
8 and total nutrients (TN, TP and TOC) in each and all compartments of FB seem to  
9 adapt to that model along the monitoring period, displaying a long-term declining trend  
10 across the bay on which seasonal oscillations are superimposed, and only interrupted  
11 by events of sudden increase followed by a relatively rapid return to pre-event  
12 conditions trailing the long-term trend. This apparently robust behavior, suggesting  
13 some degree of resilience, needs to be considered with caution, mostly when  
14 substantial efforts and resources are being devoted to restoration of the Everglades  
15 and Florida Bay, where ecosystems are extremely fragile and thresholds may be  
16 breached leading to a cascade of undesired deterioration.

17

## 18 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

19 This research was funded by the South Florida Water Management District (contract  
20 #4600000352. Data are available to the public from internet at  
21 [serc.fiu.edu/wqmnetwork/](http://serc.fiu.edu/wqmnetwork/). This is contribution ## of the Southeast Environmental  
22 Research Center at Florida International University.

23

## 1 REFERENCES

2

3 Adrian R., S. Wilhem, and D. Gerten. 2006. Life-history traits of lake plankton species  
4 may govern their phenological response to climate warming. *Global Change Biology*  
5 12: 652–661.

6 Belgrano, A., M. Lima, and N.C. Stenseth. 2004. Non-linear dynamics in marine  
7 phytoplankton population systems. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 273: 281–289.

8 Box, G., G. Jenkins, and G. Reinsel. 1994. Time-series Analysis: Forecasting & Control.  
9 Prentice Hall, New Jersey, USA.

10 Boyer, J.N., and H.O. Briceño. 2007. South Florida Coastal Water Quality Monitoring  
11 Network. FY2006 Cumulative Report South Florida Water Management District,  
12 Southeast Environmental Research Center, Florida International University  
13 (<http://serc.fiu.edu/wqmnetwork/>).

14 Boyer, J.N., J.W. Fourqurean, and R.D. Jones. 1997. Spatial characterization of water  
15 quality in Florida Bay and Whitewater Bay by principal component and cluster  
16 analyses: Zones of similar influence (ZSI). *Estuaries* 20: 743-758.

17 Boyer, J.N., J.W. Fourqurean, and R.D. Jones. 1999. Seasonal and long-term trends in  
18 water quality of Florida Bay (1989-97). *Estuaries* 22: 417-430.

19 Brand, L. 2001. The transport of terrestrial nutrients to South Florida coastal waters. In  
20 *The Everglades, Florida Bay, and Coral Reefs of the Florida Keys*, eds. J.W. Porter  
21 and K.G. Porter, 361-414. Boca Raton FL: CRC.

22 Chatfield, C. 1996. The Analysis of Time-series. 5th Edition. Chapman & Hall, London,  
23 U.K.

- 1 Davis S.E., J.E. Cable, D.L. Childers, C. Coronado-Molina, J.W. Day, C. Hittle, C.J.  
2 Madden, E. Reyes, D.T. Rudnick, and F.H. Sklar. 2004. Importance of storm events  
3 in controlling ecosystem structure and function in a Florida Gulf coast estuary.  
4 *Journal of Coastal Research* 20: 1180-1208
- 5 Delworth, T.L., and M.E. Mann. 2000. Observed and simulated multidecadal variability  
6 in the Northern Hemisphere. *Climate Dynamics* 16: 661-676.
- 7 Duncan, A.J. 1974. Quality Control and Industrial Statistics. Homewood, IL. Richard D.  
8 Irwin.
- 9 Emery, W.J., and R.E. Thomson. 2001. Data Analysis Methods in Physical  
10 Oceanography. 2nd Edition. Elsevier. San Diego, California, USA.
- 11 Enfield, D.B., A.M. Mestas-Nuñez, and P.J. Trimble. 2001. The Atlantic multidecadal  
12 oscillation and its relation to rainfall and river flows in the continental U.S.  
13 *Geophysical Research Letters* (28) 10:2077-2080.
- 14 Ewan, W.D. 1963. When and how to use Cu-sum charts. *Technometrics* 5: 1-32.
- 15 Fourqurean, J.W., R.D. Jones, and J.C. Zieman. 1993. Processes influencing water  
16 column nutrient characteristics and phosphorus limitation of phytoplankton biomass  
17 in Florida Bay, FL, USA: Inferences from spatial distributions. *Estuarine, Coastal and*  
18 *Shelf Science* 36: 295-314.
- 19 Fourqurean, J.W., J.N. Boyer, M.J. Durako, L.N. Hefty, and B.J. Peterson. 2003.  
20 Forecasting responses of seagrass distributions to changing water quality using  
21 monitoring data. *Ecological Applications* 13: 474-489.
- 22 Fourqurean, J.W., and M. Robblee. 1999. Florida Bay: A history of recent ecological  
23 changes. *Estuaries* 22:345-357.

- 1 Goldenberg, S., C.W. Landsea, A.M. Mestas-Nunez, and W.M. Gray. 2001. The recent  
2 increase in Atlantic hurricane activity: Causes and Implications. *Science* 293: 474-  
3 479.
- 4 Grant, E.L., and R.S. Leavenworth. 1980. Statistical Quality Control, 5th edition. New  
5 York: McGraw-Hill.
- 6 Hinkley, D.V. 1971. Inference about the change-point from cumulative sum tests.  
7 *Biometrika* 5): 509-523.
- 8 Hinkley, D. and E. Schechtman. 1987. Conditional bootstrap methods in the mean-shift  
9 model. *Biometrika* 74: 85-93.
- 10 Hunt, J.H. and W. Nuttle. 2007. Florida Bay Science Program: A Synthesis of Research  
11 on Florida Bay. Fish and Wildlife Research Institute Technical Report TR-11.
- 12 Hurrell, J.W. 1995: Decadal trends in the North Atlantic Oscillation: Regional  
13 temperatures and precipitation. *Science* 269: 676-679.
- 14 Ibanez F., J.M. Fromentin, J. Castel. 1993. Application of the cumulated function to the  
15 processing of chronological data in oceanography. *Comptes rendus de l'Academie  
16 des Sciences, Serie 3* 318: 745–748.
- 17 Johnson, N.L. 1961. A simple theoretical approach to cumulative sum control charts.  
18 *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 56: 83-92.
- 19 Kerr, R.A. 2000. A North Atlantic climate pacemaker for the centuries. *Science* 288:  
20 1984-1986.
- 21 Landsea C.W., N. Nicholls, W.M. Gray, L.A. Avila. 1996. Downward trends in the  
22 frequency of intense Atlantic hurricanes during the past five decades. *Geophysical  
23 Research Letters* 23: 1697-1700.

- 1 Manly, B.F.J. and D. MacKenzie. 2000. A cumulative sum type of method for  
2 environmental monitoring. *Environmetrics* 11: 151–166.
- 3 Mann, M.E., R.S. Bradley, and M.K. Hughes. 1999. Northern hemisphere temperatures  
4 during the past millennium: inferences, uncertainties, and limitations. *Geophysical  
5 Research Letters* 26: 759–762.
- 6 Manson, R., and D. Lind. 1996. Statistical Techniques in Business and Economics, 9th  
7 Edition. Irwin-McGraw-Hill, New York, USA.
- 8 Molinero, J.C., F. Ibanez, S. Souissi, E. Buecher, S. Dallot and P. Nival. 2008. Climate  
9 control on the long-term anomalous changes of zooplankton communities in the  
10 Northwestern Mediterranean. *Global Change Biology* 14: 11–26.
- 11 Nuttle, W., J.W. Fourqurean, B.J. Cosby, J. Zieman, and M. Robblee. 2000. Influence of  
12 net freshwater supply on salinity in Florida Bay. *Water Resources Research* 36:  
13 1805-1822.
- 14 Philips, E. J. and S. Badylak. 1996. Spatial distribution and composition of algal blooms  
15 in Florida Bay. *Bulletin Marine Science* 58(1): 203-216.
- 16 Philips, E.J. , S. Badylak and T. Lynch. 1999. Blooms of the picoplanktonic  
17 cyanobacterium *Synechococcus* in Florida Bay, a subtropical inner-shelf lagoon.  
18 *Limnology and Oceanography* 44: 1166-1175.
- 19 Robblee, M.B., T.B. Barber, P.R. Carlson ,Jr., M.J. Durako, J.W. Fourqurean, L.M.  
20 Muehlstein, D. Porter, L.A. Yarbro, R.T. Zieman and J.C. Zieman. 1991. Mass  
21 mortality of the tropical seagrass *Thalassia testudinum* in Florida Bay (U.S.A).  
22 *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 71: 297–299.

- 1 Rudnick, D., C. Madden, S. Kelley, R. Bennett, and K. Cunniff. 2006. Report on Algae  
2 Blooms in Eastern Florida Bay and Southern Biscayne Bay. SFWMD Tech. Report.
- 3 Schomer, N.S., and R.D. Drew. 1982. An ecological characterization of the lower  
4 Everglades, Florida Bay and the Florida Keys. FWS/OBS-82/58.1. US Fish and  
5 Wildlife Service, Office of Biological Services, Washington, D. C.
- 6 Steele, J.H., and Henderson, E.W. 1981. A simple plankton model. *American Naturalist*  
7 117: 676–691.
- 8 Sturges, W. 1983. On interpolating gappy records for time-series analysis. *Journal of*  
9 *Geophysical Research* 88: 9736-9740.
- 10 Taylor, W. (2000a. Change-Point Analyzer 2.0 shareware program, Taylor Enterprises,  
11 Libertyville, Illinois. Web: <http://www.variation.com/cpa>
- 12 Taylor A., J. Allen, and P. Clark. 2002. Extraction of a weak climatic signal by an  
13 ecosystem. *Nature* 416: 629-632.
- 14 Tomas, C.R., B. Bendis, and K. Johns. 1999. Role of nutrients in regulating plankton  
15 blooms in Florida Bay. In *The Gulf of Mexico Large Marine Ecosystem: Assessment,*  
16 *Sustainability, and Management*, eds. H. Kumpf, K. Steidenger, and K. Sherman,  
17 323-337. Malden, Blackwell Science.
- 18 Wang, J., J. Van De Kreeke, N. Krishnan, and D. Smith. 1994. Wind and tide response  
19 in Florida Bay. *Bulletin of Marine Science* 54: 579–601.
- 20 Williams, C., J.N. Boyer, and F. Jochem. 2008. Indirect hurricane effects on resource  
21 availability and microbial communities in a subtropical wetland-estuary transition  
22 zone. *Estuaries and Coasts* 31: 204-214

- 1 Woodall, W. H., and Adams, B. M. 1993. The Statistical Design of CUSUM Charts.
- 2 *Quality Engineering* 5: 559-570



1 **INFORMAL REFERENCES**

- 2 Boyer, J.N. 2004. The value of a regional water quality monitoring network in restoration  
3 planning in South Florida. EMAP Symposium, May 6, 2004 – Newport, RI.
- 4 Briceño, H. and A. Callejon. 2000. Chemostratigraphic correlation of the Source Rock in  
5 the La Luna K-T(!) Petroleum System in Southwestern Venezuela. *In*  
6 Paleogeography and hydrocarbon potential of La Luna Formation and related  
7 Cretaceous anoxic systems, Proceedings SEPM Research Conference 2000,  
8 Venezuela
- 9 Rudnick, D. ,C. Madden, S. Kelly, J. Boyer, S. Blair, K. Cunniff, C. Kelble. 2007.  
10 Disturbance and Ecosystem Change in Florida Bay and Southern Biscayne Bay.  
11 Estuarine Research Federation Conference, Providence, RI, USA
- 12 Steidinger, K., W. Richardson, M.B. Neely, G. McRae, S. Richards, R. Bray, T.H.  
13 Perkins, and C.R. Tomas. 2001. Florida Bay microalgal blooms. 2001 Florida Bay  
14 Science Conference, Key Largo, Florida USA.(Abstract)
- 15
- 16