River flow and ammonium discharge determine spring phytoplankton blooms in an urbanized estuary
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ABSTRACT

Nutrient loadings to urbanized estuaries have increased over the past decades in response to population growth and upgrading to secondary sewage treatment. Evidence from the San Francisco Estuary (SFE) indicates that increased ammonium (NH\textsubscript{4}) loads have resulted in reduced primary production, a counter-intuitive finding: the NH\textsubscript{4} paradox. Phytoplankton uptake of nitrate (NO\textsubscript{3}), the largest pool of dissolved inorganic nitrogen, is necessary for blooms to occur in SFE. The relatively small pool of ambient NH\textsubscript{4} by itself insufficient to support a bloom, prevents access to NO\textsubscript{3} and bloom development. This has contributed to the current rarity of spring phytoplankton blooms in the northern SFE (Suisun Bay), in spite of high inorganic nutrient concentrations, improved water transparency and seasonally low biomass of bivalve grazers. The lack of blooms has likely contributed to deleterious bottom-up impacts on estuarine fish. This bloom suppression may also occur in other estuaries that receive large amounts of anthropogenic NH\textsubscript{4}. In 2010 two rare diatom blooms were observed in spring in Suisun Bay (followed by increased abundances of copepods and pelagic fish), and like the prior bloom observed in 2000, chlorophyll accumulated after NH\textsubscript{4} concentrations were decreased. In 2010, low NH\textsubscript{4} concentrations were apparently due to a combination of reduced NH\textsubscript{4} discharge from a wastewater treatment plant and increased river flow. To understand the interactions of river flow, NH\textsubscript{4} discharge and bloom initiation, a conceptual model was constructed with three criteria; 1) NH\textsubscript{4} loading must not exceed the capacity of the phytoplankton to assimilate the inflow of NH\textsubscript{4}, 2) the NH\textsubscript{4} concentration must be \( \leq 4 \ \text{\mu mol L}^{-1} \) to enable phytoplankton NO\textsubscript{3} uptake, 3) the dilution rate of phytoplankton biomass set by river flow must not exceed the phytoplankton growth rate to avoid “washout”. These criteria were determined for Suisun Bay, with sufficient irradiance and present day discharge of 15 tons NH\textsubscript{4}·N d\textsuperscript{-1} at the upstream wastewater treatment plant (WTP). The loading criterion requires phytoplankton NH\textsubscript{4} uptake to exceed 1.58 mmol m\textsuperscript{-2} d\textsuperscript{-1}; the concentration criterion requires river flow >800 m\textsuperscript{3} s\textsuperscript{-1} at the WTP for sufficient NH\textsubscript{4} dilution and the washout criterion requires river flow at Suisun Bay <1100 m\textsuperscript{3} s\textsuperscript{-1}. The model and criteria are used to suggest how a reduction in anthropogenic NH\textsubscript{4} either by reduced discharge or increased dilution (river flow), could be used as a management tool to restore pre-existing productivity in the SFE and similarly impacted estuaries.

© 2012 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Prior to 1987, phytoplankton blooms occurred regularly in spring and summer in the northern San Francisco Estuary (SFE) (Fig. 1). Ball and Arthur (1979) described the high chlorophyll conditions in Suisun Bay from 1969 to 1979 with mean chlorophyll concentrations of 30–40 \( \mu \text{g L}^{-1} \) in spring and 40–100 \( \mu \text{g L}^{-1} \) in summer. Diatoms were the dominant phytoplankton functional group. Phytoplankton blooms of this magnitude are now rare (Jassby, 2008), in spite of increasing inorganic nutrient concentrations delivered to Suisun Bay by the Sacramento River (Parker et al., 2012c). The zooplankton consumer trophic level is now food-limited (Müller-Solger et al., 2002; Kimmerer et al., 2005). The lack of blooms has likely contributed to deleterious bottom-up impacts on estuarine fish by lowering the quantity and quality of food for the pelagic food web. Declines in four pelagic fish stocks and the listing of the delta smelt and longfin smelt as endangered and threatened species have been linked to the decline in phytoplankton in the northern SFE (Sommer et al., 2007),

\[ \text{NH}_4 + 2 \text{H}_2\text{O} \rightarrow \text{NH}_3 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O} + \text{H}_2 \text{O} \]
a demonstration of the dependence of fishery yield on primary production (Nixon, 1988).

The decline in chlorophyll concentrations began in the early 1980’s and blooms became rare after 1987, coincident with the introduction of an invasive clam, *Potamocorbula amurensis* (Alpine and Cloern, 1992; Jassby et al., 2002). The appearance of *P. amurensis* has been considered the major factor in the disappearance of phytoplankton blooms in Suisun Bay (Alpine and Cloern, 1988; Kimmerer and Orsi, 1996). However any role of *Potamocorbula* in eliminating phytoplankton blooms during spring is likely minor as clam biomass is low during that season (Greene et al., 2011). The lack of spring phytoplankton blooms in Suisun Bay suggests some other causal agent may suppress phytoplankton activity.

Since 1999, spring blooms have been observed only twice in Suisun Bay, in 2000 (Wilkerson et al., 2006; Kimmerer et al., 2012; Parker et al., 2012b) and recently in 2010 (during this study). A common feature of both blooms in which 30 μg L⁻¹ chlorophyll was measured, was a decline in ammonium (NH₄) concentrations to ~1 μmol L⁻¹ (Wilkerson et al., 2006), suggesting a possible link between low NH₄ and bloom formation. Ammonium concentrations increased in the northern SFE and in Suisun Bay prior to the clam invasion, coincident with human population increase since the 1970’s (Jassby, 2008; Gilbert et al., 2011), reflecting increased wastewater discharge from the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWTP). The SRWTP currently discharges 15 tons N d⁻¹, largely as NH₄, to the inland delta of the SFE and to Suisun Bay (Jassby, 2008; his Fig. 1), a 3-fold increase from 5 tons N d⁻¹ in 1987.

Elevated NH₄ from sewage effluent was implicated in depressed primary production along the California coast (MacIsaac et al., 1979), the Delaware Estuary (Yoshiyama and Sharp, 2006), the Scheldt Estuary (Cox et al., 2009), Wascana Creek, Canada (Waiser et al., 2010), and the inner bay of Hong Kong Harbor (Xu et al., 2010). At locations within the SFE, including Suisun Bay, elevated NH₄ has been linked to low chlorophyll, low rates of primary production and changes in phytoplankton community structure (Wilkerson et al., 2006; Dugdale et al., 2007; Gilbert et al., 2011; Parker et al., 2012a,c).

The well-known inhibition of NO₃ uptake by NH₄ (e.g. Pennock, 1987) appears to be a key process and a likely causal agent leading to reduced primary production in environments with elevated NH₄ concentrations. In the SFE and the Sacramento River, phytoplankton NO₃ uptake is inhibited by NH₄ (Dugdale et al., 2007; Parker et al., 2012c). The lack of access to NO₃ limits primary production (Parker et al., 2012a,c) and the buildup of chlorophyll, i.e. blooms, since NO₃ is by far the largest component of the inorganic N pool, about 80% in Suisun Bay. The increased NH₄ may have also resulted in deleterious changes in the food web structure, e.g. diatoms replaced by cryptomonads and flagellates, large zooplankton replaced by smaller species (Gilbert, 2010; Gilbert et al., 2011).

Drawing from time-series data of chlorophyll, nutrient concentrations, phytoplankton nitrogen uptake (Wilkerson et al., 2006) and results from enclosure experiments (Dugdale et al., 2007; Parker et al., 2012a), the events leading to a spring phytoplankton bloom in SFE were shown to follow a predictable sequence (Dugdale et al., 2007; Parker et al., 2012a). In early spring, phytoplankton N demand in Suisun Bay is satisfied by NH₄ but with low biomass-specific and depth-integrated NH₄ uptake rates due to high turbidity and poor irradiance (Parker et al., 2012b). NO₃ uptake is low or near zero during this period due to NH₄ inhibition. With improved irradiance conditions (via increased water transparency, water column stability or seasonal increase in irradiance), phytoplankton NH₄ uptake rates and biomass increase causing water column NH₄ concentrations to decrease. Once NH₄ decreases to <4 μmol L⁻¹ phytoplankton NO₃ uptake is enabled. With continued phytoplankton growth, NH₄ concentration is further

---

**Fig. 1.** Map of study site in northern San Francisco Estuary, California, USA showing the Sacramento Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (SRWTP), Sacramento River (Sac. R), San Joaquin River (SJ. R) and the seven sampling stations in Suisun Bay.
reduced to \( \leq 1 \) \( \mu \)mol L\(^{-1} \) and biomass-specific NO\(_3\) uptake rates accelerate resulting in a rapidly developing bloom nourished by NO\(_3\). However, if residence time is too low to allow the phytoplankton to assimilate the inflowing NH\(_4\), as may happen with high river flow conditions or if there is very elevated NH\(_4\) inflow, the production processes are only NH\(_4\)-based. NO\(_3\) is unused and exported from the ecosystem (i.e. to the Pacific Ocean). Reduced primary production is a counter-intuitive result of elevated NH\(_4\); the NH\(_4\) paradox.

Here, we focus on a change in the chronically elevated NH\(_4\) as a potential trigger for blooms in northern SFE; and those factors that may decrease the NH\(_4\) concentration. A weekly sampling program was conducted during spring 2010 allowing a detailed examination to be made of the conditions that enabled the spring bloom to develop. The data are interpreted with respect to a conceptual model describing how NH\(_4\) discharge from the SRWTP and flow in the Sacramento River may modulate nutrient conditions in Suisun Bay to allow a phytoplankton bloom (as occurred in 2000 and 2010) or to prevent blooms as in other years. These results contribute toward an understanding of the role of elevated anthropogenic NH\(_4\) in estuarine primary productivity such that similar ecosystems with low productivity related to elevated NH\(_4\) discharge could be successfully managed.

2. Conceptual model of nutrients, river flow and phytoplankton in Suisun Bay: criteria for phytoplankton blooms

2.1. Box model

A simple input/output model for Suisun Bay (herein “Bay”) based on the sequence of bloom events described by Dugdale et al. (2007) was used to establish three criteria to evaluate when conditions are favorable for phytoplankton blooms. Fundamentally, the initial phytoplankton population must be capable of assimilating and converting NH\(_4\) input to the Bay so that NH\(_4\) concentrations can be reduced sufficiently to enable NO\(_3\) uptake. The critical variables of the NH\(_4\) input are loading and concentration. 1) Loading to the Bay must not exceed the capacity of the phytoplankton to assimilate inflowing NH\(_4\) (Loading Criterion) otherwise NH\(_4\) concentrations within the Bay will increase. 2) The NH\(_4\) concentration in the Bay must be \( \leq 4 \) \( \mu \)mol L\(^{-1} \) or if the inflow concentration is \( > 4 \) \( \mu \)mol L\(^{-1} \) then water residence time must be sufficient for the phytoplankton to reduce the concentration to \( \leq 4 \) \( \mu \)mol L\(^{-1} \) (Concentration Criterion). 3) To avoid washout of the phytoplankton from the Bay before they can accumulate, the dilution rate of the Bay must not exceed the growth rate of the phytoplankton (Washout Criterion). If any of the criteria are not met, blooms will not form and the ecosystem will remain in a low productivity mode based solely on NH\(_4\) uptake.

The variables needed to evaluate these criteria are NH\(_4\) input to the river, river flow, and NH\(_4\) uptake by the phytoplankton. From these variables, the parameters: loading, concentration, residence time and washout flow can be obtained by considering Suisun Bay as a box with surface area (\( A \)) of \( 1.7 \times 10^8 \) m\(^2\) and volume (\( V \)) of \( 9.9 \times 10^8 \) m\(^3\) with inflow from the Sacramento River that contains NH\(_4\) from the SRWTP and outflow toward Suisun Bay and the northern SFE. River flow rates (\( F \)) were obtained from California Department of Water Resources Dayflow algorithm (“Delta Outflow” — www.water.ca.gov/dayflow/). Effluent NH\(_4\) concentrations and effluent flow rate were obtained from SRWTP (SRWTP pers. comm.). First, the NH\(_4\) input (discharge) as metric tons N d\(^{-1}\) or mmol N d\(^{-1}\) at the SRWTP (NH\(_4\) input\(_{\text{SRWTP}}\)) is calculated from the NH\(_4\) concentration in the effluent multiplied by the effluent flow.

\[
\text{NH}_4 \text{input}_{\text{SRWTP}} = [\text{NH}_4 \text{effluent}] \times \text{effluent flow}
\] (1)

Then the NH\(_4\) input at the SRWTP (in mmol N d\(^{-1}\)) divided by the area of Suisun Bay (\( A \)) provides an estimate of the potential loading to the Bay:

\[
\text{Potential loading to Suisun Bay} = \frac{\text{NH}_4 \text{input}_{\text{SRWTP}}}{A}
\] (2)

The realized loading will be lower than the potential loading due to in situ changes in the Sacramento River during its transit from SRWTP to Suisun Bay, e.g. by nitrification and phytoplankton uptake (Parker et al., 2012c). NH\(_4\) concentrations decline downstream and NO\(_3\) and NO\(_2\) concentrations increase (e.g. Parker et al., 2012c), an indication of nitrification (Hager and Schemel, 1996). The NH\(_4\) was observed to decrease downstream by 75% (Foe et al., 2010; Parker et al., 2012c; their Table 1) and this change must be applied to calculate realized loadings to Suisun Bay. Measurements of phytoplankton NH\(_4\) uptake (4.65 mmol N m\(^{-2}\) d\(^{-1}\)) using \( ^{15} \)N–NH\(_4\) and estimates of microbial nitrification (32.0–51.2 mmol N m\(^{-2}\) d\(^{-1}\)) indicated that the downstream decrease in NH\(_4\) was due mostly to nitrification (Parker et al., 2012c). The nitrification rates were obtained using both a mass balance approach from increasing NO\(_3\) concentrations downstream between SRWTP and Suisun Bay along with travel time, and also using an average specific nitrification factor (Yool et al., 2007) to predict the NO\(_3\) produced from the ambient NH\(_4\) in the river.

The directly estimated loading to Suisun Bay can also be obtained by calculating the NH\(_4\) input to the Bay from the measured NH\(_4\) concentration of the water entering the Bay multiplied by the flow into the Bay.

\[
\text{NH}_4 \text{input}_{\text{Bay}} = \frac{[\text{NH}_4]_{\text{Bay}} \times F}{A}
\] (3)

And then:

\[
\text{Directly estimated loading to Suisun Bay} = \frac{\text{NH}_4 \text{input}_{\text{Bay}}}{A}
\] (4)

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRWTP effluent load tons NH(_4)–N d(^{-1})</th>
<th>Flow rate m(^2) s(^{-1})</th>
<th>[NH(_4)] source at SRWTP ( \mu )mol L(^{-1})</th>
<th>NH(_4) inflow at Suisun Bay ( \mu )mol L(^{-1})</th>
<th>Loading to Suisun Bay mmol m(^{-2}) d(^{-1})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>12.40</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>6.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The NH₄ concentration (in μmol L⁻¹ = mmol m⁻³) at the entrance to Suisun Bay ([NH₄]_[Suisun]) can be calculated using the NH₄ discharge at SRWTP and river flow (F) to calculate concentration at the source of discharge ([NH₄]_source(SRWTP)) that is then multiplied by 0.25 to allow for the 75% decrease in NH₄ downriver due to microbial nitrification (see Section 2.1 for rationale):

\[
[NH_4]_{[Suisun]} = [NH_4]_{[source(SRWTP)]} \times 0.25 = ([NH_4]_{input(SRWTP)}/F) \times 0.25
\] (5)

To estimate the maximum river flow (F_max) allowed before dilution (D) results in no net phytoplankton growth for the Washout Criterion, Suisun Bay dilution is calculated as:

\[
D = \frac{F}{V}
\] (6)

where \( F \) is river flow and \( V \) is volume of Suisun Bay (9.9 × 10⁸ m² s⁻¹). Then:

\[
F = D \times V
\] (7)

From chemostat analogy, dilution (D) cannot be greater than phytoplankton growth rate — in this case the mean phytoplankton biomass-specific NH₄ uptake rate (VNH₄, time⁻¹).

So the washout point \( D_{max} = VNH_4 \) from Eqn. (7).

\[
F_{max} = D_{max} \times V = VNH_4 \times V = VNH_4 \times 9.9 \times 10^8 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}
\] (8)

At this flow and greater, there is no net growth of phytoplankton in the Bay, and the concentration of inflowing and outflowing phytoplankton biomass will be the same.

The interrelationships between NH₄ discharge, NH₄ concentration and river flow are shown as three hyperbolae (Fig. 2) calculated for discharges at the SRWTP of 15, 10 and 5 metric tons NH₄—N d⁻¹ from Eqn. (5) relating river flow and NH₄ concentration. At any given river flow, the NH₄ concentration at the entrance to Suisun Bay increases as discharge increases (Eqn. (5)). The intersection of the solid horizontal line drawn from the NH₄ = 4 μmol L⁻¹ with a discharge hyperbola indicates the minimum flow needed to dilute NH₄ concentration to 4 μmol L⁻¹ (the Concentration Criterion). The washout threshold flow (\( F_{max} \)) is shown as the right-hand vertical dashed line on Fig. 2. The range of river flows within which bloom initiation can occur is set by this upper limit and a lower flow set by the discharge (vertical dotted lines). The window of flow rates contracts as the discharge increases, shown by the dotted vertical lines.

### 2.2. Calculating NH₄ loadings and concentrations

Using NH₄ discharges at SRWTP of 5, 10 and 15 tons NH₄—N d⁻¹ (bracketing 1987 to present-day NH₄—N discharges, Jassby, 2008) and Eqn. (2), the potential area-based loading of NH₄ to Suisun Bay from the Sacramento River increased from 2.11 to 6.32 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ over that period (Table 1). A reduction of 75% is applied to the discharge at SRWTP, to give nitrification-corrected, see Section 2.1 area-based NH₄ loadings to Suisun Bay of 0.53 (when there was 5 tons NH₄—N d⁻¹ discharge at SRWTP), to 1.58 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ at 15 tons NH₄—N d⁻¹ (present-day).

Three flow rates (500, 1000, and 2000 m³ s⁻¹) and three NH₄ inputs at SRWTP (5, 10, and 15 tons NH₄—N d⁻¹) were used to calculate NH₄ concentration at the SRWTP discharge point and then at the entrance to Suisun Bay applying the 75% reduction due to nitrification (Table 1, Eqn. (5)). Ammonium concentrations at a given flow rate increase as the discharge rate increases. This analysis does not include when the flow into Suisun Bay is not equal to the flow at the SRWTP which occurs when water is diverted from the Sacramento for agricultural and domestic use. Also, additional sources of NH₄ (e.g. other WTPs) were not included in these calculated loadings as it is assumed here that SRWTP represents the only NH₄ source to Suisun Bay. It has been shown that SRWTP as a point source supplies 90% of the NH₄ (Jassby, 2008) in the northern SFE. Present-day nutrient inventories for the Sacramento River and Suisun Bay are incomplete but Hager and Schmehl (1992) suggest that agricultural sources are minor downstream of the SRWTP and the location of nonpoint source of nutrients is unclear and likely to have insignificant inputs.

### 2.3. Obtaining values for the three criteria

#### 2.3.1. Loading Criterion

To evaluate the Loading Criterion (i.e. that NH₄ loading must not exceed the NH₄ uptake capacity of the phytoplankton), peak and non-peak phytoplankton NH₄ uptake rates were used to evaluate whether Suisun Bay phytoplankton have the capacity to keep pace with potential NH₄ loading. The mean phytoplankton NH₄ uptake during spring in Suisun Bay measured from 1999 to 2003 was 0.032 mmol m⁻³ h⁻¹ (Wilkerson et al., 2006) and the peak value was 0.074 mmol m⁻³ h⁻¹ (unpublished data). These hourly rates were converted to daily rates (*24) and then depth-integrated values were obtained (0.88 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ and 2.02 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹) assuming uniform uptake throughout the euphotic zone and estimating euphotic zone from the mean spring Secchi depth measured in Suisun of 0.3 m (Wilkerson et al., 2006) using the relationship in Cole and Cloern (1987). Comparison of the historical NH₄ discharges to Suisun Bay with the mean and peak phytoplankton NH₄ uptake rates (0.88 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ and 2.02 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹) indicates that the discharge of 10 tons NH₄—N d⁻¹ and the current 15 tons NH₄—N d⁻¹ exceed the mean capacity of the Suisun Bay phytoplankton to absorb the input of NH₄ (Table 1). With discharge of 15 tons NH₄—N d⁻¹ phytoplankton uptake rate must exceed 1.58 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ (Table 1). In order to change the balance in favor of phytoplankton...
bloom formation, either NH₄ loading would need to decrease or the phytoplankton NH₄ uptake rate would need to increase (to the peak value). At the 5 tons NH₄–N d⁻¹ discharge in 1987, the phytoplankton uptake would have been capable of absorbing the NH₄ input.

2.3.2. Concentration Criterion

The second criterion (Concentration Criterion) for rapid NO₃-based bloom initiation requires an NH₄ concentration of ≤4 μmol L⁻¹. The concentrations calculated for Suisun Bay (allowing for 75% reduction between the SWRTP and Suisun Bay due mostly to nitrification—see Section 2.1) (Table 1) suggest that this criterion is met at present-day discharge at flows of 1000 and 2000 m³ s⁻¹. At 500 m³ s⁻¹, the calculated inflowing NH₄ concentration is 6.2 μmol L⁻¹, in excess of the required 4 μmol L⁻¹. In Fig. 2, a line drawn from the y-axis at a concentration of 4 μmol L⁻¹ is the upper boundary for the Concentration Criterion. The intersection of that line with a discharge hyperbola indicates the minimum flow required to meet the Concentration Criterion indicated by the vertical line intersecting the x-axis. As discharge increases, the necessary river flow increases. At the present discharge, 15 tons NH₄–N d⁻¹, flow of at least 800 m³ s⁻¹ is required.

2.3.3. Washout Criterion

The washout threshold flow (Fₚₙₐₓ), shown as the right-hand vertical dashed line on Fig. 2, is based on the mean biomass-specific NH₄ uptake rate for Suisun Bay in spring, 0.004 h⁻¹ (Wilkerson et al., 2006). From Eqn. [8]

\[ F_{\text{max}} = 0.004 \text{ h}^{-1} \times 9.9 \times 10^{5} \text{ m}^{3} = 1100 \text{ m}^{3} \text{ s}^{-1} \]  

(9)

The range of river flows within which bloom initiation can occur is set by this upper limit and a lower flow set by the discharge. The window of flow rates contracts as the discharge increases and at present discharge (15 metric tons NH₄–N d⁻¹), Criterion 1 (Loading Criterion) requires that the phytoplankton NH₄ uptake rate must exceed 1.58 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹, Criterion 2 (Concentration Criterion, NH₄ = ~4 μmol L⁻¹ at Suisun Bay) requires river flow >800 m³ s⁻¹ at the SWRTP for sufficient dilution and Criterion 3 (Washout Criterion) requires river flow at Suisun Bay <1100 m³ s⁻¹. The river flow, discharge and loading conditions during spring 2010 were evaluated to establish if any of these criteria were met to allow bloom initiation.

3. Site description and methods

Seven stations were sampled in the main channel (∼10 m depth) of Suisun Bay along with a single shoal station (∼2 m depth: DWR-D7), on 17, 24 March; 7, 14, 26 April; 12, 24 May and 16, 21 June 2010 (Fig. 1). At each station measurements of water transparency were made with a Secchi disk, and temperature and salinity with a YSI-6820 sonde. Salinity was measured using the Practical Salinity Scale. Surface water was sampled with a clean bucket for concentrations of nutrients and chlorophyll as well as enumeration of phytoplankton species.

The sampled water was filtered through clean precombusted (450 °C, 4-hr) 25 mm Whatman GF/F filters and the filtrate collected for nutrient analyses. Twenty-ml filtered samples were analyzed using a Bran and Luebbe AutoAnalyzer II with MT-19 manifold chemistry module for NO₃ + NO₂ and NO₂ according to Whitledge et al. (1981) and Bran and Luebbe Method G-172-96 (Bran Luebbe, 1999a), phosphate (PO₄) according to Bran and Luebbe Method G-175-96 (Bran Luebbe, 1999b) and silicate (Si(OH)₄) by Bran and Luebbe Method G-177-96 (Bran Luebbe, 1999c). NO₃ + NO₂ is referred to as NO₃ throughout the text as NO₂ concentrations were very low (<1.0 μmol L⁻¹). Twenty-five ml filtered samples were analyzed for NH₄ according to Solorzano (1969). Samples for chlorophyll were prepared in the field by filtering 50 ml of sample water onto 25 nm Whatman GF/F filters. Chlorophyll on the filters was determined by in vitro fluorometry after extraction in 90% acetone using a Turner 10AU fluorometer (Arar and Collins, 1992) calibrated with commercially available chlorophyll (Turner Designs) and corrected for phaeophytin by hydrochloric acid addition (Holt-Hansen et al., 1965). Water was sampled in 250-ml amber glass bottles and preserved with Lugol’s iodine for phytoplankton enumeration, using the Utermöhl setting technique (Utermöhl, 1958) with 25–ml chambers and inverted microscopy. Phytoplankton were identified to genus. Laboratory quality assurance/quality control followed the Surface Water Ambient Monitoring Program (SWAMP) protocols set by the California State Water Resources Control Board (http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/water_issues/programs/swamp/qamp.shtml).

This included implementation of standard laboratory procedures including replicates, field blanks, matrix spikes, certified reference materials, setting of control limits, criteria for rejection, and data validation methods. All analyses were carried out on fresh samples within 24 h of collection.

4. Results

4.1. Field observations of chlorophyll, nutrients and phytoplankton

When sampling began on 17 March, 2010, NH₄ concentrations were high, (6.8–10.3 μmol L⁻¹) with the maximum value at the most upstream location, at the entrance to Suisun Bay, DWR-D4 (Figs. 1 and 3a) and chlorophyll concentrations were uniformly low (1.4–3.4 μg L⁻¹). By 24 March, chlorophyll concentrations increased (2.8–4.3 μg L⁻¹) and NH₄ concentrations were relatively unchanged (Fig. 3b) except for DWR-D4 where NH₄ had declined substantially. Two weeks later, 7 April, chlorophyll concentrations had increased (3.7–7.4 μg L⁻¹) at all but the two most downstream stations (Fig. 3c). NH₄ concentrations had declined at all stations except DWR-D4. The lowest NH₄ concentrations were found at the mid Suisun Bay stations, USGS 5 and USGS 6 (4.4 and 3.7 μmol L⁻¹, respectively) and the shoal station DWR-D7 (3.4 μmol L⁻¹). Station DWR-D4 had elevated NH₄ compared to the other stations.

One week later, 14 April, a phytoplankton bloom was observed in mid Suisun Bay (USGS 5) with a chlorophyll concentration of 30.9 μg L⁻¹. NH₄ concentrations at this station were 1.7 μmol L⁻¹ (Fig. 3d) and were consistently low across stations in mid Suisun Bay. The highest NH₄ concentration (8.6 μmol L⁻¹) occurred at USGS 7, located in western Suisun Bay adjacent to the Central Contra Costa Sanitation District WTP outfall. Chlorophyll concentrations were low (1.9 μg L⁻¹ and 1.5 μg L⁻¹) at USGS 7 and the next downstream station, USGS 8.

On 26 April, there was a clear U-shaped pattern of NH₄ concentration within Suisun Bay with a minimum at USGS 5 (Fig. 3e). A mirror image pattern of chlorophyll was also observed (Fig. 3e) with the lowest chlorophyll upstream and downstream and the maxima at USGS 5 (21 μg L⁻¹) and the shoal station (DWR-D7, 20 μg L⁻¹). By May 12, the bloom had largely faded although substantial chlorophyll concentrations (5–10 μg L⁻¹) still remained at all but the two downstream stations where the highest NH₄ concentrations (5.2 and 7.2 μmol L⁻¹) were measured (Fig. 3f).

Two weeks later, 24 May, a second, larger phytoplankton bloom both in magnitude and spatial extent had developed, with
chlorophyll up to 34 \( \mu g \cdot L^{-1} \) at all but the two downstream stations, USGS 7 and USGS 8 (Fig. 3g). Ammonium concentrations were \( \leq 1 \) \( \mu mol \cdot L^{-1} \) at mid-Bay stations including DWR-D7, and \(<4 \) \( \mu mol \cdot L^{-1} \) at the most upstream station (DWR-D4). By 16 June, chlorophyll had declined to between 2.5 and 6.9 \( \mu g \cdot L^{-1} \) within the study area and NH4 concentrations were \( \sim 4 \) \( \mu mol \cdot L^{-1} \) (Fig. 3h). One week later, 21 June, chlorophyll concentrations had declined further (2–5 \( \mu g \cdot L^{-1} \)) and a pattern of NH4 concentration (2.5–5.5 \( \mu mol \cdot L^{-1} \)) increasing downstream was apparent (Fig. 3i).

The spatial and temporal patterns in chlorophyll and NH4, along with NO3, Si(OH)4 and PO4 are shown also as contours on a location (DWR-D4 in Suisun Bay to USGS 8 near San Pablo Bay) versus time plane in Fig. 4a–e. The two blooms (end of April and May) were centered at USGS 3 to USGS 5 (Fig. 4a). These blooms occurred on the upstream side of the 2 isohaline (Fig. 4a). NH4 concentration (Fig. 4b) declined through mid-Bay but increased again at USGS 7, with an NH4 minimum (<4 \( \mu mol \cdot L^{-1} \)) corresponding closely to the chlorophyll maximum distribution with time. NO3 concentrations

---

**Fig. 3.** Chlorophyll (white bars) and NH4 concentrations (black bars) at the seven sampling locations measured in 2010 on a) 17 March, b) 24 March, c) 7 April, d) 14 April, e) 26 April, f) 12 May, g) 24 May, h) 16 June and i) 21 June. The dashed lines show NH4 = 4 \( \mu mol \cdot L^{-1} \). DWR-D7 is not located on the Suisun Bay transect but lies to the north of USGS 6 so is plotted next to USGS 6.
declined with time from about 35 to 10 μmol L⁻¹, the latter coincident with the second bloom. Phosphate and Si(OH)₄ concentrations declined as spring progressed with lower values observed during the periods of both blooms (Fig. 4d, e). A Si(OH)₄ minimum was associated with the second bloom. At DWR-D4 the Secchi depth varied little with a mean of 0.6 ± 0.2 m and the mean salinity was low, 0.14 ± 0.07 (Table 2).

Diatoms made up virtually all of the phytoplankton counted (Fig. 5). The abundances of the five most common diatoms at three channel stations, DWR-D4, USGS 3, USGS 5 and at the shoal station, DWR-D7 are plotted for five sampling dates in 2010; 24 March, 7, 14 and 26 April and 24 May (Fig. 5). The first bloom in April (Fig. 5c) was dominated by the pennate diatom *Entomoneis* (synonym: *Amphiprora*; http://westerndiatoms.colorado.edu) and the second on 24 May (Fig. 5e) by the long-chain centric diatom *Melosira* (a tychopelagic diatom that is normally benthic; Cupp, 1943) occurred persistently in the shoal and downstream region of Suisun Bay, while centric pelagic diatoms (*Cyclotella* and *Melosira*) were upstream (Fig. 5a–d). Diatom dominance in the two blooms is consistent with the concurrent decline in Si(OH)₄ and increased chlorophyll (Fig. 4).

### 4.2. NH₄ loading to Suisun Bay, NH₄ concentrations in Suisun Bay and river flow in spring 2010

#### 4.2.1. Loading

Discharge of NH₄ at SRWTP (Fig. 6a) was calculated from effluent concentrations and effluent flow at the SRWTP and normalized to the surface area of Suisun Bay (Eqns. (1) and (2)). In the period 17 March to 7 April potential loading varied from 5.24–6.61 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ (Table 2), then remained ~6 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ through 12 May and then declined to 5.59 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ on 24 May. The mean NH₄ loading for the period 17 March to 24 May, 5.86 ± 0.52 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ is not distinguishable from the loading with a discharge rate of 15 tons NH₄–N d⁻¹, 6.32 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ (Table 1). When realized loading at the entrance to Suisun Bay was estimated by application of a 75% reduction due to nitrification (see section 2.1), the values (Table 2) fall within the range of the Loading.

![Fig. 4. Surface contours of concentrations of nutrients and chlorophyll plotted versus sampling location on the Suisun Bay transect (y-axis) from USGS 8 (downstream) to DWR-D4 (upstream) and time (x-axis). DWR-D7 is not included. a) Chlorophyll with areas >10 μg L⁻¹ shaded in grey. The 2 salinity isohaline is overlaid as a bold black line. b) NH₄ with areas <4 μmol L⁻¹ shaded in grey, c) NO₃, d) Si(OH)₄, e) PO₄. Crosses on c) show the sampling locations.](image-url)
Criterion defined by mean and peak NH₄ uptake (Fig. 6a, horizontal dotted lines). Using the discrete measurements of NH₄ concentrations at DWR-D4 (entrance to Suisun Bay) and Delta Outflow, a more direct estimate of the NH₄ loading to Suisun Bay for the same period in spring 2010 was calculated (Eqns. (3) and (4)). This directly estimated NH₄ loading declined from 2.79 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ on 7 April prior to the bloom period, to 0.91 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ at the end of the bloom period (Table 2, Fig. 6a). During the bloom period, it fell within the Loading Criterion range (only slightly above the peak criterion line on 12 April) (Fig. 6a). The overall mean directly estimated NH₄ loading from March through May (1.73 ± 0.69 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ (Table 2), is close to the value estimated assuming 15 tons NH₄–N d⁻¹ discharge at the WTP discharge location after accounting for nitrification losses of NH₄, 1.58 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ (Table 1).

4.2.2. Ammonium concentrations

Although changes in river flow at SRWTP do not affect the calculated NH₄ loading to Suisun Bay (with no export pumping), changes in flow at SRWTP affect the concentration of NH₄ in the river as a result of dilution and these changes are propagated downstream. A rapid change in concentration (calculated from the SRWTP discharge and flow) occurred at SRWTP between 7 and 14 April when NH₄ concentration declined by ~30% from 30.95 to 20.63 μmol L⁻¹ (Table 2, Fig. 6b). The discharge at SRWTP decreased only slightly from 6.61–6.22 mmol m⁻² d⁻¹ between these dates and could not have caused such a change in concentration at SRWTP (Table 2, Fig. 6b). The change in concentration was the result of rapid increase in flow at the SRWTP (from 418.9 to 591.6 m³ s⁻¹) (Fig. 6b, Table 2). Between 7 and 14 April the calculated NH₄ concentrations at DWR-D4 also declined, from 7.74 to 5.16 μmol L⁻¹ (Table 2) and the measured concentration of NH₄ declined nearly 50% from 9.66 to 5.50 μmol L⁻¹ as river flow at DWR-D4 (i.e. Delta Outflow) increased from 567.0–759.7 m³ s⁻¹.

Both measured and calculated NH₄ concentrations at DWR-D4 fell slightly above the Concentration Criterion, 4 μmol L⁻¹, with measured concentrations near the criterion value from the first bloom period in April to the second bloom in late May. The overall mean NH₄ concentration (6.52 ± 2.59 μmol L⁻¹) that was measured at the overall mean river flow (543.2 ± 173.8 m³ s⁻¹, Table 2) is in good agreement with the predicted NH₄ concentrations at the entrance to Suisun Bay assuming 15 tons NH₄–N d⁻¹ discharge and 500 m s⁻¹ river flow (6.20 μmol L⁻¹, Table 1) at DWR-D4.

4.2.3. Washout flow

The highest river flow at DWR-D4, on April 14, 759.7 m³ s⁻¹ (Table 2), was well below the present Washout Criterion threshold, 1100 m³ s⁻¹. For the rest of the period flows into Suisun Bay were about 50% of the washout thresholds.

5. Discussion

5.1. Overview

Two diatom blooms were observed in Suisun Bay in spring 2010. Ammonium loading was within the criteria limits set by mean and peak NH₄ uptake capacity of the phytoplankton. NH₄ concentrations in Suisun Bay in April were near the Concentration Criterion (4 μmol L⁻¹) predicted to enable blooms. Washout was clearly avoided and river flow was below the current Washout flow Criterion. The major trigger was a sudden decline in both measured and predicted NH₄ concentration at the entrance to Suisun Bay (DWR-D4), the result of rapid increases in flow at both SRWTP and Delta Outflow (Fig. 6b, Table 2). Ammonium concentrations continued to decline throughout the bloom period to about 1 μmol L⁻¹ (Figs. 3 and 4). The 2010 bloom followed the sequence described by Dugdale et al. (2007) in which NH₄ initially declined and chlorophyll biomass started to increase. When NH₄ concentration was reduced to 1 μmol L⁻¹ NO₃ was used and chlorophyll biomass increased rapidly.

5.2. The NH₄ paradox

The observation that high NH₄ concentrations, in the presence of ample NO₃, results in reduced algal productivity is counter-intuitive and requires explanation, since it is well known that when most algae are grown in batch culture on a medium containing both NH₄ and NO₃, NH₄ will be taken up first and when exhausted NO₃ will be taken up. The physiological process that reduces or eliminates phytoplankton NO₃ use is generally referred to as NH₄ inhibition of NO₃ uptake (e.g. Eppl ey et al., 1979; Dortch, 1990; Cochlan and Bronk, 2003) and may occur at NH₄ concentrations as low as 0.1–0.3 μmol L⁻¹ (Wheeler and Kokkinakis, 1990).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Secchi depth m</th>
<th>Salinity</th>
<th>Delta Outflow m³ s⁻¹</th>
<th>Measured NH₄ at DWR-D4 μmol L⁻¹</th>
<th>Directly estimated NH₄ loading m⁻² d⁻¹</th>
<th>Calc NH₄ at DWR-D4 μmol L⁻¹</th>
<th>Realized NH₄ at DWR-D4 m⁻² d⁻¹</th>
<th>River flow at SRWTP m³ s⁻¹</th>
<th>Calc NH₄ at SRWTP μmol L⁻¹</th>
<th>Potential NH₄ loading at SRWTP mmol m⁻² d⁻¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 March</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>395.1</td>
<td>10.31</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>495.3</td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 March</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>262.5</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>384.9</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 April</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>567.0</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>7.74</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>418.9</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td>6.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 April</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>759.7</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>591.6</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 April</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>709.8</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>546.3</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 May</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>604.8</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>433.1</td>
<td>27.90</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 May</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>503.7</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>421.7</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 June</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 June</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ± s.d.</td>
<td>0.56 ± 0.21</td>
<td>0.14 ± 0.07</td>
<td>543.2 ± 173.8</td>
<td>6.52 ± 2.59</td>
<td>1.73 ± 0.69</td>
<td>6.23 ± 1.01</td>
<td>1.47 ± 0.13</td>
<td>470.3 ± 76.1</td>
<td>24.92 ± 4.03</td>
<td>5.86 ± 0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Mar–7 Apr</td>
<td>0.67 ± 0.29</td>
<td>0.20 ± 0.09</td>
<td>408.2 ± 152.7</td>
<td>8.98 ± 1.77</td>
<td>1.93 ± 0.94</td>
<td>6.54 ± 1.28</td>
<td>1.43 ± 0.20</td>
<td>433.1 ± 56.5</td>
<td>26.15 ± 5.11</td>
<td>5.70 ± 0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Apr–24 May</td>
<td>0.50 ± 0.20</td>
<td>0.12 ± 0.02</td>
<td>644.5 ± 113.9</td>
<td>4.67 ± 0.86</td>
<td>1.57 ± 0.54</td>
<td>6.00 ± 0.88</td>
<td>1.50 ± 0.07</td>
<td>498.2 ± 83.9</td>
<td>24.00 ± 3.52</td>
<td>5.98 ± 0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 5. Cell concentration (cells ml$^{-1}$) of the most abundant diatom species (from bottom: Cocconeis, Cyclotella, Entomoneis, Fragilaria, Melosira) at three channel stations and one shoal station (DWR-D7) collected in 2010 on a) 24 March, b) 7 April, c) 14 April, d) 26 April and e) 24 May.
Calculated (predicted) NH$_4$ concentration at SRWTP and DWR-D4, and measured NH$_4$ concentration at DWR-D4 (crosses). The concentration criterion of 4 mol L$^{-1}$ NH$_4$ at entrance to Suisun Bay is shown as a horizontal dotted line.

When both NH$_4$ and NO$_3$ are fully assimilated, the yield of algae is the sum of the commonly considered inorganic nitrogen forms (typically NH$_4$ plus NO$_3$). In a lake or lagoon, the progression of NH$_4$ concentration with NO$_3$ uptake and algal production would follow that of the laboratory culture flask, providing no other nutrient becomes limiting. However, in a river or estuary, nutrients are refreshed from source regions by flow and the relative proportions of NH$_4$ and NO$_3$ become important. For example, consider source water flowing into a bay containing a 50:50 mixture of NH$_4$ and NO$_3$, 20 $\mu$mol L$^{-1}$ NH$_4$ and then 40 $\mu$mol L$^{-1}$ NO$_3$, all NO$_3$ will be produced. This is equivalent to 40 $\mu$g L$^{-1}$ chlorophyll (1 $\mu$mol N removed produces $\approx$ 1 $\mu$g L$^{-1}$ chlorophyll; see Dugdale and Goering, 1970; Marra et al., 1990 and refs therein). However, if the flow is sufficiently high to prevent full biomass accumulation (i.e. residence time is short), NH$_4$ may remain at concentrations sufficient to block NO$_3$ uptake. The 20 $\mu$mol L$^{-1}$ of NO$_3$ is unused and flows out of the system. The maximum phytoplankton biomass ($\approx$ chlorophyll) would depend only on the NH$_4$ taken up, a maximum of 20 $\mu$mol L$^{-1}$ NH$_4$ in the inflowing source water ($\approx$ maximum of 20 $\mu$g L$^{-1}$ chlorophyll). In this way, high NH$_4$ results in less than maximal chlorophyll and productivity.

### 5.3. Diatom contribution and distribution

Diatoms made up virtually all of the phytoplankton (72–100% of the phytoplankton counted) during the bloom periods, consistent with recent phytoplankton studies in the SFE (Cloern and Dufford, 2005) and with historic studies (Ball and Arthur, 1979). The diatoms observed included benthic Cocconeis and Entomoneis. Lidstrom (2008) also observed an abundance of Entomoneis in Suisun Bay in 2007. Two of the dominant diatom genera described in Ball and Arthur (1979), Melosira and Cyclotella, were also dominant in the Suisun 2010 bloom. From Fig. 3a–e it appears that the April 2010 bloom began in the channel of the central part of Suisun Bay and then was observed at the shoal station.

### 5.4. Comparison of 2009 and 2010

No bloom was observed in 2009 and some comparisons can be made for 2009 with criteria parameters and environmental conditions during the bloom year 2010. Loading Criteria for 2009 compared to 2010 can be evaluated from average April SRWTP discharge rates. No direct estimates of loading at DWR-D4 are available since no detailed sampling of Suisun Bay was made in 2009. The average discharge of NH$_4$ from SRWTP declined by 7% in 2010 compared to 2009, and the loading to Suisun Bay declined by the same amount (Table 3).

The average river flow rate at SRWTP in April was 50% higher in 2010 compared to 2009 (Fig. 7a, Table 3). The temporal pattern of flow also was different in the March to May periods of the two years. In 2009 flow declined to a low level and remained low until a single peak in early May. In 2010, a March low flow was followed by a sharp increase in mid-April declining by the end of May, the flow increase thought to be the trigger for the 2010 bloom. The effect of different flow patterns is shown by the trends in NH$_4$ concentration at the effluent discharge location from March to June of 2009 and 2010 (Fig. 7b). The decline in NH$_4$ concentration in 2010 in April does not occur in 2009 due to the lack of increased flow in April 2009.

### Table 3

Mean (± s.d.) flow, effluent discharge and calculated NH$_4$ concentration at SRWTP in April 2009 and 2010, and realized loading and calculated NH$_4$ concentration at entrance to Suisun Bay.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flow m$^3$ s$^{-1}$</th>
<th>Effluent discharge*</th>
<th>NH$_4$ at SRWTP $\mu$mol L$^{-1}$</th>
<th>Realized loading to Suisun Bay mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$</th>
<th>NH$_4$ at Suisun Bay (DWR-D4) $\mu$mol L$^{-1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009 345 ± 37</td>
<td>1.11 ± 0.26</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>37.62 ± 9.67</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 518 ± 80</td>
<td>1.03 ± 0.10</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>23.38 ± 4.10</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Calculated from daily data from SRWTP.
Flow rates were below the current Washout Criterion, 110 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$, during the 2010 study period (Fig. 7a) and the same was true for the spring period in 2009 except for early March (Fig. 7a). The interaction between calculated NH$_4$ concentration, discharge and flow can be visualized using the data for 2009 and 2010 (Fig. 8). The two hyperbolae were calculated for the mean April 2009 and 2010 estimates of discharge at SRWTP (Table 3). The NH$_4$ concentrations at SRWTP calculated from the daily discharge and flow data are shown. Some of the data for 2010 (crosses) falls below the hyperbola drawn through the mean conditions, indicating that during the study period in April 2010 discharge was reduced below the average value. The horizontal dotted line drawn from the y-axis at 16 μmol L$^{-1}$ is the NH$_4$ concentration at SRWTP required to meet the Concentration Criterion at the entrance to Suisun Bay. The vertical dotted line indicates the flow (≈760 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$) required to reduce the concentration of NH$_4$ to 16 μmol L$^{-1}$ at the discharge point and to 4 μmol L$^{-1}$ at DWR-D4 in Suisun Bay. The left-most vertical dashed line drawn at average river flow for April 2009 (345 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$) intersects the 2009 hyperbola at about 38 μmol L$^{-1}$ (Table 3). The next vertical dashed line plotted for the river flow (592 m$^3$ s$^{-1}$) at SRWTP on 14 April 2010, intersects the 2010 hyperbola above the Concentration Criterion (dotted horizontal line). In 2009 the flow was too low to meet the Concentration Criterion whereas in 2010 the higher flow and the likely lower discharge allowed concentrations close to the criterion to be met.

5.5. Other factors that might influence the spring Suisun Bay blooms

Other possible factors that might influence bloom occurrences are improved irradiance, physical processes, e.g. entrapment or fronts, and changes in the clam population density. The irradiance field in the SFE is determined primarily by the sediment load, except for times of high chlorophyll concentrations, when the latter will also decrease the water column transparency. The sediment load has decreased substantially in the northern SFE, and is predicted to continue to decline, leading to improved irradiance conditions (McKee et al., 2006; Jassby, 2008; Schoellhamer, 2009). However, increased irradiance does not always result in phytoplankton blooms (Ball and Arthur, 1979). From 1999 to 2002, Suisun Bay had a mean Secchi depth of 0.3 m in spring (Willkerson et al., 2006). In 2010 Secchi depths were greater and averaged 0.7 m prior to the bloom (Table 2). Depth-integrated NH$_4$ uptake rates were likely enhanced by the resultant deeper euphotic zone depth and this may have enabled the phytoplankton to meet the Loading Criterion.

Physical processes in addition to flow, which affects NH$_4$ concentration and interacts with growth rate to determine the
threshold flow for washout, will also play a role in bloom initiation. Mixing often results in a homogeneous water column in Suisun Bay. Transient water column stratification may act to not only improve the average water column irradiance conditions but also may concentrate the phytoplankton and aid bloom formation. Such increased biomass would result in an increase in NH₄ uptake, another mechanism that would contribute to assimilation of the NH₄ load. One candidate for such a mechanism is the particle entrapment zone or turbidity maximum, a feature of many estuaries. In the SFE, a salinity of 2 has been shown to coincide with the turbidity maximum and the distance from the Golden Gate where the bottom water salinity declines to 2 and is referred to as X₂ (Kimmerer, 2002). X₂ was within Suisun Bay during the historic bloom periods observed by Ball and Arthur (1979) for a range of river flows and also in this study (X₂ ~ 68 km, water.ca.gov/day-flow). The 2010 data set described here was obtained from surface samples only and not useful for investigating vertical distributions of water properties. However Fig. 4a shows that the blooms occurred in surface water of < 2 suggesting that particle entrapment might have contributed to the bloom. A detailed study of the vertical salinity field during an ongoing bloom with nutrient and carbon uptake rate measurements is needed to better constrain the role of circulation and stratification in bloom development. Stratification would also create a barrier to benthic grazing on the phytoplankton.

The invasive clam, Potamocorbula amurensis (=Corbula amurensis) has been present in Suisun Bay since 1987 and considered the cause of the rapid decline in summer phytoplankton that occurred shortly after its introduction (Alpine and Cluern, 1992; Jassby et al., 2002). The clam population follows a seasonal cycle of growth and predation, with a biomass minimum in spring and biomass maximum in fall (e.g. Greene et al., 2011). The question arises; was the population lower in spring 2010 than 2009? In Suisun Bay similar population sizes were reported for spring 2009 and 2010, except for at DWR-D6 where the mean population of P. amurensis was higher in April 2010 (6337 ± 1226 individuals m⁻²) than April 2009 (5985 ± 705 individuals m⁻²) (Fuller, Bay-Delta Monitoring and Analysis, California Department of Water Resources, pers. comm.). The similarity in clam abundance between years argues against reduced grazing on phytoplankton in 2010 as a cause for the bloom.

In summary, the major drivers of the spring 2010 bloom in Suisun Bay were increased river flow and decreased discharge of NH₄ at SRWTP, enabling the phytoplankton population to absorb the inflowing NH₄ and reduce the NH₄ concentration to levels that would allow use of NO₃. The populations that arose were very similar quantitatively and qualitatively (diatom dominated) to pre-1987 Suisun blooms of phytoplankton.

5.6. Food web response

The cause(s) of the decline in pelagic fisheries in the northern SFE has so far eluded the scientific and management community. No sustained resurgence in fish populations has occurred in spite of extensive financial contributions towards habitat restoration and research (Sommer et al., 2007). The present study, in concert with other studies conducted in the northern SFE (Gilbert et al., 2011; Parker et al., 2012c) suggests increased discharge of NH₄ into the Sacramento River as a cause of reduced phytoplankton blooms and the subsequent food-limited conditions in Suisun Bay. When this NH₄ discharge is reduced, the food web should respond positively. In May 2010, accompanying the observed phytoplankton blooms and lower NH₄ loading, there was a nine-fold higher abundance of the zooplankton food source (calanoid copepod adults) for the pelagic fishes in Suisun Bay compared to May 2009 (Hennessey, CA Dept. Fish and Game, pers. comm.), likely a result of the 2010 phytoplankton blooms described here. Eurytemora affinis increased from 32 individuals m⁻³ in May 2009 to 246 individuals m⁻³ in May 2010 and Sinocalanus doerri from 70 individuals m⁻³ in May 2009 to 1299 individuals m⁻³ in May 2010. Results from the 2010 Fall Midwinter Trawl Index for delta smelt and longfin smelt were 70% and 194% greater than those reported for 2009 (CA Dept. Fish and Game, dfg.ca.gov/delta/data/fmwt/preh_PP.asp).

5.7. Future predictions

In December 2010, changes were approved to the SRWTP discharge permit requiring reductions in NH₄ inputs to the Sacramento River both through nitrification and denitrification. Reductions in NH₄ loadings should result in an increased probability of spring diatom blooms. Upgrading the SRWTP to full biological nitrogen removal (BNR, coupled nitrification/denitrification) would likely result in the Sacramento River phytoplankton productivity and community structure being driven by the conditions in the upper Sacramento River above the SRWTP (Parker et al., 2012c). These conditions of high NO₃, low NH₄ would likely fuel diatom blooms in Suisun Bay if the washout flow was not exceeded (i.e. the Washout Criterion) since both the Loading and Concentration Criteria would be met.

Increased irradiance conditions due to the expected decrease in sediment load (Schoellhamer, 2009) should result in an improved capacity of the phytoplankton to assimilate the NH₄ load to Suisun Bay from the Sacramento River, thereby reducing NH₄ concentrations to below NO₃ threshold, and enabling phytoplankton NO₃ use and blooms. The similarity in spring conditions occurring during the 2010 bloom (low NH₄, high chlorophyll, diatom success) with spring conditions (high chlorophyll and diatom dominance) that were described by Ball and Arthur (1979) for Suisun Bay from 1969 to 1979 suggests that a return to a diatom-fueled food web should also result in a return to the pre-1979 food web that supported larger zooplankton and higher food quality for fish. Ball and Arthur (1979) give mean values of chlorophyll of 30–40 μg L⁻¹ for Suisun Bay in spring and 40–100 μg L⁻¹ in summer 1969–1979 and according to Cloern and Cheng (1981) mean NH₄ concentrations for this period were low, in summer 1.8 and 4.0 μmol L⁻¹ in winter. These results suggest that the high concentrations of chlorophyll characteristic of the pre-1987 period could occur in spring if low NH₄ concentrations were restored to the river and flow conditions were within prescribed limits. Phytoplankton could be restored to high spring chlorophyll conditions in Suisun Bay and even to high summer values if the clams were to disappear, as has happened elsewhere when NH₄ inputs were reduced (see case studies in Glibert, 2010). In this scenario, an increase in SFE productivity would follow the pattern of recovery observed in the Scheldt Estuary where nutrient inputs were reduced (Cox et al., 2009; Mialet et al., 2011). The present study provides an example of how the reduction of anthropogenic NH₄ inputs may be employed to restore pre-existing productivity to SFE and similarly impacted estuaries and coasts.
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