

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

¹Department of Biological Sciences
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia 23529

²Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia 23529

³Chesapeake Bay Program Office
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
Richmond, Virginia 23230

AN UPDATE OF CURRENT STATUS AND LONG-TERM TRENDS IN WATER QUALITY AND LIVING RESOURCES IN THE VIRGINIA TRIBUTARIES FROM 1985 TO 2005

Prepared by

Principal Investigators:

Daniel M. Dauer¹
Harold G. Marshall¹
John R. Donat²
Michael F. Lane¹
Suzanne C. Doughten²
Frederick A. Hoffman³

Submitted to:

Chesapeake Bay Program
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality
629 East Main Street
Richmond, Virginia 23230

January, 2007

Table of Contents

List of Appendices	ii
I. Introduction	1
II. Methods and Materials	1
A. Monitoring Program Descriptions	1
B. Statistical Analysis	2
III. Results and Discussion	4
A. James River Basin	4
1. Basin Characteristics	4
2. Water Quality	4
3. Living Resources	6
4. Management Issues	6
B. York River Basin	7
1. Basin Characteristics	7
2. Water Quality	8
3. Living Resources	9
4. Management Issues	10
C. Rappahannock River Basin	11
1. Basin Characteristics	11
2. Water Quality	11
3. Living Resources	12
4. Management Issues	13
IV. Literature Cited	13

List of Appendices

- Appendix A. Relative status of water quality in the Virginia tributary and main stem stations for the period 2002 through 2004.
- Appendix B. Long-term trends in water quality for the Virginia tributary and main stem stations for the period 1985 through 2004.
- Appendix C. Scatterplots of water quality parameters.
- Appendix D. Status of phytoplankton bioindicators at the Virginia tributary and main stem stations for the period 2002 through 2004.
- Appendix E. Long-term trends in phytoplankton bioindicators at the Virginia tributary and main stem stations from the start of monitoring through 2004.
- Appendix F. Scatterplots of phytoplankton bioindicators.
- Appendix G. Status of primary productivity at the Virginia tributary and main stem stations for the period of 2002 through 2004.
- Appendix H. Long-term trends in primary productivity at the Virginia tributary and main stem stations for the period of 1989 through 2004.
- Appendix I. Scatterplots of primary productivity.
- Appendix J. Status in benthic community condition based on the B-IBI at the Virginia tributary and Chesapeake Bay main stem stations for the period of 2002 through 2004.
- Appendix K. Long term trends in the B-IBI and associated bioindicators for the Virginia tributary and Chesapeake Bay main stem monitoring stations for the period of 1985 through 2004.

I. Introduction

A marked decline in the water quality of the Chesapeake Bay has occurred over the past several decades. The disappearance of submerged aquatic vegetation in certain regions of the Bay, declines in the abundance of some commercially and recreationally important species, increases in the incidence of low dissolved oxygen events, changes in the Bay's food web, and other ecological problems have been related to the deteriorating water quality. The results of concentrated research efforts in the late 1970s and early 1980s stimulated the establishment of Federal and state directives to better manage the Chesapeake Bay watershed. By way of the Chesapeake Bay Agreements of 1983, the State of Maryland, the Commonwealths of Virginia and Pennsylvania, and the District of Columbia, agreed to share the responsibility for improving environmental conditions in the Chesapeake Bay. As part of this agreement, a long-term monitoring program of the Chesapeake Bay was established in order to: 1) track long-term trends in water quality and living resource conditions over time, 2) assess current water quality and living resource conditions, and 3) establish linkages between water quality and living resources communities. By tracking long-term trends in water quality and living resources, managers may be able to determine if changes in water quality and living resource conditions have occurred over time and if those changes are a reflection of management actions. Assessments of current status may allow managers to identify regions of concern that could benefit from the implementation of pollution abatement or management strategies. By identifying linkages between water quality and living resources it may be possible for managers to determine the impact of water quality management on living resource communities.

Water quality and living resource monitoring in the Virginia main stem and tributaries began in 1985 and has continued for 21 years. Detailed assessments of the status and long-term trends in water quality and living resources in Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries have been previously conducted (Alden et al., 1991,1992; Carpenter and Lane, 1998; Dauer, 1997; Dauer et al., 1998a,1998b, 2002b; Lane et al.,1998; Marshall, 1994,1996; Marshall and Burchardt, 1998, 2003, 2004a, 2004b; 2005 Marshall et al., 1998; 2005; 2006).). This report summarizes the status of and long-term trends in water quality and living resource conditions for the Virginia tributaries and updates the previous reports (Dauer et al., 2005a, 2005b, 2005c).

II. Methods and Materials

A. Monitoring Program Descriptions

Non-tidal water quality samples were collected from 1988 through 2005 at five stations at or near the fall-line in each of the major tributaries as part of the U. S. Geological Survey's (USGS) and the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality's (DEQ) River Input Program (Figure 1). Tidal water quality was regularly monitored at 28 sites in the Bay main stem and at 27 sites in the James, York and Rappahannock rivers (Figure 2) beginning in July, 1985 and continuing through 2005. Six additional permanent water quality monitoring sites were established in the Elizabeth River in 1989 (Figure 2). Details of changes in the monitoring program sampling regime are provided elsewhere (Dauer et al., 2005a, 2005b, 2005c) while sample collection and processing protocols are provided on the World Wide Web at <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/qatidal.htm>.

Phytoplankton monitoring was conducted at seven stations in the Chesapeake Bay main stem beginning in 1985 and at six sites in the major tributaries beginning in 1986 (Figure 3). Two phytoplankton monitoring programs stations were added in the Elizabeth River in 1989 although one was eventually discontinued. Epi-fluorescent picoplankton and C¹⁴ primary productivity analysis was added to all stations in 1989. Details of changes in the monitoring program, field sampling and laboratory procedures are described by Dauer et al. (2005a, 2005b, 2005c).

Benthic monitoring was conducted at sixteen fixed point stations in the lower Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries beginning in 1985. Sampling at five additional stations two in the Elizabeth River and one in each of the three other tributaries began in 1996 (Figure 3). Details of and changes to the fixed point monitoring program sampling regime and laboratory procedures are described by Dauer et al. (Dauer et al., 2005a, 2005b, 2005c).

In 1996, the benthic monitoring program was modified to add a probability-based sampling regime to supplement data collected at fixed-point stations and estimate the area of Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries that met restoration goals as indicated by the B-IBI (Ranasinghe et al., 1994; Weisberg et al., 1997; Alden et al., 2002). Data are collected at 25 randomly allocated stations in each of four separate strata in Virginia including: 1) the James River; 2) the York River (including the Pamunkey and Mattaponi rivers); 3) the Rappahannock River; and 4) the main stem of the Chesapeake Bay. An additional set of 25 random locations have been collected in the Elizabeth River as a part of DEQ's Elizabeth River Monitoring Program beginning in 1999. Probability-based monitoring data are used to assess biological impairment in Chesapeake Bay at several different spatial scales on an annual basis. Details of the sampling, laboratory and assessment protocols are provided in Dauer et al. (2005a;2005b;2005c) and Llansó et al. (2005).

B. Statistical Analysis

Tabular summaries of land-use coverages are modified from the USEPA's Chesapeake Bay Program Watershed Profile website: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/wspv31/>. Discharged point source nutrients were obtained from the USEPA Chesapeake Bay Program's point source data base available on the World Wide Web at <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/data/index.htm> and plotted on an annual basis to assess changes in total point source loadings over time. A comparison of the relative importance of point and non-point sources was made by comparing delivered loads of nutrients and sediments for the two sources as well as percent changes estimated for the period from 1985 to 2005. These estimates were provided by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality and are based on the Year 2005 Progress Run of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model using estimates of Best Management Practices as monitored by the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation.

To ensure that long-term trends in water quality and living resource data are correctly interpreted, a unified approach for conducting the statistical analyses and interpreting their results was developed. Statistical analytical procedures used in this study were based on guidelines developed by the CBP Monitoring Subcommittee's Tidal Monitoring and Assessment Workgroup. For both status and trend analyses, the stations were grouped into segments based on the segmentation

scheme developed by the Data Analysis Workgroup (Figure 2) and data were analyzed for different time periods or “seasons” as defined for each monitoring component in Table 1.

Status of tidal water quality for each Chesapeake Bay program segment was determined using two methods: 1) the relative status as described in Dauer et al. (2005a; 2005b; 2005c) and 2) by comparing three year median values during the SAV growing season to SAV habitat criteria (see Table 2) using a Mann-Whitney U-test. The terms good, fair, and poor used in conjunction with relative status are statistical classifications for comparison between areas of similar salinity within Chesapeake Bay. Though useful in comparing current conditions among different areas of Chesapeake Bay, these terms are not absolute evaluations but only appraisals relative to other areas of what is generally believed to be a degraded system.

Status for phytoplankton involved the calculation of relative status for various phytoplankton community indicators using the same technique as described for water quality. Status of benthic communities at each station was characterized using the three-year mean value (2003 through 2005) of the B-IBI (Weisberg et al., 1997). Status of the benthic community was classified as follows: values less than or equal to 2 were classified as severely degraded, values greater than 2.0 to 2.6 were classified as degraded, values greater than 2.6 but less than 3.0 were classified as marginal, and values of 3.0 or more were classified as meeting goals. Status of benthic communities was also quantified by using the probability-based sampling to estimate the bottom area of each stratum populated by benthos classified as impaired using the B-IBI originally produced by and adopted from Llansó et al. (2006).

Trend analyses of non-tidal water quality parameters were using a seven parameter regression model that took into account the effects of flow, time, seasonal effects and other predictors (USGS, 2006). conducted on flow-adjusted concentrations using a non-parametric Kendall-Theil analysis. Trend analyses of tidal water quality parameters were conducted using a “blocked” seasonal Kendall approach (Gilbert, 1987) for nutrients in order to account for method changes early in the program and using a seasonal Kendall test for monotonic trends and the Van Belle and Hughes tests for homogeneity of trends between stations, seasons, and station-season combinations for all other parameters (Gilbert, 1987). Trend analyses for phytoplankton communities and benthic communities were conducted using the same approach as that used for non-nutrient water quality parameters.

III. Results and Discussion

A. James River Basin

1. Basin Characteristics

The James River basin has the largest population, the highest population density, the largest percentage of developed land, and the largest percentage of land with impervious surfaces of the three Virginia tributaries while at the same time having the highest total area and percentage of forested land, and the lowest percentage of agricultural land (Table 3A). Above the fall-line, the James River is predominantly rural with the dominant land use type being forest coupled with some agricultural lands. The tidal portion of the river is characterized by two large urbanized regions (Richmond and Hampton Roads) with high population densities, higher percentages of impervious surfaces, relatively lower forest cover and fewer riparian buffer miles separated by large areas of predominantly forest land and open water with some agricultural land (Table 3B).

Non-point sources accounted for nearly 58% of the 16,803,156 kg/yr of nitrogen loads and 72% of the 2,440,531 kg/yr of phosphorus loads entering the James River in 2005. Overall, BMPs have resulted in 10% and 15% reductions in nitrogen and phosphorus non-point sources loads, respectively and 33% and 62% reductions in total nitrogen and total phosphorus point source loads, respectively for the period from 1985 to 2005 (Table 4).

Annual point source loadings of nitrogen were from five to eleven times higher below the fall-line (BFL) than above the fall-line (AFL). Annual AFL point source loadings of total nitrogen ranged between approximately 2,000,000 to 3,000,000 kg/yr from 1985 through 2003 with values prior to 1998 being generally 200,000 to 400,000 kg/yr higher. Following an initial increase from 22,140,000 kg/yr in 1985 to nearly 27,100,000 kg/yr in 1989, annual BFL loadings of total nitrogen declined steadily to approximately 12,300,000 kg/yr in 1999. During the next four years, BFL total nitrogen loadings have shown a slight but steady increase reaching approximately 14,600,000 kg/yr in 2003 (Figure 4).

Annual point source loadings of phosphorus were generally two to eight times higher below the fall-line (BFL) than above the fall-line (AFL). AFL total phosphorus loadings were near or above 500,000 kg/yr prior to 1988, declined sharply during the next two years to nearly 330,000 kg/yr in 1989 but have risen steadily since then to nearly 600,000 kg/yr in 2003. Following a peak at just over 4,070,000 kg/yr in 1986, BFL total phosphorus loadings declined sharply and have generally continued to steadily decline reaching approximately 1,050,000 kg/yr in 2003 (Figure 5).

2. Water Quality

There were no significant trends in freshwater flow in either the James River or Appomattox River at the fall-line. In general, water quality above the fall-line in the James River appear to be improving as indicated by the decreasing trends in flow adjusted concentrations of both nitrogen and phosphorus parameters (Table 5). However, water quality conditions above the fall-line in the

Appomattox River appear to be degrading as indicated by the increasing trend in total phosphorus (Table 5).

Relative status of most nutrients in the tidal James River was good or fair except in the lower river (JMSMH) where status of surface and bottom dissolved inorganic phosphorus was poor (Figure 6). While the relative status of surface chlorophyll *a* and bottom dissolved oxygen was good throughout most of the James River, status of total suspended solids and secchi was fair or poor throughout the river (Figure 7). Most long term trends and all post-1994 trends in nutrients observed indicated improving water quality conditions except in the lower river (JMSMH), where a degrading long-term trend in bottom dissolved inorganic phosphorus was detected (Figure 6). An improving long-term trend in surface chlorophyll *a* was detected in the Chickahominy River (CHKOH) but a degrading trend in this parameter was detected at the James River Mouth (JMSPH). Degrading trends in total suspended solids and/or secchi depth were detected in several segments (JMSTF1, CHKOH, JMSMH and JMSPH). Improving trends in Summer bottom dissolved oxygen were detected in one segment in the Upper James River (JMSTF2) and at the James River Mouth (JMSPH) (Figure 7).

SAV habitat requirements for nutrients, where applicable, were borderline or not met for most segments except at the River Mouth (JMSPH) and in the Chickahominy River (CHKOH) where surface dissolved inorganic nitrogen and surface dissolved inorganic phosphorus passed the SAV requirements, respectively (Figure 8). SAV habitat requirements were met in most segments for surface chlorophyll *a* but either borderline or not met in most segments for surface total suspended solids and secchi depth (Figure 8). Long-term trends during the SAV growing season were degrading for surface total nitrogen and dissolved inorganic phosphorus in the lower river (JMSMH) but improving for surface total nitrogen in the Upper James River (segment JMSTF1 only). Improving trends in surface chlorophyll *a* were detected in the Appomattox River (APPTF) and the Chickahominy River (CHKOH) during the SAV growing season. Degrading trends in secchi depth and total suspended solids were detected in the upper segments of the James River (APPTF, JMSTF1 and CHKOH) as well as the James River Mouth (JMSPH) (Figure 8).

Status of all nutrients was either fair or poor in all segments of the Elizabeth River (Figure 9). Status of chlorophyll *a* and bottom dissolved oxygen was good or fair throughout the Elizabeth River and good or fair for surface total suspended solids in all segments except the Western Branch (WBEMH). Status of secchi depth was poor throughout the Elizabeth River (Figure 10). With the exception of the Elizabeth River main stem (ELIPH), improving trends were detected for nutrients in all segments of the Elizabeth River (Figure 9). An improving trend in surface chlorophyll *a* was detected only in the Western Branch (WBEMH). Improving long-term trends in surface and bottom total suspended solids were observed in nearly all segments of the Elizabeth River (Figure 10).

SAV habitat requirements for nutrients were not met or borderline in all segments of the Elizabeth River (Figure 11). SAV habitat requirements for chlorophyll *a* and total suspended solids were met in most segments of the Elizabeth River while the SAV habitat requirement was borderline or not met in all segments for secchi depth. Improving long-term trends were detected for phosphorus parameters in all segments during SAV growing season, except the Elizabeth River main stem

(ELIPH) where a post-1994 improving trend in surface total phosphorus was detected (Figure 11). Improving trends in surface chlorophyll *a* in the Western Branch (WBEMH), surface total suspended solids in the Eastern Branch (EBEMH) and bottom dissolved oxygen in the Southern Branch (SBEMH) were detected during the SAV growing season (Figure 11).

3. Living Resources

In the main stem of the James River, status of most bioindicators was fair or poor with Margalef species diversity, C¹⁴ primary productivity, and cyanobacteria biomass being poor at all stations. However diatom and cryptophyte biomass was good at all stations and diatom biomass was good at most stations. At station SBE5 in the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River, status of most phytoplankton bioindicators was poor or fair (Figure 12). Most of the long term trends in phytoplankton indicators observed were improving with diatom and chlorophyte biomass improving trends detected at all stations and improving trends in picoplankton biomass being detected at most stations (Figure 12). However, degrading trends in Margalef species diversity were detected at stations RET5.2 in the Middle James River (JMSTF1) and at station LE5.5 in the James River Mouth (JMSPH) and degrading trends in cyanobacteria biomass and abundance were detected at stations TF5.5 in the Upper James River (JMSTF1) and LE5.5 in the James River Mouth (JMSPH) (Figure 12). Degrading trends in Margalef species diversity and cyanobacteria biomass and abundance were observed at station SBE5 in the Southern Branch of the Elizabeth River (Figure 12). The more favorable algal composition as a food and oxygen source in this estuary would be the diatoms and chlorophytes. However, accompanying these positive components are the increasing presence of the less favorable cyanobacteria and their potential for increased algal bloom production and degrading influence on the water quality.

The B-IBI met restoration goals at most stations in the main stem of James River except station TF5.5 in the Upper James River (JMSTF1), and station RET5.2 in the Middle James River (JMSTF1) where the status was severely degraded and marginal, respectively. Status of the B-IBI at both stations in the Elizabeth River was degraded (Figure 13). Improving trends in the B-IBI were detected at station RET5.2 in the Middle James River (JMSTF1) and at station SBE5 in the Southern Branch (SBEMH) of the Elizabeth River (Figure 13). In 2005, results of the probability-based benthic monitoring indicate that 44% of the total area of the James River is degraded (Llanso, 2006). Previous studies suggest that anthropogenic contaminant may account for much of the degradation (Dauer et al., 2005a; Llansó et al., 2005).

4. Management Issues

A persistent and predominant water quality issue in the James River is water clarity which is generally poor and deteriorating throughout the tidal portion of the river. Nutrients, while not as elevated as other areas of the Chesapeake Bay system, also remain above desirable levels. In addition, some degradation in nutrient concentrations is indicated in the lower segments of the estuary. Phytoplankton communities throughout the James River were characterized by fair or poor relative status for the biomass-to-abundance ratio, Margalef species diversity, and cyanobacteria abundance and biomass and exhibited long-term degrading trends at most stations. With respect to

the fixed point stations, benthos in the lower portion of the estuary met restoration goals while the upstream stations were marginal or degraded. Probability based monitoring indicated that a high percentage (44%) of the total area of the river was degraded. A probable source of this stress is anthropogenic contamination.

Intense urbanization resulting in high non-point source runoff into the Elizabeth River coupled with high point source nutrient loadings result in poor water quality in this tributary. Recent BMPs and reductions in point source loadings may be ameliorating these problems as indicated by improving trends in both nutrient concentrations and living resource conditions and expansion of these practices should result in further improvements. Increasing trends in cyanobacteria biomass and abundance and decreasing trends in Margalef species diversity in the Elizabeth River are an important concern. Benthic communities in the Elizabeth River were impaired but conditions appear to be improving. The primary stress to these communities appears to be anthropogenic contamination due to a variety of sources including historical contamination, municipal and industrial point sources, non-point source storm water run-off, and automobile emissions.

B. York River Basin

1. Basin Characteristics

Although the York River watershed has the second highest total area and percentage of developed land and the second highest overall population density of all three of the Virginia tributaries, it is predominantly rural as indicated by the high percentages of forested and agricultural land with forested land accounting for over 60% of the total area. In addition, the York River has the highest percentages of open water and wetlands of all of the Virginia tributaries, as well as, the highest percentage of shoreline with a riparian buffer (Table 3A). Total area of developed land in all sub-watersheds of the York River was low and percent area of developed land was comparable between sub-watersheds. Total areas and percentages of impervious surface were always less than 3% of the total sub-watershed area. Total area and percentages of total sub-watershed area in agricultural land was generally higher in the upstream and non-tidal portions of the Pamunkey and Mattaponi rivers than in the tidal portion of the York River. Forested land decreases substantially moving downstream to the Lower Tidal York River both in total area and percent of the total sub-watershed area due primarily to an increase in open water (Table 3C).

Non-point sources accounted for 85% of the approximately 3,339,301 kg/yr of the total nitrogen loadings to the York River. There has been an 18% reduction of non-point source loadings to the watershed due to the application of best management practices and point source loadings decreased by 12% since 1985 (Table 4). Non-point sources accounted for 81% of the 332,383 kg/yr of total phosphorus loadings to the York River in 2005. Best management practices and the phosphate ban have resulted in an overall reduction of 19% and 67% in non-point and point source loadings to the river since 1985 (Table 4).

Point source loadings of total nitrogen above the fall-line in the Pamunkey River increased steadily from 1985 until 2000 when they decreased substantially. In the Upper Mattaponi River (MPNTF),

point source nitrogen loadings declined in 1985 through 1998 and then increased in subsequent years remaining above 500,000 through 1999 when they declined to levels below those observed in 1985. Following a substantial decline from 1985 through 1987, point source loadings of total nitrogen in the Lower York River increased in the last 16 years to reach nearly 757,000 kg/yr, an increase of nearly 18% since 1985. Point source total nitrogen loadings in Mobjack Bay increased overall from 1985 through 1992 but declined substantially in 1993 and thereafter, have remained below 2,000 kg/yr in most years (Figure 14).

Point source loadings in total phosphorus in all segments experienced an initial decline in 1985 of varying magnitudes probably in response to the phosphate ban. In the Upper Mattaponi River, the Lower York River, and Mobjack Bay these declines were followed by several years of fluctuations and a period of stability at levels substantially less than those observed in 1985. However, above the fall-line in the Pamunkey River, total phosphorus loadings increased after 1991 and continued to do so reaching over 57,000 kg/yr in 2003 (Figure 15).

2. Water Quality

There were no trends in freshwater flow in either the Pamunkey or Mattaponi rivers. Although there was an improving trend in total suspended solids, water quality conditions above the fall-line in the Pamunkey River appear to be degrading overall as indicated by the increasing trends in flow adjusted concentrations of nitrogen and phosphorus observed at the fall-line station at Hanover. There were no trends in water quality parameters at the fall-line station in the Mattaponi River (Table 5).

Status of nitrogen parameters was fair or good in most segments. Status of phosphorus parameters was good in the Upper Pamunkey River (PMKTF), the Upper Mattaponi River (MPNTF) and Mobjack Bay (MOBPH) but generally fair or poor in the lower segments of the Pamunkey and Mattaponi (PMKOH and MPNOH) as well as the Middle and Lower York River (YRKMH and YRKPH) (Figure 16). Status of surface chlorophyll *a* was good in the Pamunkey River and Mattaponi River segments, but fair in remaining segments. Status of total suspended solids was poor or fair in most segments except in the Upper Pamunkey River and the Upper Mattaponi River where status was good. Status of secchi depth was poor in all segments of the York River except in the upper segments of the Pamunkey and Mattaponi rivers where it was fair and good, respectively. Status of Summer bottom dissolved oxygen was good or fair in all segments (Figure 17).

Degrading long-term or post 1994 trends in surface and/or bottom nitrogen parameters were detected in all segments except Mobjack Bay (MOBPH) where improving trends in total nitrogen were detected and in the Upper Mattaponi (MPNTF) where no trends in nitrogen were detected. Degrading long term trends were detected in phosphorus parameters in the Lower Mattaponi River (MPNOH), and the Middle York River (YRKMH) while in the Upper Pamunkey River (PMKTF) both improving and degrading trends were observed in phosphorus parameters. Improving post 1994 trends in surface and bottom dissolved inorganic phosphorus were detected in the Upper Mattaponi River (MPNTF) (Figure 16). Degrading trends were detected for surface chlorophyll *a* in the Lower York River (YRKPH) and Mobjack Bay (MOBPH), for bottom total suspended solids in the Middle

York River (YRKMH) and Lower York River (YRKPH) and for secchi depth in the Upper Mattaponi River (MPNTF), the Lower York River (YRKPH) and Mobjack Bay (MOBPH). Improving trends were detected in surface and bottom total suspended solids and Summer bottom dissolved oxygen in Mobjack Bay (MOBPH) (Figure 17).

In regard to SAV habitat requirements, surface dissolved inorganic nitrogen was borderline in the Lower Pamunkey River (PMKOH), the Lower Mattaponi River (MPNOH) and the Middle York River but met the SAV habitat requirements in the Lower York River (YRKPH) and Mobjack Bay (MOBPH). Surface dissolved inorganic phosphorus met the SAV requirements or was borderline in all segments (Figure 18). Surface chlorophyll *a* met the SAV habitat requirement in all segments while surface total suspended solids and secchi depth were borderline or failed to meet the SAV criteria (Figure 18).

During the SAV growing season degrading trends in nitrogen parameters were detected in all segments except the Lower Pamunkey River (PMKOH) where no long-term trends were detected and in Mobjack Bay (MOBPH) where improving trends were detected. Degrading trends in phosphorus parameters were detected in the Lower Pamunkey River (PMKOH) and the Middle York River while improving trends in phosphorus were detected in the Upper Pamunkey River (PMKTF) and Mobjack Bay (MOBPH). Improving trends in surface chlorophyll *a* were detected in the upper segments of the Pamunkey and Mattaponi rivers while degrading trends in secchi depth were detected in the Lower York River (YRKPH) and Mobjack Bay (MOBPH) during the SAV growing season.

3. Living Resources

Relative status of the majority of station/parameter combinations for phytoplankton was poor with total biomass, the biomass to abundance ratio and Margalef diversity being poor throughout the York River while productivity, cyanobacteria biomass, cyanobacteria abundance and picoplankton biomass were poor in the Middle York River (YRKMH) and Mobjack Bay (MOBPH) (Figure 19). Degrading trends in cyanobacteria abundance and biomass were detected at all stations of the York River and degrading trends in Margalef species diversity were observed at all stations except RET4.3 in the Middle York River (YRKMH). Improving trends were detected in diatom biomass at station RET4.2 in the Middle York River (YRKMH) and in chlorophyte biomass at station TF4.2 in the Upper Pamunkey River (PMKTF) and station WE4.2 in Mobjack Bay (MOBPH) (Figure 19). In addition to the increasing trends among the unfavorable cyanobacteria in the river, the Lower York River is the site of re-occurring dinoflagellate blooms. This past year a major bloom of the dinoflagellate *Cochlodinium polykrikoides* again took place. This species has potential harmful effects on other biota and during major blooms will degrade the water quality.

Benthic community status, as measured with the B-IBI, was good only at stations LE4.3 and LE4.3B in the Lower York River (YRKPH) while status of the B-IBI was severely degraded at station TF4.2 in the Upper Pamunkey River (PMKTF) and marginal at station RET4.3 and degraded at station LE4.1 in the Middle York River (YRKMH) (Figure 20). An improving trend in the B-IBI was detected at station LE4.3B in the lower York River while a degrading trend in the B-IBI was

detected at station LE4.1 in the Middle York River (Figure 20). In 2005, results of the probability-based benthic monitoring indicate that 68% of the total area of the York River is degraded. Previous studies indicate that a combination of anthropogenic contamination, eutrophication and low dissolved oxygen adversely affect benthic communities in the York River (Dauer et al., 2005b; Llansó et al., 2005).

4. Management Issues

Water quality in the non-tidal portion of the Pamunkey River appears to be degrading overall despite improvements in suspended solids as indicated by degrading trends observed in flow adjusted concentrations of both nitrogen and phosphorus parameters. Despite the generally good relative status, increasing trends in both nitrogen and to a lesser degree phosphorus indicate that water quality in the tidal portion of the York River may be degrading although no readily apparent source of the problem has been identified. Poor water clarity is a persistent and widespread problem in the York River as indicated by the poor relative status and SAV habitat criterion violations throughout the estuary coupled with degrading trends in some segments. Source of the water clarity problem is unknown but probably tied to increases in total suspended solids concentrations. Localized increases in discharged point source nutrients were observed in portions of the York River. Although the increases in point source nutrients observed were relatively small, the small total area and low flow rates of the York River may make it more susceptible to changes in point or non-point source nutrient loadings.

Poor status of several phytoplankton indicators and increasing long-term trends in abundance and biomass among the cyanobacteria are of concern and are probably related to the increasing trends in nutrients observed. Increases in cyanobacteria may adversely affect water clarity and could result in the degrading trends in phytoplankton species diversity observed. Although sporadic in their occurrence, the downstream dinoflagellate blooms are often extensive in areal coverage and in the duration of their development. On these occasions, they represent a serious influence to the general degradation of water quality of the area.

Fixed point monitoring stations identified two areas of concern for the benthic communities: (1) the Upper Pamunkey as indicated by the severely degraded status of the B-IBI at station TF4.2, and (2) the area near station LE4.1 in the Middle York River where benthic status was degraded and a degrading trend in the B-IBI was detected. Probability-based monitoring indicated that a high percentage of the total area of the benthos in the York River is impaired. Previous studies suggest that anthropogenic contamination appears to be the predominant source of stress to the benthos but eutrophication and low dissolved oxygen also play a role (Dauer et al., 2005b). There is a possibility that physical disturbance of the benthos caused by seabed mixing, a natural source of stress, may also be an important factor determining benthic community status in the York River (Dellapenna et al., 1998; 2003).

C. Rappahannock River Basin

1. Basin Characteristics

The Rappahannock River is predominantly rural with lowest overall population density and percentage of developed land of all three Virginia tributaries coupled with high percentages of agricultural and forest land use types. It has the second highest area of agricultural cropland of all three of the Virginia tributaries (Table 3A). Sub-watershed specific percentages of agricultural land were generally near or greater than 20% and decreased moving downstream from above the fall-line while percentages of forest land were above 40% and also decreased moving downstream. The percentage of shoreline with a riparian buffer was 35.6% overall in the basin and decreased moving downstream from the Upper Tidal portion of the river (Table 3D).

Non-point sources accounted for nearly 92% of the nearly 3,370,000 kg/yr of nitrogen loads and almost 94% of the 403,800 kg/yr of phosphorus loads entering the Rappahannock River in 2005. Overall BMPs have resulted in over 20% reductions in both nitrogen and phosphorus non-point sources loads and a 12% increase and 70% reduction in nitrogen and phosphorus point source loads to the Rappahannock from 1985 to 2005 (Table 4).

Point source loadings of nitrogen were generally higher below the fall-line than above. AFL point source loadings of nitrogen typically ranged between 160,000 kg/yr to 200,000 kg/yr and peaked at 312,000 kg/yr and 283,000 kg/yr in 1996 and 2003, respectively. BFL point source loadings of nitrogen increased initially from 330,000 kg/yr in 1985 to 470,000 kg/yr in 1989, declined to levels near or below 300,000 during the next eight years, peaked at 491,000 kg/yr in 1998 and generally declined during the next six years (Figure 21A).

Annual BFL point source loadings of phosphorus were typically higher than AFL values for the period of 1985 through 1995 but have become comparable during the last eight years following substantial and generally steady declines in both regions that began in 1989 following the phosphate ban (Figure 21B).

2. Water Quality

No significant trends in freshwater flow at the Rappahannock River fall-line were detected but improving trends in flow adjusted concentrations of all nutrients monitored were detected (Table 5). Relative status of nutrients was good for all parameter/segment combinations in the Rappahannock River except for bottom total phosphorus in the Middle Rappahannock River (RPPOH) for which the status was fair (Figure 22). Relative status of most non-nutrient parameters was fair or good with the exception of surface and bottom total suspended solids and secchi depth at station TF3.3 in the middle river (RPPOH) to station LE3.6 in the lower river (RPPMH) where it was poor (Figure 23).

Degrading long-term trends were detected in bottom total nitrogen and in surface and bottom dissolved inorganic nitrogen in the Middle Rappahannock River (RPPOH) and the Upper Rappahannock River (RPPTF), respectively while improving trends in surface and bottom dissolved inorganic phosphorus was detected in the Middle Rappahannock River (RPPTF). A degrading surface total phosphorus was detected in the Corrotoman River (CRRMH) (Figure 22). Degrading trends in surface chlorophyll *a* were detected in the Middle Rappahannock River (RPPOH) and Lower Rappahannock River (RPPMH). A degrading trend in secchi depth was also detected in the Corrotoman River (CRRMH) (Figure 23).

SAV habitat requirements for nutrients were met in all applicable segments (Figure 24). Surface chlorophyll *a* was either borderline or met the SAV habitat criteria throughout the Rappahannock River. Both surface total suspended solids and secchi depth failed to meet the SAV habitat criteria in both the Upper Rappahannock River (RPPOH) and the Middle Rappahannock River (RPPMH) but were borderline or met the criteria elsewhere (Figure 24). During the SAV growing season, a degrading long-term trend in surface total phosphorus was detected in the Middle Rappahannock River (RPPOH) while an improving trend in surface dissolved inorganic nitrogen was detected in the Corrotoman River (CRRMH). Degrading trends in surface chlorophyll *a* were detected in the Middle Rappahannock River (RPPOH) and the Lower Rappahannock River (RPPMH). A degrading trend in secchi depth was also detected in the Corrotoman River (Figure 24).

3. Living Resources

The status of most phytoplankton indicators was poor with the biomass to abundance ratio, Margalef species diversity and primary productivity being poor throughout the Rappahannock River. However, the status of chlorophyte and cryptophyte biomass was good throughout the Rappahannock River (Figure 25). Improving trends in the diatom biomass occurred at stations TF3.3 (RPPOH) and RET3.1 (RPPMH) along with improving trends in the biomass to abundance ratio and picoplankton abundance at stations TF3.3 and station LE3.6 in the Lower Rappahannock River (RPPMH), respectively. Degrading trends were detected in cyanophyte biomass and abundance throughout the Rappahannock River as were degrading trends in primary productivity at stations TF3.3 and RET3.1 and a degrading trend in dinoflagellate abundance at station LE3.6 (Figure 25). Of concern is the cyanobacteria trends within the river system and their potential for future algal bloom development and accompanying degradation of water quality.

Benthic community status met the restoration goals only at station TF3.3 in the Middle Rappahannock River (RPPOH) and in general became more degraded moving downstream. A degrading trend in the B-IBI was detected at station RET3.1 in the Middle Rappahannock River (RPPMH) (Figure 26). Probability-based benthic monitoring results indicated that 92% of the total area of the Rappahannock River is impaired (Llansó et al., 2006). Previous studies indicate benthic degradation in the Upper Rappahannock River appears to be the result of anthropogenic contamination while degradation in the lower segments of the river may be the result of a combination of contamination and low dissolved oxygen effects (Dauer et al., 2005c; Llansó et al., 2005).

4. Management Issues

Water quality problems appear to be more severe in the upper segments of the Rappahannock River and include poor status and violations of SAV habitat criteria for both suspended solids and secchi depth along with increasing trends in either total or dissolved nitrogen concentrations. Issues with phytoplankton communities include poor status and degrading trends in cyanobacteria abundance and biomass throughout the basin, as well as, poor status and degrading trends in dinoflagellate abundance in the Lower Rappahannock River. The pattern of increasing trends in cyanobacteria development is exhibited not only in each of the Virginia rivers mentioned in this report, but also the Potomac River located north of the Rappahannock River. Already major blooms of cyanobacteria occur annually in the Potomac. If the increasing trends among the cyanobacteria continue, management concerns will include the impact of any long term, extensive development of these taxa within Virginia rivers. It is noted that several of the cyanobacteria identified in Virginia rivers through this monitoring are potential toxin producers. One of the most common species is *Microcystis aeruginosa*, which to date has not produced major blooms in the James, York, or Rappahannock Rivers, but has been associated with blooms and the toxin microcystin in several of the Virginia bays and streams bordering the Potomac River. Status of benthic communities for fixed point monitoring stations was degraded at stations in the Lower Rappahannock River probably as a result of low dissolved oxygen. Degrading trends were detected in B-IBI and or its component metrics in segment RPPOH and uppermost station of segment RPPMH. Probability-based monitoring results indicated that a large proportion of the total area of the Rappahannock River is degraded probably as a result of a combination of anthropogenic contamination and low dissolved oxygen.

IV. Literature Cited

- Alden, R.W. III., R.S. Birdsong, D.M. Dauer, H.G. Marshall and R.M. Ewing. 1992a. Virginia Chesapeake Bay water quality and living resources monitoring programs: Comprehensive technical report, 1985-1989. Applied Marine Research Laboratory Technical Report No. 848, Norfolk VA. Final Report to the Virginia State Water Control Board, Richmond, Virginia. pp. 366.
- Alden, R.W. III, D.M. Dauer, J.A. Ranasinghe, L.C. Scott, and R.J. Llansó. 2002. Statistical verification of the Chesapeake Bay Benthic Index of Biotic Integrity. *Environmetrics* 13: 473- 498.
- Alden, R.W. III., R.M. Ewing, S.W. Sokolowski, J.C. Seibel. 1991. Long-term trends in water quality of the Lower Chesapeake Bay. p. 502-522, In: New Perspectives in the Chesapeake System: A Research and Management Partnership. Proceedings of a Conference. Chesapeake Research Consortium Publication No. 137, Solomons, MD., pp. 780.
- Alden, R.W. III, S.B. Weisberg, J.A. Ranasinghe and D.M. Dauer. 1997. Optimizing temporal sampling strategies for benthic environmental monitoring programs. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 34: 913-922.

- Batiuk, R.A., R.J. Orth, K.A. Moore, W.C. Dennison, J.C. Stevenson, L.W. Staver, V. Carter, N.B. Rybicki, R.E. Hickman, S. Kollar, S. Beiber, and P. Heasley. 1992. Chesapeake Bay Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Habitat Requirements and Restoration Targets: A Technical Synthesis. CBP/TRS83/92. US Environmental Protection Agency Chesapeake Bay Program. Annapolis, MD., pp. 186.
- Batiuk, R.A., P. Bergstrom, M. Kemp, E. Koch, L. Murray, J.C. Stevenson, R. Bartleson, V. Carter, N.B. Rybicki, J.M. Landwehr, C. Gallegos, L. Karrh, M. Naylor, D. Wilcox, K.A. Moore, S. Ailstock, and M. Teichberg. 2000. Chesapeake Bay Submerged Aquatic Vegetation Habitat Requirements and Restoration Targets: A Second Technical Synthesis. US Environmental Protection Agency Chesapeake Bay Program, pp. 217.
- Carpenter, K.E. and M.F. Lane. 1998. Zooplankton Status and Trends in the Virginia Tributaries and Chesapeake Bay: 1985-1996. AMRL Technical Report No. 3064. Final Report to the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Richmond, Virginia. Applied Marine Research Laboratory, Norfolk VA., pp. 28.
- Dauer, D.M. 1993. Biological criteria, environmental health and estuarine macrobenthic community structure. *Mar. Pollut. Bull.* 26: 249-257.
- Dauer, D.M. 1997. Virginia Chesapeake Bay Monitoring Program. Benthic Communities Report. 1985-1996. Final Report to the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, pp. 92.
- Dauer, D.M., M. F. Lane, H.G. Marshall, and K.E. Carpenter. 1998a. Status and trends in water quality and living resources in the Virginia Chesapeake Bay: 1985-1997. Final report to the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, pp. 86.
- Dauer, D.M., H.G. Marshall, K.E. Carpenter, M.F. Lane, R.W. Alden III, K.K. Nesius and L.W. Haas. 1998b. Virginia Chesapeake Bay Water Quality and Living Resources Monitoring Programs: Executive Report, 1985-1996. Final Report to the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Richmond, Virginia. Applied Marine Research Laboratory, Norfolk VA., pp. 28.
- Dauer, D.M. H.G. Marshall, J.R. Donat, M.F. Lane, S.C. Doughten, P.L. Morton, and F.A. Hoffman, 2005a. Status and trends in water quality and living resources in the Virginia Chesapeake Bay: James River (1985-2004). Final Report to the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Richmond, Virginia. Applied Marine Research Laboratory, Norfolk VA., pp. 73.
- Dauer, D.M. H.G. Marshall, J.R. Donat, M.F. Lane, S.C. Doughten, P.L. Morton, and F.A. Hoffman, 2005b. Status and trends in water quality and living resources in the Virginia Chesapeake Bay: York River (1985-2004). Final Report to the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Richmond, Virginia. Applied Marine Research Laboratory, Norfolk VA., pp. 63.

- Dauer, D.M. H.G. Marshall,, J.R. Donat,, M.F.Lane,, S.C.Doughten, P.L. Morton, and F.A. Hoffman, 2005b. Status and trends in water quality and living resources in the Virginia Chesapeake Bay: Rappahannock River (1985-2004). Final Report to the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Richmond, Virginia. Applied Marine Research Laboratory, Norfolk VA., pp. 66.
- Dellapenna, T.M., S.A. Kuehl and L. C. Schaffner. 1998. Sea-bed mixing and particle residence times in biologically and physically dominated estuarine systems: a comparison of lower Chesapeake Bay and the York River subestuary *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* 46:777-795
- Dellapenna, T.M., S.A. Kuehl, L.C. Schaffner. 2003. Ephemeral deposition, seabed mixing and fine-scale strata formation in the York River estuary, Chesapeake Bay. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* 58:621-643.
- Gilbert, R.O. 1987. Statistical methods for environmental pollution monitoring. Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York, pp. 320.
- Lane, M.F., R.W. Alden III, and A.W. Messing. 1998. Water Quality Status and Trends in the Virginia Tributaries and Chesapeake Bay: 1985-1996. AMRL Technical Report No. 3067. Final Report to the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Richmond, Virginia. Applied Marine Research Laboratory, Norfolk VA., pp. 116.
- Llansó, R.J., J. Vølstad, and D. M. Dauer. 2005. 2006 303(d) Assessment methods for Chesapeake Bay benthos. Final Report to the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, Chesapeake Bay Program. pp. 32.
- Llansó R.J., J. Dew, and L.C. Scott, 2006. Chesapeake Bay Water Quality Monitoring Program Long-term Benthic Monitoring and Assessment Component Level 1 Comprehensive Report July 1984-December 2005 (Volume 1), Final Report to the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Annapolis, MD. Versar Inc. Columbia, MD. Pp. 88.
- Marshall, H.G. 1994. Chesapeake Bay phytoplankton: I. Composition. *Proc. Biological Soc. Washington*, 107:573-585.
- Marshall, H.G. 1996. Toxin producing phytoplankton in Chesapeake Bay. *Virginia J. Science*, 47:29-37.
- Marshall, H.G. and L. Burchardt. 1998. Phytoplankton composition within the tidal freshwater region of the James River, Virginia. *Proc. Biol Soc. Wash.* 111:720-730.
- Marshall, H.G. and L. Burchardt. 2003. Characteristic seasonal phytoplankton relationships in tidal freshwater/oligohaline regions of two Virginia (U.S.A.) rivers. In: *Algae and the Biological State of Water, Acta Botanica Warmiae et Masuriae* 3:71-78.

- Marshall, H.G. and L. Burchardt. 2004a. Monitoring phytoplankton populations and water quality parameters in estuarine rivers of Chesapeake Bay, U.S.A. *Oceanological and Hydrobiological Studies*, 33:55-64.
- Marshall, H.G. and L. Burchardt. 2004b. Phytoplankton composition within the tidal freshwater-oligohaline regions of the Rappahannock and Pamunkey Rivers in Virginia. *Castanea* 69:272-283.
- Marshall, H.G. and L. Burchardt. 2005. Phytoplankton development within tidal freshwater regions of two Virginia rivers, U.S.A. *Virginia J. Science*, 56:67-81.
- Marshall, H.G., L. Burchardt, and R. Lacouture. 2005. A Review of phytoplankton composition within Chesapeake Bay and its tidal estuaries. *J. Plankton Research*. 27:1083-1102.
- Marshall, H.G., R. Lacouture, C. Buchanan, and J. Johnson. 2006. Phytoplankton assemblages associated with water quality and salinity regions in Chesapeake Bay, U.S.A. *Estuarine, Coastal, and Shelf Science*, 69:10-18.
- Marshall, H.G., T.A. Egerton, L. Burchardt, S. Cerbin, and M. Kokocinski. 2005. Long term monitoring results of harmful algal populations in Chesapeake Bay and its major tributaries in Virginia, U.S.A. *Oceanological and Hydrobiological Studies*, In Press.
- Ranasinghe, J.A., S.B. Weisberg, D.M. Dauer, L.C. Schaffner, R.J. Diaz and J.B. Frithsen. 1994. Chesapeake Bay benthic community restoration goals. Report for the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Chesapeake Bay Office and the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, pp. 49.
- Weisberg, S.B., J.A. Ranasinghe, D.M. Dauer, L.C. Schaffner, R.J. Diaz and J.B. Frithsen. 1997. An estuarine benthic index of biotic integrity (B-IBI) for Chesapeake Bay. *Estuaries*. 20: 149-158.
- Langland, M.J. and others, In review. Summary of Trends for Flow, Nutrients, and Sediments at Selected Non-tidal Sites, Chesapeake Bay Basin, 1985-2005. U.S. Geological Survey Technical Report. pp. 31.

Tables

Table 1. Definitions of seasonal time periods for status and trend analyses conducted for of the tidal monitoring programs. A “x” indicates the analysis was conducted for the season and parameter group combination while a “-“ indicates that no analysis was conducted. Benthic status and trend analyses were conducted on data collected from July 15 through September 30*.

Season	Definition	Water Quality			Plankton		Benthos	
		Status	Trend	SAV Goals	Status	Trend	Status	Trend
Annual	Entire year	x	x	-	x	x	-	-
SAV1	March through May and September through November	x	x	x	x	x	-	-
SAV2	April through October	x	x	-	x	x	-	-
Summer1	June through September	x	x	-	x	x	-	-
Summer2	July through September	x	x	-	x	x	x*	x*
Spring1	March through May	x	x	-	x	x	-	-
Spring2	April through June	x	x	-	x	x	-	-
Fall	October through December	-	x	-	x	x	-	-
Winter	January and February	-	x	-	x	x	-	-

Table 2. Habitat requirements for growth and survival of SAV (from Batiuk et al., 1992; 2000).

Salinity Regime	SAV Growth Season	Secchi Depth (m)	Total Suspended Solids (mg/l)	Chlorophyll <i>a</i> (µg/l)	Dissolved Inorganic Nitrogen (mg/l)	Dissolved Inorganic Phosphorus (mg/l)
Tidal Freshwater	Apr.-Oct.	<2	<15	<15	none	<0.02
Oligohaline	Apr.- Oct.	<2	<15	<15	none	<0.02
Mesohaline	Apr.-Oct.	<1.5	<15	<15	<0.15	<0.01
Polyhaline	Mar.-May, Sep.-Nov.	<1.5	<15	<15	<0.15	<0.01

Table 3. Land use and population patterns in the James River watershed in comparison to A. Watersheds of the Virginia portion of Chesapeake Bay, and within B. Sub-watersheds of the James River, C. Sub-watersheds of the York River and D. Sub-watersheds of the Rappahannock River. Land use values are expressed as the total area in km² within each watershed or sub-watershed and in parentheses as percentages of the total area within the watershed or sub-watershed. Note that the Impervious Surface land use category encompasses portions of the other land use types. Riparian buffers are measured in km of shoreline with a 30 m riparian buffer. Population values are provided as both total number per watershed or sub-watershed and densities expressed in the number of individuals per km². All land use and population data presented were provided by and/or modified from data available from the USEPA's Chesapeake Bay Program Watershed Profiles website: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/wspv31/>.

A. Watersheds of the Virginia portion of Chesapeake Bay										
	Land Use Area in km² (percent of total)									
Watershed	Total Area	Developed	Agriculture	Forested	Open Water	Wetland	Barren	Impervious Surfaces	Riparian Buffers (%)	Pop. Number/Density(#/km²)
Chesapeake Bay	171,944	6,239(3.6)	48,938(28.5)	103,343(60.1)	7,415(4.3)	4,421(2.6)	1,551(0.9)	3,026(1.8)	110,134 (58.5)	15,594,241(91)
James River	27,019	1,222(4.5)	4,605(17.0)	19,119(70.8)	989(3.7)	704(2.6)	365(1.4)	511(1.9)	16,636(60.2)	2,522,583(93)
York River	8,469	192(2.3)	1,761(20.8)	5,159(60.9)	647(7.6)	575(6.8)	135(1.6)	81(1.0)	6,062(60.3)	372,488(44)
Rappahannock River	7,029	124(1.8)	2,207(31.4)	4,009(57.0)	443(6.3)	171(2.4)	75(1.1)	46(0.7)	3,672(35.6)	240,754(34)
B. Sub-watersheds of the James River										
	Land Use Area in km² (percent of total)									
Subwatershed	Total Area	Developed	Agriculture	Forested	Open Water	Wetland	Barren	Impervious Surfaces	Riparian Buffers (%)	Pop. Number/Density(#/km²)
AFL Upper James	7,938	67(0.8)	1158(14.6)	6630(83.5)	44(0.6)	10(0.1)	26(0.3)	24(0.3)	4427(40)	313780(40)
AFL North of Hopewell	642	171(26.6)	127(19.8)	280(43.5)	31(4.8)	18(2.8)	16(2.4)	68(10.6)	359(33)	367126(572)
AFL Piedmont	12,362	184(1.5)	2173(17.6)	9438(76.3)	114(0.9)	212(1.7)	243(2.0)	49(0.4)	8061(40)	186360(15)
AFL Richmond	790	91(11.5)	179(22.6)	461(58.4)	23(3.0)	28(3.6)	8(1.0)	30(3.8)	478(37)	60550(77)
AFL Swift Creek	471	21(4.4)	60(12.6)	376(79.7)	8(1.6)	3(0.5)	5(1.1)	10(2.1)	346(43)	188746(400)
AFL Upper Chickahominy	787	137(17.4)	148(18.8)	394(50.0)	10(1.3)	91(11.5)	8(1.0)	49(6.3)	739(32)	85669(109)
Appomattox	212	47(22.0)	44(20.7)	101(47.6)	5(2.4)	8(2.7)	8(3.7)	19(9.0)	121(32)	84765(399)
Lower Chickahominy	430	5(1.2)	52(12.0)	277(64.5)	39(9.0)	52(12.0)	5(1.2)	2(0.4)	537(34)	10343(24)
Upper Tidal James	730	18(2.5)	135(18.4)	445(61.0)	93(12.8)	31(4.3)	5(0.7)	9(1.2)	419(34)	36769(50)
Middle Tidal James	368	13(3.5)	62(16.9)	168(45.8)	96(26.1)	28(7.7)	3(0.7)	7(1.9)	311(35)	39886(108)
Lower Tidal James	803	73(9.0)	137(17.1)	256(31.9)	272(33.9)	62(7.7)	5(0.6)	30(3.8)	371(26)	166367(207)
Nansemond	559	28(5.1)	181(32.4)	197(35.2)	60(10.6)	85(15.3)	10(1.9)	14(2.5)	248(22)	49578(89)
Elizabeth River/Hampton Roads	668	259(38.8)	114(17.1)	52(7.8)	163(24.4)	67(10.1)	13(1.9)	141(21.1)	74(9)	594760(890)

Table 3. Continued. Land use values are expressed as the total area in km² within each watershed or sub-watershed and in parentheses as percentages of the total area within the watershed or sub-watershed. Note that the Impervious Surface land use category encompasses portions of the other land use types. Riparian buffers are measured in km of shoreline with a 30 m riparian buffer. Population values are provided as both total number per watershed or sub-watershed and densities expressed in the number of individuals per km². All land use and population data presented were provided by and/or modified from data available from the USEPA's Chesapeake Bay Program Watershed Profiles website: <http://www.chesapeakebay.net/wspv31/>.

C. Sub-watersheds of the York River										
	Land Use Area in km² (percent of total)									
Sub-watershed	Total Area	Developed	Agriculture	Forested	Open Water	Wetland	Barren	Impervious Surfaces	Riparian Buffers (%)	Pop. Number/ Density(#/km²)
Above Fall-Line Pamunkey	2748	31(1.1)	645(23.5)	1870(68.0)	67(2.5)	75(2.7)	62(2.3)	11(0.4)	1720(65)	55111(20)
Upper Pamunkey	785	21(2.6)	243(31.0)	425(54.1)	13(1.7)	67(8.6)	13(1.7)	6(0.8)	686(74)	33911(43)
Lower Pamunkey	282	3(0.9)	44(15.6)	150(53.2)	31(11.0)	49(17.4)	5(1.8)	1(0.5)	189(38)	3696(13)
Above Fall-Line Mattaponi	1023	16(1.5)	199(19.5)	717(70.1)	10(1.0)	52(5.1)	23(2.3)	13(1.3)	816(81)	32564(32)
Upper Mattaponi	805	3(0.3)	179(22.2)	541(67.2)	10(1.3)	54(6.8)	16(1.9)	2(0.3)	774(87)	8430(10)
Lower Mattaponi	534	5(1.0)	111(20.9)	350(65.5)	23(4.4)	47(8.7)	3(0.5)	2(0.4)	482(67)	7577(14)
Upper Tidal York	523	10(2.0)	80(15.3)	293(55.9)	91(17.3)	47(8.9)	3(0.5)	5(1.0)	376(53)	23676(45)
Lower Tidal York	215	10(4.8)	26(12.0)	78(36.1)	85(39.8)	13(6.0)	0(0)	5(2.2)	91(31)	21072(98)
Mobjack Bay	671	10(1.5)	88(13.1)	272(40.5)	205(30.5)	93(13.9)	5(0.8)	5(0.7)	270(27)	24929(37)
D. Sub-watersheds of the Rappahannock River										
	Land Use Area in km² (percent of Sub-watershed total)									
Sub-Watershed	Total Area	Developed	Agriculture	Forested	Open Water	Wetland	Barren	Impervious Surfaces	Riparian Buffers (%)	Pop. Number/ Density(#/km²)
AFL Rappahannock	4035	57(1.4)	1466(36.3)	2463(61.0)	16(0.4)	10(0.3)	28(0.7)	16(0.4)	1470(32.2)	101306(25)
Upper Tidal Rappahannock	878	41(4.7)	223(25.4)	521(59.3)	31(3.5)	47(5.3)	16(1.8)	21(2.4)	682(41.3)	97960(112)
Middle/Lower Rappahannock	982	16(1.6)	282(28.8)	502(51.2)	85(8.7)	80(8.2)	16(1.6)	5(0.5)	825(38.7)	12373(13)
Lower Rappahannock	694	8(1.1)	155(22.4)	339(48.9)	155(22.4)	28(4.1)	13(1.9)	3(0.4)	449(37.2)	10480(15)
Mouth of Rappahannock	440	8(1.8)	80(18.2)	184(41.8)	155(35.3)	8(1.8)	5(1.2)	2(0.5)	244(32.0)	10786(24)

Table 4. Nutrient and Sediment A. Non-point Source and B. Point Source and C Total Loadings for Virginia tributaries for 2005, modified from data provided by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality. Phosphorous and nitrogen loads are in kg/yr and sediment loads are metric tonnes per year (t/yr). Percent changes compare 2005 data to 1985 data. Non-point source loads are results based on the Year 2005 Progress Run of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Model and calculated reductions for calendar year 2005 Best Management Practices (BMPs) as monitored by the Department of Conservation and Recreation and are expressed as delivered loads. Point source loadings are expressed as delivered loads. Number of major point sources for each watershed are provided in parentheses to the right of the watershed name.

A. Non point Sources

Tributary	2005		2005		2005	
	Phosphorus		Nitrogen		Sediment	
	Loads (kg/yr)	% Change	Loads (kg/yr)	% Change	Loads (kg/yr)	% Change
James	1,760,581	-15	9,662,332	-10	1,007,791	-13
York	268,426	-19	2,823,614	-18	111,330	-22
Rappahannock	378,556	-23	3,114,229	-26	285,506	-25
Potomac	1,540,053	-15	18,326,447	-10	1,546,638	-16
Eastern Shore	83,170	-15	830,857	-11	17,875	-7

B. Point Sources

Tributary	2005		2005	
	Phosphorus		Nitrogen	
	Loads (kg/yr)	% Change	Loads (kg/yr)	% Change
James (37)	679,950	-62	7,140,824	-33
York (10)	63,957	-67	515,687	-12
Rappahannock (18)	25,245	-70	255,471	+12
Potomac (39)	400,415	-33	5,463,945	-53
Eastern Shore (5)	2,803	+1	55,169	-58


C. Total

Tributary	2005		2005		2005	
	Phosphorus		Nitrogen		Sediment Loads	
	Loads (kg/yr)	% Change	Loads (kg/yr)	% Change	(kg/yr)	% Change
James	2,440,531	-37	16,803,156	-21	1,007,791	-13
York	332,383	-36	3,339,301	-18	111,330	-22
Rappahannock	403,801	-30	3,369,699	-24	285,506	-25
Potomac	1,940,468	-19	23,790,393	-26	1,546,638	-16
Eastern Shore	85,974	-14	886,027	-17	17,875	-7

Table 5. Long-term trends in nutrients and total suspended solids at Chesapeake Bay River Input Monitoring Program stations located at or near the fall-line for each of the major Virginia tributaries for the period of 1984 through 2005. Results adopted from U.S. Geological Survey (2006). Note that although analyzed there were no significant results for freshwater flow at any fall-line station or for any parameter at the Mattaponi River fall-line station.

Station	Location	Parameter	Slope	P-value	Direction
2035000	James River at Cartersville	TSS	-0.2728	0.0269	Degrading
2035000	James River at Cartersville	TN	-0.2880	<0.0001	Improving
2035000	James River at Cartersville	DNO23	-0.5961	<0.0001	Improving
2035000	James River at Cartersville	TP	-0.9090	<0.0001	Improving
2035000	James River at Cartersville	DIP	-1.4204	<0.0001	Improving
2041650	Appomattox River at Matoaca	TP	0.1996	0.0200	Degrading
1673000	Pamunkey River near Hanover	TSS	0.4869	0.0006	Improving
1673000	Pamunkey River near Hanover	TN	0.1629	0.0009	Degrading
1673000	Pamunkey River near Hanover	DNO23	0.4155	<0.0001	Degrading
1673000	Pamunkey River near Hanover	TP	0.6926	<0.0001	Degrading
1673000	Pamunkey River near Hanover	DIP	0.9017	<0.0001	Degrading
1668000	Rappahannock River near Fredericksburg	TN	-0.2019	0.0055	Improving
1668000	Rappahannock River near Fredericksburg	DNO23	-0.5356	0.0001	Improving
1668000	Rappahannock River near Fredericksburg	TP	-0.4003	0.0006	Improving
1668000	Rappahannock River near Fredericksburg	DIP	-0.2440	0.0217	Improving

Figures



- 1 Station 01668000 - Rappahannock River near Fredericksburg**
- 2 Station 01674500 - Mattaponi River near Beulahville**
- 3 Station 01673000 - Pamunkey River near Hanover**
- 4 Station 02035000 - James River at Cartersville**
- 5 Station 02041650 - Appomattox River**

Figure 1. Locations of the USGS sampling stations at the fall-line in each of the Virginia tributaries.




Figure 3. Location of living resource monitoring stations in the Virginia tributaries and the Lower Chesapeake Bay main stem.




Figure 4. Long-term changes in above fall-line (AFL) and below fall-line (BFL) point source Total Nitrogen Loadings A. Above the Fall-line, and B. Below the Fall-line in the James River for 1985 through 2003.




Figure 5. Long-term changes in above fall-line (AFL) and below fall-line (BFL) point source Total Phosphorus Loadings A. Above the Fall-line, and B. Below the Fall-line in the James River for 1985 through 2003.




Figure 6.

Map of the James River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for each segment for the period of 1985 through 2005. Abbreviations for each parameter are: TN=total nitrogen, DIN=dissolved inorganic nitrogen, TP=total phosphorus, DIP=dissolved inorganic phosphorus. The prefixes S and B refer to surface and bottom measurements, respectively. The presence of two trend symbols indicates a significant difference between pre- and post-method change trends. For such cases, the first symbol represents the pre-method change result while the second symbol is the post method change result.




Figure 7. Map of the James River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for each segment for the period of 1985 through 2005. Abbreviations for each parameter are: CHLA=chlorophyll *a*, TSS=total suspended solids, SECCHI=secchi depth, DO=dissolved oxygen, WTEMP=water temperature, SALIN=salinity. The prefixes S and B refer to surface and bottom measurements, respectively.




Figure 8. Map of the James River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for each segment for the period of 1985 through 2005 for the SAV growing season. Abbreviations for each parameter are: TN=total nitrogen, SDIN=dissolved inorganic nitrogen, TP=total phosphorus, DIP=dissolved inorganic phosphorus, CHLA=chlorophyll *a*, TSS=total suspended solids, SECCHI=Secchi depth, DO=dissolved oxygen. The prefixes S and B refer to surface and bottom measurements, respectively. The presence of two trend symbols indicates a significant difference between pre- and post-method change trends. For such cases, the first symbol represents the pre-method change result while the second symbol is the post method change result.




Figure 9.

Map of the Elizabeth River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for each segment for the period of 1989 through 2005. Abbreviations for each parameter are: TN=total nitrogen, DIN=dissolved inorganic nitrogen, TP=total phosphorus, DIP= dissolved inorganic phosphorus. The prefixes S and B refer to surface and bottom measurements, respectively.




Figure 10.

Map of the Elizabeth River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for each segment for the period of 1985 through 2005. Abbreviations for each parameter are: CHLA=chlorophyll a, TSS=total suspended solids, SECCHI=secchi depth, DO=dissolved oxygen, WTEMP=water temperature, SALIN=salinity. The prefixes S and B refer to surface and bottom measurements, respectively.




Figure 11.

Map of the Elizabeth River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for each segment for the period of 1985 through 2005 for the SAV growing season. Abbreviations for each parameter are: TN=total nitrogen, SDIN=dissolved inorganic nitrogen, TP=total phosphorus, DIP=dissolved inorganic phosphorus, CHLA=chlorophyll *a*, TSS=total suspended solids, SECCHI=Secchi depth, DO=dissolved oxygen. The prefixes S and B refer to surface and bottom measurements, respectively. The presence of two trend symbols indicates a significant difference between pre- and post-method change trends. For such cases, the first symbol represents the pre-method change result while the second symbol is the post method change result.




Figure 12. Map of the James River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for phytoplankton bioindicators for each segment for the period of 1985 through 2005.




Figure 13. Map of the James River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for benthic bioindicators for each segment for the period of 1985 through 2005.




Figure 14. Long-term changes in point source total nitrogen loadings in the A) Pamunkey River Above the Fall-B) Upper Mattaponi (MPNTF), C) Lower York (YRKPH) and in D) Mobjack Bay (MOBPH) for 1985 through 2003.




Figure 15. Long-term changes in point source total phosphorus loadings in the A) Pamunkey River Above the Fall-B) Upper Mattaponi (MPNTF), C) Lower York (YRKPH) and in D) Mobjack Bay (MOBPH) for 1985 through 2003.




Figure 16. Map of the York River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for each segment for the period of 1985 to 2005. Abbreviations for each parameter are: TN=total nitrogen, DIN=dissolved inorganic nitrogen, TP=total phosphorus, DIP=dissolved inorganic phosphorus. The prefixes S and B refer to surface and bottom measurements, respectively. The presence of two trend symbols indicates a significant difference between pre- and post-method change trends. For such cases, the first symbol represents the pre-method change result while the second symbol is the post method change result.




Figure 17. Map of the York River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for each segment for the period of 1985 to 2005. Abbreviations for each parameter are: CHLA=chlorophyll a, TSS=total suspended solids, SECCHI=secchi depth, DO=dissolved oxygen, WTEMP=water temperature, SALIN=salinity. The prefixes S and B refer to surface and bottom measurements, respectively.




Figure 18. Map of the York River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for each segment for the period of 1985 through 2005 for the SAV growing season. Abbreviations for each parameter are: TN=total nitrogen, SDIN=dissolved inorganic nitrogen, TP=total phosphorus, DIP=dissolved inorganic phosphorus, CHLA=chlorophyll *a*, TSS=total suspended solids, SECCHI=Secchi depth, DO=dissolved oxygen. The prefixes S and B refer to surface and bottom measurements, respectively. The presence of two trend symbols indicates a significant difference between pre- and post-method change trends. For such cases, the first symbol represents the pre-method change result while the second symbol is the post method change result.




Figure 19. Map of the York River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for phytoplankton bioindicators for each segment for the period of 1985 to 2005.




Figure 20. Map of the York River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for benthic bioindicators for each segment for the period of 1985 to 2005.




Figure 21. Long-term changes in above fall-line (AFL) and below fall-line (BFL) point source A. Total Nitrogen Loadings, and B. Total Phosphorus Loadings in the Rappahannock River for 1985 through 2005.




Figure 22. Map of the Rappahannock River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for each segment for the period 1985 through 2005. Abbreviations for each parameter are: TN=total nitrogen, DIN=dissolved inorganic nitrogen, TP=total phosphorus, DIP=dissolved inorganic phosphorus. The prefixes S and B refer to surface and bottom measurements, respectively. The presence of two trend symbols indicates a significant difference between pre- and post-method change trends. For such cases, the first symbol represents the pre-method change result while the second symbol is the post method change result.




Figure 23. Map of the Rappahannock River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for each segment for the period 1985 through 2005. Abbreviations for each parameter are: CHLA=chlorophyll *a*, TSS=total suspended solids, SECCHI=secchi depth, DO=dissolved oxygen, WTEMP=water temperature, SALIN=salinity. The prefixes S and B refer to surface and bottom measurements, respectively.




Figure 24. Map of the Rappahannock River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for each segment for the period of 1985 through 2005 for the SAV growing season. Abbreviations for each parameter are: TN=total nitrogen, SDIN=dissolved inorganic nitrogen, TP=total phosphorus, DIP=dissolved inorganic phosphorus, CHLA=chlorophyll *a*, TSS=total suspended solids, SECCHI=Secchi depth, DO=dissolved oxygen. The prefixes S and B refer to surface and bottom measurements, respectively. The presence of two trend symbols indicates a significant difference between pre- and post-method change trends. For such cases, the first symbol represents the pre-method change result while the second symbol is the post method change result.




Figure 25. Map of the Rappahannock River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for phytoplankton bioindicators for each segment for the period 1985 through 2005.




Figure 26. Map of the Rappahannock River basin showing summaries of the status and trend analyses for benthic bioindicators for each segment for the period of 1985 through 2005.