## May River Project Assessing Change After 20 Years

Andrew Tweel, Ph.D.
Pamela Marcum, Denise Sanger,
Ph.D.,
Gary Sundin, Peter KingsleySmith, Ph.D.
Marine Resources Research

Institute



## Rationale

- In 2002, with several large developments planned, the Town of Bluffton commissioned a study to characterize the environmental condition of the May River and its contributing tidal creek habitats.
- This Baseline Study leveraged existing statewide monitoring programs and research to allow for comparison to other areas
  - SCECAP
  - Tidal Creek Project
  - State-wide oyster research

## The watershed has changedot



2982



#### **Forested Watershed**

# Some outcomes of development and BMPs

- Net result of increased impervious cover:
  - Increased volume of water conveyed to coastal system
  - Often increased <u>concentration</u> of contaminants in stormwater
  - Increased contaminant load conveyed to coastal system
  - Often occurs in tandem with loss of natural buffers such as wetlands and vegetated areas
- Other changes, such as increases in precipitation magnitude may further exacerbate this
- Stormwater ponds are designed as a BMP to these changes
  - Rain event/storage requirements
  - Detain/retain stormwater, slow flow to coast
  - Allow for particle settling





Prohibited shellfish harvesting

Restricted shellfish harvesting

## Goals of current study

- Assess changes that have occurred since 2002 Baseline Study
  - Land use/watershed
  - Variety of coastal waters ranging from small to large
  - Oyster demographics, disease, contaminants and stressors
- Assess current state of May River watershed
- Provide recommendations for management

## Definitions

 Small tidal creeks: Tidal Creek Project refers to as headwater tidal creeks, primary interface with upland areas. Intertidally-dominated, < 30 ft wide. Typically 10-15 ft.

 <u>Tidal channels</u>: Larger tidal rivers, secondarily connected to uplands. Subtidallydominated, > 30 ft wide





## Timeline

- Small tidal creek and tidal channel sampling: summer 2023
- Oyster sampling: collection summer 2023, retrieval of trays spring 2024















## Land Use Assessment

#### • Land use data:

- Impervious cover
- Wetland and vegetated cover
- Development types (high, medium, low density)
- 2001 to 2021 (9 time points)
- Town-provided basins
- Small tidal creek subwatersheds

## Results: Land Use

• Developed land cover classes increased rapidly between 2001 and 2021



## Results: Land Use

• Along with development, impervious cover increased similarly



## Results: Land Use

- Vegetated land cover classes decreased
  - Vegetated uplands (fields, forests)
  - Wetlands (forested or woody wetlands, emergent wetlands or fresh marsh)



Vegetated cover excl. forested wetlands (3019 a

Forested wetlands (513 ac

## Results: Small Tidal

- Stoney and Rose Dhu Creek subwatersheds contain a large proportion of this development
- Still contain most of the remaining forested wetlands
- Heyward Cove developed earliest



2,500





## Small Tidal Creek

- Primary interface between and coastal systems
- Sentinel ecosystem
  - Shows impact before larger sy
- Leverage SCDNR long-term T Creek Project, 1994-
- Six creeks
- Variety of parameters



## Small tidal creeks <30 ft, intertidal



500 site 500 m downstream

Water qual. Continuous WQ

## Heyward Cove

COM



## Measures of habitat quality

Water Quality	Sediment Quality	Biological
Nutrients (5)	Contaminants (20+)	Benthic community
Fecal Coliform	legacy sources (e.g., DDT)	<pre>% poll. sens.</pre>
Chlorophyll a	ongoing sources (e.g., PAH)	<pre>% poll. tolerant</pre>
Dissolved Oxygen	Grain size	
Salinity	Total Org. Carbon	
рH	Toxicity	

#### Results: Small Tidal Creek Water Quality

- One-time sampling events, may include natural variability
- Most parameters decreased except nitrate/nitrite.
- Surrounding land use may explain high nitrate/nitrite



#### Results: Small Tidal C Sediment Contaminants

- Mixed results- some higher, some lower.
  - Legacy contaminants DDT, PCB
  - PAH, Pesticides, Metals
- Heyward Cove had high PAH in 2001 and had even higher PAH in 2023
  - ERL (11) and ERM (7) exceedances in 2023, EPA classifies as 'poor'
- Aside from PAH in Heyward Cove, levels generally within





#### Results: Small Tidal Cre Benthic Community

- Paired t-test, no significant change in pollutionindicative or sensitive species
- Overall, across all creeks studied, impervious cover is significantly correlated to an increase in pollution-





## Tidal Channel Study

- Represents most of the coastal h by area
- Leverages large SCDNR SCECAP dat 1999-present
- Indices to evaluate ecosystem holistically
- Ten sites
- Variety of parameters



## Tidal channels > 30 ft wide, subtidal





## Measures of habitat quality

Water Quality	Sediment Quality	Biological
Nutrients (5)	Contaminants (20+)	Benthic community
Fecal Coliform	legacy sources (e.g., DDT)	<mark>B-IBI</mark>
Chlorophyll a	ongoing sources (e.g., PAH)	<mark>Nekton</mark>
Dissolved Oxygen	Grain size	
Salinity	Total Org. Carbon	
рН	Toxicity	

## Results: Tidal ChanedtStudy Water Quality SCECAP Same Year

- One-time sampling events, may include natural variability
- Total N, P, Ortho-P higher in upper watershed
- Chlorophyll a significantly increased, ammonia significantly



#### Results: Tidal Channels Fecal Coliform

- SCDES Shellfish Sanitation data
  - 3000+ observations
  - Restricted harvest
- Uppermost long-term sites both increased most
- Lower sites decreased



Baseline Study Results: Tidal Channeltsdy SCECAP Sediment Quality

Same

- ERMQ: biologicallyrelevant concentrations
- Large increase in PAH all sites, PCB decrease
- Overall ERMQ driven by metals, 2002-2023 patterns
- ERL or ERM • No exceedances, levels are  $\sim 1_{r}$



#### Results: Tidal Channels Indices



## Oyster Study

- Demographics, disease, and stressor
  - Ecosystem engineer
    - Creates or maintains habitat for other spec
  - Sessile
    - Good indicator to represent a loca
  - Culturally and economically imp
  - Six sites (2 upper, 2 mid, 2 lo





## Measures of oyster quality

Demographics	Disease and Stress	Contamination
Density	Dermo (preval./intens.)	Contaminants (20+)
Size	MSX (preval./intens.)	legacy sources (e.g., DDT)
Recruitment	Stress metabolites (2)	ongoing sources (e.g., PAH)
Mortality	Genetic markers (3)	
Associated fauna		

#### Results: Oyster Demographics

- Quadrats: smaller mean shell height & higher density
  - More small oysters
- Trays: similar or larger recruit height
- Low mortality
  - Consistent with statewide average (2023-24 lowest in last 9 years)



Results: Oyster Demographics Higher density of recruits and sub-legal oysters in upper section

• Larger average size of recruits in upper section

• Upper section closed to harvest since 2009

 Part of lower section (L-02) opened to increased harvest



Results: Oyster Study Health and Disease • Dermo (*Perkinsus* 

*marinus*)

- Ubiquitous
- Prevalence slightly higher
- MSX (Haplosporidium nelsoni)
  - Mid and lower sites only
  - Consistent with previous study
- Consistent with



#### Results: Oyster Study Tissue Contaminants

- Values generally low compared to urbanized watersheds
- Values decreased for pesticides, PCB between 2002 and 2023

- PAH is mixed. Consistent increase at lower sites
- Uiahar than adiacont



## Key Results

- The May River watershed has developed substantially since 2002, converting a forested and agricultural watershed to a suburban landscape
- Despite these changes, marine habitats in the May River watershed are still healthy in many regards, relative to SCDNR long-term datasets
- But there are also several indicators of degradation...

## Key Results

- In small tidal creeks:
  - Chlorophyll
  - Nitrate/nitrite
  - Fecal coliform
  - Heyward Cove PAH in sediments
- In *tidal channels*, especially upper reach and smaller branches:
  - Chlorophyll
  - Total phosphorus
  - Fecal coliform
- Oyster populations and health are consistent with other areas of the coast and primarily reflect changes in management rather than urbanization

## Recommendations

- Continued monitoring and synthesis of data
  - Especially for metrics that indicate degradation trend
  - Identify focus areas (i.e. spatially targeted sampling)
  - Distinguish natural variability from urbanization impacts

- Potential management priorities, consistent with Blueprint Bluffton
  - Improvements to stormwater and wastewater infrastructure (public and private)
  - Conservation of remaining natural landscape features

## Thank you tweela@dnr.sc.gov

Thank you to SCDNR staff, Town of Bluffton, NOAA, SCDNR support



## Supplemental Information



			Imperviou	Impervio			VP and P	
Small Tidal			s Cover	us Cover	Ponds	Ponds	Draining	
Creek		Area	2001	2021	1999	2021	Soils	
Subwatershed		acres	010	010	acres	acres	010	
Stoney Creek	SC	4830	1.1	10.9	58.6	321.9	0.33	
Rose Dhu								
Creek	RD	2431	3.1	13.8	0.6	125.2	0.31	
Palmetto								
Bluff	PB	990	0.6	3.4	0.0	41.7	0.40	
Heyward Cove	HW	466	15.7	27.5	4.9	12.5	0.39	
Brighton								
Beach	BB	365	1.5	1.6	4.4	5.1	0.14	
Bass Creek	BC	124	28.4	30.4	1.2	2.1	0.13	

					Water Quality							1	Sedime	ent Qual	lity	Biologic	Habitat	
Туре	Site	Year	Lat	Long	Total Nitrogen	Total Phosphorus	Chlorophyll-a	Eutrophic Index	Dissolved Oxygen	рН	Fecal Coliform	Water Quality Index	Toxicity	Sediment TOC	Contaminants	Sediment Quality Index	Biological Index (B-IBI)	Habitat Quality Index
TC	U-01	2002	32.224	-80.926				0				3				5	5	5
ow	U-02	2002	32.224	-80.901				5				5				5	5	5
OW	U-03	2002	32.227	-80.904				5				5				5	5	5
ow	M-01	2002	32.232	-80.941				5				5				5	5	5
ow	M-02	2002	32.208	-80.868				5				5				5	5	5
ow	M-03	2002	32.184	-80.883				5				5				5	5	5
ow	L-01	2002	32.205	-80.822				5				5				5	5	5
ow	L-02	2002	32.205	-80.010				5				5				5	5	5
TC	L-03	2002	32.211	-80.815				5				5				5	5	5
TC	L-04	2002	32.223	-80.808				5				5				5	5	5
TC	U-01	2023	32.224	-80.901				0				3				5	5	5
OW	U-02	2023	32.227	-80.903				0				3				5	3	3
OW	U-03	2023	32.223	-80.860				0				3				5	5	5
ow	M-01	2023	32.208	-80.866				3				5				5	5	5
OW	M-02	2023	32.184	-80.883				3				5				5	5	5
OW	M-03	2023	32.205	-80.822				3				5				5	5	5
ow	L-01	2023	32.205	-80.801				5				5				5	5	5
ow	L-02	2023	32.224	-80.925				5				5				5	5	5
тс	L-03	2023	32.211	-80.815				3				3				5	5	5
TC	L-04	2023	32.223	-80.808				5				5				5	5	5

Index	/ Par	rameter	Criteria							
			Poor	Fair	Good					
WATER	QUALI	TY								
	Wate	er Quality Index	< 3	$3 \leq x < 4$	≥ 4					
	D	issolved Oxygen (mg/L)	< 3	$3 \leq x < 4$	≥ 4					
	p	H (salinity corrected)	≤ 7.22	7.22 < x ≤ 7.35	> 7.35					
	F (	ecal Coliform cfu/100mL)	> 400	43 < x ≤ 400	≤ 43					
	E	utrophic Index	< 3	$3 \leq x < 4$	≥ 4					
		Total Nitrogen (mg/L)	> 1.05	0.81 < x ≤ 1.05	≤ 0.81					
		Total Phosphorus (mg/L)	> 0.12	0.10 < x ≤ 0.12	≤ 0.10					
		Chlorophyll a (µg/L)	> 16.4	11.5 < x ≤ 16.4	≤ 11.5					
SEDIME	NT QU	JALITY								
	Sedi	ment Quality Index	< 3	$3 \leq x \leq 4$	> 4					
	C	ontaminants (ERM-Q)	> 0.058	0.020 < x ≤ 0.058	≤ 0.020					
	Т	oxicity	≥ 2	1 ≤ x < 2	< 1					
	S	ediment TOC (%)	> 5	$3 \le x \le 5$	< 3					
BIOLOG	ICAL	CONDITION								
	Bent	hic-IBI	< 2	2 ≤ x < 3	≥ 3					
HABITA	T QUA	LITY								
	Habi	tat Quality Index	≤ 2	1.5 < x ≤ 2.5	> 2.5					

	U-03		U-01		M-03		M-01		L-03		L-02	
		202										1
Row Labels	2002	3	2002	2023	2002	2023	2002	2023	2002	2023	2002	2023
2,4'-DDD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2,4'-DDE	0.294	0	0.301	0	0	0	0.312	0	0.322	0	0	0
2,4'-DDT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4,4'-DDD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		1.3		1.204		0.965				0.70423		0.74143
4,4'-DDE	1.13	1	1.3	2	0.7	1	1.57	1.086855	0.179	9	0.733	1
4,4'-DDT	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Aldrin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chlorpyrifos	1.37	0	0.678	0	0.972	0	<mark>13</mark>	0	0.586	0	<mark>7.7</mark>	0
		0.7		0.823		0.772				0.82851		0.74143
cis-Chlordane	0.149	9	0.23	9	0.0983	1	0.192	0.865057	0	7	0.121	1
	1 424	1.3	1 601	1.204	0 7	0.965	1 000	1 006055	0 501	0.70423	0 722	0.74143
DDT_TOLAT	1.424	T	1.001	∠ 5 323	0.7	T	1.002	1.000000	0.301	2	0.755	T
Dieldrin	0	0	0	9.525	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.249	0
	0.412											
Endosulfan I	5	0	0.528	0	1.79	0	0.136	0	0.423	0	1.88	0
Endosulfan II	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Endosulfan sulfate	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gamma-HCH (g-BHC,												
lindane)	<mark>3.295</mark>	0	12.2	0	<mark>11.5</mark>	0	<mark>4.28</mark>	0	<mark>4.91</mark>	0	<mark>21.7</mark>	0
Heptachlor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1.133	0	<b>•</b> • • • •	0	0	0		0	1 1 4	0	0.005	0
Heptachlor epoxide	5	U	0.445	0	0	0	0.986	U	1.14	0	0.685	0
Vevachlorohenzene	0.031	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
llexaciitoropenzene	0.677	0.3	Ū	0.253		0.135	Ū	, in the second s	J.	Ū	Ū	~
Mirex	5	3	0.737	5	0	1	0.301	0.088722	0.28	0	0	0
	8.655	2.4		7.605		1.872	20.99			1.53275		1.48286
Total_Pest	4	2	16.552	5	15.0603	3	6	2.040634	7.84	6	33.068	2
Trans-nonachlor	0.162	0	0.133	0	0	0	0.219	0	0	0	0	0