BENTLEY UNIVERSITY

Introduction

- Coastal marine ecosystems are among the most productive and biodive Seagrass beds are declining globally, with an average loss of 1.5% of se coverage per year from 1879 to 2006².
- Diminished water quality and light availability are some of the largest three seagrasses³.
- In Lake Worth Lagoon (LWL), seagrass decline has been observed betw and 2018 (Figure 1). While seagrasses acreage increased in the North moderate-highly dense seagrass beds mapped in 2013 had sparse cove 2018⁴.
- To better understand the potential drivers of seagrass loss in LWL, we not understand the spatiotemporal patterns in light availability to seagrasses Lake Worth Lagoon Seagrass Coverage



Figure 1. Total seagrass coverage in Lake Worth Lagoon across its Northern, Central, and Southern reg

Objective

Our goals in this research were as follows:

- 1. Is there a spatio-temporal difference in light availability across LWL syste
- 2. Is there a relationship between light availability and seagrass cover LW
- 3. How does water clarity and quality influence the relationship between light
- seagrass cover in LWL?

Field Collection

Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Managemer began a lagoon-wide seagrass monitoring program in 2000. This monitoring has allowed PBC-ERM to assess long-term trends in seagrass distribution abundance across seagrass species prevailing in LWL⁵. PBC-ERM measur abundance using the Braun-Blanquet scale. PBC-ERM also collected photo active radiation (PAR) to quantify how much light reaches the seagrass. Ad LWL water quality data from the South Florida Water Management District assess water quality parameters not measured by PBC-ERM.

Figure 2 below maps LWL, the location of PBC-ERM's 10 transects (differer monitoring sites), and seagrass abundance. Each transect has 3 or 4 statio seagrasses and water quality parameters are monitored.





Figure 2. Map of LWL, the location of PBC-ERM's 10 transects, and seagrass abundance

Figure 3. Seagrass monitoring station at Transect 4 (top) and Halophila decipiens

Spatial and temporal trends in long-term seagrass coverage in Palm Beach County, Florida Anthony S. Milluzzo and Elizabeth W. Stoner Bentley University 175 Forest St Waltham, MA 02452

	Methods
erse globally ¹ . eagrass reats to ween 2007 region, region, erage by	Narrative Nutrient Criterion (NNCs) NNCs represent the uppermost acceptable levels for nutrient NNCs for Chlorophyll-a, Total Nitrogen, and Total Phosphorus criteria is expressed as an annual geometric mean (AGM) ex region's Chl-a (shown in bold below). For NNCs expressed as exceed the NNC more than once during a three-year period. NNC, the values should not exceed 10% of the NNC. Parameter North LWL NNC Chlorophyll-a (LC) 2.9 Total Nitrogen 0.54 0.66
S.	Figure 4. LWL NNCs for Chlorophyll-a, Total Nitrogen, and Total Phosphorus Light Availability PAR data was collected at the surface, middle, and bottom de following steps were used to convert those values into % Light 1. Compute average PAR at surface, middle, and bottom de 2. Compute light attenuation coefficients (K _d) for each transe $K_d = \frac{\Delta \ln(PAR Readings)}{\Delta(Depths)}$
gions	3. Convert K _d into % Light Available for each transect (% Lig Results
tem? L? ght and	 In SPSS (V. 28), we ran 2-way ANOVA evaluating the inter and geographic region (transect) on water clarity and qual Pearson bivariate correlations between seagrass cover ar We found no difference in light availability across transect was a difference in light availability between Fall 2021 and =0.02). Also, there was no interaction between transect ar We found no relationship between seagrass cover and lig 0.01, <i>P</i>=0.93) nor was there a significant relationship between individual seagrass species and light availability.
nt (PBC-ERM) g program and red seagrass osynthetic ditionally, was used to	 There is a difference in seagrass cover across the LWL (F differences in all aquatic vegetation parameters across trates of the cover of the cover of the cover of the cover. Chlorophyll-a, Total Nitrogen (TN), and Total Phosphorus of instances between January 2020 and July 2022 (Figure 5 substantial relationships between Chl-a, TN, and TP and I cover.
	B 2.00 1.80 1.60 1.40 1.20 0.80 0.80 0.20 0.00 1.00 0.20 0.00 1.00 0.20 0.00 1.00 0.20 0.00
	$C = 0.14$ $(1 \ 0.12)$ $(1 \ 0.12)$ $(1 \ 0.12)$ $(1 \ 0.12)$ $(1 \ 0.10)$ $(1 \ $

Figure 5. Distributions of Chlorophyll-a (A), Total Nitrogen (B), and Total Phosphorus (C) from January 2020 through July 2022. The red lines on the boxplots represent the NNC for each parameter. Boxplots are ordered from north to south.



