WELLS (WEL) National Estuarine Research Reserve Water Quality Metadata January-December 2003

Latest Update: July 1, 2021

- I. Data Set & Research Descriptors
- 1). Principal investigator & contact persons:

Address:

Wells NERR

342 Laudholm Farm Road

Wells, ME 04090

Phone: (207) 646-1555 FAX: (207) 646-2930

Contact Persons:

Dr. Michele Dionne, Research Coordinator

E-mail: dionne@wellsnerrcec.lib.me.us; (207) 646-1555 ext. 136

Jim Dochtermann, SWMP Technician

E-mail: jdoc@wellsnerrcec.lib.me.us; (207) 646-1555 ext. 104

Scott Orringer, Research Associate

E-mail: sorringer@wellsnerrcec.lib.me.us; (207) 646-1555 ext. 112

2). Entry verification:

The data are directly downloaded in the YSI-PC6000 format (as a .dat file) and $\frac{1}{2}$

the Comma Delimited format (as a .csv file) from the dataloggers to a PC lap-

top. The data are reviewed using the PC6000 software (Eco-Watch). Graphs and

basic statistics are then generated with the Eco-Watch program and the information is printed out for each data file. These graphs are used to determine any obvious data outliers and sonde and/or probe malfunction. All

downloaded data files from the dataloggers (both raw unedited .dat and .csv $\,$

files) are then transferred via disk to a Dell Inspiron 4100, where all

are reviewed and formatted for CDMO and stored. Here the raw unedited .csv data

files are imported into Microsoft Excel 2000. After a complete month of data

has been recorded, each file is ready to review, which requires several steps.

The NERR CDMO QA/QC Excel macros are used for all data.

The CDMO cdmomac3.xls macro will allow the user to automatically format column

widths to the correct number of decimal places based on YSI sensor

specifications. It also allows the user to QA/QC each data logger generated

file for missing data points, fill all cells that do not contain data with

periods, and find all data points that fall outside the range of what the data

logger is designed to measure (i.e. outliers). The CDMO import.xls macro will

allow PC users with 30-minute data to automatically create a monthly Excel file

from a two-week deployment and insert periods for missing data. In addition,

in November 1999 a graphing capability was added to this macro allowing users to produce single parameter and missing data point graphs on a monthly basis.

A data file is created (from the merged raw unedited .csv data files) in ${\tt Excel}$

format with a full month of data. The first step is to make sure that the

parameter columns are in the correct order, specified by the NERR CDMO. If any

parameters are not collected due to probe failure or other causes, the cells

with this missing data are filled in with periods (.) and documented and explained in the appropriate section of the metadata. Secondly, missing dates

and times are inserted in the data file where data were not collected due to

maintenance, sonde failure, etc., and the cells with this missing data are

filled in with periods (.) and documented and explained in the appropriate

section of the metadata. The first NERR CDMO QA/QC Excel macro is then run to $\,$

determine if there are any missing dates and times; and if so these missing $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left($

dates and times are inserted. Next, the second NERR CDMO QA/QC Excel macro is

used to find and filter all data readings outside the sonde specification measuring range for each parameter. Here the outlier data generated by the

second macro are examined and determined as either explained or unexplained

anomalies, as specified by NERR CDMO Operations Manual (Version 4.0). All

anomalous data (explained and unexplained) are documented and explained in the

appropriate sections of the metadata. The explained anomalous data are then

removed from the data file and replaced by periods. The unexplained anomalous

data are investigated for validity based on weather data, field observations,

instrument diagnostics, and Eco-Watch printouts. If these data are rejected

from the file then these are removed and replaced by periods. Lastly, the third

and final NERR CDMO QA/QC Excel macro is used to reformat all the columns in the $\,$

data file to the correct number of significant digits. After this last step,

once the file has been completely formatted and edited as specified by ${\scriptsize \mathtt{NERR}}$

CDMO, the file is saved as a Tab delimited (.txt) text file and sent by ${\tt FTP}$ to

the CDMO (where all periods were later removed for data dissemination purposes

and left blank). The metadata form is also submitted with the data file to the

CDMO, sent also as a text file (text only with line breaks). Jim Dochtermann and

Scott Orringer are responsible for this task of entry verification with the

analyses of suspect and anomalous data. Michele Dionne supervises, proofs and

answers questions with the evaluation of suspect and anomalous data.

The use of the newest (Version 3.0) National Estuarine Research Reserve (NERR)

System-Wide Monitoring Program (SWMP) YSI 6-Series Multi-Parameter Water Quality

Monitor Standard Operating Procedures began in December 2000 when they became available.

3). Research objectives:

The Webhannet River estuary is located in proximity to heavily used beaches in Wells, Maine. It has a shoreline that is highly developed with

residential and commercial structures. The estuary receives water from a 14 sq.

mi. watershed that is well forested. We are measuring variations in hydrologic

variables in the Webhannet River estuary at the Head of Tide and at the Inlet.

Data from Head of Tide will integrate surface and ground water inputs (from both

point and non-point sources) from the freshwater watershed into the estuary.

Data from the Inlet will integrate surface and ground water inputs from the

freshwater watershed and the estuarine watershed. Differences in data between

the Head of Tide and the Inlet will indicate inputs from the estuarine portion

of the watershed (on the \mbox{ebb} tide), and inputs from the \mbox{Gulf} of \mbox{Maine} on the

flood tide. The instruments will track runoff events via salinity, and will

measure pollutant-carrying sediment particles via turbidity. Our working hypothesis is that the freshwater watershed is the primary source of sediment

and therefore potential NPS pollutants in the estuary. These two variables will

indicate the potential for non-point source pollutants to enter the estuary, and

whether they are of upland, estuarine, or Gulf of Maine origin. Other variables

measured by the data loggers (DO, temperature, pH, specific conductivity, and

water level) will provide important baseline data to track changes in the estuary's physicochemical parameters over the long term. These variables can be

affected by changes in human water use, and by natural or human induced changes

in inlet and river channel morphology, climate, and organic loadings. The Inlet

site is heavily impacted at the Wells Harbor dock and is our long-term monitoring site. The Head of Tide site is relatively unimpacted, located just

east of the Route One Bridge, and is our roving site. We also collect data at

the Mile Road site, which is our creek site, as well as the Little River Mouth

site, which is our comparative system site.

4). Research Methods

The Wells NERR YSI monitoring program began in April 1995 at one site

(Head of Tide site-HT) and May 1995 at a second site (Inlet site-IN) in the

Webhannet River estuary. Two additional sites were added in 2002, Mile Road

(ML) site began in March in the Webhannet River estuary and Little River Mouth

(LM) in April in the Little River Estuary. The four data loggers are installed

with bottom moorings, as described below. Both data loggers have 1/4 inch black

vector mesh placed on the outside (using rubber bands) of the sonde guard to

prevent fouling and unwanted animals. All deployment structures (PVC tubes)

described below are labeled with the Wells NERR information.

*IMPORTANT CHANGES TO NOTE AT THE INLET SITE (IN) where our telemetry unit is

stationed: A new vented level YSI 6600 with its new vented level cable was

deployed to collect its first data on 5/4/99 at 12:00. The YSI telemetry unit

began collecting its first data on 3/16/98 at 10:30:00.

The Inlet site (IN) deployment methods are different than the other sites (HT,ML,LM), due to the installation of a YSI telemetry unit. A 23 foot, 4 inch

diameter high grade PVC tube was installed against a dock piling. Four steel

flat bars with bolts were used to attach this 23 foot PVC tube against the dock

piling. A 3 by 1.5 inch PVC transducer was glued on the inside bottom of the $\,$

PVC tube to allow the sonde to sit exactly 1.0 meter $(3.28\,\,\text{ft})$ off the bottom.

Several vertical holes, representative of the sonde guard, were cut out the

circumference near the bottom of the PVC pipe to allow water flow to the probes.

An "L" shaped steel bar with two end-holes is placed through two created slits

about a half of foot from the top of the PVC tube. A stainless steel wire $\,$

(1/16") is attached to the sonde bail using two stainless steel clips; and to

one end of the "L" shaped steel bar for sonde deployment and retrieval. $\ensuremath{\mathtt{A}}$

marine lock is attached through the other end of the "L" shaped steel bar to

hold the bar, wire, and sonde in place and for security. A PVC threaded cap

screws in to the threaded top of the PVC tube, also for security. A hole was

created in the PVC cap to allow the sonde to hook up with the telemetry unit $\ensuremath{\mathsf{E}}$

using the 50 foot cable. The collection of data parameters at the Inlet (IN)

site are slightly different then at the roving sites, due to the telemetry $\ensuremath{\mathsf{E}}$

unit installation. Two to four week variable sampling periods were chosen due

to limitations created by the life of the dissolved oxygen membrane and probe

fouling. Battery power is not needed anymore within the sonde itself (although,

battery power is needed during calibrations and downloading) at the time of

deployment at this site because of the telemetry unit's solar batter power.

Measurements of temperature, specific conductivity, salinity, percent

saturation, dissolved oxygen, depth, pH, and turbidity are recorded at 30 minute

intervals throughout the deployment period. Time, date, and battery voltage are

no longer programmed to be recorded by the sonde, since these parameters are

already programmed with the Eco-Watch Program (see YSI's Eco-Watch Users Guide).

The other sites, Head of Tide (HT), Mile Road (ML), and Little River Mouth $\,$

(LM) are deployed similarly, except for sonde height off the bottom (see below).

These sites use a 5 foot, 4 inch diameter high grade PVC tube. The PVC tube is

attached to a 12 foot, heavy steel sign post using a stainless steel bolt at the

bottom of the tube, a stainless steel cable wrap at the top, and several thick

electrical cable ties in between. The steel sign post was pounded in about 6

feet into the river bottom, such that the bottom of the PVC tube was flat on the $\ensuremath{\mathsf{E}}$

river bottom. The PVC tube has one 3 by 1.5 inch PVC transducer glued on the $\ensuremath{^{15}}$

inside bottom of the PVC tube to allow the sonde to sit exactly at a $\operatorname{certain}$

height off the bottom (see below). Several vertical holes, representative of

the sonde guard, were cut out the circumference near the bottom of the PVC pipe $\,$

to allow water flow to the probes. An "L" shaped steel bar with two endholes

is placed through two created slits about a half of foot from the top of the $\ensuremath{\operatorname{PVC}}$

tube. A stainless steel wire (1/16") is attached to the sonde bail using two

stainless steel clips; and to one end of the "L" shaped steel bar for sonde

deployment and retrieval. A marine lock is attached through the other end of

the "L" shaped steel bar to hold the bar, wire, and sonde in place and for $\$

security. A flotation buoy is tied to the PVC tubes incase the deployment $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +$

structure ever gets dislodged. The deployment depth for these sites is such

that the probe-end of the data logger is secured 0.30 meters $(1.0 \ \text{ft})$ off the bottom.

Two to four week variable sampling periods were chosen for the data sonde

due to limitations created by the life of the dissolved oxygen membrane, probe

fouling, and limited battery power. Measurements of temperature, specific

conductivity, salinity, percent saturation, dissolved oxygen, depth, pH, and

turbidity are recorded at 30 minute intervals throughout the deployment period.

After the deployment period, the data logger is brought back into the $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right)$

Wells Reserve Laboratory for downloading, cleaning, and calibration. These

procedures are carried out to the methods described in the YSI Operating Manual.

Calibration standards are needed and used for only specific conductivity (10)

mS/cm), pH (buffer solutions of pH 4, 7, and 10), and turbidity (100 NTU).

Conductivity and pH standards are purchased from Fisher Scientific. Turbidity

standards are purchased from Advanced Polymer Systems, Inc. (Redwood City, CA).

The dissolved oxygen membranes are replaced and sit 6-24 hours before each

deployment. After approximately 6-24 hours of down time for cleaning, maintenance and recalibration, the YSI Data logger is redeployed for another

sampling period. Also, with our extra data sonde, we have been reducing the

amount of time of missing data from calibrations and maintenance.

The use of the newest (Version 3.0) National Estuarine Research Reserve (NERR)

System-Wide Monitoring Program (SWMP) YSI 6-Series Multi-Parameter Water Quality

Monitor Standard Operating Procedures began in December 2000 when they became available.

5). Site location and character

The Wells National Estuarine Research Reserve is located in York County,

within the Town of Wells, on the coast of southern Maine and faces the Atlantic

Ocean. The Wells NERR is approximately 31 km (20 miles) south of Portland, $\,$

Maine and 110 km (70 miles) north of Boston, Massachusetts. The Reserve encompasses 1,690 acres along the Gulf of Maine coastline of tidally-flushed

wetlands, riparian and transitional upland fields and forests within the Little

River Estuary and the larger Webhannet River Estuary. Both estuaries arise in

the sandy glacial outwash plain about eight miles inland. Both rivers empty

into Wells Bay, a sandy basin stretching for approximately ten miles along the

Atlantic coast. Bordering each river's inlet are double spit barrier beaches

attached to the mainland. The backbarrier system in the Webhannet River Estuary

is approximately 5 sq. km and is composed of large intertidal marshes (predominantly S. patens and S. alterniflora), intertidal sand and mud flats,

and tidal channels. The watershed for the Webhannet River estuary covers an

area of 35 sq. km and has a total of 6 streams, brooks or creeks, which enter $\,$

the estuary. These tributaries flow across sand and gravel deposits near the

headwaters and the impermeable sandy muds of the Presumpscot Formation in the

lower reaches. The watershed for the Little River estuary covers an area of 84

 $\operatorname{sq.}$ km and has a total of 2 tributaries. The backbarrier system in the Little

River Estuary is approximately 2.51 sq. km and is composed of large intertidal

marshes (predominantly S. patens and S. alterniflora), intertidal sand and $\operatorname{\mathsf{mud}}$

flats, and tidal channels. The Webhannet River is connected to the ocean via

Wells Inlet, which has a spring tidal prism of 28,200,000 cub. m (Ward 1993).

The Little River is connected to the ocean by an unstructured, double spit

system and is one of the few tidal inlets along the southern Maine coast that is $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$

not stabilized by either natural outcrops or artificial jetties. The force and

volume of tidal action affect the salinity level of both rivers. In the $\operatorname{\mathtt{Wells}}$

region, the annual mean wave height is almost 20 inches. These estuarine systems are dominated by semi-diurnal tides having a range of 8.5 to 9.8 feet

The volume of freshwater influx into both estuaries is moderate to low (on the

order of $0.5\ \text{cubic meters/second}$), especially in the summer, because of the

rivers' relatively small drainage areas and the presence of deep glacial deposits. The relatively low flows from these two rivers taken in with the 20

inch per year average runoff of the area surrounding the estuaries combine to

form a fresh water flow which is dwarfed by tidal flushing. Twelve-foot tides

dwarf the freshwater flow into the Webhannet estuary, which has a drainage area

of 14.1 square miles. The Merriland River and Branch Brook meet south of Route 9

to form the Little River which drains an area of $10.75~\mathrm{sq.}$ miles. The Webhannet

estuary, fed by both Blacksmith and Depot Brooks, is adjacent to the harbor and

greatly developed land. It offers a valuable opportunity for comparison with

the relatively pristine Little River estuary. The land use of the Webhannet

estuary include a total of 15% for wetland, fresh water, and tidal marsh; a

total of 63.7 % for woodland; and a total of 18.6% for developed land compared

to a total of 5.7% development in the Little River estuary (WNERR RMA 1996;

Holden 1997).

The following information regarding annual weather patterns in the area was supplied by Maine State Climatologist Professor Gregory A. Zielinski extracted from "Monthly Station Normals of Temperature, Precipitation,

Heating and Cooling Degree Days 1971-2000", Climatography of the United States No. 81, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Climatic Data Center, Asheville, NC. and "Daily Normals of Temperature, Precipitation, and Heating and Cooling Degree Days, 1971-2000", Climatography

of the United States No. 84: "Average monthly temperatures range from 21.6F

in January to 66.7F in July with daily highs averaging just below freezing

in January and lows around 11F. Daily highs in July average around 76F and

daily lows around 57F. The sea breeze often keeps daily highs lower during

the summer than areas inland. Annual average temperature is 44.6F. Annual precipitation is 47.07 inches, including the water equivalent of snowfall,

with monthly averages ranging from 3.01 inches in July to 4.77 inches in October. August receives just 3.02 inches on average. Annual snowfall is around 66 inches." According to Zielinski, "cool ocean temperatures keep down the number of afternoon showers and especially thunderstorms resulting

in low summer precipitation amounts."

There are three sampling sites in the Webhannet River estuary. These are

located at the Head of Tide, Mile Road, and at the Inlet. The tidal range at

each of these sites is 2.6-2.9 meters.

The Head of Tide site (43 deg 17' 54.25227" Latitude, 70 deg 35' 13.82728"

Longitude) is located 4 miles south of the Wells Reserve, just downstream of the

Webhannet Falls (freshwater) and 10 feet east of Route One. Route One is used

heavily with traffic all year, especially during the summer tourist months.

This site has soft mud, sand, and a rocky substrate, and the low and high tide

depth is relatively shallow. The salinity range here is $0-31~\mathrm{ppt}$, with a mean

of 3.6 ppt. These headwaters of the Webhannet are relatively undeveloped.

This site is located just 10 feet east of the Route One bridge, and is our $\ensuremath{\text{\text{out}}}$

roving site.

The Mile Road site is located 3.5 miles south of the Wells Reserve, on

Mile Road roughly 300' north of the bridge (N43 deg 18.300' Latitude, W 70 deg

34.583 Longitude). This site has soft mud and a rocky substrate, and the low

and high tide depth is relatively shallow. The salinity range here is 3.6-33.4

ppt, with a mean of 27.0 ppt.

The Inlet site is located 1.5 miles south of the Wells Reserve, at the $\,$

Wells Harbor pier (43 deg 19' 12.44804" Latitude, 70 deg 33' 13.82728" Longitude). The mouth of the Webhannet estuary forms an extensive wetland/salt

marsh area which is surrounded by development. Wells Harbor, which was most

recently dredged in 1971, has moorings for approximately 200 commercial fishing

and recreational boats. The mouth of the river flows between two jetties to the

Atlantic Ocean. This channel was dredged in 1974. This site has a predominately sand substrate and is characterized by strong current during

incoming and outgoing tides. The maximum depth of the Inlet site is 3 meters.

The salinity range here is 7-35 ppt, with a mean of 31 ppt. The Inlet site is

heavily impacted at the Wells Harbor dock and is our long-term monitoring site.

The Little River Mouth site is located .4 miles of the Wells Reserve. Due $\,$

to problems with heavy sediment movement in the inlet of the Little River, we

were forced to relocate the site (see 2002 metadata). We designated a new location for the 2003 sampling season (N 43 deg 20.413 Latitude, W 70 deg 32.441

Longitude). It is located just off the bank of the marsh, in the main channel of

the river, upstream from the previous year's sites. The first location attempted

in 2002 (N 43 deg 20.176 Latitude, W 70 deg 32.497 Longitude) was located in the

main channel of the river, just inland of a spit, beside a bank. The second

location attempted in 2002 (N 43 deg 20.083 Latitude, W 70 deg 32.585 Longitude)

was located $1/8~\mathrm{mi.}$ southwest of the first site, within an inlet, just inland of

a spit. The second site was located in an area of much lower current than

first site and often drains completely during low tides. It was also placed

within a pool next to incipient low marsh peat that retains calm water during

low tides. Both sites were abandoned in 2002. The tidal range of the Little

River estuary is 2.6-3.0 meters (Mariano and FitzGerald, 1988). The Little River

sites existed in a shallow and relatively pristine system with a sandy to $\ensuremath{\mathsf{mud}}$

bottom and a salinity range of $0-32~\mathrm{ppt}$. There are two major freshwater inputs,

the Merriland and Branch Brook Rivers, which converge to form the Little River.

6). Data collection period:

The Webhannet River Head of Tide (HT) site data collection was redeployed

(after being pulled in every December from 1995-2001) on March 18, 15:30 and

pulled after December 16, 11:00 for the winter months to prevent ice damage.

This site gets a large amount of ice coverage from December through late March. The Webhannet River Mile Road (ML) site data collection was redeployed

(following a CICEET project) on March 18, 16:30 and pulled after December 16,

10:30 for the winter months to prevent ice damage. This site gets a large amount

of ice coverage from December through late March. The Webhannet River Inlet (IN) $\,$

site data collection began January 1, 2004 00:00. The IN datalogger is ongoing

throughout the year and is considered our long-term monitoring site, as this

site remains relatively ice-free. The Little River Mouth (LM) site data

collection began March 25, 14:00 and ended December 30, 13:00 for winter months

to prevent ice damage. This site gets a large amount of ice coverage fro December through late March.

Deployment and retrieval dates and times, model YSI 6-series sonde used for 2003:

2003:						
BEGAN		ENDED		SONDE	MODEL	
Head of Ti						
03/18/03,	15:30	04/10/03,	12:00		6600	
04/10/03,	12:30	05/06/03,	14:00		6600	
05/06/03,	14:30	05/29/03,	13:30		6600	
05/29/03,	14:00	07/11/03,	08:30		6600	
07/11/03,	09:00	08/05/03 ,	11:00		6600	
08/06/03,	17:00	09/08/03,	10:00		6600	
09/09/03,	10:00	10/08/03,	13:00		6600	
10/09/03,	13:30	11/12/03,	14:00		6600	
11/13/03,	16:00	12/16/03,	11:00		6600	
M'l. D. d						
Mile Road 03/18/03,	Site 16:30	04/09/03,	10:30		6600	
04/10/03,	12:00	04/09/03,	12:00		6600	
04/10/03,	12:30	05/21/03,	10:00		6600	
05/21/03,	10:30	07/01/03,	08:30		6600	
07/01/03,	09:00	08/04/03,	09:30		6600	
08/05/03,	11:00	08/04/03,	15:00		6600	
08/03/03,	16:30	09/30/03,	09:00		6600	
10/02/03,	10:30	11/06/03,	14:30		6600	
11/07/03,	15:30	12/02/03,	14:00		6600	
12/03/03,	15:00	12/02/03,	11:00		6600	
12/03/03,	13.00	12/10/03,	11.00		0000	
Inlet Site	9					
12/10/02,		01/06/03,	14:00		6600	
01/08/03,	16:00	02/03/03,	13:30		6600	
02/04/03,	14:00	03/05/03,	13:00		6600	
03/06/03,	14:00	03/31/03,	11:30		6600	
04/01/03,	10:00	05/14/03,	10:00		6600	
05/15/03,	10:00	06/02/03,	12:00		6600	
06/03/03,	14:00	06/30/03,	12:30		6600	
07/01/03,	12:30	07/23/03,	07:30		6600	
07/24/03,	09:00	08/25/03,	09:00		6600	
08/27/03,	12:00	-crash-			6600	
10/02/03,	17:30	10/28/03,	11:30		6600	
10/29/03,		12/10/03,			6600	
12/11/03,		12/31/03,			6600	
12/31/03,	17:30	01/22/04,	11:30		6600	
Little River Mouth Site						
03/25/03,			08:30		6600	
04/17/03,		05/20/03,			6600	
05/20/03,		06/19/03,			6600	
06/19/03,		07/07/03,			6600	
50/±5/05 /		01,01,00,	12.00		3000	

07/07/03,	12:30	08/04/03,	11:00	6600
08/05/03,	12:30	09/03/03,	12:00	6600
09/04/03,	13:30	10/15/03,	09:30	6600
10/16/03,	11:00	11/19/03,	13:30	6600
11/20/03,	15:00	12/30/03,	13:00	6600

7). Distribution

According to the Ocean and Coastal Resource Management Data Dissemination Policy

for the NERRS System-wide Monitoring Program,

 ${\tt NOAA/ERD}$ retains the right to analyze, synthesize and publish summaries of the

NERRS System-wide Monitoring Program data. The PI retains the right to be

fully credited for having collected and processed the data. Following academic

courtesy standards, the PI and NERR site where the data were collected will be $\,$

contacted and fully acknowledged in any subsequent publications in which any

part of the data are used. Manuscripts resulting from the NOAA/OCRM supported research that are produced for publication in open literature, including refereed scientific journals. Will acknowledge that the research was

conducted under an award from the Estuarine Reserves Division, Office of Ocean ${\sf Ocean}$

and Coastal Resource Management, National Ocean Service, National Oceanic and

Atmospheric Administration. The data set enclosed within this package/ transmission is only as good as the quality assurance and quality control procedures outlined by the enclosed metadata reporting statement. The user

bears all responsibility for its subsequent use/misuse in any further analyses

or comparisons. The Federal government does not assume liability to the Recipient of third persons, nor will the Federal government reimburse or indemnify the Recipient for its liability due to any losses resulting in any way

from the use of this data.

NERR water quality data and metadata can be obtained from the Research Coordinator at the individual NERR site (please see section 1. Principal investigators and contact persons), from the Data Manager at the Centralized

Data Management Office (please see personnel directory under general information

link on CDMO homepage) and online at the CDMO homepage

http://cdmo.baruch.sc.edu. Data are available in text tab-delimited
format,

Microsoft Excel spreadsheet format and comma-delimited format.

8). Associated researchers and projects

WELLS NATIONAL ESTUARINE RESEARCH RESERVE RESEARCH AT THE RESERVE for 2002

(Please visit our website: www.wellsreserve.org/research.htm for further information on the Wells NERR research program):

The Research Program at the Wells NERR conducts and supports research, monitoring, workshops, and research/resource management planning of relevance at

local, regional and national levels. The overall aim of our work is to produce

science-based information needed to sustain or restore Gulf of Maine coastal

habitats and resources, especially those found in salt marsh estuaries and

watersheds. During 2000-2001 twenty-three different studies (involving 79

scientists, students, and staff $\,$ from the Reserve, 26 academic institutions and

19 resource management groups) focused on several related themes:1) the quality

of water resources in salt marsh estuaries and watersheds 2) land conservation

strategies to protect coastal watersheds 3) factors controlling salt marsh

accretion, erosion and plant community vigor 4) the value of salt marsh as

habitat for fish, shellfish and birds, and 5) restoration of salt marsh habitat

degraded through human actions.

Estuarine Water Resource Quality

Water quality is monitored continuously at several stations with automated

instruments as part of a NERRS systemwide monitoring program, as well as bimonthly at 15--20 stations through our WET volunteer monitoring program. The

WET program also monitors two important biological parameters: fecal coliform

bacterial contamination (an indicator of human health risk) and phytoplankton

productivity (an indicator of estuarine health). These data have 1) allowed us

to identify several bacterial "hot spots" that we will be working to eliminate,

2) are used to identify and open areas safe for shellfishing, and 3) have uncovered a relation between tides and low dissolved oxygen (a stressful condition for marine life) that needs further study. Our water quality work has

contributed to the designation of several Priority Watersheds in coastal Southern Maine by the Maine Department of Environmental Protection.

Coastal Conservation Strategies

The Coastal Mosaic Project is a new program developed in response to requests

for support from the conservation community to increase the quantity, $\ensuremath{\text{quality}}$

and ecological integrity of conserved lands in our region. Research staff $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +$

organize and facilitate meetings, workshops, and communications for 18 partner

conservation groups. A key element of the Project is the Conservation Resource

Center, a Reserve staffed GIS facility with a growing database able to provide maps of property, natural features and other data needed to develop

effective conservation goals and strategies. The Project is nearing completion

of conservation lands maps for 13 Southern Maine coastal towns, and is undertaking an initiative to develop coastal watershed conservation strategies

for 12 coastal watersheds within these towns. The Reserve has a particular

interest in educating communities about the ecologic and economic benefits of

land conservation, especially along estuarine and riverine shorelines.

Salt Marsh Habitats and Communities

Factors that control the dynamics and vigor of salt marsh plant communities and

marsh peat formation consequently determine the ability of a salt marsh to

persist in the face of sea level rise. Through a combination of experimental

manipulations and long term monitoring, a number of multi-year studies are

currently producing data to answer questions concerning the sustainability of $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1$

salt marsh habitats in this region. These studies are looking at nutrient-plant

relations, plant community responses to physical and hydrologic disturbance, and

the relative contribution of short-term natural events (e.g. storms) and human

activities (dredging, tidal restriction) on patterns of sediment accretion and $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +\left($

erosion. The Reserve's marshes and beaches are already among the best studied

sites in the U.S. with regard to long term accretion and erosion (over thousands of years).

HABITAT VALUE FOR FISH, SHELLFISH AND BIRDS

The Reserve combines long-term monitoring with periodic surveys and short-term

experiments to identify species and measure trends and changes in populations of

fish, crustaceans, clams and birds. We have 10 years of data on upland and

shore birds with which to assess the status of resident and migratory avian $\frac{1}{2}$

populations, and 8 years of wading bird data that we use as a gross level indicator of salt marsh health, which appears to be stable. Our periodic larval, juvenile and adult fish surveys have produced the best available data

for fish utilization of salt marsh estuaries in the Gulf of Maine. In the

coming year we plan to develop a long-term monitoring program for finfish that.

will be coordinated with other sites within the Gulf of Maine and along the east

coast. Since 1994 we have been conducting surveys and field experiments to look

at the survival and growth of hatchery seed, juvenile and adult softshell

with regard to habitat characteristics and predation by the invasive green crab.

Salt Marsh Degradation and Restoration

Salt marsh ecosystems in the Gulf of Maine have sustained themselves in the

face of sea-level rise and other natural disturbances for nearly five thousand

years. Since colonial times large areas of salt marsh (up to half of the total

area) have been lost through diking, draining and filling. Today, the remaining

marshland is fairly well protected from outright destruction, but during the

past 100 years, and especially since the 1950's, salt marshes have been divided $\,$

into fragments by roads, causeways, culverts and tide gates. Most of these

fragments have severly restricted tidal flow, leading to chronic habitat degradation and greatly reduced access for fish and other marine species. Since

1991, the Wells Reserve has been studying the impact of these restrictions on

salt marsh functions and values, and the response of salt marshes to tidal

restoration. We have been working to promote an awareness of the damage being

done and the benefits of salt marsh restoration throughout the Gulf of Maine.

Research Program Update:

In addition to the Reserve-sponsored projects outlined above, numerous visiting

investigators will be involved in on-site research. Topics include: the effects

of land use, sea level, and climate on estuarine productivity; the relationship

between soil nutrients and plant community patterns; the influence of soil

salinity on plant community interactions; the effect of tidal restriction on

marsh peat accretion; the comparative ecology of fringe marshes and back barrier

marshes; habitat use by upland birds, and the ecology of lyme disease.

• The Wells NERR Research Dept. is working on the following projects: "Ecological processes, energy pathways, and the impact of human activities on Maine marsh-estuarine secondary production: a salt marsh panne model". We used stable isotopic tracers (15N additions and naturally abundant 13C) coupled with secondary production measurements (nekton, invertebrates) to track energy flow on the high marsh surface in southern Maine salt marsh systems. The project is still under way.

"Ecological Functions of Fringing Salt Marshes Susceptible to Oil Spills in Casco Bay, Maine". We examined the ecological function of 9 different fringing marsh systems in Casco Bay that ranged from undisturbed to disturbed. Physical parameters measured included sedimentation rates, total suspended solids, and tidal range. Biological parameters included primary production, macroinvertebrate community composition and secondary production (4cm sediment cores), and resident and transient nekton community composition (fyke net). The project is still under way.

"BENTHIC HABITAT CORRELATES OF JUVENILE FISH DISTRIBUTION IN THE BIGELOW BIGHT AND ADJACENT ESTUARIES: LINKAGES BETWEEN FISH, HABITATS, SUBSTRATE AND HUMAN ACTIVITY". This project was a collaboration between the Wells N.E.R.R. and several members of the local fishing community. Through the use of beam trawls, gill nets, fish traps, van veen ponar, and a sediment profile imager (SPI camera), we are attempting to correlate benthic habitat type to juvenil groundfish an dinvertebrate assemblages in estuarine, nearshore, and offshore habitat. Stations were also established near dredge spoil dump sites as well as sweage outflow to determine the impacts of human activity on the coast to benthic habitat. The project is still under way.

• The Wells NERR Research Dept. also completed the work on the following project:

In partnership with the York Rivers Association and the Town of York, the Wells

Reserve conducted a survey of the York River watershed. In this survey, volunteers looked for sources of pollution within a 250-foot buffer of the river

and its tributaries (erosion, trash and debris and runoff from roads and lawns

could have a negative impact on water quality). Most pollutants entering water

bodies come from such undefined sources. Therefore, this type of survey is

the best way to begin to address the problems of pollution in a water body. The

idea of the project was to work with the community and landowners to help them

understand the problems that come from these types of pollution and learn activities they might be able to do on their own land that would help prevent

this pollution from entering the water. The results of the survey will become

part of a Watershed Management Plan to improve and restore the water quality of $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +\left($

the York River.

- •The Wells NERR Research Dept. is involved with the following CICEET* Projects-
- I. Project Title: Estuarine Responses to Dredging: Analysis of Sedimentary and

Morphological Change in Back Barrier Marsh to Aid Local Management and Develop a

Regional Management Tool Principal Investigator (s): Michele Dionne, Wells NERR,

ME; Duncan Fitzgerald, Boston University; Joe Kelley, University of Maine; David

Burdick and Larry Ward, University of New Hampshire

Management Issue: Coastal management tool for assessing the impacts of dredging

in estuaries. Project Summary: An adequate supply of sediment is essential for

maintaining salt marshes. Human activities, such as channel dredging and tidal

restriction due to road construction, can alter water flows in estuaries and

result in dramatic changes in salt marsh sediment supply, affecting the speed of

salt marsh erosion. The objective of this project is to determine the impact of

dredging and tidal restriction on salt marshes in the Wells NERR. A digital

coastal management guide will be created on CD ROM, providing coastal managers $\,$

with useful conceptual models for predicting the impacts of dredging and other

activities that affect water flow and sediment deposition in salt marshes.

II. Project Title: Microbial Source Tracking in Two Southern Maine Watersheds. A

two year project written by Maine Sea Grant associate Kristen Whiting-Grant, and

funded by Cooperative Institute for Coastal and Estuarine Environmental

Technology (CICEET), involving Wells NERR, UNH Jackson Estuarine Lab (JEL), USM

Muskie School, AmeriCorps and the Maine Conservation Corps. We are pioneering

the use inMaine of genetic analysis as a means of determining the source species

associated with bacterial contamination in the Webhannet andLittle River Estuary. Volunteers collect water samples from streams and the estuaries, staff

test for and isolate E. coli.

At JEL, a genetic technique (ribotyping) creates a genetic fingerprint of the

bacteria which is compared to known sources. The project is still underway.

*The following information on CICEET taken directly from its website: (http://www.ciceet.unh.edu)

Other Onsite Research:

Michele Dionne, Wells NERR, Nancy McReel, Chuck Lubelczyk Project Title: Effect of herbivory by deer on forest regeneration

June Ficker

Project Title: Monitoring avian productivity and survivorship

Outside Researchers:

•Theresa Theodose, Ph.D., University of Southern Maine Project Title: Relationships between soil nutrient availability and species composition of a high salt marsh in southern Maine.

•David Burdick, Ph.D. and Roelof Boumans, Ph.D. University of New Hampshire, University of Maryland Project Title: Sediment dynamics in salt marshes: functional assessment of

•Peter Rand, M.D., Chuck Lubelczyk, Robert Smith, M.D.

Maine Medical Center

accretionary biofilters

Project Title: Ecological determinants of the spread of the tick vector of Lyme

disease and other pathogens.

- II. Physical Structure Descriptors
- 9). Variable sequence, range of measurements, units, resolution, and accuracy:

YSI 6600 datalogger

Variable Range of Measurements Resolution

Accuracy
Date 1-12, 1-31, 00-99 (Mo,Day,Yr) 1 mo, 1 day, 1 yr NA
Time 0-24, 0-60, 0-60 (Hr,Min,Sec) 1 hr, 1 min, 1 s NA

Temp	-5 to 45 (c)	0.01 C	+/-
0.15C			
Sp COND	0-100 (mS/cm)	0.01mS/cm	+/-0.5%
Of			
reading + 0.001mS/	Cm		
Salinity 0-70	Parts per thousand (ppt)	0.01 ppt	+/- 1%
of			
Reading or 0.1 ppt	, (whichever is greater)		
DO 0-20	0 (% air saturation)	0.1% @air sat	+/-2%
@air			
Saturation			
DO 200-	500 (% air saturation	0.1% @ air sat	+/- 6%
@			
Saturation			
DO	0-20 (mg/l)	0.01 mg/l	+/-
0.2mg/l			
DO	20-50 (mg/1)	0.01 mg/l	+/-
0.6mg/l			
Depth (shallow)	0-9.1 (m)	0.001m	+/-
0.018m			
PH	2-14 units	0.01 units	+/-
0.2units			
Turb	0-1000 NTU	0.1 NTU	+/- 5%
of			

Reading or 2 NTU (whichever is greater)

Data columns are separated by tabs. Each file contains a two line column header at the top of the page which identifies measurements and units for each column.

10). Coded variable indicator and variable code definitions:

Site definitions: HT = Head of Tide of Webhannet River

ML = Mile Road near mid-point of estuarine portion of

Webhannet River

IN = Inlet at Webhannet River Mouth

LM = Little River Mouth

File definitions: YSI deployment site/file definition/month/year (ex: INWQ0703

= Webhannet Inlet water quality data from July 2003).

11). Data anomalies:

January, 2003 Sampling Period

Head of Tide: None to report; sonde not deployed until March. Mile Road: None to report; sonde not deployed until March. Little River Mouth: None to report; sonde not deployed until March.

Inlet:

a) For the month of January there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

 $\ensuremath{^{-2}}$ NTU specifications of the probe. Several values did go beyond the probe

specifications (-3 to -7 NTU) but are probably still due to the possible calibration error. Data were retained.

b) There was one high positive turbidity spike (>1000 NTU) that occurred during $\left(\right)$

the deployment that was not consistent with the overall data record, possibly

due to an obstruction in front of the optics of the probe. This suspect datum

was not deleted, as we are not absolutely sure that this value is bad (the post $\frac{1}{2}$

calibration checked out normal).

Date Time Turb 01/03/2003 01:00 1564

February, 2003 Sampling Period

Head of Tide: None to report; sonde not deployed until March.

Mile Road: None to report; sonde not deployed until March.

Little River Mouth: None to report; sonde not deployed until March.

Inlet: None to report

March, 2003 Sampling Period

Head of Tide:

a) No data on 3/1 0:00 to 3/18 15:00; this was the first logger deployment (3/18

at 15:30) at this site for 2003.

b) For the month of March there were several negative and/or zero turbidity $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

-2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.

c) All depth data from 3/18 15:30 to 3/20 10:30 is suspect due to large piece of

ice completely knocking over the sonde and its deployment structure.

Inlet:

a) For the month of March there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the $\ensuremath{\mathsf{N}}$

-2 NTU specifications of the probe. Several values did go beyond the probe

specifications (-3 to -9 NTU) but are probably still due to the possible calibration error. All data were retained.

b) There was one high positive turbidity spike (>1000 NTU) that occurred during $\frac{1}{2}$

the deployment that was not consistent with the overall data record, possibly

due to an obstruction in front of the optics of the probe. This suspect datum

was not deleted, as we are not absolutely sure that this value is bad (the post

calibration checked out normal).

Date Time Turb 03/29/2003 13:00 1144

Mile Road

a) No data on 3/1 0:00 to 3/18 16:00; this was the first logger deployment (3/19

at 16:30) at this site for 2003.

b) For the month of March there was one negative turbidity value. While this may

be due to a small calibration error, it is within the $\mbox{-2}$ NTU specifications of

the probe. Data were retained.

DATE TIME VALUE 03/25/2003 19:00 -0001

Little River Mouth:

a) No data on 3/1 0:00 to 3/25 13:30; this was the first logger deployment (3/25 at 14:00) at this site for 2003.

April, 2003 Sampling Period

Head of Tide:

a) For the month of April there were several negative and/or zero turbidity $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.
- b) For the month of April there were several shallow negative and/or zero depth

data (198 values with a range of -0.01 to -0.11 m; mean of -0.046m). Sonde

probes suspected to be underwater as other parameters check out normal. These

data were not deleted.

Inlet:

a) For the month of April there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the $\,$

-2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.

Mile Road:

a) The following are shallow negative and/or zero depth data (42 values with a

range of -0.01 to -0.2 m; mean of -0.09m). Sonde probes suspected to be underwater as other parameters check out normal. These data were not deleted.

DATE TIME

04/12/2003 13:00-14:00

```
04/13/2003 14:30-15:30
04/15/2003 03:30-05:00
04/15/2003 15:00-17:30
04/16/2003 03:30-06:00
04/16/2003 16:30-18:30
04/21/2003 09:00-10:30
04/22/2003 09:30-11:00
04/23/2003 10:30-12:00
04/24/2003 11:30-12:00
```

b) For the month of April there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

-2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.

Little River Mouth:

a) For the month of April there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.
- b) There was a high positive turbidity spike (>1000 NTU) that occurred during

the deployment that was not consistent with the overall data record, possibly

due to an obstruction in front of the optics of the probe. This suspect ${\tt datum}$

was not deleted, as we are not absolutely sure that this value is bad (the post

calibration checked out normal).

Date Time Turb 04/27/2003 13:30 1130

May, 2003 Sampling Period

Head of Tide:

- a) For the month of May there were several negative and/or zero turbidity values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the $\frac{1}{2}$
- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Several values did go beyond the probe

specifications $(-3 \ \text{NTU})$ but are probably still due to the possible calibration

error. All data were retained.

b) For the month of May there were several shallow negative and/or zero depth

data (162 values with a range of -0.01 to -0.06 m; mean of -0.026m). Sonde

probes suspected to be underwater as other parameters check out normal. These

data were not deleted.

Inlet:

a) For the month of May there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

-2 NTU specifications of the probe. Several values did go beyond the probe

specifications (-3 NTU) but are probably still due to the possible calibration

error. All data were retained.

b) For deployment $05/15/2003\ 10:00\ -\ 06/02/2003\ 12:00$ dissolved oxygen (% and

 $\mbox{mg/L})$ data should be considered suspect due to possible drift of sensor. Post

calibration readings were 75.8% with no record of heavy fouling or membrane

puncture. All data retained but suspect.

Mile Road:

a) The following are shallow negative and/or zero depth data. Sonde probes

suspected to be underwater as other parameters check out normal. These data were

not deleted.

DATE TIME VALUE
05/29/2003 04:00 -0.04
05/29/2003 04:30 -0.07
05/30/2003 04:30 -0.05
05/30/2003 05:00 -0.11
05/30/2003 05:30 -0.08
05/31/2003 05:30 -0.01
05/31/2003 05:30 -0.08
05/31/2003 06:00 -0.09

- b) For the month of May there were several negative and/or zero turbidity values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the $\frac{1}{2}$
- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.

Little River Mouth:

a) The following are shallow negative and/or zero depth data. Sonde probes

suspected to be underwater as other parameters check out normal. These data were

not deleted.

DATE TIME VALUE 05/10/2003 14:00 -0.01 05/10/2003 14:30 -0.02 05/10/2003 15:00 -0.03 05/11/2003 03:30 -0.01 05/12/2003 03:30 -0.02 05/12/2003 04:30 -0.02 05/13/2003 05:00 -0.02 05/13/2003 17:30 -0.01

b) For the month of May there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.
- c) There was a high positive turbidity spike (>1000 NTU) that occurred during $\frac{1}{2}$

the deployment that was not consistent with the overall data record, possibly

due to an obstruction in front of the optics of the probe. This suspect datum

was not deleted, as we are not absolutely sure that this value is bad (the post

calibration checked out normal).

Date Time Turb 05/31/2003 13:30 1037

June, 2003 Sampling Period

Head of Tide:

a) For the month of June there were several negative and/or zero turbidity $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

-2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.

Inlet .

a) For the month of June there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

-2 NTU specifications of the probe. Several values did go beyond the probe

specifications (-3 NTU) but are probably still due to the possible calibration

error. All data were retained.

Mile Road:

a) The following are shallow negative and/or zero depth data (40 values with a $\,$

range of -0.01 to -0.11 m; mean of -0.04m). Sonde probes suspected to be underwater as other parameters check out normal. These data were not deleted.

DATE TIME

06/01/2003 06:00-06:30

06/02/2003 06:30-07:30

06/03/2003 07:30-08:00

06/05/2003 09:00-09:30

06/06/2003 09:30-10:00

06/07/2003 11:00

06/08/2003 12:30

06/10/2003 01:00

06/10/2003 13:00-14:00

06/11/2003 14:00-15:00

06/12/2003 02:30-04:30

06/12/2003 15:30-16:00

06/14/2003 05:30-06:00 06/14/2003 17:00-17:30 06/15/2003 06:30-07:00 06/18/2003 10:00

06/19/2003 09:00-10:00

06/20/2003 10:30-11:00

b) For the month of June there were several negative and/or zero turbidity $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

-2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.

c) A green crab of somewhat significant size was found inside of sonde $\operatorname{\mathsf{guard}}$, by

sensors, during next month's retrieval on 07/01.

d) The following drop in dissolved oxygen data is suspect for unknown reasons as

we are not sure what caused the low DO readings. Therefore data is retained but $\,$

suspect.

06/04/2003 03:00 - 08:00

Little River Mouth:

a) For the month of June there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the $\ensuremath{\mathsf{T}}$

-2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.

July, 2003 Sampling Period

Head of Tide:

a) For the month of July there were several negative and/or zero turbidity $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

-2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.

b) For the month of July there were several shallow negative and/or zero depth

data (188 values with a range of -0.01 to -0.08 m; mean of -0.028m). Sonde

probes suspected to be underwater as other parameters check out normal. These

data were not deleted.

Inlet:

a) For the month of July there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

 $\ensuremath{^{-2}}$ NTU specifications of the probe. Several values did go beyond the probe

specifications $(-3 \ \mathrm{NTU})$ but are probably still due to the possible calibration

error. All data were retained.

Mile Road: a) The following are shallow negative and/or zero depth data (55 values range of -0.01 to -0.11 m; mean of -0.038m). Sonde probes suspected to underwater as other parameters check out normal. These data were not deleted. DATE TIME 07/03/2003 07:30-08:30 07/04/2003 08:30-09:30 07/05/2003 09:00-10:00 07/05/2003 22:00 07/06/2003 10:00-11:00 07/07/2003 11:00-11:30 07/08/2003 12:00 07/09/2003 00:30 07/09/2003 01:00 07/09/2003 13:00 07/09/2003 13:30 07/11/2003 02:30-04:00 07/12/2003 04:00-05:00 07/12/2003 16:00-16:30 07/13/2003 05:00-06:00 07/16/2003 07:30-08:30 07/16/2003 19:30-20:00 07/17/2003 08:00-09:00 07/18/2003 09:00-09:30 07/19/2003 09:30-10:00 07/27/2003 03:30-04:30 07/28/2003 04:00-05:30 07/29/2003 05:00-06:30 b) For the month of July there were several negative and/or zero turbidity values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained. c) There was an increasing and decreasing range of high positive turbidity spikes (>1000 NTU) that occurred during the deployment that were not consistent with the overall data record, possibly due to an obstruction in front of optics of the probe. These suspect data were not deleted, as we are not absolutely sure that these values are bad (the post calibration checked out normal). Date Time Turb 07/25/2003 00:00 2048

07/25/2003 14:30

07/25/2003 15:00

07/27/2003 01:00

07/27/2003 14:00

07/27/2003 21:30

07/28/2003 00:00

1636

1419

1960

1724

1515

1255

```
07/28/2003 01:00
                     1162
07/28/2003 02:30
                      1632
07/28/2003 14:30
                      1722
07/29/2003 14:30
                      1355
07/29/2003 16:30
                      1371
07/30/2003 04:30
                      1098
                      1410
07/30/2003 16:00
07/31/2003 04:30
                      1565
```

d) A green crab of somewhat significant size was found inside of sonde $\operatorname{\mathsf{guard}}$, by

sensors,

during the retrieval on 07/01.

Little River Mouth:

- a) For the month of July there were several negative and/or zero turbidity
- values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the
- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.
- b) There was an increasing and decreasing range of high positive turbidity
- spikes (>1000 NTU) that occurred during the deployment that were not consistent
- with the overall data record, possibly due to an obstruction in front of the
- optics of the probe. These suspect data were not deleted, as we are not absolutely sure that these values are bad (the post calibration checked out

normal).

Date	Time	Turb
07/01/2003	22:30	1017
07/07/2003	06:30	1636
07/18/2003	13:30	1078
07/19/2003	02:00	1422
07/21/2003	17:00	1898
07/24/2003	19:30	1825

c) A green crab of somewhat significant size was found inside of sonde quard, by

sensors, during next month's retrieval on 08/04.

August, 2003 Sampling Period

Head of Tide:

- a) For the month of August there were several negative and/or zero turbidity $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$
- values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the
- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.
- b) For the month of August there were several shallow negative and/or zero depth $\,$
- data (142 values with a range of -0.01 to -0.06 m; mean of -0.029 m). Sonde
- probes suspected to be underwater as other parameters check out normal. These

data were not deleted.

Inlet:

a) Data is missing from 8/27/03 12:00 to 8/31/03 23:30 due to sonde failure (See

Section 14).

- b) For the month of August there were several negative and/or zero turbidity $\ensuremath{\mathsf{S}}$
- values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the
- $\ensuremath{^{-2}}$ NTU specifications of the probe. Several values did go beyond the probe

specifications (-3 and -4 NTU) but are probably still due to the possible calibration error. All data were retained.

Mile Road:

a) The following is a shallow negative depth datum. Sonde probes suspected to be

underwater as other parameters check out normal. This datum was not deleted.

DATE TIME VALUE

08/16/2003 08:30 -0.05

- b) For the month of August there were several negative and/or zero turbidity
- values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the
- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.
- c) There was an increasing and decreasing range of high positive turbidity
- spikes $(>1000\ \text{NTU})$ that occurred during the deployment that were not consistent
- with the overall data record, possibly due to an obstruction in front of the
- optics of the probe. These suspect data were not deleted, as we are not absolutely sure that these values are bad (the post calibration checked out

normal).

Date	Time	Turb
08/01/2003	19:00	1995
08/02/2003	02:30	1626
08/02/2003	07:00	1980
08/02/2003	09:30	1896
08/02/2003	11:00	1439
08/02/2003	14:30	1355
08/02/2003	18:30	2006
08/02/2003	22:00	2014
08/03/2003	03:00	1156
08/03/2003	08:00	1966
08/03/2003	15:30	1366
08/03/2003	19:00	1918
08/03/2003	20:30	2019
08/04/2003	05:00	1149
08/04/2003	07:00	1997
08/04/2003	09:30	2016

c) A green crab of somewhat significant size was found inside of sonde quard, by

sensors, during the retrieval on 08/04. The turbidity wiper was noticed to have

not been parking properly.

Little River Mouth:

a) For the month of August there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.
- b) A green crab of somewhat significant size was found inside of sonde $\operatorname{\mathsf{guard}}$, by

sensors, during the retrieval on 08/04.

September, 2003 Sampling Period

Head of Tide:

a) For the month of September there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.
- b) There was a high positive turbidity spike (>1000 NTU) that occurred during $\frac{1}{2}$

the deployment that was not consistent with the overall data record, possibly

due to an obstruction in front of the optics of the probe. This suspect datum

was not deleted, as we are not absolutely sure that this value is bad (the post $\frac{1}{2}$

calibration checked out normal).

DATE TIME TURB 09/02/2003 03:30 1685

c) For the month of September there were several shallow negative and/or zero

depth data (565 values with a range of -0.01 to -0.23 m; mean of -0.066 m).

Sonde probes suspected to be underwater as other parameters check out normal.

These data were not deleted.

Inlet:

Data is missing for entire month due to sonde failure (see Section 14).

Mile Road:

a) For the month of September there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the $\ensuremath{\mathsf{N}}$

-2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.

Little River Mouth:

a) For the month of September there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

-2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.

October, 2003 Sampling Period

Head of Tide:

- a) For the month of October there were several negative and/or zero turbidity
- values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the
- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.
- b) For the month of October there were several shallow negative and/or zero

depth data (711 values with a range of -0.01 to -0.27 m; mean of -0.105 m).

Sonde probes suspected to be underwater as other parameters check out normal .

These data were not deleted.

Inlet:

a) Data is missing from 10/01/03 0:00 to 10/02/03 17:00 due to sonde failure

(See Section 14).

b) For the month of October there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

-2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.

Mile Road:

a) The following are shallow negative and/or zero depth data (27 values with a

range of -0.01 to -0.15 m; mean of -0.058 m). Sonde probes suspected to be

underwater as other parameters check out normal. These data were not deleted:

TIME VALUE DATE 10/05/2003 01:00 -0.04 10/05/2003 01:30 -0.05 10/05/2003 02:00 -0.05 10/12/2003 19:00 -0.02 10/13/2003 19:30 -0.01 10/15/2003 21:00 -0.02 10/22/2003 01:30 -0.01 10/22/2003 02:00 -0.09 10/22/2003 02:30 -0.04 10/22/2003 14:30 -0.01 10/23/2003 02:30 -0.04 10/23/2003 03:00 -0.12 10/23/2003 15:00 -0.10 10/23/2003 15:30 -0.15

10/23/2003 16:00 -0.12

```
10/24/2003 03:30 -0.05

10/24/2003 04:00 -0.06

10/27/2003 07:00 -0.01

10/27/2003 18:30 -0.04

10/27/2003 19:00 -0.10

10/27/2003 19:30 -0.13

10/27/2003 20:00 -0.14

10/28/2003 07:30 -0.02

10/28/2003 08:00 -0.01

10/29/2003 21:00 -0.03

10/29/2003 21:30 -0.05
```

Little River Mouth:

a) The following are shallow negative depth data (40 values with a range of -0.01 to -0.19 m; mean of -0.089m). Sonde probes suspected to be

underwater as other parameters check out normal. These data were not deleted:

DATE TIME VALUE 10/19/2003 06:00 -0001 10/19/2003 06:30 -0001 10/19/2003 18:00 -0001 10/20/2003 07:30 -0001

b) The following are episodes of low dissolved oxygen and percent saturation

during several tidal fluctuations that were not consistent with the overall

data record. There may have been a problem with drift and the DO probe. The $\,$

dissolved oxygen post-cal ($81.7\ \%$) is questionable. These suspect data were

not deleted, as we are not absolutely sure that these values are bad.

Date Time DO% Domg/L 10/13/2003 13:00 -000.2 00.0 10/14/2003 01:30 -000.1 00.0 10/14/2003 02:00 -001.0 -00.1

c) All data for entire month may be suspect due to accumulation of seaweed

particles around silts in sonde deployment tube (see Section 14-D).

November, 2003 Sampling Period

Head of Tide:

a) For the month of November there were several negative and/or zero turbidity $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right) \left(1\right) +\left(1\right) \left(1\right)$

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.
- b) For the month of November there were several shallow negative and/or zero

depth data (34 values with a range of -0.01 to -0.08 m; mean of -0.054 m). Sonde

probes suspected to be underwater as other parameters check out normal. These

data were not deleted.

Inlet:

a) For the month of November there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

-2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.

Mile Road:

a) The following are shallow negative depth data (40 values with a range of -0.01 to -0.19 m; mean of -0.089m). Sonde probes suspected to be

underwater as other parameters check out normal. These data were not deleted:

```
TIME
DATE
11/12/2003 20:00-21:30
11/13/2003 19:30-21:30
11/14/2003 08:00-08:30
11/14/2003 20:00-22:00
11/20/2003 01:30
11/20/2003 14:00
11/21/2003 02:30
11/21/2003 15:00
11/21/2003 15:30
11/24/2003 18:30
11/24/2003 19:00
11/25/2003 06:00-06:30
11/28/2003 21:00-22:30
11/29/2003 09:30-10:00
11/29/2003 21:00-23:30
11/30/2003 00:00
11/30/2003 10:30-11:00
11/30/2003 22:30-23:30
```

- b) For the month of November there were several negative and/or zero turbidity
- values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the
- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.

Little River Mouth:

- a) For the month of November there were several negative and/or zero turbidity ${\bf r}$
- values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the $\,$
- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.
- b) All data for entire month may be suspect due to accumulation of seaweed

particles around silts in sonde deployment tube (see Section 14-D).

December, 2003 Sampling Period Head of Tide:

a) For the month of December there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.
- b) No data from 12/16 11:30 to 12/31 23:30. This datalogger was pulled for the

year to prevent ice damage.

Inlet:

For the following dates and times, the sonde malfunctioned, therefore data is $\frac{1}{2}$

missing:

12/06 1800

12/07 0300, 0400 - 0600, 1500 - 1900

12/08 0430 - 0700, 1900 - 1930

12/09 0600 - 0730, 1830, 1930 - 2030

12/10 0330 - 0900

Mile Road:

a) The following are shallow negative and/or zero depth data (27 values with a $\,$

range of -0.01 to -0.19 m; mean of -0.07m). Sonde probes suspected to be underwater as other parameters check out normal. These data were not deleted:

DATE TIME

12/01/2003 00:00-00:30

12/01/2003 11:00-12:30

12/02/2003 00:00-01:00

12/02/2003 13:00-13:30

12/10/2003 18:30-19:30

12/12/2003 07:00-07:30

12/12/2003 19:30-21:00

12/15/2003 21:00-23:30

12/16/2003 00:00

b) For the month of December there were several negative and/or zero turbidity

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the $\ensuremath{\mathsf{T}}$

- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.
- c) No data from 12/16 11:00 to 12/31 23:30. This datalogger was pulled for the

year (winter months) to prevent ice damage.

Little River Mouth:

a) For the month of December there were several negative and/or zero turbidity $\ensuremath{\mathsf{E}}$

values. While these may be due to a small calibration error, they are within the

- -2 NTU specifications of the probe. Data were retained.
- b) No data from 12/30 13:30 to 12/31 23:30. This datalogger was pulled for the

year (winter months) to prevent ice damage.

c) All data from 12/01/03 0:00 to 12/30/03 13:00 may be suspect due to accumulation of seaweed particles around silts in sonde deployment tube (see

Section 14-D).

12). Missing data:

Missing data are denoted by a period in the data set. Periods were later removed

for data dissemination purposes and left blank. Data are missing due to equipment failure where no probes were deployed, maintenance/calibration of

equipment, elimination of obvious outliers or elimination of data due to calibration problems (both pre and post). For more details on deleted data, see

the Data Anomalies Section. To find out more details about missing data, contact the Research Coordinator at the site submitting the data.

13). Post deployment information

End of Deployment Post-calibration Readings in Standard Solutions:

Site	Date Sp.Co	ond(mS) DO (%) Dochg (r	mv) De	pth(m)	рН	
	<u> </u>	10.0) (Std:	100) (Std:	Varia	ble) (Std	:7)	(Std: 0.0)
HT HT	04/10/03 05/06/03	9.84 9.94	96.1 98.1	42.0 46.1	0.119 -0.133	6.96 7.02	0.3 0.1
HT	05/29/03	10.39	102.6	54.3	-0.202	7.02	-0.3
HT	07/11/03	9.809	95.9	n/a	0.25	7.05	-0.1
HT	08/05/03	9.855	99.6	43.1	-0.002	7.03	-0.3
HT	09/08/03	10.13	102.3	44.1	0.092	7.03	-0.3
HT	10/08/03	9.92	95.9	46.1	-0.111	6.99	0.5
HT	11/12/03	9.79	101.1	48.2	-0.149	7.02	0.3
HT	12/16/03	9.89	103.5	n/a	0.169	7.02	-0.1
ML	04/09/03	9.98	102.0	46.1	0.141	7.02	0.0
ML	04/24/03	10.13	101.6	n/a	-0.209	7.10	0.5
ML	05/21/03	10.11	86.3	42.0	0.247	7.07	0.0
ML	07/01/03	9.61	72.2	43.1		7.02	0.0
ML	08/04/03	9.76	94.7	44.1	-0.019	7.09	3.6
ML	08/26/03	10.40	68.0	40.0	-0.044	7.09	0.8
ML	09/30/03	9.95	94.6	n/a	0.136	7.12	-0.4
ML	11/06/03	9.92	90.4	n/a	0.032	7.00	2.5
ML	12/02/03	9.88 9.98	103.2 102.2	38.0	-0.008	7.00	-0.2 -0.4
ML	12/16/03	9.98	102.2	44.1	-0.66	7.01	-0.4
IN	01/06/03	10.03	96.2	53.3	0.00	6.98	0.2
IN	02/03/03	10.02	86.9	42.0	0.00	7.08	0.1
IN	03/05/03	9.97	99.3	46.1	0.00	7.00	0.3
IN	03/31/03	10.05	99.2	47.1	0.002	7.00	1.1
IN	05/14/03	9.89	95.0	46.1	0.00	7.07	-0.5
IN	06/02/03	10.28	75.8	44.1	0.00	7.02	0.5
IN	06/30/03	10.05	94.6	46.1	0.00	6.97	-0.6

IN IN IN IN	07/23/03 08/26/03 10/28/03 12/10/03 12/31/03 01/22/04	9.88 10.60 9.90 9.81 10.03 10.54	80.2 93.2 96.2 99.7 98.3 83.6	43.1 n/a n/a 44.1 46.1 n/a	0.00 0.00 0.044 0.215 0.135 -0.126	7.03 7.21 7.10 7.05 7.01 6.93	0.2 -0.2 0.1 0.1 0.7 -4.0
LM	04/17/03	10.00	103.2	41.0	0.146	7.07	0.2
LM	05/20/03	9.96	99.5	45.1	-0.126	7.20	0.1
LM	06/19/03	10.48	95.8	46.1	-0.162	7.08	-0.5
LM	07/07/03	9.89	97.1	n/a	0.107	7.04	0.6
LM	08/04/03	9.93	79.8	n/a	0.006	7.15	-0.1
LM	09/03/03	10.66	63.7	49.2	0.073	7.13	0.2
LM	10/15/03	9.854	81.7	50.2	-0.256	7.11	1.5
LM	11/19/03	9.92	104.5	45.1	-0.009	7.16	0.4
LM	12/30/03	9.95	97.9	48.2	0.175	7.10	0.2

14). Other Remarks/Notes:

On 07/01/2021 this dataset was updated to include embedded QAQC flags for anomalous/suspect data. System-wide monitoring data beginning in 2007 were

processed to allow for QAQC flags and codes to be embedded in the data files $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right$

rather than detailed in the metadata alone (as in the anomalous/suspect, deleted, and missing data sections above). Prior to 2006, rejected data were

deleted from the dataset so they are unavailable to be used at all, but suspect

embedded retroactively in order to allow suspect data to be easily identified

and filtered from the dataset if desired for analysis and reporting purposes.

No other flags or codes were embedded in the dataset and users should still $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right)$

refer to the detailed explanations above for more information.

A) IMPORTANT CHANGES TO NOTE AT THE INLET SITE (IN): where our telemetry unit is

stationed: A new vented level YSI 6600 with its new vented level cable was

deployed to collect its first data on 5/4/99 at 12:00. The YSI telemetry unit

began collecting its first data on 3/16/98 at 10:30:00 (see Section 4-Research

Methods). The telemetry unit failed some time between 02/03/02 and 02/26/02.

Water contaminated the vented level cable and shorted out the attached vented

level 6600 sonde. Both the cable and sonde were sent back for repair and

returned in September of 2002. The cable was then re-attached and the sonde

deployed but there has been no communication to the field boxes since. The

vented level YSI was used all of 2003 until sometime between the deployment on

08/27/03 12:00 to the retrieval on 10/01/03 17:00 the sonde was discovered to

be damaged due to water contamination within the port connection to the telemetry cable. It was sent back for repair and all data within that time range was lost.

- B) IMPORTANT CHANGES TO NOTE AT THE INLET SITE (IN): For all data collected from $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right) +\left$
- 10/02 17:30 through 12/31 12:30, a non-vented YSI 6600 was used.
- C) IMPORTANT CHANGES TO NOTE AT THE LITTLE RIVER MOUTH SITE (LM): The deployment

for this site was the first ever for the SWMP program at the Wells NERR. $_{\mbox{\scriptsize WP}}$

deployed the sonde in the mouth of the Little River on 4/01/02 and upon retrieval on 4/23/02 we noticed a serious accumulation of sediment that buried

the probes of the sonde. We located another site within an inlet adjacent to the

main channel and deployed the sonde again on 5/06/02. We had several successful

deployment periods at this new site but found the sonde buried again on 7/09/02.

We needed time to re-evaluate the situation and did not deploy again at the

Little River Mouth for the rest of the year.

- D) Upon retrieval of data sonde at the Little River Mouth site on 10/15/03,
- 11/19/03 and 12/30/03; it was noticed that there was a significant accumulation
- of loose seaweed (algae) pieces surrounding the slits in the deployment tube

where water accesses the sensors. The metal stake that the deployment tube is

attached to, and the PVC tube itself, have caused scouring beneath the tube due

to occasional strong current. This has led to the creation of a small ditch

where seaweed can accumulate. The increased amount of seaweed present in the

water may be due to several large storms including Hurricane Isabelle. The $\,$

amount of seaweed present increased more by each retrieval date regardless of

attempts to clear it away (Sept/Oct was not too bad, Dec was severe).

 ${\tt E}{\tt)}$ The use of the newest (Version 3.0) National Estuarine Research Reserve

(NERR) System-Wide Monitoring Program (SWMP) YSI 6-Series Multi-Parameter Water

Quality Monitor Standard Operating Procedures began in December '00 when they

became available.

 $\mbox{\ensuremath{F}})$ With our extra data sonde, we have been reducing the amount of time of missing data from calibrations and maintenance for all sites. Some months have

no missing data from the use of this extra sonde.