## Long-term changes in coastal oxygen: impacts from global and local anthropogenic stressors

#### **Marjorie Friedrichs**

Virginia Institute of Marine Science

#### With contributions from many!

- Pierre St-Laurent, Ike Irby, Fei Da, Kyle Hinson, Ray Najjar, Eileen Hofmann, Hanqin Tian, Yuanzhi Yao, Ming Li, Wenfei Ni, Raleigh Hood
- EPA/NOAA/USGS Chesapeake Bay Program: Lewis Linker, Gary Shenk, Richard Tian, Gopal Bhatt







VIRGINIA INSTITUTE OF MARINE SCIENCE

### Increasing Baltic Sea hypoxia/anoxia



Spatial distribution of annual mean bottom hypoxia and anoxia over time in the Baltic Sea.

Jacob Carstensen et al. PNAS 2014

### **Decreasing Chesapeake Bay Bottom Oxygen (July)**



 $\rightarrow$  Decreased bottom O<sub>2</sub> in deep mainstem

#### Local Anthropogenic Changes from the Dynamic Land Ecosystem Model (DLEM)



### **Global Anthropogenic Changes**

#### **Global temperature change**



T<sub>atm</sub> difference between 2017 & 1981-2010 mean [°F]

#### SSH difference 2014 – 1992 [cm]

## **Chesapeake Bay T<sub>atm</sub> and Sea Level Change**



## **Chesapeake Bay T<sub>atm</sub> and Sea Level Change**



## **Chesapeake Bay T<sub>atm</sub> and Sea Level Change**



Over the next century, how will these local and global anthropogenic changes impact coastal oxygen, given the complex feedbacks between the multiple physical, chemical and biological processes involved?



Significant management interest in Chesapeake Bay oxygen

Managers want to know:

- How much more difficult will it be to meet our oxygen restoration goals, when we account for climate change?
- How much greater would our progress be if climate change wasn't underway?

## Management model results

- CBP used their watershed-hydrodynamicwater quality modeling system
- Preliminary results showed:
  - → Impact climate change < impact of nutrient reductions
  - → Climate change *increased* bottom oxygen, primarily due to sea level rise

Redo climate change experiments with another modeling system forced with identical watershed model outputs – do the results agree?

#### Chesapeake Bay Program's Watershed Model

#### Major Basin Eastern Shore James Potomac Rappahannock Susquehanna Western Shore Patuxent York

(Shenk and Linker, 2013)

- Realistic nutrients (Base run)
- Reduced nutrients (TMDL)
- 1990's climate (T, SLR, rivers)
- 2050's climate (T, SLR, rivers)

(Feng et al., 2015; Da et al., 2018)

30m

10m

20m

**ChesROMS-ECB** 





- Climate change impact on bottom  $O_2 <<$  impact of nutrient reductions
  - → same result as CBP model
- Climate change decreased bottom O<sub>2</sub>
  - → management efforts are going to have to be greater than we originally thought (opposite result from CBP model!)



Which mechanism causes lower O<sub>2</sub> concentrations? Temperature? SLR? Rivers?

→ Three more experiments to isolate individual mechanisms



- 2050 temperature decreases oxygen
  - → Temperature has greatest impact on hypoxia, mostly (75%) due to solubility



- 2050 temperature decreases oxygen
  - → Original CBP results had underestimated coastal ocean warming



- 2050 temperature decreases oxygen
- 2050 rivers/precip causes small change in oxygen



- 2050 temperature decreases oxygen
- 2050 rivers/precip causes small change in oxygen
- 2050 SLR increases oxygen



- 2050 temperature decreases oxygen
- 2050 rivers/precip causes small change in oxygen
- 2050 SLR increases oxygen

#### → Why does SLR increase bottom oxygen? St-Laurent, in prep.

#### Impacts of SLR on oxygen: Differences between 2050 and 1995



#### Why do we see opposite results in two ROMS-based models?

- Both models indicate SLR causes increases estuarine circulation
- > Why opposite effects on  $O_2$ ?

Original hypothesis:

- One model shows SLR *increases* O<sub>2</sub> because more *high oxygen* water is advected in from shelf
- One model shows SLR *decreases* O<sub>2</sub> because more *high salinity* water is advected in from shelf

#### Why do we see opposite results in two ROMS-based models?

- Both models indicate SLR causes increases estuarine circulation
- > Why opposite effects on  $O_2$ ?

Original hypothesis:

 One model shows SLR *increases* O<sub>2</sub> because more *high oxygen* water is advected in from shelf

 One model shows SLR *decreases* O<sub>2</sub> because more *high salinity* water is advected in from shelf

#### Relative skill of two models (mean July conditions)



 $\rightarrow$  Both models reproduce observations similarly well

#### How does modeled O<sub>2</sub> respond to 1m SLR?



- $\rightarrow$  Both models show O<sub>2</sub> decreasing in upper waters, increasing at depth
- $\rightarrow$  ChesROMS shows much greater increase at depth
- → Why? Physics? Biology? Chemistry?

#### How does modeled T and S respond to 1m SLR?



 $\rightarrow$  Both models show similar increase in salinity

- → ChesROMS shows greater decrease in July *temperature*
- $\rightarrow$  Why?

ChesROMS

### Why do we see opposite results in two ROMS-based models?

Revised hypotheses:

**Different physics (vertical mixing):** 

ChesROMS - cold water advected in from shelf in summer reduces respiration,  $O_2$  increases

UMCES-ROMS - higher vertical mixing causes surface heat fluxes to warm cold water entering from shelf, before it reaches the deep hypoxic trench region; no  $O_2$  increase

#### **Different biology (respiration):**

ChesROMS-ECB has a respiration rate that is more sensitive to temperature change than that used in UMCES-ROMS-RCA.

Colder waters entering from shelf cause a greater decrease in respiration rate ( $O_2$  increase) for ChesROMS-ECB than for UMCES-ROMS-RCA.

## Conclusions

- Oxygen response to planned nutrient reductions >> oxygen response to climate change
- But restoring the Bay to previous oxygen concentrations will be slightly harder with climate change, because....

# **Conclusions (cont.)**

- Warming bay waters will <u>decrease</u> O<sub>2</sub>
  - $\rightarrow$  decreased solubility year-round, throughout Bay
  - → increased respiration/remineralization rates in spring
- Changing river inputs will only slightly change O<sub>2</sub>
- Increasing sea level results still unclear:

Preliminary results suggest this depends on assumptions:

Physics - vertical mixing rates Biology - temperature dependence of O<sub>2</sub> consumption

# **Conclusions (cont.)**

- Both local and global anthropogenic changes are affecting estuarine O<sub>2</sub> in complex ways
  → through physical, chemical, and biological processes
- Important to use multiple models when working with managers and with complex modeling systems
- Possible to work with managers and do meaningful, interesting science!

