Influence of Watershed Alteration on Oyster Health and Oyster Reef Habitat: Management Implications for the Faka Union and Estero Bays

Michael Savarese, Aswani K. Volety, & S. Gregory Tolley Florida Gulf Coast University

## Management & Restoration of Southwest Florida's Estuaries

- Importance of estuaries.
- Effects of water management.
- Need to prevent future damage to pristine estuaries.
- Need to restore those that are highly altered.

# **Estero Bay**

- Estuary relatively pristine.
- High demand for suburban and industrial development.
- Document the bay's state of health.
- Develop a management plan for freshwater delivery.
- Our first attempt to investigate estuarine health.

### Estero Bay SW FL

### **Faka-Union Bay**

- Land development planned by Gulf American Corporation -- creation of Southern Golden Gate Estates.
- Problem: Excessive freshwater; 115,000 extra acres of wetland drained into estuary.
- No flow control structures.
- Critical Greater Everglades project for restoration.
- Previous BCB-funded project studied estuarine health; in need of 2nd year of data.





#### **Southern Golden Gate Estates**

- 813 miles of roads
- 138 miles of canals

# All water flows out of one canal into Faka Union Bay



# **Oyster Physiology & Reef Ecology**

- Propose using oysters for monitoring conditions of estuarine health.
- Impacts of watershed management.
- Establish restoration target conditions.
- Monitor restoration effectiveness performance measure.

# Why Oysters?

- Oysters prolific within estuaries.
- Tolerate wide range of environmental conditions, yet physiology & distribution are maximal under limited conditions.
- Biologic & ecologic condition indicative of water quality, particularly salinity.
- Reefs support great deal of life a "valued ecosystem component".









### Reef Distribution in Blackwater



### Reef Distribution in Faka-Union



### Aspects of Oyster Physiology & Reef Ecology

- Used many measures for other studies.
- Focused here upon:
  - Oyster condition index.
  - Oyster disease susceptibility (Perkinsus).
  - Oyster living density.
  - Crustacean and fish use of reefs.



- Infections lessened by freshwater.
- Doesn't offset other ill-effects.



- Oysters in better health in Estero.
- Too much freshwater reduces condition.



- Density patterns normal for Estero. No wet/dry season differences.
- Upstream site at Faka Union ill-effected by freshwater.





Table 9. Decapod crustaceans and fishes collected on oyster reefs using lift nets. Size represents mean carapace width or length (as appropriate) for decapods and standard length for fishes (standard deviations are in parentheses).

Snecies	Common Name	Number	Size	Percent	Relative	
species	Common Aume	collected	(mm)	occurrence	occurrence	
ESTERO						
Decanods						
Alpheus heterochaelis	bigclaw snapping shrimp	49	18.5 (4.8)	40.8	common	
Eurvpanopeus depressus	flatback mud crab	2.525	9.5 (4.2)	100.0	abundant	
Menippe mercenaria	Florida stone crab	11	18.3 (9.2)	12.2	uncommon	
Palaemonetes.	grass shrimp	6	11.1 (0.9)	4.1	rare	
Panopeus simpsoni	oystershell mud crab	272	13.6 (9.2)	79.6	abundant	
Petrolisthes armatus	green porcelain crab	3,595	5.3 (2.1)	69.4	abundant	
Fishes						
Archosargus probatocephalus	sheenshead	4	54 2 (11 4)	4 1	rare	
Chasmodes saburrae	Florida blenny	2	340(42)	4 1	rare	
Cyprinodon variegatus	sheepshead minnow	2 4	32.2(2.1)	2.0	rare	
Eucinostomus	mojarra	22	14.8(1.6)	61	uncommon	
Gobiesox strumosus	skilletfish	14	24.4 (5.5)	26.5	common	
Gobiosoma robustum	code goby	7	20.1(2.5)	10.2	uncommon	
Lagodon rhomboides	pinfish	9	51.8 (11.0)	12.2	uncommon	
Lophogobius cyprinoides	crested goby	112	35.4 (9.7)	34.7	common	
Lupinoblennius nicholsi	highfin blenny	1	45.6 (0)	2.0	rare	
Lutjanus griseus	gray snapper	5	59.9 (15.0)	6.1	uncommon	
Lutjanus synagris	lane snapper	3	29.8 (16.6)	4.1	rare	
Opsanus beta	Gulf toadfish	27	43.3 (20.8)	20.4	common	
*			· /			





Table 12. Correlation coefficients for comparisons among oyster community metrics and environmental parameters in the Estero. Numbers accompanied by an asterisk represent significant relationships (n = 49 unless otherwise noted).

	Abundance	Biomass	Dependents	Diversity	Dominance	Petro:Eury	Richness	Salinity
			(%)					
Biomass	0.43*							
Dependents (%)	-0.33*	0.05						
Diversity	-0.30*	0.14	0.62*					
Dominance	-0.03	-0.17	-0.40*	-0.70*				
Petro:Eury	0.76*	0.57*	-0.26	-0.28	0.03			
Richness	0.11	0.35*	0.28	0.63*	-0.29*	0.00		
Salinity*	-0.04	0.36	0.49*	0.38*	-0.52*	0.12	0.30	
Temperature**	0.37	-0.36	-0.30	-0.18	-0.07	0.14	-0.04	-0.27

\* n = 18 \*\* n = 16

• Higher salinity leads to greater diversity & greater number of reef-dependent species.

• These patterns most pronounced in Estero. Faka Union has lower diversity and reef-dependent percentages.

### **Conclusions & Recommendations**

### For Estero Bay:

- Best conditions in middle of bay and near river mouth.
- Locations with greatest accommodation space.
- Estero in good shape. Presently receiving a good mix of marine and freshwater.

### For Faka Union Bay:

- Best conditions further downstream near coastal margin.
- Locations with minimal accommodation space.
- Freshets are detrimental.
- Restoration alternative 3D is favored.