Estimating Hypoxic Volume in the Chesapeake Bay Using Two Continuously Sampled Oxygen Profiles

Aaron Bever, Marjorie Friedrichs,
Carl Friedrichs, and Malcolm Scully

Motivation

- Hypoxia has numerous detrimental effects on biota
- Measuring dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration is straightforward with modern instruments
  - Quantifying the amount of hypoxia is more difficult (hypoxic volume, HV, DO<2 mg/L)
- Management actions focus on reducing hypoxia

Objective

- Demonstrate that hypoxia is strongly constrained by the Bay geometry and daily hypoxic volume can be estimated using only two to three vertical profilers

Outline

- Mainstem hypoxia

- Methods for a simple "geometric" hypoxic volume calculation

- Hypoxic volume estimates

- Interannual severity of hypoxia

- Conclusions

Mainstem Hypoxia

- Chesapeake Bay has a deeper region behind a sill

- Hypoxia occurs annually in the deeper portion of the mainstem

- Begins near the bed and fills the mainstem from the bottom up

Bottom Oxygen: Nowcast
June 10, 2018

Source: www.vims.edu/hypoxia
See Hagy et al. 2004; Officer et al. 1984

Mainstem Hypoxia

- Extent is estimated by interpolating vertical profiles
  - Cruise-based profiles span multiple days
  - Collected twice monthly

- Uncertainty from twice-monthly cruises can be as large as from interpolation

- Annual metrics possibly biased by cruise dates

Nowcast: June 10, 2018

Source: www.vims.edu/hypoxia
See Bever et al. 2013

Geometric Hypoxic Volume

- Hypoxic water is constrained by the geometry
- Determine embayment volume above the deepest depth
- Height of 2 mg/L surface correlates to hypoxic volume

Geometric Hypoxic Volume

- Vertical profiles based on long-term regional monitoring stations

- Geometric HV calculated from individual profiles

- Individual HVs are averaged to estimate Bay-wide HV

- Trailing mean smooths short-duration variability

● Regional Monitoring Station

Hypoxic Volume Calculations

- Interpolated and Geometric HVs
  - Interpolated HV (IHV) calculated using 13 and two stations
  - Geometric HV (GHV) calculated using combinations of one to eight stations

- Long-term regional-monitoring cruise-based data
  - 1985–2013
  - Twice monthly, cruises span multiple days

- 3-D numerical model results
  - 1985–2005
  - Provides a "true" reference daily 3-D HV from 3-D grid cells
  - Vertical profiles are averaged over 24 hours and used to estimate a continuous daily HV

Geometric vs. Interpolated (Cruise-based Data)

- Geometric HV reproduces Interpolated HV to within uncertainty in Interpolated HV

Interpolated
13 Stations
(current method)

Geometric
2 Stations

Geometric vs. Interpolated (Cruise-based Data)

- Geometric HV reproduces Interpolated HV to within uncertainty in Interpolated HV

## How Well Geometric HV Reproduces Interpolated (13 stations)

Number of Stations	Total RMSD [km^3]	r^2	Stations Used							
1	2.19	0.73	CB5.2							
2	1.68	0.85	CB5.1	CB5.4						
3	1.40	0.91	CB4.2C	CB5.2	CB5.4					
4	1.24	0.90	CB4.2C	CB5.1	CB5.2	CB5.4				
5	1.29	0.91	CB4.2C	CB5.1	CB5.2	CB5.3	CB5.4			
6	1.25	0.91	CB4.2C	CB4.3C	CB5.1	CB5.2	CB5.3	CB5.4		
7	1.30	0.92	CB4.2C	CB4.3C	CB5.1	CB5.2	CB5.3	CB5.4	CB5.5	
8	1.30	0.91	CB4.2C	CB4.3C	CB4.4	CB5.1	CB5.2	CB5.3	CB5.4	CB5.5

Geometric vs. True 3-D HV (Model-based)

- Geometric HV reproduces daily true 3-D HV using only two stations

Note: trailing mean applied to Geometric HV

Interpolated versus True 3-D HV (Model-based)

Model-based Hypoxic Volumes

How Well Geometric and Interpolated HVs Reproduce True 3-D HV

| HV method	Number of Stations	Total RMSD [km³]	r²	Stations Used						
GHV	1	2.65	0.79	CB5.1						
GHV	2	1.57	0.89	CB5.2	CB4.2C					
GHV	3	1.65	0.88	CB5.1	CB5.2	CB4.1C				
GHV	4	1.65	0.88	CB5.1	CB5.2	CB5.1W	CB4.3C			
GHV	5	1.69	0.89	CB5.1	CB5.2	CB5.1W	CB4.3C	CB4.1C		
GHV	6	1.85	0.88	CB5.1	CB5.2	CB5.1W	CB4.4	CB4.3C	CB4.1C	
GHV	7	2.01	0.88	CB5.1	CB5.2	CB5.1W	CB4.4	CB4.3C	CB4.2C	CB4.1C
IHV	2	1.29	0.91	CB5.2	CB4.2C					
IHV	13	0.60	0.98	CB3.2	CB3.3C	CB4.1C	CB4.2C	CB4.3C	CB4.4	CB5.1
				CB5.2	CB5.4	CB6.2	CB6.4	CB7.1	LE2.3	

GHV: Geometric HV   IHV: Interpolated HV

Annual Severity of Hypoxia

Cumulative Hypoxic Volume (HV$_C$)

Uncertainty from sparse sampling

Uncertainty from twice-monthly sampling

Annual Severity of Hypoxia: Uncertainty from Twice-monthly Sampling

- Continuous data at two locations is as accurate as knowing the dissolved oxygen everywhere twice monthly

Difference from True 3-D Cumulative HV

HV Method	Number of stations	Temporal Frequency	RMS Difference [km³ days]	RMS % Difference
GHV	2	Continuous	102	9.9%
GHV	3	Continuous	104	9.8%
GHV	4	Continuous	69	6.7%
3-D	Data everywhere	Bimonthly CBP dates	79	9.2%
IHV	13	Bimonthly CBP dates	120	13.2%

Sparse sampling uncertainty, Temporal uncertainty, Both

Conclusions

- Hypoxia in Chesapeake Bay is strongly constrained by the bathymetry and embayment geometry

- Continuous data at two locations is as accurate as knowing the dissolved oxygen everywhere twice monthly

- Automated sampling at a few locations will not be potentially biased by dates of sampling

- Automated sampling at a few locations can provide continuous HV estimates and accurate estimates of the annual severity of hypoxia

Questions

Bever et al., 2018. *JGR-Oceans*. DOI: 10.1029/2018JC014129
www.vims.edu/hypoxia