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Summary

This proposal is for one additional, brief but intense field season to follow up on field work in 2006 - 2007. The additional work will be to estimate a carbon budget for the Low-Salinity Zone in summer, which will give us a more complete picture of the importance of carbon subsidies from the Delta to the LSZ. We will also fill in some key gaps revealed by our previous research.

Project Purpose

The original project addressed two distinct but related topics: Foodweb support for delta smelt, and potential mechanisms underlying relationships of abundance or survival of estuarine fish to freshwater flow. These topics are related through the productivity of the pelagic foodweb in the estuarine Low-Salinity Zone (LSZ, salinity ~ 0.5 – 6 psu). This is a key region of the estuary and the rearing area for numerous estuarine-dependent fishes including delta smelt.

As described below, we have completed the field work and most of the laboratory work to address our original research questions, and have begun synthesizing these results, with plans for a synthesis workshop in late spring-summer 2008. However, the research to date has revealed some unanswered questions that we hope to address with additional field and laboratory work:

1. How do riverine subsidies of phytoplankton, organic matter, and zooplankton influence dynamics in the LSZ?
2. What is the overall balance of sources and sinks of organic matter and its principal components in the LSZ?
3. What is the trophic structure leading to zooplankton consumed by fish?
4. Does Microcystis play a role in disrupting the LSZ foodweb?

Background and Conceptual Models

The original basis for our study was that the foodweb supporting delta smelt and other fish species of the upper estuary had been radically altered by the introduction of the clam Corbula amurensis, resulting in an apparent disconnect between the supply of organic matter and the demands of fish, and between the strong flow responses of some fish and the weak response of the lower trophic levels (Kimmerer 2002a). The northern San Francisco Estuary has one of the lowest levels of primary productivity in any estuary worldwide (Jassby et al. 2002). Nearly every quantitative study of reproduction or feeding in the estuary has demonstrated or inferred food limitation, e.g., in cladocerans (Müller-Solger et al. 2002), copepods (Bouley and Kimmerer 2006; Hooff and Bollens 2004; Kimmerer et al. 1994; Kimmerer et al. 2005), the clam Corbicula fluminea (Foe and Knight 1985), and diving ducks (Richman and Lovvorn 2004). Juvenile delta
smelt showed signs of low food consumption in at least one year (Bennett 2005), and an index of survival from summer to fall is correlated with zooplankton biomass (Kimmerer In press).

One potential cause of the Pelagic Organism Decline (POD) in ~2002 is low food supply (Sommer et al. 2007). A poor feeding environment does not necessarily imply a close correlation between abundance indices of POD fish species and abundance of food organisms. For example, moderate abundance of copepods in 2006 was not accompanied by high delta smelt abundance in fall. Nevertheless, chronic food limitation in the system may limit the scope for positive population growth in estuarine fishes, amplifying responses to other stressors.

Our conceptual model (Fig. 1) depicts principal flows of material within the LSZ foodweb and from the freshwater regions into the LSZ. As a result of previous work in the estuary and our studies in 2006-2007, we understand better how the foodweb operates and have data to determine at least semi-quantitatively most of the flows in the diagram. Principally we have learned that the foodweb is more complex than we had thought, with overlapping trophic levels.

Energy supplies to support delta smelt and other fishes can be disrupted by a variety of factors. The principal energy source for the LSZ is phytoplankton production, but there are subsidies of organisms and substances from the freshwater Delta. Sources of organic matter from seaward of the LSZ appear unimportant because concentration gradients are small, net flow is seaward, and since gravitational circulation near the LSZ is weak, at least in the dry season. Production by larger phytoplankton, especially diatoms, is more directly linked to higher trophic levels than production by smaller phytoplankton which fuel mainly the microbial foodweb. In addition, diatom growth may be constrained by high ammonium concentrations (Wilkerson et al. 2006). Bacterial growth and respiration are supported by dissolved organic carbon (DOC) which may come from local sources (e.g., sloppy feeding by animals) or from upstream. Bacteria are consumed by ciliates but also by an intermediate trophic step, probably nanoflagellates, themselves consumed by ciliates. Most of the mesozooplankton such as the copepods *Limnoithona tetraspina* and *Pseudodiaptomus forbesi* feed on microzooplankton including ciliates (Bouley and Kimmerer 2006, Gifford et al. 2007), although *P. forbesi* can also feed on phytoplankton. Preliminary results indicate that *Acartiella sinensis*, which can be important in the diet of delta smelt, may feed on early life stages of other copepods, mainly *Limnoithona*. Most of the foodweb components are also consumed by clams.

The only link to the benthos in Fig. 1 is that through consumption by clams, but there are others. In particular, release of DOC from sediments (Caffrey et al. 1996), which has not been measured in this part of the estuary, is likely to be an important term in the carbon budget. We are also uncertain of the role of DOC uptake by clams, which could get them through periods of low food abundance (Baines et al. 2007).

A potential disruption not shown in Fig. 1 is that due to the toxic cyanobacterium *Microcystis aeruginosa* (Lehman et al. 2005). This freshwater phytoplankton species is salinity-tolerant (Tonk et al. 2007) and can cause harmful effects to copepods and fish (Ojaveer et al. 2003). It was abundant in some of our samples in 2007 and may have been associated with a die-off of *P. forbesi* in July-August 2007 (see below).
We developed a simple box model to investigate the importance of upstream subsidies of available organic carbon (AOC) to the Low-Salinity Zone in summer (Cloern 2007; Sobczak et al. 2005). Following Sobczak et al. (2002, 2005), we assumed that the principal source of organic matter fueling the metazoan foodweb of the LSZ was phytoplankton. The model estimates total input of AOC to the Low-Salinity Zone as the sum of in-situ production, advection from the Delta, and dispersion. We ignored dispersive inputs from seaward of the LSZ because gradients were small, and assumed net flux was into Suisun Marsh because of net evaporation during summer. Total input of AOC is thus:

$$\Phi_{AOC} = P_{LSZ}A_{LSZ} + C_{Delta}Q_{out} + \left. \frac{dC}{dx} \right|_{D-Z} K_x A_{xc}$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $\Phi_{AOC}$ is the total input of available organic carbon, $P_{LSZ}$ is primary production per unit surface area in the low-salinity zone, $A_{LSZ}$ is the surface area within the LSZ, $C$ is phytoplankton carbon, $Q_{out}$ is net Delta outflow, $x$ is distance along the axis of the estuary, the subscript D-Z refers to the concentration gradient from the Delta to the LSZ, $K_x$ is the horizontal dispersion coefficient, and $A_{xc}$ is the cross-sectional area through which the dispersion takes place.

We used data from selected stations from 115 IEP water quality surveys during June-October 1975 through 2006. Flows were daily means from the Dayflow water accounting program (http://www.iep.ca.gov/dayflow/). $X_2$ values were calculated as in Jassby et al. (1995). Phytoplankton carbon was calculated using a carbon: chlorophyll ratio of 30. Primary production was calculated for each LSZ station as in Cole and Cloern (1984) using the parameters in Jassby et al. (2002), and data sources in Kimmerer (2006).

A flow-weighted mean phytoplankton C concentration in Delta stations landward of the LSZ was used to calculate $C_{Delta}$. Negative flow in the lower San Joaquin River gave a weighting of zero. The slope of a robust regression of phytoplankton C on distance up the axis of the estuary, in and landward of the LSZ, were used to obtain the gradient in Eq. 1. This slope differed significantly from zero in about half of the cases, generally negative before 1988 and small and positive after.

Cross-sectional area at Chipps Island was obtained from a USGS bathymetric database, about 17,000 m$^2$. The spatial extent of the LSZ and dispersion coefficients were obtained from the TRIM3D model (Ed Gross, pers. comm. Dec. 2007). This model has recently been calibrated against an extensive set of data on stage, velocity, and salinity (Gross et al. in prep.). Model outputs from a series of constant-flow scenarios were combined into tables of area and volume by depth and salinity in increments of 1 (Kimmerer et al. in prep.).

The box model calculations (Fig. 2) show that nearly all of the phytoplankton carbon is from local primary production. The median proportion supplied by primary production was 92%. In only 12 surveys was more than 25% of the carbon supply from advection, during high-flow periods. In only two surveys did dispersive flux comprise >5% of the total.

The general conclusion from this box model is that most of the supply of phytoplankton carbon to the LSZ comes from in situ production. However, this does not take into account at least two important sources of labile DOC: transport from the Delta and flux from the sediments. The
time scale for advective movement between the Delta and the LSZ in summer is rather long (weeks), so phytoplankton-derived carbon in the Delta has a lot of time for transformation and oxidation during transit to the LSZ. Carbon stored in the sediments may recycle into the water column over short (e.g., clam feces and pseudofeces) or long (e.g., flow pulses) time scales.

The model results together with our field and laboratory results offer a conundrum. The supply rate of phytoplankton carbon from the Delta is small, yet microbial carbon demand within the LSZ exceeds primary production (see below), suggesting an external subsidy. Three potential sources of this mismatch are: 1) phytoplankton production is actually larger than we have estimated; 2) the total supply rate of labile organic carbon from the Delta is large, probably as DOC but possibly also in other forms; or 3) the sediments, the largest pool of C, may be contributing to a net imbalance of carbon. These sources suggest the need for a more thorough estimate of the carbon budget for the LSZ, which we propose to develop here. Estimating these fluxes will require a more fine-scale sampling scheme measuring more variables than used in the simple box model above, or in our previous (2006-2007) studies.

**Summary of Progress to Date**

Our previous study design focused on ~weekly sampling cruises in spring-summer 2006 and 2007 to stations at 0.5, 2, and 5 psu salinity at the surface. We completed 24 cruises in 2006 and 19 in 2007, although not always to all 3 stations. In situ measurements and samples were coupled with incubations for key metabolic rates (Table 1). Benthic samples were taken in separate, spatially-intensive surveys as well as in more limited monthly surveys (Table 1). Experiments to investigate foodweb structure included “cascade” experiments which attempted to force trophic cascades by manipulating the numbers of copepods in containers of ambient water, and two comprehensive experiments in which stable isotopes of C and N were added to water samples and incubated to observe the transfer of isotope among foodweb components.

Although many analyses are complete, other samples are still being processed (Table 1), so we do not yet have a clear picture of all aspects of our results; in particular we have not completed analysis of clam biomass and many of the zooplankton samples. Results of the first trophic transfer experiment were very encouraging (see below), but the second experiment resulted in ~300 samples for stable isotope analysis which were not budgeted for in the original proposal, and we are requesting funds for this analysis. Results have been presented in numerous talks and posters at conferences and in one symposium volume (Table 2). The current plan is to hold a workshop in late spring 2008 to develop syntheses and plan cross-disciplinary papers.

Space does not permit a full discussion of results to date. Here we present some highlights.

**Phytoplankton** production remains low in the LSZ, although it was slightly elevated during the high-flow period of 2006. Although generally biomass is controlled by grazing losses and growth rate by light, we have evidence that high ammonium concentration suppresses nitrate uptake and therefore limits the growth potential of diatoms (Wilkerson et al. 2006). Although our study did not focus on the effects of *Microcystis*, it was a nuisance in collections of live zooplankton for experiments, and caused some experiments to be scrapped.
Bacterial carbon demand exceeds phytoplankton production most of the time, implying a subsidy of DOC. Experiments to date suggest that freshwater phytoplankton do not lyse, but may shrink, on exposure to brackish water in the LSZ; there was little effect of exposing phytoplankton from 0.5 psu salinity to 2 psu water. However, the flux of freshwater phytoplankton to the LSZ is known only from the rather crude estimates above, and we do not yet understand the pathway by which they are incorporated into the LSZ foodweb, either through direct consumption by clams or other consumers, or through release of DOC and subsequent uptake by bacteria.

Microzooplankton play a key role in the estuarine foodweb. Most of our cascade experiments (Calbet and Landry 1999) did not induce trophic cascades, indicating that some members of the foodweb were feeding at multiple trophic levels (omnivory). This means that the foodweb has more trophic steps (see Fig. 1), and is therefore less efficient, than previously believed, which has significant implications for the potential productivity of higher trophic levels, including POD species. Tintinnid ciliates were abundant at times but not heavily consumed by copepods, although previous studies indicate they are ingested by clams (Kimmerer unpublished). Copepods continue at low abundance except for the cyclopoid Limnoithona tetraspina. This copepod has a higher reproductive rate than previously determined, and a specific growth rate of about 10% d^{-1}. Reproductive rate was insensitive to prey abundance. The population of the calanoid copepod Pseudodiaptomus forbesi crashed during summer of 2007, and dead copepods were numerous around the time that Microcystis became abundant. Acartiella sinensis did not feed on ciliates or phytoplankton but may have been consuming Limnoithona nauplii. Since Acartiella can be an abundant prey of delta smelt (S. Slater, CDFG, pers. comm.), it is important to determine its trophic position and role in the foodweb.

The first trophic transfer experiment was conducted by adding $^{13}$C-labeled bicarbonate and $^{15}$N-labeled ammonium to water and zooplankton from the 2 psu station, then incubating for up to 3 days. Analyses of the time course of label uptake into the various fractions (Fig. 3) revealed that rapid uptake of labeled carbon by the seston occurred almost entirely in the >2 μm fraction, probably through photosynthesis by phytoplankton. In contrast, uptake of N was nearly half as fast in the <2 μm fraction, implying that bacterial growth was ~half as rapid as phytoplankton growth. Pseudodiaptomus initially took up both labels faster than Limnoithona, which caught up by the last day. This suggests that Pseudodiaptomus may have become food limited toward the end, or that Limnoithona was getting its C and N from sources whose own isotope ratios lagged behind those of both bacteria and phytoplankton, i.e., more feeding more on ciliates than was Pseudodiaptomus.

These results encouraged us to conduct a follow-up experiment but with more replication, two contrasting light levels, and a large array of ancillary measurements designed to tease apart the responses of different foodweb components. In addition, the $^{13}$C was added as bicarbonate and the $^{15}$N as leucine; the former is taken up by phytoplankton and the latter by bacteria, which should have separated the two pathways clearly. Because it is difficult or impossible to separate the smaller organisms from the water to determine their isotope ratios (York et al. 2007) we were forced to measure isotope ratios on the same fractions as in the first experiment, and rely on the ancillary measurements to help in interpreting those results.
Numerous other projects provide information useful in our study. These include a study of nutrient regeneration by *Corbula* (Kleckner et al. 2007), a laboratory study of effects of *Microcystis* on copepods (Ali Ger, UC Davis), and a study of distribution of *Microcystis* (Lehman et al. 2005).

**Scope of New Work**

Our studies to date have focused on three stations identified by salinity, with a sampling interval of one week for most of the cruises. Incubations and other labor-intensive measurements focused on the 2 psu station. The results to date, together with the box model described above, provide an opportunity and suggest a need to develop material budgets for the LSZ and to determine the major sources and sinks of material.

We propose to extend our previous and ongoing work to answer the questions posed in the Introduction. First, we will develop carbon and nitrogen budgets for the LSZ foodweb using box models similar to that presented above, but including principal sources and sinks and material transformations. Some of these terms will require additional field measurements as discussed below. We also propose to examine the possible role of *Microcystis* in depressing abundance of *Pseudodiaptomus*, and the trophic role of *Acartiella*.

The focus will remain on the LSZ, but most of the sampling will be conducted during an intense 2-week period of fieldwork in summer of 2008. Summer is a time of relative stasis in the foodweb and low freshwater flow, so inputs from upstream will be relatively stable. Furthermore, reverse net flow in the San Joaquin River will mean that the advective inputs will be from the Sacramento River, reducing the complexity of the problem of estimating inputs.

Inputs of key components will be estimated (Eq. 1) by determining concentration gradients along a transect from the LSZ into the Sacramento River. Measurements (Table 3) will be made at 3-km intervals from the LSZ to Rio Vista during 3 surveys. Power analysis using previous data on chlorophyll concentrations and bacterial biomass shows that this sampling scheme has 80% power (i.e. 20% chance of Type II error) for detecting a daily dispersive flux of these quantities equal to 10% of the standing biomass. On alternate days, samples will be taken within the LSZ for estimates of biomass, abundance, and (through incubation) productivity (Table 3). Additional samples will be taken as before for bivalve biomass, and core samples will be taken for benthic flux of organic matter and nutrients.

Most of the measurements listed in Table 3 will use the same approaches as described in the original proposal and carried out during 2006 and 2007. Several additional measurements will be added to those taken in 2006 and 2007:

1. **Bacterial yield** will be determined by 3-day incubations of filtered estuarine water in sealed bottles followed by counts of bacterial cells and estimates of biomass (McManus et al. 2004). Bacterial yield provides a measure of bioavailable DOC with a shorter incubation time than required to measure the decline in DOC (Sobczak et al. 2002, 2005). The resulting value will probably be lower but the time scale is more relevant to those of the model and the other measurements.
2. Feeding and growth of *Acartiella sinensis* will be measured using standard incubation techniques (e.g., Kimmerer and McKinnon 1987, Hooff and Bollens 2004).

3. Consumption of *Limnoithona* by clams will be measured in 24-hour incubations in beakers with suitable controls (Kimmerer et al. 1994).

4. Effects of *Microcystis* on *Pseudodiaptomus* will be determined if and when substantial *Microcystis* blooms are present, or if a die-off of *Pseudodiaptomus* is noted. Short-term bioassays will be used to determine relative effects on *Pseudodiaptomus* and *Limnoithona*, with survival and egg production as endpoints.

5. DOC uptake by *Corbula* will be examined in preliminary experiments. Zebra mussels can take up DOC directly (Roditi et al. 2000, Baines et al. 2007). We will use the methods of Baines et al. (2007) to examine DOC uptake by *Corbula*. This entails removing DOC from water using ultraviolet radiation, and comparing the change in organic weight over a 1-month period between clams exposed to DOC in natural water and those exposed to low-DOC water. In both cases small quantities of phytoplankton will be provided to ensure clams continue to filter during the experiment.

6. DOC and nutrient flux from the benthos will be estimated by determining fine-scale profiles in sediment porewater, and estimating diffusion out of sediments. This gives a conservative estimate of these rates since it does not account for bioturbation or sediment stirring by currents. However, this method is superior in many respects to the alternatives (in situ chambers and incubating cores in the laboratory), both of which have limitations (Caffrey et al. 1996, Topping and Kuwabara 2003, Kuwabara et al. 2007). Since this measurement is new to the project team, we request funds to support Dr. James Kuwabara to do this work.

7. We will complete the stable isotope analyses, which were not in the original work plan.

**Relevance to the CALFED Science Program**

The overall project addresses two key issues for CALFED: the potential role of lower trophic levels in the Pelagic Organism Decline, and its potential role in the “fish-X2” relationships. Although some aspects of both of these topics have changed since this project was first conceived, the fact remains that the upper San Francisco Estuary is chronically short of energy, and operates differently from foodwebs in other well-studied estuaries. Understanding how this foodweb works is critical to understanding the POD and X2 issues and how food limitation may contribute to them.

**New Personnel and Qualifications**

Dr. Jim Kuwabara has a Ph.D. in Environmental Engineering Science from California Institute of Technology. He joined the USGS in 1980 and has served as project chief for the National Research Program (NRP) within the Water Resources Division since 1986. His expertise is in sediment-water interactions, and he has invented a pore-water profiler for measuring benthic fluxes that will be used in this study.
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Table 1. Summary of measurements and analysis to be completed by summer 2008. N is number of samples taken in 2006 and 2007. TT1 and TT2 refer to trophic transfer experiments, for which N is the total number of incubated samples. IP, In Progress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Salinity, temperature, irradiance profiles (most samples)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrients</td>
<td>Nitrate, ammonium, silicate, phosphate</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic matter</td>
<td>DON DOC</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PON POC, size fractionated</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytoplankton</td>
<td>Chlorophyll, size fractionated</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary production – $^{13}$C single samples</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary production – $^{14}$C profiles, size fractionated</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutrient uptake measurements</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Species composition</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lysis</td>
<td>Lysis and shrinkage experiments</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOC release from above experiments</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bacterial response from above experiments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacteria</td>
<td>Abundance and biomass</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microzooplankton</td>
<td>Abundance and taxonomic composition</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumption rate (dilution experiments)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumption rate (fluorescently labeled bacteria)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zooplankton</td>
<td>Abundance and taxonomic / life stage, 2 size fractions</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth rate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reproductive rate (<em>Limnoithona</em>)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Molting rate (<em>Limnoithona</em>)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clams</td>
<td>Spatial distribution of <em>Corbula</em> biomass</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temporal distribution of <em>Corbula</em> biomass</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clam condition in above samples</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade</td>
<td>Impact of zooplankton on microbial foodweb</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trophic Transfer</td>
<td>Stable isotope transfer through the foodweb (5 components, 2 isotopes, plus nutrients)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stable isotope transfer through the foodweb (8 components, 2 isotopes, plus nutrients, primary production, abundance, and C and N content)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Presentations (talks, posters, papers) based on work done under the Foodweb project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Author &amp; Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kimmerer 2006</td>
<td>Foodweb Support for the Threatened Delta Smelt: Subtle Interactions may be a Cause of the Pelagic Organism Decline</td>
<td>Calfed Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughter 2006</td>
<td>Foodweb Support for the Threatened Delta Smelt: Summary of Program Objectives and Preliminary Results</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen 2006</td>
<td>The Effects of Salinity on Phytoplankton and Dissolved Organic Carbon Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogue 2006</td>
<td>The Role of Excess Ammonium in Reducing Phytoplankton in San Francisco Estuary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignoffio 2006</td>
<td>Growth and Development of Limnoithona tetraspina, the Most Abundant Copepod in the Estuary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lidstrom 2006</td>
<td>Phytoplankton Production within the Low Salinity Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker 2006</td>
<td>Evaluating the Potential Contribution of Bacterial Carbon for Higher Trophic Levels</td>
<td>Estuarine Ecology Teachers Workshop, RTC and SFNERR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson 2006</td>
<td>Grazing Potential of Corbula amuresis on Lower Trophic Levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York 2006</td>
<td>Microzooplankton Dynamics in the Low Salinity Zone of the San Francisco Estuary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker 2006</td>
<td>The Health of Urbanized Estuaries: A Reevaluation of the Consequences of Fertilizing our bays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker 2007</td>
<td>NH4 as a potential source of ‘contaminant stress’ in Suisun Bay</td>
<td>Contaminants working group, Davis, CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugdale 2007</td>
<td>Do low phytoplankton growth rates signal the ‘bad’ habitat conditions in Suisun Bay driving the pelagic organism decline?</td>
<td>IEP annual workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker 2007</td>
<td>The importance of separate consideration of anthropogenic NH4 and NO3 inputs for effective management of estuarine cultural eutrophication.</td>
<td>CAERS, Bodega Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimmerer 2007</td>
<td>Indirect human impacts on an estuarine foodweb illustrate the false dichotomy of top-down and bottom-up.</td>
<td>Fourth Zoopl. Prod. Symp., Hiroshima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimmerer 2007</td>
<td>Foodweb Support for Pelagic Fishes of the San Francisco Estuary: Subtle Interactions and Decade-Scale Changes.</td>
<td>AFS San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen 2007</td>
<td>Salinities in the Upper San Francisco Estuary Affect Phytoplankton Biomass and Dissolved Organic Carbon Availability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gould 2007</td>
<td>Population Dynamics of Limnoithona tetraspina: The success of an introduced copepod in San Francisco Estuary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugdale 2007</td>
<td>DIN is an inadequate descriptor for evaluating nitrogen based effects on estuarine ecosystems.</td>
<td>ERF Providence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parker 2007</td>
<td>Evaluating the Contribution of Bacterioplankton Carbon to the Foodweb of the Northern San Francisco Estuary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimmerer 2007</td>
<td>Foodweb Support for Pelagic Fishes of the Upper San Francisco Estuary: Subtle Interactions and Subsidies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson 2007</td>
<td>Corbicula and Corbula are stressing the restoration: Can we manage freshwater to limit their success?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilkerson 2007</td>
<td>Anomalously low phytoplankton productivity in northern San Francisco Estuary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York 2007</td>
<td>Microzooplankton dynamics in the upper San Francisco Estuary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Summary of measurements to be made in summer 2008. Measurements indicated in bold are new to the project, and methods are described in the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>LSZ</th>
<th>Transect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Salinity, temperature, irradiance profiles</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrients</td>
<td>Nitrate, ammonium, silicate, phosphate</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic matter</td>
<td>PON POC</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytoplankton</td>
<td>Chlorophyll, size fractionated</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary production – $^{13}$C single samples</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary production – $^{14}$C profiles, size fractionated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutrient uptake measurements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Species composition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lysis</td>
<td>Lysis and shrinkage experiments</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOC release from above experiments</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bacterial response from above experiments</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacteria</td>
<td>Abundance and biomass</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth rate and estimated C demand</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bacterial yield</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microzooplankton</td>
<td>Abundance and taxonomic composition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consumption rate (dilution experiments)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zooplankton</td>
<td>Abundance and taxonomic / life stage, 2 size fractions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Feeding and growth</strong> <em>(Acartiella)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Consumption by clams</strong> <em>(Limnoithona)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Microcystis effects</em>* <em>(Pseudodiaptomus)</em></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clams</td>
<td>Spatial distribution of <em>Corbula</em> biomass</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clam condition in above samples</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>DOC uptake</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benthos</td>
<td><strong>DOC and nutrient flux</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cascade</td>
<td>Impact of zooplankton on microbial foodweb</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Simplified material flow diagram for the pelagic foodweb of the Low Salinity Zone of the San Francisco Estuary. For clarity we include mainly the components and links we propose to investigate. Links shown as solid lines will be investigated in field or laboratory work, while those shown as dotted lines will be inferred from literature data or results of other projects. We focus on events and effects in the Low-Salinity Zone (LSZ), with a salinity range of roughly 0.5 – 6. The foodweb is fueled by local phytoplankton production and by subsidies mainly due to advection from the Delta, e.g., in phytoplankton biomass and dissolved organic carbon (DOC). The foodweb may be more complex than previously thought, with additional trophic steps in the microbial web and among the copepods, both of which reduce efficiency of energy transfer to fish.
Figure 2. Estimated flux of phytoplankton carbon into the LSZ including in situ primary production, advection from the Delta, and dispersion from the Delta. Dispersion was negligible, and the difference between total and primary production is due to advection.
Figure 3. Results of preliminary trophic transfer experiment. Surface water from the LSZ was pre-screened to remove larger zooplankton, then copepods were added, followed by $^{13}$C-labeled bicarbonate and $^{15}$N-labeled ammonium. Controls and total seston (top) behaved similarly, except that some of the seston samples were lost because of jamming in the mass spectrometer (also the likely source of outliers). Patterns for C and N addition were similar except that the atom percent $^{15}$N for seston < 2μm increased much faster than the atom percent $^{13}$C, presumably because bacteria were taking up N directly from the water. Seston atom percent $^{15}$N leveled off after 2 days because the ammonium was exhausted. Copepods had similar patterns in general except that the atom percent $^{13}$C and $^{15}$N for Pseudodiaptomus increased faster than that for Limnoithona, presumably because Pseudodiaptomus is feeding more on phytoplankton, whereas most of the diet of Limnoithona was ciliates. Note differences in scales among the panels.
Budget and justification

Summary Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SFSU</th>
<th>Phytopl. &amp; Bacteria</th>
<th>Micro-zoop</th>
<th>Lysis</th>
<th>Zoop</th>
<th>Benthos</th>
<th>Joint</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>32,080</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>20017</td>
<td>24200</td>
<td>10,517</td>
<td></td>
<td>88,714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>13,887</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>9781</td>
<td>2130</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td></td>
<td>31,930</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel: local</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel: out of state</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>29,220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>12,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcontracts</td>
<td>26,874</td>
<td>22,720</td>
<td>21,215</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>70,809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Costs</td>
<td>74,966</td>
<td>26,874</td>
<td>27,752</td>
<td>36,298</td>
<td>249,272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>299,872</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subcontracts</th>
<th>U Conn</th>
<th>Georgia Southern</th>
<th>USGS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries &amp; Wages</td>
<td>13087</td>
<td>11000</td>
<td>7673</td>
<td>31,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>1629</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>1406</td>
<td>4,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel: local</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>3588</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>5,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel: out of state</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>5358</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td>4,578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other costs</td>
<td>17,916</td>
<td>16,450</td>
<td>15,857</td>
<td>50,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Direct Costs</td>
<td>8958</td>
<td>6270</td>
<td>5358</td>
<td>20,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Costs</td>
<td>26,874</td>
<td>22,720</td>
<td>21215</td>
<td>70,809</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed project is set up as a single contract with SFSU, with subcontracts to the University of Connecticut (Microzooplankton studies), Georgia Southern University (Lysis of phytoplankton), and the U.S. Geological Survey (Benthic studies). Other cost items under these categories will be incurred by SFSU. The Joint category is for boat time, field supplies, 1 month of the lead PI’s time, and 0.5 month of a technician II’s time for organizing fieldwork.

SFSU salaries and wages cover about 20 person-months of work including 2 months by Kimmerer, 3 months for Parker, 9 months for technical assistants, and 1 year for a student assistant at half-time. Fringe benefits vary by person but for most employees the benefit rate is 40-50%. Funds are requested for travel to 4 national meetings, 2 by members of the phytoplankton group (Dugdale, Wilkerson, Parker) and 2 by members of the zooplankton group (Kimmerer and a student). Supplies include field and laboratory supplies for each subproject, particularly for the chemical and isotope analyses proposed. The costs of these analyses have been estimated based on running 3 transects with 15 stations, plus 4 days of rate studies (Table
3), all at suitable levels of replication based on past experience. Indirect costs are calculated at 25% of all costs except for the amount of subcontracts that exceed $25,000.

**UConn:** This budget is to conduct cascade and dilution experiments and bioassays for labile DOC. We have budgeted 65 days for Dr. Joanna York, who is the postdoctoral associate on the current project, and 100 hours of a graduate student assistant. Fringe benefits are 13% and 9% respectively. We request $1000 in supplies, mainly filters and chemicals, and funds for 2 round trips to Tiburon for Dr. McManus and Dr. York, for the field work and participation in a team meeting during the field season. McManus will not take any salary from the project.

**Georgia Southern University:** Dr. Risa Cohen will be responsible for the lysis experiments. She requests 2 months of summer salary. Benefits are 16.93%, and overhead is 57% on salaries only. Two trips to Tiburon are planned to participate in the field work and in the synthesis meeting (this was not budgeted in the original proposal because Dr. Cohen was at SFSU at that time).

**USGS:** Dr. Jim Kuwabara will conduct the benthic flux measurements. He requests 40 hours’ salary for himself and 120 hours for an analytical chemist, Mr. Brent Topping. Benefits are budgeted at 30% of salaries. Supplies include gases and chemicals. Travel is requested for field sampling and shipping of samples and equipment. Sample analyses (nutrients, DOC, chlorophyll) will be run at RTC in the Dugdale/Wilkerson lab. USGS also requests costs of collecting benthic blitz samples, which will be analyzed in the Kimmerer lab.
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