Progress toward water quality improvement: Macrophytes. AMP 2010 Annual Report. (Assessment Measure)

AMENDED CONSENT JUDGMENT GOAL

Expansion of the areal coverage and increase in diversity of macrophyte community, where number of species and biomass in the littoral zone (6m water depth) are comparable to other regional lakes. Increase percent cover of littoral zone to optimal levels (40% - 60%) for largemouth bass habitat, to achieve desired use of the lake for warmwater fish reproduction.

Hypotheses to be tested:	Status:		
Metro improvements and watershed phosphorus load reductions indirectly result in increased areal coverage of macrophytes in littoral zone of Onondaga Lake.	 Metro improvements to reduce nutrient loading were implemented in 2004 (BAF) and 2005 (HRFS) Areal coverage in the littoral zone has increased between 2000 and 2010 		
Metro improvements and watershed phosphorus load reductions indirectly result in increased number of macrophyte species in Onondaga Lake.	• The number of macrophyte species has increased from 5 in 1991 to 23 in 2010		
Current Conditions with Historical Comparison			
Community Composition (Lakewide)	Year	Number of species present	Dominant species by relative % cover
	1991:	5	no data
	2000:	10	Sago pondweed (52%) Common waterweed (26%)
	2005:	17	Common waterweed (62%) Coontail (19%)
	2010	23	Coontail (30%) Common waterweed (23%) Water stargrass (17%)
	199	1 data from John Mad	sen, Army Corps of Engineers, 1996
Biomass (Lakewide average)	2005: 51	g data $g g/m^2$ dry weight g/m^2 dry weight g/m^2 dry weight	
Species Richness (Transect average)	 1991: 1.3 species per transect (Madsen et al 1996) 2000: 3.6 species per transect 2005: 5.6 species per transect 2010: 6.8 species per transect 		
Percent of Subplots with Macrophytes	1991: 13% (Madsen et al 1996) 2000: 61% 2005: 74% 2010: 83%		
Percent Cover in littoral zone (Lakewide average)	1991: no 2000: 18		2005: 26% 2010: 65%
Aerial Photographs (Percent indicates percent coverage of littoral zone. Aerial photographs were obtained in June prior to 2006, and in August since 2006.)	2001: 13 2002: 14 2003: 26 2004: No	acres (11%) 4 acres (17%) 2 acres (18%) 7 acres (34%) o data 8 acres (49%)	2006: 183 acres (24%)* 2007: 210 acres (27%)* 2008: 314 acres (40%)* 2009: 382 acres (50%)* 2010: 409 acres (54%)
Factors affecting macrophyte community		nent texture (oncolite penetration, salinity,	s are nutrient-poor and unstable) zebra mussels

Progress towards water quality improvement: Macrophytes. AMP 2010 Annual Report. (Assessment Measure) (*continued*).

Monitoring and Assessment Program	
Lake Monitoring	 Survey species composition, percent cover, and biomass every 5 years, from 2000 to 2010. Annual aerial photographs of littoral zone to estimate acres of macrophytes.
	Metrics to track over time
	• Number of species (richness)
	Percent cover
	• Biomass
Tools for Decision Making	
Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis	Compare to baseline survey in 2000