

The Effects of Tropical Storm Agnes
on the Chesapeake Bay Estuarine System

The Chesapeake Research Consortium, Inc.

**THE EFFECTS OF TROPICAL STORM AGNES
ON THE CHESAPEAKE BAY ESTUARINE SYSTEM**

**THE EFFECTS OF
TROPICAL STORM AGNES
ON THE
CHESAPEAKE BAY ESTUARINE SYSTEM**

THE CHESAPEAKE RESEARCH CONSORTIUM, INC.

The Johns Hopkins University
Smithsonian Institution
University of Maryland
Virginia Institute of Marine Science

Project Coordinator, Jackson Davis (VIMS)
Volume Coordinator, Beverly Laird (VIMS)

Section Editors

Evon P. Ruzecki, Hydrological Effects (VIMS)
J. R. Schubel, Geological Effects (JHU)
Robert J. Huggett, Water Quality Effects (VIMS)
Aven M. Anderson, Biological Effects, Commercial (U.Md.)
Marvin L. Wass, Biological Effects, Non-Commercial (VIMS)
Richard J. Marasco, Economic Impacts (U.Md.)
M. P. Lynch, Public Health Impacts (VIMS)

November 1976

CRC Publication No. 54

*Published for The Chesapeake Research Consortium, Inc.,
by The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore and London*

Copyright © 1977 by The Chesapeake Research Consortium, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, xerography, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Manufactured in the United States of America

The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland 21218
The Johns Hopkins Press Ltd., London

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 76-47392
ISBN 0-8018-1945-8

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication data
will be found on the last printed page of this book.

Preface

During June 1972 Tropical Storm Agnes released record amounts of rainfall on the watersheds of most of the major tributaries of Chesapeake Bay. The resulting floods, categorized as a once-in-100-to-200-year occurrence, caused perturbations of the environment in Chesapeake Bay, the nation's greatest estuary.

This volume is an attempt to bring together analyses of the effects of this exceptional natural event on the hydrology, geology, water quality, and biology of Chesapeake Bay and to consider the impact of these effects on the economy of the Tidewater Region and on public health.

It is to be hoped that these analyses of the event will usefully serve government agencies and private sectors of society in their planning and evaluation of measures to cope with and ameliorate damage from estuarine flooding. It is also to be hoped that the scientific and technical sectors of society will gain a better understanding of the fundamental nature of the myriad and interrelated phenomena that is the Chesapeake Bay ecosystem. Presumably much of what was learned about Chesapeake Bay will be applicable to estuarine systems elsewhere in the world. Most of the papers comprising this volume were presented at a symposium held May 6-7, 1974, at College Park, Maryland, under the sponsorship of the Chesapeake Research Consortium, Inc., with support from the Baltimore District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Contract No. DACW 31-73-C-0189). An early and necessarily incomplete assessment, *The Effects of Hurricane Agnes on the Environment and Organisms of Chesapeake Bay* was prepared by personnel from the Chesapeake Bay Institute (CBI), the Chesapeake Biological Laboratory (CBL), and the Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) for the Philadelphia District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Most of the scientists who contributed to the early report conducted further analyses and wrote papers forming a part of this report on the effects of Agnes. Additional contributions have been prepared by other scientists, most notably in the fields of biological effects and economics.

The report represents an attempt to bring together all data, no matter how fragmentary, relating to the topic. The authors are to be congratulated for the generally high quality of their work. Those who might question, in parts of the purse, the fineness of the silk must keep in mind the nature of the sow's ears from which it was spun. This is not to disparage the effort, but only to recognize that the data were collected under circumstances which at best were less than ideal. When the flood waters surged into the Bay there was no time for painstaking experimental design. There were not enough instruments to take as many measurements as the investigators would have desired. There were not enough containers to obtain the needed samples or enough reagents to analyze them. There were not enough technicians and clerks to collect and tabulate the data. While the days seemed far too short to accomplish the job at hand, they undoubtedly seemed far too long to the beleaguered field parties, vessel crews, laboratory technicians, and scientists who worked double shifts regularly and around the clock on many occasions. To these dedicated men and women, whose quality of performance and perseverance under trying circumstances were outstanding, society owes an especial debt of gratitude.

It should be noted that the Chesapeake Bay Institute, the Chesapeake Biological Laboratory, and the Virginia Institute of Marine Science, the three major laboratories doing research on Chesapeake Bay, undertook extensive data-gathering programs, requiring sizable commitments of personnel and equipment, without assurance that financial support would be provided. The emergency existed, and the scientists recognized both an obligation to assist in ameliorating its destructive effects and a rare scientific opportunity to better understand the ecosystem. They proceeded to organize a coordinated program in the hope that financial arrangements could be worked out later. Fortunately, their hopes proved well founded. Financial and logistic assistance was provided by a large number of agencies

that recognized the seriousness and uniqueness of the Agnes phenomenon. A list of those who aided is appended. Their support is gratefully acknowledged.

This document consists of a series of detailed technical reports preceded by a summary. The summary emphasizes effects having social or economic impact. The authors of each of the technical reports are indicated. To these scientists, the editors extend thanks and commendations for their painstaking work.

Several members of the staff of the Baltimore District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, worked with the editors on this contract. We gratefully acknowledge the helpful assistance of Mr. Noel E. Beegle, Chief, Study Coordination and Evaluation Section, who served as Study Manager; Dr. James H. McKay, Chief, Technical Studies and Data Development Section; and Mr. Alfred E. Robinson, Jr., Chief of the Chesapeake Bay Study Group.

The editors are also grateful to Vickie Krahn for typing the Technical Reports and to Alice Lee Tillage and Barbara Crewe for typing the Summary.

The Summary was compiled from summaries of each section prepared by the section editors. I fear that it is too much to hope that, in my attempts to distill the voluminous, detailed, and well-prepared papers and section summaries, I have not distorted meanings, excluded useful information or overextended conclusions. For whatever shortcomings and inaccuracies that exist in the Summary, I offer my apologies.

Jackson Davis
Project Coordinator

Acknowledgements

The Chesapeake Research Consortium, Inc. is indebted to the following groups for their logistic and/or financial aid to one or more of the consortium institutions in support of investigations into the effects of Tropical Storm Agnes.

U. S. Army

- Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District
- Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District
- Corps of Engineers, Philadelphia District
- Transportation Corps, Fort Eustis, Virginia

U. S. Navy

- Naval Ordnance Laboratory
- Coastal River Squadron Two, Little Creek, Virginia
- Assault Creek Unit Two, Little Creek, Virginia
- Explosive Ordnance Disposal Unit Two, Fort Story, Virginia
- Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland

U. S. Coast Guard

- Reserve Training Center
- Coast Guard Station, Little Creek, Virginia
- Portsmouth Supply Depot
- Light Towers (Diamond Shoal, Five Fathom Bank, and Chesapeake)

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

- National Marine Fisheries Service (Woods Hole, Massachusetts and Sandy Hook, New Jersey)

The National Science Foundation

Food and Drug Administration

Environmental Protection Agency

U. S. Office of Emergency Preparedness

State of Maryland, Department of Natural Resources

Commonwealth of Virginia, Office of Emergency Preparedness

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface.	v
Acknowledgements	vii
SUMMARY.	1
Hydrological Effects	1
The Storm and Resulting Flood.	1
Effects of Flood Waters on the Salinity Distribution in Chesapeake Bay, Its Major Tributaries and Contiguous Continental Shelf.	6
Effects of Agnes Flooding on Smaller Tributaries to Chesapeake Bay	12
Geological Effects	12
Water Quality Effects.	15
Biological Effects	16
Shellfishes.	16
Fishes	18
Blue Crabs	19
Aquatic Plants	19
Jellyfish.	19
Plankton and Benthos	19
Economic Impact.	20
Shellfish and Finfish Industries	21
Economic Impact on Recreation Industries and Users	23
Other Impacts.	27
Public Health Impacts.	27
Shellfish Closings	28
Water Contact Closings	28
Shellfish Contamination.	28
Waterborne Pathogens	29
Miscellaneous Hazards.	29
APPENDICES: TECHNICAL REPORTS	
A. Hydrological Effects	
Effects of Agnes on the distribution of salinity along the main axis of the bay and in contiguous shelf waters, <i>Schubel, Carter, Cronin.</i>	33

Changes in salinity structure of the James, York and Rappahannock estuaries resulting from the effects of Tropical Storm Agnes, <i>Hyer, Ruzecki</i>	66
The effects of the Agnes flood in the salinity structure of the lower Chesapeake Bay and contiguous waters, <i>Kuo, Ruzecki, Fang</i>	81
Flood wave-tide interaction on the James River during the Agnes flood, <i>Jacobson, Fang</i>	104
Daily rainfall over the Chesapeake Bay drainage basin from Tropical Storm Agnes, <i>Astling</i>	118
The effect of Tropical Storm Agnes on the salinity distribution in the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal, <i>Gardner</i>	130
Agnes impact on an eastern shore tributary: Chester River, Maryland, <i>Tzou, Palmer</i>	136
Tributary embayment response to Tropical Storm Agnes: Rhode and West rivers, <i>Han</i>	149
Rhode River water quality and Tropical Storm Agnes, <i>Cory, Redding</i>	168
B. Geological Effects	
Effects of Agnes on the suspended sediment of the Chesapeake Bay and contiguous shelf waters, <i>Schubel</i>	179
Response and recovery to sediment influx in the Rappahannock estuary: a summary, <i>Nichols, Thompson, Nelson</i>	201
The effects of Tropical Storm Agnes on the copper and zinc budgets of the Rappahannock River, <i>Huggett, Bender</i>	205
Agnes in Maryland: Shoreline recession and landslides, <i>McMullan</i>	216
Chester River sedimentation and erosion: equivocal evidence, <i>Palmer</i>	223
Effect of Tropical Storm Agnes on the beach and nearshore profile, <i>Kerhin</i>	227
Agnes in the geological record of the upper Chesapeake Bay, <i>Schubel, Zabawa</i>	240

C. Water Quality Effects	
Some effects of Tropical Storm Agnes on water quality in the Patuxent River estuary, <i>Flemer, Ulanowicz,</i> <i>Taylor</i>	251
Indirect effects of Tropical Storm Agnes upon the Rhode River, <i>Correll</i>	288
Effects of Tropical Storm Agnes on nutrient flux and distribution in lower Chesapeake Bay, <i>Smith, MacIntyre,</i> <i>Lake, Windsor</i>	299
Effects of Agnes on the distribution of nutrients in upper Chesapeake Bay, <i>Schubel, Taylor, Grant, Cronin,</i> <i>Glendering</i>	311
The effect of Tropical Storm Agnes on heavy metal and pesticide residues in the eastern oyster from southern Chesapeake Bay, <i>Bender, Huggett</i>	320
Effects of Agnes on the distribution of dissolved oxygen along the main axis of the bay, <i>Schubel, Cronin</i>	335
Observations on dissolved oxygen conditions in three Virginia estuaries after Tropical Storm Agnes (summer 1972), <i>Jordan</i>	348
The effect of Tropical Storm Agnes as reflected in chlorophyll <u>a</u> and heterotrophic potential of the lower Chesapeake Bay, <i>Zubkoff, Warinner</i>	368
Calvert Cliffs sediment radioactivities before and after Tropical Storm Agnes, <i>Cressy</i>	389
D. Biological Effects	
Distribution and abundance of aquatic vegetation in the upper Chesapeake Bay, 1971-1974, <i>Kerwin, Munro,</i> <i>Peterson</i>	393
Effects of Tropical Storm Agnes and dredge spoils on benthic macroinvertebrates at a site in the upper Chesapeake Bay, <i>Pearson, Bender</i>	401
Some effects of Tropical Storm Agnes on the sea nettle population in the Chesapeake Bay, <i>Cargo</i>	417

Effects of Tropical Storm Agnes on Zooplankton in the lower Chesapeake Bay, <i>Grant, Bryan, Jacobs, Olney</i>	425
Effects of Tropical Storm Agnes on standing crops and age structure of zooplankton in middle Chesapeake Bay, <i>Heinle, Millsaps, Millsaps</i>	443
Short-term Response of Fish to Tropical Storm Agnes in mid-Chesapeake Bay, <i>Ritchie</i>	460
The effects of Tropical Storm Agnes on fishes in the James, York, and Rapahannock rivers of Virginia, <i>Hoagman, Wilson</i>	464
Mortalities caused by Tropical Storm Agnes to clams and oysters in the Rhode River area of Chesapeake Bay, <i>Cory, Redding</i>	478
The effect of Tropical Storm Agnes on oysters, hard clams, soft clams, and oyster drills in Virginia, <i>Haven, Hargis, Loesch, Whitcomb</i>	488
A comparative study of primary production and standing crops of phytoplankton in a portion of the upper Chesapeake Bay subsequent to Tropical Storm Agnes, <i>Loftus, Seliger</i>	509
Effects of Tropical Storm Agnes on the bacterial flora of Chesapeake Bay, <i>Nelson, Colwell</i>	522
Species diversity among sarcodine protozoa from Rhode River, Maryland, following Tropical Storm Agnes, <i>Sawyer, Maclean, Coats, Hilfiker, Riordan, Small</i>	531
The impact of Tropical Storm Agnes on mid-bay infauna, <i>Hamilton</i>	544
Patterns of distribution of estuarine organisms and their response to a catastrophic decrease in salinity, <i>Larsen</i>	555
The effect of Tropical Storm Agnes on the benthic fauna of eelgrass, <i>Zostera marina</i> , in the lower Chesapeake Bay, <i>Orth</i>	566
Effect of Tropical Storm Agnes on setting of shipworms at Gloucester Point, Virginia, <i>Wass</i>	584

The displacement and loss of larval fishes from the Rappahannock and James rivers, Virginia, following a major tropical storm, <i>Hoagman, Merriner</i>	591
Effect of Agnes on jellyfish in southern Chesapeake Bay, <i>Morales-Alamo, Haven</i>	594
E. Economic Impacts	
Economic impacts of Tropical Storm Agnes in Virginia, <i>Garrett, Schifrin</i>	597
The Maryland commercial and recreational fishing industries: an assessment of the economic impact of Tropical Storm Agnes, <i>Smith, Marasco</i>	611
F. Public Health Impacts	
Public health aspects of Tropical Storm Agnes in Virginia's portion of Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries, <i>Lynch, Jones</i>	625
Public health aspects of Tropical Storm Agnes in Maryland's portion of Chesapeake Bay, <i>Andersen</i>	636

THE DISPLACEMENT AND LOSS OF LARVAL FISHES
FROM THE RAPPAHANNOCK AND JAMES RIVERS, VIRGINIA,
FOLLOWING A MAJOR TROPICAL STORM¹

Walter J. Hoagman²
John V. Merriner²

EXPANDED ABSTRACT

Methods

Two days after Tropical Storm Agnes, the Virginia Institute of Marine Science (VIMS) established an anchor station at Mile 15 in the Rappahannock and Mile 10 in the James River. Both stations were in mainstream, manned constantly for 10 days, and took continuous current data from meters placed at 0, 6, 8, and 15 m in the Rappahannock and 0, 4, 5, 8, and 14 m in the James. Concurrently, 0.85 m diameter plankton nets of No. 1 nylon mesh were hung in the flowing surface water for 10 minutes hourly. A small collection of midwater (4 m) plankton samples was obtained from the James station. The shoal areas were not sampled for larval fish. The ichthyoplankton and zooplankton captured were preserved and later identified to species. Both rivers experienced constant ebb tide for several days because of the freshwater layer sweeping to Chesapeake Bay. Below 4 m, the currents were often strongly opposed to the surface currents.

The number of larvae swept to Chesapeake Bay was computed by using a moving average of three of the 10 minute counts and the current measurements; then expanding to hourly estimates, with the flood tide periods subtracted from the loss on ebb tide to obtain daily totals. Outflow was nearly constant from 0-4 m over the first 6 days of sampling, but to allow for shoal areas where currents may have been slower and larvae less affected, only the upper meter in each river was used to calculate total volume containing fish larvae passing the river mile. The program began June 24, 1972 on each river and was discontinued on July 7, 1972, providing 184 surface samples from the Rappahannock, and 61 surface samples and 23 midwater samples from the James.

Results

Eighteen species of fish larvae were captured from the Rappahannock and 22 species from the James. *Gobiosoma boscii* typically made up 75-99% of the daily catches, followed by *Anchoc. mitchilli* with 2-20%. The next most abundant were *Syngnathus fuscus* and *Menidia menidia*.

All of the *G. boscii* were young, ranging 4.2 to 10.1 mm total length with an average of 6.2 mm. *A. mitchilli* ranged 3.0 to 18 mm but the vast majority were near 10 mm. *S. fuscus* were below 50 mm average length and *M. menidia* were typically close to 20 mm. *Alosa sapidissima* and *Alosa* sp. (river herring) were few in numbers and very small (6.0-11 mm).

Catches of larval fish were highest at the beginning, then tapered off rapidly after six days. On June 24, 65 million *G. boscii* and 0.7 million *A. mitchilli* were swept past Mile 15 on the Rappahannock. Seven days later, strong flood tides began to reverse the flow and millions of fish larvae were carried

¹Contribution No. 799, Virginia Institute of Marine Science.

²Virginia Institute of Marine Science, Gloucester Point, Va. 23062.

back into the river. These estimates were subtracted from the estimated losses. In the Rappahannock, the grand total estimated loss from June 24 to July 7, 1972, using only the upper 1 m for calculation, was 93 million *G. bosci*, 3.6 million *A. mitchilli*, 1.8 million *S. fuscus*, and 2.2 million *M. menidia*. All other species had estimated losses of less than 0.5 million. The estimates are additionally conservative, because Agnes produced strong outflows on June 21, 22, and 23 and these days were not sampled or included in the total estimates.

The James River, using to 1 m only, lost 429 million *G. bosci*, 26 million *A. mitchilli*, 0.9 million *M. menidia*, 0.4 million *S. fuscus*, 13.1 million *Alosa aestivalis*, and 1.6 million *Dorosoma cepedianum*. June 25 and 28 were the days of greatest loss.

Midwater catches (4 m) of fish larvae from the strongly outflowing water demonstrate a high proportion of the total loss (unknown) was below 1 m. Between 0630 on June 25 and 1040 on June 28, 13 sets of surface and midwater samples were taken concurrently from the James station. The actual number of larvae captures was:

	<i>G. bosci</i>	<i>A. mitchilli</i>	<i>A. aestivalis</i>
Surface	627	62	56
Midwater	1,035	111	16
Midwater as % of Total Captured	62%	64%	22%

Based on these data, the 1 m estimate of total loss could be low by a factor of 5 to 10. The midwater data were not complete enough to allow volume estimates of flow or estimate total loss of fish larvae with catch data below 1 m.

Conclusions

The loss of fish larvae from both rivers was high for 4 species in the Rappahannock and 6 species in the James. The James lost 5 times the *G. bosci*, 7 times the *A. mitchilli*, and 30 times the *A. aestivalis* as the Rappahannock. The Rappahannock lost more *M. menidia* and *S. fuscus*, however.

In 1972, the juvenile *A. aestivalis* population in the James on September 1 was estimated to be 264 million (Hoagman & Kriete 1975). This was only 23% of the 1971 year class and 66% of the 1973 year class for the James.

Turner and Chadwich (1972) using 11 years of c/f sampling, gave a daily Z of 0.053 for *Morone saxatilis* over the sizes of 20 to 51 mm. Their Z may not apply to *A. aestivalis*, but without Z for these, an approximation of stock size on June 22 can be computed by substitution in the general population formula:

$$N_t = N_0 e^{(Zt)}$$

$$264 = N_0 e^{(-0.53 \times 71 \text{ days})}$$

$$N_0 = 613 \text{ mill.}$$

An estimated loss of 13 million *A. aestivalis* because of Agnes, therefore, represents a 2% loss of the larvae. This would be the low estimate. More likely, the loss was above 5%, but probably less than 20%.

We do not know the actual impact on the stocks which had substantial larval losses. Agnes did not wipe out any river or stock it seems. The fish populations with high losses were abundant the year after Agnes, but quantitative measures of the relationship are not available.

LITERATURE CITED

- Hoagman, W. J. and W. H. Kriete. 1975. Biology and management of river herring and shad in Virginia. VIMS Adadromous Fish Project, Annual Report, AFC-8-2, 105 p.
- Turner, J. L. and H. K. Chadwick. 1972. Distribution and abundance of young-of-the-year striped bass, *Morone saxatilis*, in relation to river flow in the Sacramento-San Joaquin estuary. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 101(3):442-452.