

# Experimental Nutrient Enrichment Causes Complex Changes in Seagrass, Microalgae, and Macroalgae Community Structure in Florida Bay

ANNA R. ARMITAGE<sup>1,\*</sup>, THOMAS A. FRANKOVICH<sup>1</sup>, KENNETH L. HECK, JR.<sup>2</sup>, and JAMES W. FOURQUREAN<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Biological Sciences and Southeast Environmental Research Center, Florida International University, Miami, Florida 33199

<sup>2</sup> Dauphin Island Sea Laboratory, 101 Bienville Boulevard, Dauphin Island, Alabama 36528

**ABSTRACT:** We examined the spatial extent of nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) limitation of each of the major benthic primary producer groups in Florida Bay (seagrass, epiphytes, macroalgae, and benthic microalgae) and characterized the shifts in primary producer community composition following nutrient enrichment. We established 24 permanent 0.25-m<sup>2</sup> study plots at each of six sites across Florida Bay and added N and P to the sediments in a factorial design for 18 mo. Tissue nutrient content of the turtlegrass *Thalassia testudinum* revealed a spatial pattern in P limitation, from severe limitation in the eastern bay (N:P > 96:1), moderate limitation in two intermediate sites (approximately 63:1), and balanced with N availability in the western bay (approximately 31:1). P addition increased *T. testudinum* cover by 50–75% and short-shoot productivity by up to 100%, but only at the severely P-limited sites. At sites with an ambient N:P ratio suggesting moderate P limitation, few seagrass responses to nutrients occurred. Where ambient *T. testudinum* tissue N:P ratios indicated N and P availability was balanced, seagrass was not affected by nutrient addition but was strongly influenced by disturbance (currents, erosion). Macroalgal and epiphytic and benthic microalgal biomass were variable between sites and treatments. In general, there was no algal overgrowth of the seagrass in enriched conditions, possibly due to the strength of seasonal influences on algal biomass or regulation by grazers. N addition had little effect on any benthic primary producers throughout the bay. The Florida Bay benthic primary producer community was P limited, but P-induced alterations of community structure were not uniform among primary producers or across Florida Bay and did not always agree with expected patterns of nutrient limitation based on stoichiometric predictions from field assays of *T. testudinum* tissue N:P ratios.

## Introduction

Increased nutrient input as a consequence of human land use can cause changes in species composition and primary productivity in terrestrial and aquatic habitats (Borum and Sand-Jensen 1996; Smith et al. 1999; Kennish 2002). Urban and agricultural development in watersheds render coastal systems particularly susceptible to nutrient input (Nixon 1995; Smith et al. 1999), making the prediction of nutrient loading effects on coastal systems a key management goal. Nitrogen (N) is frequently a limiting nutrient in coastal systems, but increasing evidence for phosphorus (P) limitation suggests that both N and P enrichment are of concern in nearshore habitats (Howarth 1988).

Frequently documented responses of tropical and subtropical seagrasses to elevated N or P supply include increases in biomass and productivity (Powell et al. 1989; Tomasko and Lapointe 1991; Lee and Dunton 2000), though consequences of

nutrient enrichment vary widely within and among species and regions. Seagrass beds in carbonate sediments are generally considered to be P limited (Short et al. 1985) and may respond strongly to P enrichment, though N limitation in carbonate sediments has been documented as well (Udy et al. 1999; Ferdie and Fourqurean 2004). Different nutrient requirements among seagrass species can cause co-occurring species to be limited by different nutrients (Udy and Dennison 1997). Different levels of N or P limitation for individual seagrass species can occur along regional nutrient availability gradients (Lee and Dunton 2000; Fourqurean and Zieman 2002; Ferdie and Fourqurean 2004).

Macroalgae are important components of seagrass communities as well, but increases in nutrient supply can cause algal proliferations that overgrow and displace aquatic vegetation (Duarte 1995; Valiela et al. 1997; Hauxwell et al. 2001; McGlathery 2001). Evidence for both P limitation (Lapointe 1989) and N limitation (Larned 1998) suggests that tropical macroalgal responses to nutrient en-

\* Corresponding author; tele: 305/348-7317; fax: 305/348-4096; e-mail: armitage@fiu.edu

richment are highly species-specific and vary among regions. Like seagrasses, tropical macroalgae may also exhibit intraspecific variation in responses to nutrient enrichment along gradients corresponding to background nutrient influence (Fong et al. 2003), but algae do not necessarily exhibit the same limitation patterns as co-occurring seagrasses (Ferdie and Fourqurean 2004).

Microalgae, both benthic and epiphytic, comprise another important primary producer in seagrass communities (Moncreiff et al. 1992). Microalgal biomass and productivity can increase when enriched with N or P (Nilsson et al. 1991) and can overgrow other aquatic vegetation (Tomasko and Lapointe 1991). Microalgal responses to nutrient enrichment may also be strongly limited by biotic factors such as herbivory (Williams and Ruckelshaus 1993).

Florida Bay is a shallow, semi-enclosed system with extensive seagrass beds dominated by *Thalassia testudinum* (turtle grass). *T. testudinum* tissue in much of Florida Bay has a N:P ratio of  $\gg 30:1$  with a maximum of 115:1 (Fourqurean and Zieman 2002), suggesting severe P limitation (Atkinson and Smith 1983). A complex network of shallow carbonate banks within the Bay restricts water flow and creates numerous, effectively isolated basins, such that sites in close proximity may have dramatically different stoichiometric patterns. Spatial gradients in N:P of seagrass tissue (Fourqurean et al. 1992) and the water column (Fourqurean et al. 1993) suggest that P availability is highest along the western marine boundary of the Bay and decreases towards the east and north. From this pattern, it has been hypothesized that the marine waters of the Gulf of Mexico are the major P source for Florida Bay (Fourqurean et al. 1992, 1993); these hypotheses have been supported with budgetary calculations (Rudnick et al. 1999). There is evidence that N can limit some components of the pelagic primary producers in the western regions of the Bay (Lavrentyev et al. 1998; Tomas et al. 1999), and arguments have been made that some of the changes in the Florida Bay ecosystem, including loss of seagrass and increases in phytoplankton abundance, may be a result of increased N loading into western Florida Bay (Brand 2002; Lapointe and Barile 2004). Given the gradient of N:P and the finding of N limitation of benthic primary producers offshore towards the Florida Barrier Reef (Ferdie and Fourqurean 2004), such arguments bear testing experimentally.

Our objectives were to evaluate the spatial extent of nutrient (N or P) limitation of each of the major benthic primary producer groups in Florida Bay (seagrass, epiphytes, macroalgae, and benthic microalgae) and characterize the shifts in primary




Fig. 1. Map of Florida Bay and study sites. Bay regions are defined based on delineations from Zieman et al. (1989). Region A is Gulf, Region B is Interior-Central, and Region C is Northeast.

producer community composition following fertilization of the seagrass community. We hypothesized that N and P enrichment would stimulate acute primary producer responses corresponding to the degree of nutrient limitation as predicted by ambient *T. testudinum* tissue N:P ratios along the gradient of P availability in the Bay. We also predicted that nutrient enrichment would shift primary producer community composition towards microalgal and macroalgal species with high turnover rates (sensu Duarte 1995).

### Methods

To evaluate the effects of N and P enrichment across a P-availability gradient within Everglades National Park in Florida Bay, we used a three-way, split-plot ANOVA design, where the factors were P addition, N addition, and region of the bay. In October 2002 we established six study sites (all depths  $< 2$  m), with two sites nested in each of three major regions of the Bay: Northeast, Interior-Central, and Gulf, as defined by Zieman et al. (1989) based on macrophyte and sediment characteristics. The two eastern sites (Region C, Fig. 1) were characterized by a sparse, short *T. testudinum* canopy with some calcareous green macroalgae, primarily *Penicillus* spp., and occurred in an area of severe P limitation (Fourqurean and Zieman 2002). The middle two sites (Region B) occurred in a region of intermediate P limitation (Fourqurean and Zieman 2002) but varied in their vegetation characteristics. The easternmost of these sites (B2) had vegetation characteristics similar to those in Region C, while the western site (B1) featured a dense, tall *T. testudinum* canopy and little macroalgae. The westernmost two sites (Region A) were located in a region that may experience both N and P limitation. The eastern site in Region A (A2) had vegetation characteristics similar to site B1.

The western site (A1) was characterized by a dense macroalgal-*Syringodium filiforme* (manatee grass)-*T. testudinum* assemblage. At each site we established 24 0.25-m<sup>2</sup> study plots demarcated with a PVC frame secured to the benthos at 1-m intervals.

We randomly assigned treatments (control [C], nitrogen only [N], phosphorus only [P], both nitrogen and phosphorus [NP]) to six plots per site (at site A1,  $n = 3$  due to the loss of 12 plots from erosion and boat disturbance over the course of the study). N was added in the form of slow release nitrogen fertilizer (Polyon, Pursell Technologies Inc., 38-0-0, 94% N as urea) and P as granular phosphate rock (Multifos, IMC Global, Ca<sub>3</sub>(PO<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub>, 18% P). Loading rates of 1.43 g N m<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup> and 0.18 g P m<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup> (molar N:P ratio 17.6:1) were selected based on potential sewage loading rates (MCSM 2001) and previous studies in the region (Ferdie and Fourqurean 2004). We began bi-monthly applications of fertilizer in October 2002 by sprinkling granular fertilizer evenly on the sediment surface and gently working it into the sediment by hand. Sediment in the control plots was similarly disturbed but no fertilizer was added. Benthic fertilizer applications ensured accessibility of nutrients to both aboveground and benthic primary producers (Ferdie and Fourqurean 2004; Mutchler et al. 2004).

In February 2004 we determined sediment, seagrass tissue, and seagrass epiphyte N and P content to assess the effectiveness of the enrichment treatments. Macroalgal tissue nutrient content was not determined due to insufficient algal abundance and the occurrence of different species at each site. Sediment cores (1 cm diameter, 5 cm deep) were collected from each plot and dried at 60°C. Two *T. testudinum* short-shoots were collected from each plot and the epiphytes removed by gently scraping the blades with a razor blade. At site A1, nutrient content of *S. filiforme* tissue was also determined. N content of the sediment, epiphytes, and the cleaned seagrass tissue were determined separately using a CHN analyzer (Fisons NA1500). P content was determined by a dry-oxidation, acid hydrolysis extraction followed by a colorimetric analysis of phosphate concentration of the extract (Fourqurean et al. 1992).

Using methods based on extensive monitoring in this region (Fourqurean et al. 2002), we estimated seagrass (*T. testudinum*, *S. filiforme*, and *Halodule wrightii* [shoalgrass]) and macroalgal percent cover with a modified Braun-Blanquet (BB) abundance scale: 0 = absent; 0.1 = one individual, < 5% cover; 0.5 = few individuals, < 5% cover; 1 = many individuals, < 5% cover; 2 = 5–25% cover; 3 = 25–50% cover; 4 = 50–75% cover; and 5 = 75–100% cover. To measure *T. testudinum* produc-

tivity, two haphazardly selected short-shoots in each plot were marked at the base of the leaves with an 18-gauge hypodermic needle and labeled with a cable tie for identification. We collected the shoots after 11–13 d, recorded the increase in leaf lengths, and calculated productivity (mg short-shoot<sup>-1</sup> d<sup>-1</sup>). We limited our productivity measurements to two shoots to minimize impact and facilitate future long-term sampling of this experiment.

All epiphytes were removed from one short shoot from each plot as above. Epiphytes were freeze dried and pigments extracted with 90% acetone. The chlorophyll *a* (chl *a*) concentration was determined using a Shimadzu RF-Mini 150 fluorometer with low bandwidth filters (Welschmeyer 1994) following calibration with a chl *a* standard using a Shimadzu UV Mini 1240 spectrophotometer and the spectrophotometric equations of Jeffrey and Humphrey (1975).

To determine benthic microalgal biomass, we collected a 2.5 cm diameter, 1 cm deep core haphazardly located within each plot. Sediments were freeze dried, pigments extracted with 90% acetone, and chl *a* concentration determined as for the epiphytes.

The variances of all data were tested for homoscedasticity using the  $F_{\max}$  test and log transformed if necessary to conform to the assumptions of analysis of variance (ANOVA). All data were analyzed with three-way, split-plot ANOVA, where the factors were  $\pm$  P,  $\pm$  N, and region (A, B, C) with sites (A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2) nested within regions. Region, P, and N factors were considered fixed and sites were random for this ANOVA model. The linear model for this design was: (response variable)<sub>ijklm</sub> =  $\mu$  + (region)<sub>i</sub> + (P addition)<sub>k</sub> + (N addition)<sub>l</sub> + (interaction between region and P)<sub>ik</sub> + (interaction between region and N)<sub>il</sub> + (interaction between P and N)<sub>kl</sub> + (interaction between region, P, and N)<sub>ikl</sub> + (site within region)<sub>j(i)</sub> + (interaction between site within region and P)<sub>j(i)k</sub> + (interaction between site within region and N)<sub>j(i)l</sub> + (interaction between site within region, P, and N)<sub>j(i)kl</sub> +  $\epsilon_{ijklm}$ .  $\mu$  is the overall mean,  $\epsilon$  is the unexplained error, i, j, k, and l represent the levels within each factor, and m is the number of observations per site per nutrient treatment (Quinn and Keough 2002). Site A1 was excluded from analyses of *T. testudinum* productivity and epiphyte nutrient content due to insufficient replication, as several plots at that site contained only one *T. testudinum* short shoot, and we prioritized the epiphyte chl *a* and seagrass tissue nutrient analyses.

## Results

Sediment, seagrass, and epiphyte nutrient content reflected nutrient treatments, though the

magnitude of the responses varied among regions and sites. Significant region  $\times$  P and site  $\times$  P interactions for sediment %P (Table 1) suggested that although sediment P content increased at all sites when P was added, the magnitude of increase varied among sites within regions. All sites had low P content ( $< 0.05\%$ ) prior to P addition, but sites A2 and B1 appeared to have the largest increases when P was added (Fig. 2). Sediment N content was significantly affected by region, site, and N addition. Sediment %N increased when N was added, but the increase was generally less than 50% over control levels. Sediment N content was lower in Region C than in Regions A and B and highest overall in sites A2 and B1.

Significant region  $\times$  P and site  $\times$  P  $\times$  N interactions suggested that responses of *T. testudinum* tissue %P content to nutrient treatments varied among sites within regions but that there was no clear regional pattern (Table 1). *T. testudinum* P content increased by up to 300% when P was added at all sites except A1, where control and enriched levels of P were similar to each other and to enriched P levels at other sites (Fig. 3). At sites B2 and C2, P addition did not increase tissue P content as much when N was also added. Tissue %N content significantly increased in response to N addition, though the change was small (10–20% increase), relative to the P responses. Significant site  $\times$  P and region  $\times$  P interactions suggested that tissue %N content response to P enrichment varied among sites within regions. Tissue %N content increased when P was also added, but only at sites B2 and C1. At site A1, N content decreased when P was added. Significant region  $\times$  P and site  $\times$  P  $\times$  N interactions for *T. testudinum* molar N:P ratios closely followed the site-specific but not region-specific tissue %P responses. In control plots, the *T. testudinum* N:P ratio was approximately 31:1 at site A1, 63:1 at sites A2 and B1, and 96:1 at sites B2, C1, and C2. At all sites except A1, P addition lowered *T. testudinum* N:P ratios to values approaching those at A1, though the largest relative decreases occurred at sites B2 and C2. At those two sites, N:P ratios appeared to be lower when P was added alone than when P and N were added together. *S. filiforme* tissue nutrient content did not vary with nutrient treatment, but did have slightly higher P (mean  $0.24 \pm 0.01$  SE %P) and N ( $2.45 \pm 0.09$  %N) content and a lower N:P ratio ( $22.58 \pm 1.27$  N:P) than *T. testudinum* at site A1.

The nutrient content of *T. testudinum* epiphytes also showed complex responses to nutrient addition. Significant region  $\times$  P and site  $\times$  P interactions for epiphyte P content stemmed from larger increases in %P following P addition at sites B2 and C2 than at the other sites with no distinct re-

gional pattern (Table 1 and Fig. 4). No epiphyte elemental analyses were performed for site A1 due to insufficient *T. testudinum* tissue available for collection. Epiphyte N content was lower in Region C than in the other regions and variable among sites, with the highest content at sites A2 and B1, but was not affected by nutrient addition treatment (Fig. 4). Significant region  $\times$  P and site  $\times$  P interactions for epiphyte molar N:P ratios were driven by large P-induced decreases in N:P ratios at all sites except A2. Epiphyte N:P ratios were significantly higher when N was added in all regions, though the magnitude of the N effect was smaller than the P effect.

*T. testudinum* cover and productivity generally responded positively to P addition but were unaffected by N addition. A significant interaction between site and P for *T. testudinum* cover stemmed from large P-induced increases in cover at sites B2, C1, and C2 (Table 2 and Fig. 5). The strong site-specific responses of *T. testudinum* cover to P addition obscured any regional patterns. At sites B2, C1, and C2, control plots had a BB score of approximately 2, which corresponds to about 25% cover. P addition plots had BB scores of 3 or 4, corresponding to 50–75% cover. *T. testudinum* productivity varied significantly with P and N addition but strong site-specific responses masked regional trends. Productivity increased with both N and P addition relative to controls, though productivity tended to be similar between P and NP plots at sites B2, C1, and C2 (Fig. 5). Productivity tended to be higher at sites A2 and B1 than at the other sites. Site A1 was excluded from the productivity analysis due to insufficient *T. testudinum* tissue available for collection.

Two additional species of seagrass occurred at some study sites. *S. filiforme* was found in all plots at site A1 throughout the study period, but percent cover was similar across nutrient treatments (average BB score  $3.1 \pm 0.3$ ). *H. wrightii* colonized one NP plot at both sites A2 and B1 and comprised 25–50% cover in those plots.

Macroalgal cover showed group-specific responses to nutrient treatment that varied widely among regions and between sites within regions. Filamentous and other uncalcified, branching red algae (Div. Rhodophyta) and calcified green algae (Div. Chlorophyta) were the most common groups. A significant region  $\times$  P interaction suggested that cover of red macroalgae (especially the epiphytic species *Polysiphonia binneyi*, *Ceramium brevizonatum* var. *caribicum*, and *Chondria* sp.) increased in response to P addition, but primarily at sites in Region C (Table 2 and Fig. 5). Percent cover tended to be highest overall at site A1, and red algae were not detected at site B1 or in the control and N only

TABLE 1. Results from three-way, split-plot ANOVA of phosphorus (P), nitrogen (N), and bay region, with site nested within region, on N and P content of the sediment, *Thalassia testudinum* tissue, and epiphytes.

|                       | Sediment Percent P |         |         |         | Sediment Percent N |       |        |         |
|-----------------------|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------------------|-------|--------|---------|
|                       | df                 | MS      | F       | P       | df                 | MS    | F      | P       |
| Region                | 2                  | 3773.91 | 365.20  | <0.0001 | 2                  | 3.83  | 106.36 | <0.0001 |
| P                     | 1                  | 1640.11 | 1601.92 | <0.0001 | 1                  | 0.01  | 0.20   | 0.6580  |
| N                     | 1                  | 1.60    | 1.57    | 0.2134  | 1                  | 0.82  | 22.71  | <0.0001 |
| P × N                 | 1                  | 0.35    | 0.35    | 0.5577  | 1                  | <0.01 | 0.01   | 0.9403  |
| Region × P            | 2                  | 300.37  | 293.38  | <0.0001 | 2                  | 0.07  | 1.87   | 0.1597  |
| Region × N            | 2                  | 1.75    | 1.71    | 0.1851  | 2                  | 0.01  | 0.22   | 0.8053  |
| Region × P × N        | 2                  | 0.36    | 0.35    | 0.7025  | 2                  | 0.01  | 0.35   | 0.7078  |
| Site (Region)         | 3                  | 60.95   | 59.53   | <0.0001 | 3                  | 1.52  | 42.17  | <0.0001 |
| Site (Region) × P     | 3                  | 19.58   | 19.12   | <0.0001 | 3                  | 0.04  | 1.03   | 0.3821  |
| Site (Region) × N     | 3                  | 0.81    | 0.79    | 0.5002  | 3                  | 0.08  | 2.24   | 0.0874  |
| Site (Region) × P × N | 3                  | 0.25    | 0.24    | 0.8663  | 3                  | 0.03  | 0.85   | 0.4723  |
| Residual              | 108                | 1.02    |         |         | 108                | 0.04  |        |         |

|                       | <i>T. testudinum</i> Percent P |      |        |         | <i>T. testudinum</i> Percent N |       |       |         | <i>T. testudinum</i> N:P |      |        |         |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------|--------|---------|--------------------------------|-------|-------|---------|--------------------------|------|--------|---------|
|                       | df                             | MS   | F      | P       | df                             | MS    | F     | P       | df                       | MS   | F      | P       |
| Region                | 2                              | 0.71 | 70.98  | <0.0001 | 2                              | 0.03  | 25.73 | <0.0001 | 2                        | 0.55 | 60.89  | <0.0001 |
| P                     | 1                              | 1.75 | 175.44 | <0.0001 | 1                              | <0.01 | 2.46  | 0.1196  | 1                        | 1.61 | 177.76 | <0.0001 |
| N                     | 1                              | 0.11 | 10.69  | 0.0014  | 1                              | 0.01  | 8.47  | 0.0044  | 1                        | 0.18 | 20.24  | <0.0001 |
| P × N                 | 1                              | 0.05 | 4.67   | 0.0329  | 1                              | <0.01 | <0.01 | 0.9807  | 1                        | 0.05 | 5.20   | 0.0245  |
| Region × P            | 2                              | 0.25 | 25.53  | <0.0001 | 2                              | 0.01  | 5.93  | 0.0036  | 2                        | 0.18 | 19.56  | <0.0001 |
| Region × N            | 2                              | 0.01 | 1.13   | 0.3277  | 2                              | <0.01 | 0.15  | 0.8603  | 2                        | 0.01 | 1.56   | 0.2152  |
| Region × P × N        | 2                              | 0.02 | 2.37   | 0.0985  | 2                              | <0.01 | 0.58  | 0.5616  | 2                        | 0.02 | 2.29   | 0.1059  |
| Site (Region)         | 3                              | 0.20 | 20.13  | <0.0001 | 3                              | 0.05  | 45.63 | <0.0001 | 3                        | 0.41 | 45.67  | <0.0001 |
| Site (Region) × P     | 3                              | 0.08 | 8.45   | <0.0001 | 3                              | <0.01 | 2.72  | 0.0481  | 3                        | 0.07 | 7.63   | <0.0001 |
| Site (Region) × N     | 3                              | 0.01 | 0.96   | 0.4164  | 3                              | <0.01 | 1.17  | 0.3231  | 3                        | 0.01 | 1.29   | 0.2832  |
| Site (Region) × P × N | 3                              | 0.03 | 3.33   | 0.0225  | 3                              | <0.01 | 0.66  | 0.5811  | 3                        | 0.03 | 3.30   | 0.0233  |
| Residual              | 107                            | 0.01 |        |         | 107                            | <0.01 |       |         | 107                      | 0.01 |        |         |

|                       | Epiphyte Percent P |       |       |         | Epiphyte Percent N |       |       |         | Epiphyte N:P |       |       |         |
|-----------------------|--------------------|-------|-------|---------|--------------------|-------|-------|---------|--------------|-------|-------|---------|
|                       | df                 | MS    | F     | P       | df                 | MS    | F     | P       | df           | MS    | F     | P       |
| Region                | 2                  | 0.55  | 19.24 | <0.0001 | 2                  | 0.21  | 16.57 | <0.0001 | 2            | 0.12  | 6.23  | 0.0030  |
| P                     | 1                  | 1.32  | 45.93 | <0.0001 | 1                  | 0.02  | 1.72  | 0.1932  | 1            | 1.13  | 56.86 | <0.0001 |
| N                     | 1                  | 0.04  | 1.38  | 0.2427  | 1                  | 0.03  | 2.02  | 0.1584  | 1            | 0.11  | 5.45  | 0.0219  |
| P × N                 | 1                  | <0.01 | 0.07  | 0.7988  | 1                  | 0.04  | 2.84  | 0.0951  | 1            | 0.01  | 0.68  | 0.4127  |
| Region × P            | 2                  | 0.13  | 4.62  | 0.0124  | 2                  | 0.01  | 0.59  | 0.5578  | 2            | 0.16  | 8.01  | 0.0006  |
| Region × N            | 2                  | <0.01 | 0.05  | 0.9466  | 2                  | 0.01  | 1.04  | 0.3577  | 2            | <0.01 | 0.20  | 0.8217  |
| Region × P × N        | 2                  | <0.01 | 0.04  | 0.9638  | 2                  | 0.01  | 0.96  | 0.3858  | 2            | 0.01  | 0.45  | 0.6368  |
| Site (Region)         | 2                  | 0.11  | 3.64  | 0.0303  | 2                  | 0.07  | 5.60  | 0.0050  | 2            | 0.18  | 9.10  | 0.0003  |
| Site (Region) × P     | 2                  | 0.21  | 7.31  | 0.0012  | 2                  | 0.03  | 1.95  | 0.1482  | 2            | 0.11  | 5.73  | 0.0046  |
| Site (Region) × N     | 2                  | 0.07  | 2.41  | 0.0958  | 2                  | <0.01 | 0.23  | 0.7978  | 2            | 0.02  | 1.20  | 0.3069  |
| Site (Region) × P × N | 2                  | 0.01  | 0.17  | 0.8445  | 2                  | 0.01  | 0.37  | 0.6905  | 2            | 0.01  | 0.65  | 0.5228  |
| Residual              | 87                 | 0.03  |       |         | 97                 | 0.01  |       |         | 87           | 0.02  |       |         |




Fig. 2. Responses of sediment nutrient content to region and phosphorus (P) and nitrogen (N) additions: P content as a percent of dry weight; and N content as a percent of dry weight. At site A1,  $n = 3$  per nutrient treatment; at all other sites,  $n = 6$ . In all figures, significant  $p$  values are indicated and all bars represent standard error.

plots at site B2. A site  $\times$  N interaction suggested that calcified green macroalgal cover (especially the benthic genus *Penicillus* spp.) response to nutrient addition differed among sites, but high variability among sites obscured regional patterns (Fig. 5). A slight N-induced increase in cover occurred at site C2 and a small N-induced decrease in cover occurred at site A1. Calcareous green algae were not detected at sites A2 or B1.

Epiphyte loads were highly variable among regions and sites and exhibited complex responses to nutrient treatments. A significant site  $\times$  P  $\times$  N interaction suggested that epiphyte chl *a* concentration exhibited strong site-specific responses to nutrients that masked regional patterns (Table 2). The highest chl *a* concentrations occurred at sites A1 and B2 (Fig. 5). There was a strong decrease in chl *a* in the P and NP treatments at site B2, an increase in the P and NP treatments at site C1, and no nutrient effects at sites A1, A2, B1, or C2.




Fig. 3. Responses of *Thalassia testudinum* nutrient content to region and phosphorus (P) and nitrogen (N) additions: P content as a percent of dry weight; N content as a percent of dry weight; and N:P molar ratio. At site A1,  $n = 3$  per nutrient treatment; at all other sites,  $n = 6$ .

Benthic microalgal biomass, as estimated by benthic chl *a* concentration, exhibited region-specific but generally weak responses to P addition, as suggested by a significant region  $\times$  P interaction (Table 2). P addition slightly increased benthic chl *a* in region C (Fig. 5). Similar trends occurred in Region A, though variability was high at site A1. Benthic microalgal biomass did not respond to P addition treatment at sites in Region B, and no N effects were detected throughout the bay. A signif-




Fig. 4. Responses of *Thalassia testudinum* epiphyte nutrient content to region and phosphorus (P) and nitrogen (N) additions: P content as a percent of dry weight; N content as a percent of dry weight; and N:P molar ratio.  $n = 6$  per site per nutrient treatment.  $\Psi$  indicates insufficient replication for analysis.

icant site effect stemmed from higher benthic chl *a* concentrations at sites A1 and B2 than at the other sites.

### Discussion

Stoichiometric evidence from seagrass tissue N:P ratios suggests widespread P limitation in tropical seagrass communities on carbonate sediments (Atkinson and Smith 1983; Fourqurean et al.

1992). This prediction has been corroborated by experimental evidence that demonstrated positive seagrass responses to P addition (Short et al. 1985) and low porewater P concentration in carbonate sediments (McGlathery et al. 2001). P limitation in these cases may be attributed to the adsorption of phosphate to carbonate sediments (Koch et al. 2001) and the augmentation of N supply through N fixation in systems like Florida Bay with long water residence times (Howarth 1988). In our study there was little evidence for N limitation for any of the benthic primary producers throughout the bay. This agrees with predictions from studies of seagrass tissue nutrient content, which suggest that %N content above 1.8% indicates that N is not limiting (Duarte 1990), and seagrass tissue %N at all of our study sites was approximately 2%. The complex benthic primary producer responses to P enrichment that we observed support recent finding that there is no general pattern of P limitation on carbonate sediments (Ferdie and Fourqurean 2004), possibly due to an active dissolution of carbonate sediments in the rhizosphere of seagrass beds (Burdige and Zimmerman 2002), making P sorbed to sediments available for root uptake (Jensen et al. 1998). Relative supply of N and P are probably the most important determinants of the limiting nutrient, even in carbonate sediments (Erfemeijer et al. 1994).

*T. testudinum* responses to P enrichment exhibited strong site-specific variation that corresponded with the ambient seagrass N:P ratio at each site but did not follow the regional patterns we expected. The eastern bay was severely P limited, as indicated by the high (approximately 96:1) seagrass N:P ratios in unenriched plots, and P addition caused marked increases in seagrass cover and growth. The effects of P addition were not restricted to the two sites in Region C; site B2 had a similarly high ambient N:P ratio and increase in cover and productivity following P enrichment. There was little cover or growth response to P addition in the three western sites, despite tissue P content that fell well below the 0.2% threshold that suggests P limitation (Duarte 1990) at all sites except A1. Variation in growth responses was introduced by sampling only two shoots per plot in order to preserve the integrity of the canopy and facilitate future observations in this long-term study, but relative differences among sites suggest that productivity responses to nutrients were much less pronounced in the western than in the eastern sites. At sites A2 and B1, *T. testudinum* had similar N:P ratios in control plots (approximately 63:1) and exhibited similar responses to nutrient addition, despite the presence of a large, shallow bank between the two sites that limited oceanic and Gulf of Mex-




Fig. 5. Responses of primary producers to region and phosphorus (P) and nitrogen (N) additions: *Thalassia testudinum* percent cover, estimated by Braun-Blanquet (BB) score; *T. testudinum* short-shoot (ss) productivity; uncalcified red algae (Rhodophyta) cover; calcified green algae (Chlorophyta) cover; epiphyte chlorophyll *a* concentration; and benthic chlorophyll *a* concentration. At site A1,  $n = 3$  per site per nutrient treatment; at all other sites,  $n = 6$ .  $\psi$  indicates insufficient replication for analysis.  $\S$  indicates no macroalgae present.

ico water input to the Interior-Central Bay region (Region B). It is not unusual to encounter site-specific patterns of nutrient limitations in tropical seagrass communities (Agawin et al. 1996; Udy and Dennison 1997), but the spatial complexity we encountered did not follow topographic contours as we expected.

Further complexity in responses to P enrichment was revealed by the generally weak microalgal and macroalgal responses to nutrient addition throughout the Bay. Epiphytic and macroalgal overgrowth of seagrass frequently occurs in nutrient enriched conditions in both temperate (Valiela et al. 1997; Hauxwell et al. 2001; Cardoso et al. 2004) and tropical (Tomasko and Lapointe 1991; McGlathery 2001) habitats, yet this expected algal proliferation did not occur in our study. At site B2,

lower epiphyte loads in P-addition treatments followed increased *T. testudinum* productivity, which may have reduced blade life span and decreased the amount of time for epiphyte accumulation, a pattern similar to that seen in N-limited seagrass beds offshore from the Florida Keys (Ferdie and Fourqurean 2004). Differences in *T. testudinum* specific leaf productivity in Florida Bay account for less variation in epiphyte loading than grazer abundance and nutrients (Frankovich and Zieman 2005), suggesting that increased leaf productivity in enriched plots at site B2 only partially explains lower epiphyte loads. Benthic microalgal biomass can also increase in enriched conditions (Nilsson et al. 1991), but we detected little microphyto-benthic response. Although we disturbed the sediments every 2 mo during the addition of fertilizer,



TABLE 2. Results from three-way, split-plot ANOVA of phosphorus (P), nitrogen (N), and bay region, with site nested within region, on *Thalassia testudinum*, macroalgal, epiphytic microalgal, and benthic microalgal characteristics.

|                      | <i>T. testudinum</i> Cover |       |       |         |    |       | <i>T. testudinum</i> Productivity |         |     |       |       |         | Rhodophyta Cover |       |       |         |  |  |
|----------------------|----------------------------|-------|-------|---------|----|-------|-----------------------------------|---------|-----|-------|-------|---------|------------------|-------|-------|---------|--|--|
|                      | df                         | MS    | F     | P       | df | MS    | F                                 | P       | df  | MS    | F     | P       | df               | MS    | F     | P       |  |  |
| Region               | 2                          | 0.77  | 41.76 | <0.0001 | 2  | 0.42  | 9.19                              | 0.0002  | 2   | 45.34 | 83.05 | <0.0001 | 2                | 45.34 | 83.05 | <0.0001 |  |  |
| P                    | 1                          | 0.48  | 26.00 | <0.0001 | 1  | 1.18  | 25.85                             | <0.0001 | 1   | 2.04  | 3.73  | 0.0560  | 1                | 2.04  | 3.73  | 0.0560  |  |  |
| N                    | 1                          | <0.01 | 0.15  | 0.7027  | 1  | 0.31  | 6.72                              | 0.0110  | 1   | 0.43  | 0.79  | 0.3767  | 1                | 0.43  | 0.79  | 0.3767  |  |  |
| P × N                | 1                          | <0.01 | 0.21  | 0.6519  | 1  | <0.01 | 0.03                              | 0.8515  | 1   | 0.54  | 0.98  | 0.3234  | 1                | 0.54  | 0.98  | 0.3234  |  |  |
| Region × P           | 2                          | 0.03  | 1.67  | 0.1933  | 2  | 0.05  | 1.06                              | 0.3503  | 2   | 3.15  | 5.77  | 0.0042  | 2                | 3.15  | 5.77  | 0.0042  |  |  |
| Region × N           | 2                          | 0.04  | 2.03  | 0.1359  | 2  | 0.01  | 0.19                              | 0.8279  | 2   | 1.12  | 2.04  | 0.1345  | 2                | 1.12  | 2.04  | 0.1345  |  |  |
| Region × P × N       | 2                          | 0.01  | 0.60  | 0.5491  | 2  | 0.08  | 1.81                              | 0.1683  | 2   | 0.30  | 0.56  | 0.5753  | 2                | 0.30  | 0.56  | 0.5753  |  |  |
| Site(Region)         | 3                          | 1.78  | 95.72 | <0.0001 | 2  | 0.56  | 12.32                             | <0.0001 | 3   | 15.33 | 28.09 | <0.0001 | 3                | 15.33 | 28.09 | <0.0001 |  |  |
| Site(Region) × P     | 3                          | 0.22  | 11.63 | <0.0001 | 2  | 0.05  | 1.08                              | 0.3436  | 3   | 0.95  | 1.75  | 0.1613  | 3                | 0.95  | 1.75  | 0.1613  |  |  |
| Site(Region) × N     | 3                          | <0.01 | 0.17  | 0.9159  | 2  | <0.01 | <0.01                             | 0.9987  | 3   | 0.70  | 1.29  | 0.2826  | 3                | 0.70  | 1.29  | 0.2826  |  |  |
| Site(Region) × P × N | 3                          | 0.02  | 1.23  | 0.3023  | 2  | 0.01  | 0.14                              | 0.8724  | 3   | 0.35  | 0.64  | 0.5894  | 3                | 0.35  | 0.64  | 0.5894  |  |  |
| Residual             | 108                        | 0.02  |       |         | 98 | 0.05  |                                   |         | 108 | 0.55  |       |         | 108              | 0.55  |       |         |  |  |

|                      | Chlorophyta Cover |       |        |         |     |      | Epiphyte Chl <i>a</i> |         |     |      |       |         | Benthic Chl <i>a</i> |      |       |         |  |  |
|----------------------|-------------------|-------|--------|---------|-----|------|-----------------------|---------|-----|------|-------|---------|----------------------|------|-------|---------|--|--|
|                      | df                | MS    | F      | P       | df  | MS   | F                     | P       | df  | MS   | F     | P       | df                   | MS   | F     | P       |  |  |
| Region               | 2                 | 10.33 | 72.73  | <0.0001 | 2   | 0.92 | 34.28                 | <0.0001 | 2   | 0.17 | 7.97  | 0.0006  | 2                    | 0.17 | 7.97  | 0.0006  |  |  |
| P                    | 1                 | 0.01  | 0.07   | 0.7906  | 1   | 0.10 | 3.62                  | 0.0598  | 1   | 0.33 | 15.23 | 0.0002  | 1                    | 0.33 | 15.23 | 0.0002  |  |  |
| N                    | 1                 | 0.15  | 1.09   | 0.2988  | 1   | 0.02 | 0.69                  | 0.4073  | 1   | 0.01 | 0.28  | 0.6000  | 1                    | 0.01 | 0.28  | 0.6000  |  |  |
| P × N                | 1                 | 0.01  | 0.09   | 0.7594  | 1   | 0.06 | 2.09                  | 0.1513  | 1   | 0.01 | 0.22  | 0.6433  | 1                    | 0.01 | 0.22  | 0.6433  |  |  |
| Region × P           | 2                 | 0.43  | 3.01   | 0.0532  | 2   | 0.25 | 9.39                  | 0.0002  | 2   | 0.09 | 4.31  | 0.0159  | 2                    | 0.09 | 4.31  | 0.0159  |  |  |
| Region × N           | 2                 | 0.47  | 3.27   | 0.0417  | 2   | 0.03 | 1.08                  | 0.3447  | 2   | 0.02 | 0.91  | 0.4054  | 2                    | 0.02 | 0.91  | 0.4054  |  |  |
| Region × P × N       | 2                 | 0.11  | 0.75   | 0.4772  | 2   | 0.03 | 0.94                  | 0.3921  | 2   | 0.02 | 0.99  | 0.3760  | 2                    | 0.02 | 0.99  | 0.3760  |  |  |
| Site(Region)         | 3                 | 16.66 | 117.29 | <0.0001 | 3   | 4.10 | 152.69                | <0.0001 | 3   | 0.72 | 32.90 | <0.0001 | 3                    | 0.72 | 32.90 | <0.0001 |  |  |
| Site(Region) × P     | 3                 | 0.27  | 1.92   | 0.1312  | 3   | 0.31 | 11.56                 | <0.0001 | 3   | 0.02 | 0.79  | 0.5033  | 3                    | 0.02 | 0.79  | 0.5033  |  |  |
| Site(Region) × N     | 3                 | 0.45  | 3.20   | 0.0262  | 3   | 0.03 | 1.03                  | 0.3835  | 3   | 0.04 | 1.78  | 0.1549  | 3                    | 0.04 | 1.78  | 0.1549  |  |  |
| Site(Region) × P × N | 3                 | 0.13  | 0.93   | 0.4304  | 3   | 0.09 | 3.38                  | 0.0211  | 3   | 0.01 | 0.50  | 0.6856  | 3                    | 0.01 | 0.50  | 0.6856  |  |  |
| Residual             | 108               | 0.14  |        |         | 108 | 0.03 |                       |         | 108 | 0.02 |       |         | 108                  | 0.02 |       |         |  |  |

our activities were unlikely to obscure microalgal responses to nutrient addition because benthic microalgae are often dominated by biraphid pennate diatoms that have well-developed motility, allowing rapid migration back to the sediment surface following small-scale bioturbation events (Admiraal 1984). It is possible that the lack of response of the epiphytic and macroalgal primary producers may have been a result of the mode of nutrient delivery via fertilization of the sediments. It has been suggested that seagrass epiphytes and some macroalgae are unable to use sediment nutrient pools (Erfemeijer et al. 1994). In our study, substantial portions of the added nutrients, particularly P, were retained in the sediment, but we did elicit changes in the nutrient content and N:P ratios of the seagrass and epiphyte assemblages in a pattern consistent with increased N and P availability in fertilized plots. Ferdie and Fourqurean (2004) used an identical fertilization protocol in higher energy sites near the Florida Barrier Reef and detected N responses in both seagrass and epiphytes, demonstrating that this fertilization technique was effective in enriching both benthic and aboveground producers. The unexpected lack of responses to P addition by both seagrass and algae in seemingly P-limited habitats was probably not due to inaccessibility of the added nutrients but was the likely result of multiple alternative biotic and abiotic factors.

P storage in seagrass and algal tissue without subsequent growth or other morphological responses at some sites suggests that another nutrient may have been regulating plant growth. Iron availability may limit seagrasses or algal assemblages, particularly those in carbonate sediments (Duarte et al. 1995). Experimental iron additions have yielded few microalgal or macroalgal (Kuffner and Paul 2001) or seagrass (Chambers et al. 2001) responses in tropical habitats. Silica availability can control diatom growth when N and P are in excess (Carrick and Lowe 1988). This mechanism may have been important in the benthic microalgal community in our study, which is diatom-dominated (Lewis et al. 2000), but Florida Bay seagrass epiphyte loads are typically dominated by calcium carbonate (coralline algae and adhered sediment) rather than diatoms (Frankovich and Zieman 1994), so silica availability probably did not limit epiphyte responses to N and P addition.

Competition for other limiting resources, such as light (Ibarra-Obando et al. 2004) and space (Marbà and Duarte 2003), may have prevented primary producers from responding to P addition in the western portions of the Bay. Sites A2 and B1 were generally less turbid than sites in the eastern bay, but *T. testudinum* shoot densities at those sites

(500–800 short-shoots  $m^{-2}$ ) approached the maxima recorded in other studies in this region (Zieman et al. 1999), suggesting that the canopy may have been saturated and that self-shading was occurring. Shading from a P-enriched *T. testudinum* canopy may have inhibited the response of benthic microalgae to enriched conditions across all sites.

Grazing can structure temperate and tropical seagrass communities through direct consumption of seagrass (McGlathery 1995; Valentine and Heck 2001), controlling epiphyte growth (Williams and Ruckelshaus 1993; Heck et al. 2000), and regulating benthic microalgal production (Nilsson et al. 1991). Grazing pressure may have limited *T. testudinum* responses to excess nutrients in the middle Bay sites and algal responses throughout the Bay. Grazers known to regulate epiphyte assemblages, including snails (van Montfrans et al. 1982) and grass shrimp (Zupo and Nelson 1999) are frequently found in Florida Bay (McClanahan 1992; Matheson et al. 1999; Frankovich and Zieman 2005). Preferential grazing on nutrient-enriched plant tissue, a pattern observed in algal (Boyer et al. 2004) and seagrass assemblages (McGlathery 1995), may compensate for nutrient-induced increases in plant biomass. Though this may have contributed to the control of nutrient-induced microalgal or macroalgal growth, the most common seagrass grazer in Florida Bay, the pink urchin *Lytichinus variegatus*, does not exhibit a preference for nutrient-enriched seagrass (McGlathery 1995; Valentine and Heck 2001) and was seldom observed in the study areas (Armitage et al. unpublished data), suggesting that it did not mitigate *T. testudinum* response to nutrients.

Species-specific seasonal fluctuations in primary producer biomass and productivity may result in temporally variable responses to excess nutrients. Wintertime peaks in epiphyte (Frankovich and Zieman 1994) and rhodophyte (Collado-Vides et al. 1994) biomass in tropical regions suggest that algal responses to nutrient enrichment might have been most pronounced at the time of year of our sampling effort. Our continued monitoring of this project supports this assertion, as the proliferations of red algae in P-addition treatments in the eastern bay had largely senesced by May 2004 (Armitage et al. unpublished data). We monitored this experiment on a bimonthly basis since its inception and no qualitative algal proliferations were observed at any time in this study until our sampling in February 2004, further suggesting that the macroalgal responses were ephemeral.

*T. testudinum* may have responded to nutrient addition in a manner our measurements did not detect because belowground characteristics were not sampled in order to minimize impact and facilitate

future long-term sampling of this experiment. It is possible that nutrient addition was disproportionately allocated to the root-rhizome complex, particularly at sites A2 and B1, where no aboveground response was detected, though fertilizer-induced changes in shoot:root allocation generally result from an increase in shoot biomass (Lee and Dunton 2000). Alternatively, excess P may have been translocated along the rhizome system to new growth outside the treatment plot (Marbà et al. 2002) and was undetected in our sampling protocol, though our qualitative observations suggest that the fertilization effects were strongly localized around the treatment plots.

The western site with an ambient *T. testudinum* tissue N:P ratio of 31:1 was not affected by N or P addition, suggesting a balance between N and P supply (Atkinson and Smith 1983). *T. testudinum* tissue P content at that site was high (Duarte 1990), and the diverse macroalgal assemblage and the abundance of *S. filiforme*, a seagrass species associated with enriched conditions (Ferdie and Fourqurean 2004), reflected the elevated nutrient supply. This site was heavily affected by factors other than nutrient supply, particularly frequent disturbances, both through current and erosion processes as well as boat traffic, illustrating the range of factors that may regulate benthic primary producer assemblages.

The replacement of slower growing species with more opportunistic ones in nutrient enriched conditions is a commonly observed occurrence in terrestrial (Bargali 1997), freshwater (Craft and Richardson 1997), and marine habitats (Duarte 1995; Valiela et al. 1997; McGlathery 2001). In our study, there was no suggestion of macroalgal replacement of seagrass, possibly due to the seasonal nature of macroalgae in Florida Bay. *H. wrightii* began to colonize some of the NP plots, and though its occurrence was patchy at the time of this study, continued fertilization may eventually lead to *H. wrightii* replacement of *T. testudinum*, a phenomenon observed following 2 yr of increased nutrient supply in a separate study in Florida Bay (Fourqurean et al. 1995).

Our results bear directly on the hypothesis that increased freshwater and therefore N loading from the Everglades ecosystem as a result of restoration efforts could change the nature of seagrass communities of Florida Bay (Brand 2002; Lapointe and Barile 2004). Direct addition of P to eastern Florida Bay seagrass beds caused marked changes in community structure in the short time course of our experiments, but N addition had almost no effect on primary producers in any region of the Bay. These results suggest that an increase in N loading to Florida Bay would have very little direct effect on seagrass communities. Some bioassay ex-

periments have shown N limitation within the western Bay phytoplankton communities (Lavrentyev et al. 1998; Tomas et al. 1999), so it is still possible that N loading could negatively affect seagrass communities by promoting phytoplankton growth, leading to light limitation of benthic plants. The spatial scale of our experiments was not appropriate for testing this idea, as any phytoplankton bloom stimulated in our small study plots would have quickly been washed away. As the seagrass communities of the adjacent Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary are N limited (Ferdie and Fourqurean 2004), increases in N loading to Florida Bay could have an effect on the adjacent, downstream communities without directly altering seagrass communities within the Bay.

Stoichiometric ratios are widely used to predict nutrient limitation, where a N:P ratio of 30:1 represents the modified Redfield ratio for seagrasses (e.g., Atkinson and Smith 1983; Fourqurean and Zieman 2002). Our study adds to the growing body of evidence that although very high or very low stoichiometric ratios represent P or N (respectively) limitation, a broad middle range of N:P ratios (20–60:1) does not yield consistent predictions of patterns of nutrient limitation in seagrasses. Although the breadth of that middle range might be a function of the relatively short time period of this study, several experimental studies provide further support for this conclusion. Four species of seagrass in Australia had similar (approximately 20:1) molar N:P ratios, but each species exhibited a unique response to N and P addition: strong N limitation, weak N limitation, N and P balance, and no nutrient response were all observed (Udy and Dennison 1997; Udy et al. 1999). In another study on the ocean side of the Florida Keys, seagrass tissue N:P ratios (approximately 40:1) suggested P limitation in nearshore seagrass beds (Fourqurean and Zieman 2002), but experimental nutrient enrichment demonstrated N limitation in the macroalgae and microalgae and few effects of N or P on the seagrass (Ferdie and Fourqurean 2004). These studies illustrate that predictions of nutrient limitation from stoichiometric ratios may not apply uniformly to all primary producers within a community. Other biotic or abiotic factors, such as grazing pressure, space, or the level of disturbance, may exert strong influences on primary producer responses to nutrient enrichment. Supplementing stoichiometric field assays with experimental manipulations will enable more accurate predictions of the effects of nutrient enrichment on coastal habitats.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was funded by a grant from the Everglades National Park (ENP) under cooperative agreement

1443CA528001022, by the Florida Coastal Everglades Long Term Ecological Research Program funded by the U.S. National Science Foundation (Cooperative Agreement #DEB-9910514) and by the Alabama Center for Estuarine Studies. Doug Morrison and Bill Perry facilitated permit issuance and use of ENP facilities. We thank the many people who devoted time to this project, particularly Amy Willman, Susie Escorcía, Cecie Gordon, Megan Balkenbush, Melissa Cumberbatch, Bryan Dewsbury, and Ligia Collado. Pursell Technologies Inc. and IMC Global generously donated the nitrogen and phosphorus fertilizers, respectively, for this study. This is contribution number 261 from the Southeast Environmental Research Center.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- ADMIRAAL, W. 1984. The ecology of sediment-inhabiting diatoms. *Progress on Phycological Research* 3:269–322.
- AGAWIN, N. S. R., C. M. DUARTE, AND M. D. FORTES. 1996. Nutrient limitation of Philippine seagrasses (Cape Bolinao, NW Philippines): In situ experimental evidence. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 138:233–243.
- ATKINSON, M. J. AND S. V. SMITH. 1983. C:N:P ratios of benthic marine plants. *Limnology and Oceanography* 28:568–574.
- BARGALI, K. 1997. Role of light, moisture, and nutrient availability in replacement of *Quercus leucotrichophora* by *Pinus roxburghii* in Central Himalaya. *Journal of Tropical Forest Science* 10: 262–270.
- BORUM, J. AND K. SAND-JENSEN. 1996. Is total primary production in shallow coastal marine waters stimulated by nitrogen loading? *Oikos* 76:406–410.
- BOYER, K. E., P. FONG, A. R. ARMITAGE, AND R. A. COHEN. 2004. Elevated nutrient content of tropical macroalgae increases rates of herbivory in coral, seagrass, and mangrove habitats. *Coral Reefs* 23:530–538.
- BRAND, L. E. 2002. The transport of terrestrial nutrients to South Florida coastal waters, p. 361–411. In J. W. Porter and K. G. Porter (eds.), *The Everglades, Florida Bay, and Coral Reefs of the Florida Keys: An Ecosystem Sourcebook*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.
- BURDIGE, D. J. AND R. C. ZIMMERMAN. 2002. Impact of sea grass density on carbonate dissolution in Bahamian sediments. *Limnology and Oceanography* 47:1751–1763.
- CARDOSO, P. G., M. A. PARDAL, A. I. LILLEBØ, S. M. FERREIRA, D. RAFFAELLI, AND J. C. MARQUES. 2004. Dynamic changes in seagrass assemblages under eutrophication and implications for recovery. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 302: 233–248.
- CARRICK, H. J. AND R. L. LOWE. 1988. Response of Lake Michigan benthic algae to in situ enrichment with silicon, nitrogen, and phosphorus. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 45:271–279.
- CHAMBERS, R. M., J. W. FOURQUREAN, S. A. MACKO, AND R. HOPPENOT. 2001. Biogeochemical effects of iron availability on primary producers in a shallow marine carbonate environment. *Limnology and Oceanography* 46:1278–1286.
- COLLADO-VIDES, L., J. GONZÁLEZ-GONZÁLEZ, AND M. GOLD-MORGAN. 1994. A descriptive approach to the floating masses of algae of a Mexican Caribbean coastal lagoon. *Botanica Marina* 37:391–396.
- CRAFT, C. B. AND C. J. RICHARDSON. 1997. Relationships between soil nutrients and plant species composition in Everglades peatlands. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 26:224–232.
- DUARTE, C. M. 1990. Seagrass nutrient content. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 67:201–207.
- DUARTE, C. M. 1995. Submerged aquatic vegetation in relation to different nutrient regimes. *Ophelia* 41:87–112.
- DUARTE, C. M., M. MERINO, AND M. GALLEGOS. 1995. Evidence of iron deficiency in seagrasses growing above carbonate sediments. *Limnology and Oceanography* 40:1153–1158.
- ERFTEMEIJER, P. L. A., J. STAPEL, M. J. E. SMEKENS, AND W. M. E. DROSSAERT. 1994. The limited effect of in situ phosphorus and nitrogen additions to seagrass beds on carbonate and terrigenous sediments in South Sulawesi, Indonesia. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 182:123–140.
- FERDIE, M. AND J. W. FOURQUREAN. 2004. Responses of seagrass communities to fertilization along a gradient of relative availability of nitrogen and phosphorus in a carbonate environment. *Limnology and Oceanography* 49:2082–2094.
- FONG, P., K. E. BOYER, K. KAMER, AND K. A. BOYLE. 2003. Influence of initial tissue nutrient status of tropical marine algae on response to nitrogen and phosphorus additions. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 262:111–123.
- FOURQUREAN, J. W., M. J. DURAKO, M. O. HALL, AND L. N. HEFTY. 2002. Seagrass distribution in South Florida: A multi-agency coordinated monitoring program, p. 497–522. In J. W. Porter and K. G. Porter (eds.), *The Everglades, Florida Bay, and Coral Reefs of the Florida Keys: An Ecosystem Sourcebook*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.
- FOURQUREAN, J. W., R. D. JONES, AND J. C. ZIEMAN. 1993. Processes influencing water column nutrient characteristics and phosphorus limitation of phytoplankton biomass in Florida Bay, FL, USA: Inferences from spatial distributions. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 36:295–314.
- FOURQUREAN, J. W., G. V. N. POWELL, W. J. KENWORTHY, AND J. C. ZIEMAN. 1995. The effects of long-term manipulation of nutrient supply on competition between the seagrasses *Thalassia testudinum* and *Halodule wrightii* in Florida Bay. *Oikos* 72: 349–358.
- FOURQUREAN, J. W. AND J. C. ZIEMAN. 2002. Nutrient content of the seagrass *Thalassia testudinum* reveals regional patterns of relative availability of nitrogen and phosphorus in the Florida Keys USA. *Biogeochemistry* 61:229–245.
- FOURQUREAN, J. W., J. C. ZIEMAN, AND G. V. N. POWELL. 1992. Phosphorus limitation of primary production in Florida Bay: Evidence from C:N:P ratios of the dominant seagrass *Thalassia testudinum*. *Limnology and Oceanography* 37:162–171.
- FRANKOVICH, T. A. AND J. C. ZIEMAN. 1994. Total epiphyte and epiphytic carbonate production of *Thalassia testudinum* across Florida Bay. *Bulletin of Marine Science* 54:679–695.
- FRANKOVICH, T. A. AND J. C. ZIEMAN. 2005. Grazer dynamics, nutrients, and seagrass leaf controls on epiphyte loading. *Estuaries* 28:41–52.
- HAUXWELL, J., J. CEBRIAN, C. FURLONG, AND I. VALIELA. 2001. Macroalgal canopies contribute to eelgrass (*Zostera marina*) decline in temperate estuarine ecosystems. *Ecology* 82:1007–1022.
- HECK, JR., K. L., J. R. PENNOCK, J. F. VALENTINE, L. D. COEN, AND S. A. SKLENAR. 2000. Effects of nutrient enrichment and small predator density on seagrass ecosystems: An experimental assessment. *Limnology and Oceanography* 45:1041–1057.
- HOWARTH, R. W. 1988. Nutrient limitation of net primary production in marine ecosystems, p. 89–110. In R. F. Johnston (ed.), *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, Volume 19. Annual Reviews, Inc., Palo Alto, California.
- IBARRA-OBANDO, S. E., K. L. J. HECK, AND P. M. SPITZER. 2004. Effects of simultaneous changes in light, nutrients, and herbivory levels, on the structure and function of a subtropical turtlegrass meadow. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 301:193–224.
- JEFFREY, S. W. AND G. F. HUMPHREY. 1975. New spectrophotometric equations for determining chlorophylls *a*, *b*, *c*<sub>1</sub>, and *c*<sub>2</sub> in higher plants, algae and natural phytoplankton. *Biochimie und Physiologie der Pflanzen* 167:191–194.
- JENSEN, H. S., K. J. MCGLATHERY, R. MARINO, AND R. W. HOWARTH. 1998. Forms and availability of sediment phosphorus in carbonate sand of Bermuda seagrass beds. *Limnology and Oceanography* 43:799–810.
- KENNISH, M. J. 2002. Environmental threats and environmental future of estuaries. *Environmental Conservation* 29:78–107.
- KOCH, M. S., R. E. BENZ, AND D. T. RUDNICK. 2001. Solid-phase

- phosphorus pools in highly organic carbonate sediments of northeastern Florida Bay. *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science* 52: 279–291.
- KUFFNER, I. B. AND V. J. PAUL. 2001. Effects of nitrate, phosphate, and iron on the growth of macroalgae and benthic cyanobacteria from Cocos Lagoon, Guam. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 222:63–72.
- LAPOINTE, B. E. 1989. Macroalgal production and nutrient relations in oligotrophic areas of Florida Bay. *Bulletin of Marine Science* 44:312–323.
- LAPOINTE, B. E. AND P. J. BARILE. 2004. Comment on J. C. Zieman, J. W. Fourqurean, and T. A. Frankovich. "Seagrass die-off in Florida Bay: Long-term trends in abundance and growth of turtle grass, *Thalassia testudinum*." 1999. *Estuaries* 22: 460–470. *Estuaries* 27:157–164.
- LARNED, S. T. 1998. Nitrogen- versus phosphorus-limited growth and sources of nutrients for coral reef macroalgae. *Marine Biology* 132:409–421.
- LAVRENTYEV, P. J., H. A. BOOTSMA, T. H. JOHNGEN, J. F. CAVALETTO, AND W. S. GARDNER. 1998. Microbial plankton response to resource limitation: Insights from the community structure and seston stoichiometry in Florida Bay, USA. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 165:45–57.
- LEE, K.-S. AND K. H. DUNTON. 2000. Effects of nitrogen enrichment on biomass allocation, growth, and leaf morphology of the seagrass *Thalassia testudinum*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 196:39–48.
- LEWIS, M. A., D. E. WEBER, L. R. GOODMAN, R. S. STANLEY, W. G. CRAVEN, J. M. PATRICK, R. L. QUARLES, T. H. ROUSH, AND J. M. MACAULEY. 2000. Periphyton and sediment bioassessment in north Florida Bay. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 65:503–522.
- MARBÀ, N. AND C. M. DUARTE. 2003. Scaling of ramet size and spacing in seagrasses: Implications for stand development. *Aquatic Botany* 77:87–98.
- MARBÀ, N., M. A. HEMMINGA, M. A. MATEO, C. M. DUARTE, Y. E. M. MASS, J. TERRADOS, AND E. GACIA. 2002. Carbon and nitrogen translocation between seagrass ramets. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 226:287–300.
- MATHESON, JR., R. E., D. K. CAMP, S. M. SOGARD, AND K. A. BJORGO. 1999. Changes in seagrass-associated fish and crustacean communities on Florida Bay mud banks: The effects of recent ecosystem changes? *Estuaries* 22:534–551.
- MCCLANAHAN, T. R. 1992. Epibenthic gastropods of the middle Florida Keys: The role of habitat and environmental stress on assemblage composition. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 160:169–190.
- MCGLATHERY, K. J. 1995. Nutrient and grazing influences on a subtropical seagrass community. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 122:239–252.
- MCGLATHERY, K. J. 2001. Macroalgal blooms contribute to the decline of seagrass in nutrient-enriched coastal waters. *Journal of Phycology* 37:453–456.
- MCGLATHERY, K. J., P. BERG, AND R. MARINO. 2001. Using pore-water profiles to assess nutrient availability in seagrass-vegetated carbonate sediments. *Biogeochemistry* 56:239–263.
- MCSM. 2001. Monroe County Stormwater Management Master Plan; Volume 1; Section 2.3; Pollution loads targets and analysis. Monroe County, Key West, Florida.
- MONCREIFF, C. A., M. J. SULLIVAN, AND A. E. DAEHNICK. 1992. Primary production dynamics in seagrass beds of Mississippi Sound: The contributions of seagrass, epiphytic algae, sand microflora, and phytoplankton. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 87:161–171.
- MUTCHLER, T., M. J. SULLIVAN, AND B. FRY. 2004. Potential of <sup>14</sup>N isotope enrichment to resolve ambiguities in coastal trophic relationships. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 266:27–33.
- NILSSON, P., B. JONSSON, I. LINDSTROM, AND K. SUNDBÄCK. 1991. Response of a marine shallow-water sediment system to an increased load of inorganic nutrients. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 71:275–290.
- NIXON, S. W. 1995. Coastal marine eutrophication: A definition, social causes, and future concerns. *Ophelia* 41:199–219.
- POWELL, G. V. N., W. J. KENWORTHY, AND J. W. FOURQUREAN. 1989. Experimental evidence for nutrient limitation of seagrass growth in a tropical estuary with restricted circulation. *Bulletin of Marine Science* 44:324–340.
- QUINN, G. P. AND M. J. KEOUGH. 2002. *Experimental Design and Data Analysis for Biologists*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- RUDNICK, D. T., Z. CHEN, D. L. CHILDERS, J. N. BOYER, AND T. D. FONTAINE, III. 1999. Phosphorus and nitrogen inputs to Florida Bay: The importance of the Everglades watershed. *Estuaries* 22:398–416.
- SHORT, F. T., M. W. DAVIS, R. A. GIBSON, AND C. F. ZIMMERMANN. 1985. Evidence for phosphorus limitation in carbonate sediments of the seagrass *Syringodium filiforme*. *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science* 20:419–430.
- SMITH, V. H., G. D. TILMAN, AND J. C. NEKOLA. 1999. Eutrophication: Impacts of excess nutrient inputs on freshwater, marine, and terrestrial ecosystems. *Environmental Pollution* 100: 179–196.
- TOMAS, C. R., B. BENDIS, AND K. JOHNS. 1999. Role of nutrients in regulating plankton blooms in Florida Bay, p. 323–337. In H. Kumpf, K. Steidinger, and K. Sherman (eds.), *The Gulf of Mexico Large Marine Ecosystem*. Blackwell Science, Malden, Massachusetts.
- TOMASKO, D. A. AND B. E. LAPOINTE. 1991. Productivity and biomass of *Thalassia testudinum* as related to water column nutrient availability and epiphyte levels: Field observations and experimental studies. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 75:9–17.
- UDY, J. W. AND W. C. DENNISON. 1997. Growth and physiological responses of three seagrass species to elevated sediment nutrients in Moreton Bay, Australia. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 217:253–277.
- UDY, J. W., W. C. DENNISON, W. J. LEE LONG, AND L. J. MCKENZIE. 1999. Responses of seagrass to nutrients in the Great Barrier Reef, Australia. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 185:257–271.
- VALENTINE, J. F. AND K. L. HECK, JR. 2001. The role of leaf nitrogen content in determining turtlegrass (*Thalassia testudinum*) grazing by a generalized herbivore in the northeastern Gulf of Mexico. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 258:65–86.
- VALIELA, I., J. MCCLELLAND, J. HAUXWELL, P. J. BEHR, D. HERSH, AND K. FOREMAN. 1997. Macroalgal blooms in shallow estuaries: Controls and ecophysiological and ecosystem consequences. *Limnology and Oceanography* 42:1105–1118.
- VAN MONTFRANS, J., R. J. ORTH, AND S. A. VAY. 1982. Preliminary studies of grazing by *Bittium varium* on eelgrass periphyton. *Aquatic Botany* 14:75–89.
- WELSCHMEYER, N. A. 1994. Fluorometric analysis of chlorophyll *a* in the presence of chlorophyll *b* and pheopigments. *Limnology and Oceanography* 39:1985–1992.
- WILLIAMS, S. L. AND M. H. RUCKELSHAUS. 1993. Effects of nitrogen availability and herbivory on eelgrass (*Zostera marina*) and epiphytes. *Ecology* 74:904–918.
- ZIEMAN, J. C., J. W. FOURQUREAN, AND T. A. FRANKOVICH. 1999. Seagrass die-off in Florida Bay: Long-term trends in abundance and growth of turtle grass, *Thalassia testudinum*. *Estuaries* 22:460–470.
- ZIEMAN, J. C., J. W. FOURQUREAN, AND R. L. IVERSON. 1989. Distribution, abundance and productivity of seagrasses and macroalgae in Florida Bay. *Bulletin of Marine Science* 44:292–311.
- ZUPO, V. AND W. G. NELSON. 1999. Factors influencing the association patterns of *Hippolyte zostericola* and *Palaemonetes intermedius* (Decapoda: Natantia) with seagrasses of the Indian River Lagoon, Florida. *Marine Biology* 134:181–190.

Received, August 18, 2004  
 Revised, January 6, 2005  
 Accepted, February 3, 2005