

# **UKTAG Transitional and Coastal Water Assessment Method**

## **Macroalgae**

### **Opportunistic Macroalgal Blooming Tool**

by

**Water Framework Directive – United Kingdom Technical Advisory Group  
(WFD-UKTAG)**



**Publisher:** **Water Framework Directive – United Kingdom Advisory Group (WFD-UKTAG)**  
c/o SEPA  
Castle Business Park  
Stirling  
FK9 4TF  
Scotland  
[www.wfduk.org](http://www.wfduk.org)

April 2014

ISBN: 978-1-906934-37-8

### **Copyright © 2014 WFD-UKTAG**

All rights reserved. WFD-UKTAG members, servants or agents accept no liability whatsoever for any loss or damage arising from the interpretation or use of the information, or reliance upon views contained herein.

### **Health and safety statement**

WARNING. Working in or around water is inherently dangerous; persons using this standard should be familiar with normal laboratory and field practice. This published monitoring system does not purport to address all of the safety problems, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user to establish appropriate health and safety practices and to ensure compliance with any national regulatory guidelines.

It is also the responsibility of the user if seeking to practise the method outlined here, to gain appropriate permissions for access to water courses and their biological sampling.

## UKTAG Guide to the Opportunistic Macroalgal Blooming Tool

### Water Framework Directive: Transitional and Coastal Waters


**Purpose of document:** To provide an overview of the opportunistic macroalgal blooming tool (OMBT) to inform Practitioners of how to monitor, assess and classify suitable macroalgae data according to Water Framework Directive (WFD) requirements in transitional and coastal waters.

*Note:* this document does not describe all aspects of the opportunistic macroalgal blooming tool development and application; for this please refer to the full technical report (Wells *et al.*, 2010). A summary of key documents and references is provided within this document.

**Introduction to WFD Terminology and Assessment:** This guide describes a system for classifying in accordance with the requirements of Article 8; Section 1.3 of Annex II and Annex V of the WFD (2000/60/EC). Practitioners should recognise that the terminology used in this document is specific to the WFD, and as such has a meaning defined by the directive.

To carry out a WFD biological assessment, each biological quality element (BQE) (defined in the WFD) is required to give a statistically robust definition of the 'health' of that element in the sampled water body. The 'health' of a BQE is assessed by comparing the measured conditions (observed value) against that described for reference conditions (minimally disturbed). This is reported as an Ecological Quality Ratio (EQR). An EQR with a value of one represents reference conditions and a value of zero represents a severe impact. The EQR is divided into five ecological status classes (High, Good, Moderate, Poor and Bad) that are defined by the changes in the biological community in response to disturbance (Figure 1).

Alongside the EQR score and class status, any assessment must consider the certainty of the assessment (i.e. confidence in the assigned class).



**Figure 1: Illustration of the Ecological Quality Ratio and how it relates to the level of disturbance and ecological status during a classification. The class band widths relate to biological changes as a result of disturbance (WFD CIS Guidance Document No. 5, 2003).**

## 1. Key Facts

### 1.1 Tool Overview: Opportunistic Macroalgal Blooming Tool

The OMBT enables an assessment of the condition of the quality element, "Macroalgae", as listed in Tables 1.2.3 and 1.2.4 of Annex V to the WFD (2000/60/EC). The WFD requires that the assessment of the macroalgal quality element considers composition, macroalgal cover, abundance and disturbance-sensitive taxa.

The OMBT is a multimetric index composed of five metrics:

- (i) percentage cover of the available intertidal habitat (AIH) (%)
- (ii) total extent of area covered by algal mats (affected area (AA) in hectares) **or** affected area as a percentage of the AIH (AA/AIH, %)
- (iii) biomass of opportunistic macroalgae in AIH ( $\text{gm}^{-2}$ )
- (iv) biomass of opportunistic macroalgae in AA ( $\text{gm}^{-2}$ )
- (v) presence of entrained algae (percentage of quadrats).

The metrics are equally weighted and combined within the multimetric, in order to best describe the changes in the nature and degree of opportunist macroalgae growth on sedimentary shores due to nutrient pressure.

An assessment of opportunistic macroalgae was reported for the 2009 River Basin Management Plans however, the option to use either the total extent of area covered by algal mats (affected area (AA)) **or** affected area as a percentage of the AIH (AA/AIH, %) is a new modification of the tool.

The OMBT operates over a range from 0 (major disturbance) to 1 (reference/minimally disturbed). The four class boundaries are:

- High/Good = 0.80
- Good/Moderate = 0.60
- Moderate/Poor = 0.40
- Poor/Bad = 0.20.

To calculate the OMBT, the percentage cover, biomass, and presence of entrained opportunistic algae within a known area of sedimentary shore are required. Samples have to be defined by sampling (e.g. area of patch) and processing (e.g. wet weight) methodologies.

For any one year's survey the overall WB EQR is the average of the metric EQRs. Where several surveys are carried out within a reporting period, the survey EQRs are averaged to obtain a final waterbody EQR.

### 1.2 Applicability

**Where:** The OMBT is suitable for use in UK transitional and coastal waters which have intertidal areas of soft sedimentary substratum (i.e. areas of AIH for opportunistic macroalgal growth). The tool is not currently used for assessing saline lagoons due to the particular challenges in setting suitable reference conditions for these water bodies.

**When:** The OMBT has been developed to classify data over the maximum growing season, so sampling should target the maximum potential growth of the algal bloom (generally considered to be in summer). Monitoring is generally from June to September, although peaks in opportunistic algal growth can occur during the spring, and rarely "secondary" peaks may be seen in the late summer or early autumn. Peak timing may vary among water

bodies, so local knowledge is required to identify the maximum growth period. Sampling is not recommended outside the summer period due to seasonal variations that could affect the outcome of the tool and possibly lead to misclassification; blooms may become disrupted by stormy autumn weather and generally die back in winter. Sampling should be carried out during spring low tides in order to access the maximum area of the intertidal.

**Response to Pressure:** The OMBT has been designed to identify the impact on macroalgae from nutrients and should detect signs of eutrophication.

### 1.3 Key documents

The documents marked \* will be hosted on the UK technical advisory group (UKTAG) website [www.wfduk.org](http://www.wfduk.org).

\*Confidence And Precision Tool Aids aNalysis v12.8 (CAPTAIN) – *Excel workbook to estimate the precision of the assessment*.

\* Davey, A. (2013). Confidence of Class for WFD Marine Plant Tools. (Update) WRC report EA7954. 34 pp.

\*UKTAG Biological Status Methods: Coastal and Transitional Waters – Opportunistic macroalgae – *High level non-technical summary*

\* Wells, E., Best, M. A., Scanlan, C., & Foden, J. (2010). Water Framework Directive development of classification tools for ecological assessment: Opportunistic Macroalgae Blooming. UK TAG Report for Marine Plants Task Team, 2010, Publ. UK TAG

## 2. Background

### 2.1 Ecological principles

An opportunistic algal species is considered able to take advantage of conditions in which other species often struggle to survive or to compete. Due to characteristically high rates of mineral nutrient uptake and enhanced reproductive capability, they can prevent or stunt growth of perennial algae by excessive abundance and competition for space (Wallentinus, 1984; Hoffmann & Ugarte, 1985; Kruk-Dowgiallo, 1991). Blooms form principally of species of *Ulva* (this includes taxa formerly known as *Enteromorpha*), *Chaetomorpha* or *Cladophora*, although other green, red (e.g. *Ceramium*, *Porphyra*) and brown algae (e.g. *Ectocarpus*, *Pylaiella*) may also reach nuisance proportions (Fletcher, 1996a, 1996b).

All potential bloom-forming species are a natural component of intertidal ecosystems (Abbott & Hollenberg, 1976), however, the formation of opportunistic macroalgal blooms is considered indicative of anthropogenically elevated nutrient levels when they grow to nuisance proportions. Blooms of rapidly growing macroalgae can have deleterious effects on intertidal communities and an undesirable imbalance with effects such as:

- blanketing of the surface causing a hostile physico-chemical environment in the underlying sediment
- sulphide poisoning of infaunal species
- anoxic gradient at the water sediment interface
- effects on birds including changes in the feeding behaviour of waders
- smothering of seagrass beds

- interference with water use activities by rafts of floating, detached weed
- aesthetic effects such as odour nuisance and deposition on sites such as bathing waters.

In some situations it is possible for the algae to grow within the underlying sediment or to continue growth after cover by sedimentary deposits. Entrained algae can promote new algal growth by causing nutrient enrichment within the sediment through decomposing plant material and provide over-wintering material for new growth in spring.

## 2.2 Normative definitions

In Annex V (1.2.3 and 1.2.4) of the WFD, normative definitions describe the aspects of the macroalgal community that must be included in the ecological status assessment. These are:

- taxonomic composition
- abundance
- disturbance sensitive taxa.

To facilitate the development of a suitable assessment method the WFD normative definitions were further interpreted into expanded normative definitions (Table 1).

**Table 1: Description of the characteristics of opportunistic macroalgae blooms at each WFD status class in accordance with the normative definitions (WFD Annex V) and expanded normative definitions (detailed national interpretation).**

<b>Reference conditions</b>	<i>All disturbance-sensitive macroalgae associated with undisturbed conditions are present. The levels of macroalgal cover are consistent with undisturbed conditions.</i>	Algal cover <5% and low density. Area and % cover is representative of or close to reference conditions with cover at its minimum accounting for seasonal fluctuations and variations in growth. Macroalgae show no persistence including lack of entrained algae. The taxonomic composition corresponds totally or nearly totally with undisturbed conditions.
<b>High</b>		
<b>Good</b>	<i>Most disturbance-sensitive macroalgae associated with undisturbed conditions are present. The level of macroalgal cover shows slight signs of disturbance.</i>	Limited cover (<15%) and low biomass (<500gm <sup>-2</sup> ) of opportunistic macroalgal blooms and with limited growth of algae in the underlying sediment. Macroalgae cover shows slight signs of disturbance with slight deviation from reference conditions. Macroalgae shows no persistence with little entrainment of algae.
<b>Moderate</b>	<i>A moderate number of disturbance-sensitive macroalgae associated with undisturbed conditions are absent. Macroalgal cover is</i>	Increased cover (>15%) and/or biomass (>500gm <sup>-2</sup> ) of opportunistic macroalgal blooms; may have algae growing in the underlying sediment. Macroalgae growth shows moderate deviation from reference conditions and is slightly detrimental to the surrounding environment with some signs of persistence.

	<i>moderately disturbed and may be such as to result in an undesirable disturbance in the balance of organisms present in the water body.</i>	
--	---	--

## 2.3 Development of the tool

The OMBT combines measures of opportunistic macroalgae cover, biomass and entrainment into a multimetric index. The individual metrics (expressed on an EQR scale) are averaged to create the final OMBT assessment. Historical and current knowledge of the causes and effects of opportunistic macroalgal blooms were used to design a suitably responsive index. Tool development is described in Wells *et al.* (2010) and Scanlan *et al.* (2007).

Macroalgal blooms in littoral soft sediment environments have been a cause of concern under Directives that pre-date the WFD, principally the Urban Waste Water Treatment (UWWTD, 1991), Nitrates (Nitrates Directive, 1991) and Habitats (Habitats Directive, 1992) Directives, and also to OSPAR (Oslo and Paris Commission, 2003) all of which consider the assessment of eutrophication. Attention has been paid to normalising definitions of eutrophication between directives. Monitoring schemes have also been aligned in order to produce a robust assessment satisfying all relevant criteria.

### ***Understanding the individual metrics within the OMBT***

(WFD criteria compliance – taxonomic composition, disturbance sensitive taxa)

The majority of algal mats encountered in UK locations are composed principally of green algae. These are primarily *Ulva* (includes *Enteromorpha* spp), but other species of green algae such as *Cladophora* and *Chaetomorpha* occur in some places. The brown algae *Ectocarpus* and *Pylaiella* and the red alga *Porphyra* may also reach nuisance proportions. The taxonomic composition of macroalgal blooms is generally limited to one or more of a number of fast-growing, opportunistic species.

Taxonomic composition *per se* is not considered to be appropriate as a metric, due to the small number of taxa likely to be present in a sedimentary habitat. This approach conforms to Annex 5, section 1.4.1 (i) of the Directive (WFD, 2000), as opportunistic blooming species can be considered as a representative group for the quality element in areas of soft sediment and in transitional waters in particular.

### **Spatial Extent** (WFD criteria compliance – abundance)

Spatial coverage is considered as both (i) a percentage of the Available Intertidal Habitat (AIH) and (ii) total area cover (AA = affected area, in hectares) of the water body. It is important to define the AIH suitable for macroalgal growth. The intertidal area is bounded by Mean High Water Springs (MHWS) and Mean Low Water Springs (MLWS). However, it may not all be suitable for macroalgal blooming, so appropriate (i.e. “available” habitat) should be determined using local knowledge; this may require ground-truthing. Some areas, e.g. channels and channel edges subject to constant scouring, may never be suitable for algal

blooms and need to be excluded from area assessment. Suitable intertidal areas are considered to consist of mud, muddy sand, sandy mud, sand, stony mud and mussel beds. Artificial substrata are not considered as suitable habitat, nor are rocky shores. *Note:* WFD waterbody limits are defined by the responsible environment agency and information on these, if required, can be obtained from the relevant agency.

In large water bodies with proportionately small patches of macroalgal coverage, the EQR for total area covered by macroalgae (AA) might indicate high or good status, while the total area covered could actually be quite substantial and could still affect the surrounding and underlying communities. In order to account for this, an additional metric was established. This is *the affected area as a percentage of the AIH* (i.e.  $(AA/AIH)*100$ ). This helps to scale the area of impact to the size of the waterbody. In the final assessment **the lower of the two metrics** (the AA **or** percentage AA/AIH) is used, i.e. whichever reflects the worse case scenario.

### **Biomass** (WFD criteria compliance – abundance)

Assessment of the spatial extent of the algal bed alone will not indicate the level of risk to a water body. A very thin (low biomass) layer covering over 75% of a shore might have little impact on underlying sediments and fauna. The influence of biomass is therefore incorporated.

Biomass is calculated as a mean for (i) the whole of the AIH **and** (ii) for the affected areas. The potential use of maximum biomass was rejected, as it could classify a water body falsely by giving undue weighting to a small, localised blooming problem.

### **Entrained Algae**

The persistence of algae within sediments provides both a means for over-wintering of algal spores and a source of nutrients within the sediments. Build-up of weed within sediments therefore implies that blooms can become self-regenerating given the right conditions (Raffaelli *et al.*, 1989). Absence of weed within the sediments lessens the likelihood of bloom persistence, while its presence gives greater opportunity for nutrient exchange with sediments. Consequently, the presence of opportunistic macroalgae growing within the surface sediment was included in the tool.

*Note:* where there is more than one patch, metrics measured at patch level are weighted according to patch size, i.e. % cover of AIH, biomass of algae in AIH, % of entrained algae.

## **2.4 Reference conditions**

Published and unpublished literature, along with expert opinion, was used to derive critical threshold values suitable for defining quality status classes.

A Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) expert workshop suggested reference levels of < 5% cover of AIH of climax and opportunistic species for high quality sites (DETR, 2001). In line with this approach, the WFD adopted < 5% cover of opportunistic macroalgae in the AIH as equivalent to High status. From the WFD North East Atlantic intercalibration phase 1 results, German research into large sized water bodies revealed that areas over 50 ha may often show signs of adverse effects (Carletti, A. & Heiskanen, A-S., 2009; Kolbe, K., 2007). However if the overall area was less than 20% of this, adverse effects were not seen, so the High/Good boundary was set at 10 ha. In all cases a reference of 0% cover for truly unaffected areas was assumed. *Note:* opportunistic algae may occur even in pristine water bodies as part of the natural community, but at low levels.

The proposal of reference conditions for levels of biomass took a similar approach, considering existing guidelines and suggestions from DETR (2001), with a tentative reference level of  $<100\text{gm}^{-2}$  wet weight. This reference level was used for both the average biomass over the affected area and the average biomass over the AIH. As with area measurements a reference of 0 was assumed.

An ideal of no entrainment (i.e. no quadrats revealing entrained macroalgae) was assumed to be reference for un-impacted waters. After some empirical testing in a number of UK water bodies a High/Good boundary of 1% of quadrats assessed was set.

## 2.5 Class boundaries

The overall class boundaries for the OMBT are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Overall ecological status boundaries for the OMBT**

Status	EQR
High/Good	0.80
Good/Moderate	0.60
Moderate/Poor	0.40
Poor/Bad	0.20

Published and unpublished literature was used to derive the critical threshold values suitable for defining class boundaries. Some metric thresholds (e.g. for affected area) were derived using a combination of expert opinion and existing data. For the affected area metric this was achieved through a UK process using known sites of opportunistic blooms of varying intertidal habitat and environmental factors.

Work to derive standards and criteria for the Habitats and Urban Waste Water Treatment, Directives (Wither, 2003) stated that a symptom of the potential start of eutrophication is when:

- (i) 25% of the available intertidal habitat has green macroalgae

**and**

- (ii) at least 25% of the sediment (i.e. 25% in a quadrat) is covered.

This implies that an overall cover of the AIH of 6.25% (25% of 25 %) represents the start of a potential problem. For the High/Good boundary 5% is used as slight deviation from reference.

However, in reality, it was suggested that greater than 25% cover should be considered an indicator of harm. Wither (2003) stated that, in reality, true problem areas often have a  $>60\%$  cover within the affected area of 25% of the water body. This would equate to 15% overall cover of the AIH (i.e. 25% of the water body covered with algal mats at a density of 60%). Wither (2003) suggested that the 15% value could therefore be used for % cover at the next critical level (Good / Moderate boundary). The Environment Agency has considered  $>75\%$  cover as seriously affecting an area, and this formed a threshold for Bad status. The final % cover thresholds for the levels of ecological quality status are provided in Table 3. The table defines the range of potential observed, or face, values for each metric per class.

Class boundaries for biomass values were derived from DETR (2001) recommendations that  $<500\text{gm}^{-2}$  wet weight was an acceptable level above the reference level of  $<100\text{gm}^{-2}$  wet

weight. In Good status only slight deviation from High status is permitted so  $500 \text{ gm}^{-2}$  represents the Good/Moderate boundary. Moderate quality status requires moderate signs of distortion and significantly greater deviation from High status to be observed. The presence of  $>500 \text{ gm}^{-2}$  but less than  $1,000 \text{ gm}^{-2}$  would lead to a classification of Moderate quality status at best, but would depend on the percentage of the AIH covered.

DETR (2001) and others (Lowthion *et al.*, 1985; Hull, 1987; Wither, 2003) have identified  $1 \text{ kg m}^{-2}$  wet weight as a level of biomass at, or above, which significant harmful effects on biota have been observed. *Note:* some local studies have not shown harmful impacts at or above  $1 \text{ kg m}^{-2}$  (e.g. Rees-Jones, 2006) due to local conditions, but UK experts generally agreed that there is reasonable evidence to support the DETR expert committee's view that this level of biomass is unacceptable.

For the presence of entrained algae empirical studies testing a number of scales were undertaken on a number of impacted water bodies. It was clear from these that seriously affected water bodies have a very high percentage ( $>75\%$ ) of the beds showing entrainment (Poor/Bad boundary). Entrainment was felt to be an early warning sign of potential eutrophication problems, so a tight High/Good boundary of 1% was selected (this allows for the odd changed quadrat or error to be made). The Good/Moderate boundary was set at 5% where (assuming sufficient quadrats were taken) it would be clear that entrainment was occurring.

Table 3 shows the metric ranges and boundary values.

**Table 3: Face value and metric EQR ranges used in the OMBT.**


Quality Status	High	Good	Moderate	Poor	Bad
<b>EQR</b>	<b>1.0 - <math>\geq 0.8</math></b>	<b><math>&lt; 0.8</math> - <math>\geq 0.6</math></b>	<b><math>&lt; 0.6</math> - <math>\geq 0.4</math></b>	<b><math>&lt; 0.4</math> - <math>\geq 0.2</math></b>	<b><math>&lt; 0.2</math> - 0.0</b>
% cover of AIH	$\geq 0$ - $< 5$	$\geq 5$ - ,15	$\geq 15$ -,25	$\geq 25$ - ,75	$\geq 75$ - 100
Average biomass ( $\text{gm}^{-2}$ ) of AIH	$\geq 0$ - $< 100$	$\geq 100$ - 500	$\geq 500$ - 1000	$\geq 1000$ - 3000	$\geq 3000$ (- 6,000)
Average biomass ( $\text{gm}^{-2}$ ) of AA	$\geq 0$ - $< 100$	$\geq 100$ - 500	$\geq 500$ - 1000	$\geq 1000$ - 3000	$\geq 3000$ (- 6,000)
AA (hectares)*	$\geq 0$ - $< 10$	$\geq 10$ - 50	$\geq 50$ - 100	$\geq 100$ - 250	$\geq 250$ (- 6,000)
AA/AIH (%)*	$\geq 0$ - $< 5$	$\geq 5$ - 15	$\geq 15$ - 50	$\geq 50$ - 75	$\geq 75$ - 100
% entrained algae	$\geq 0$ - $< 1$	$\geq 1$ - 5	$\geq 5$ - 20	$\geq 20$ - 50	$\geq 50$ - 100

\*N.B. Only the lower EQR of the 2 metrics, AA or AA/AIH should be used in the final EQR calculation

### 3 Undertaking an assessment

#### 3.1 Summary Flow Chart

The process for undertaking a water body assessment using the OMBT is summarised below (Figure 2).



**Figure 2: Flow chart summarising the main stages involved in undertaking an OMBT assessment.**

### 3.2 Data requirements

The calculation of the OMBT requires monitoring of total bed extent (ha) in the water body, and macroalgal cover (%), macroalgal biomass (wet weight  $\text{gm}^{-2}$ ) and presence of entrained algae (%) in the measured quadrats. The algal taxa present should be recorded, but genus level only is sufficient.

Additional information such as depth of the algal mat and anoxic layer, the presence of e.g. *Corophium*, cockles within the quadrat, etc should be recorded in the field. Although this information is not used within the tool, it can provide useful supporting evidence.

### 3.3 Sampling strategy

Sampling should take place during the peak growth season, generally in the period June to, and including, September. The exact sampling strategy used varies depending on the extent on the algal bed and on safety considerations. For a full survey to take place there must be evidence of > 5 % opportunistic macroalgal cover of the AIH in the water body.

AIH is defined as the water body area composed of mud, muddy sand, sandy mud, sand, stony mud and mussel beds from mean high water springs to mean low water springs, excluding hard substrate such as piers, jetties and channels. The AIH for each water body is calculated from Ordinance Survey maps or using aerial or remotely sensed imagery and refined using local, expert knowledge.


A preliminary site visit should be made to establish, semi-quantitatively, if the percentage macroalgal cover is < 5 %. If the area of cover is < 5% of the AIH of the water body, the water body status is reported as High; no further samples are then required. If the area of cover is > 5 %, a full survey should be carried out. *Note:* some very large water bodies may have a large continuous bed under 5% of the total water body area. However this bed may be having a significant local impact so should be assessed.

Bed extent can be distinguished by aerial or remotely sensed images, or ground surveys with hand held GPS. Overall density and percentage cover are determined by measurements using quadrats within the beds.


### 3.4 Sampling methodology

The WFD competent monitoring authorities have their own operating procedures and instructions (please refer to the relevant Agency for further details).

Aerial or remotely sensed images, or ground surveys with hand held GPS, are used to identify the opportunistic macroalgal bed boundaries. Perimeters of algal beds are measured at >15%. A second boundary may be established surrounding this limit at <15% but >5% (see Figures 3 and 4). Examples of the sampling strategy where a single defined macroalgae bloom exists in the water body (Figure 3) or where several patches exist (Figure 4). These demonstrate the mapping of algal beds and use of quadrats for estimating average cover and biomass.



**Figure 3: Example 1 of sampling methods within a single defined patch of algal growth.**



**Figure 4: Example 2 of sampling methods within three discrete patches of algal growth.**

The algal taxa present are recorded to genus level. Additional information such as depth of the algal mat and anoxic layer, the presence of e.g. *Corophium*, cockles within the quadrat, etc. are recorded in the field.

**Percentage cover:** The percentage cover estimation is achieved through stratified random sampling within the areas of >15% cover (high density area) and <15% cover (low density area). These areas are considered separately to ensure accurate percentage cover is achieved for the high density areas and so as not to underestimate the cover of the bloom. Within the high density areas, a minimum of 3 quadrats for each discrete patch of algal bloom should be recorded. This should be repeated for the less dense areas of <15%. Within each quadrat the total percentage cover should be estimated as accurately as possible to 5%. The actual number of quadrats should be proportional to the variability of algal density and the irregularity of patches, i.e. one large, consistently dense patch may

require fewer quadrats than scattered, patches within which cover is variable. Quadrat size is generally 0.25m<sup>2</sup>.

**Biomass:** Macroalgae on the surface of the sediment (not that buried within the sediment) are collected to determine the average biomass of opportunistic macroalgae per monitored patch.

**Entrained Algae:** This parameter is measured in conjunction with biomass, as removal of algae for weighing will indicate its level of entrainment. Algae are considered as entrained in muddy sediment depending on the depth at which they are found. Algae growing at  $\geq 3$ cm depth is considered to indicate entrainment. This value may be different in sandy substrata.

### 3.5 Sample analysis and quality

Identification of opportunistic algae to genus level is done using an appropriate identification guide (MPTT, 2013).

Algae collected for biomass assessment are rinsed thoroughly to remove all sediment and invertebrate fauna (e.g. cockles, *Hydrobia*), hand squeezed until water stops running and the wet weight of algae recorded. Algae should not be squeezed so hard that cells lyse and run green.

For quality assurance of the percentage of cover, two independent readings should be within  $\pm 5\%$ . A photograph should be taken of every quadrat for intercalibration and cross-checking of percent cover determination. Measures of biomass should be calculated to one decimal place of wet weight for each sample. For both procedures the accuracy should be demonstrated with the use of quality assurance checks and procedures.


### 3.6 Data treatment

No specific data treatment is required prior to the calculations.

### 3.7 EQR calculation

Each metric in the OMBT has equal weighting and is combined to produce the ecological quality ratio score (EQR). The face value metrics work on a sliding scale to enable an accurate metric EQR value to be calculated. An average of these individual metric values is then used to establish the final water body level EQR and classification status for the survey. Successive survey water body EQRs may be averaged to reduce inter-annual variation. The final water body EQR for a reporting cycle is an average of the relevant survey years' EQRs.

The Ecological Quality Ratio (EQR) determining the final water body classification ranges between a value of 0 to 1. The process is illustrated in the conceptual diagram (Figure 5).



**Figure 5: Conceptual diagram illustrating how the OMBT indices are combined to calculate a water body classification.**

To calculate the overall water body classification it is necessary to convert the face value measurement to an equidistant EQR scale, so that the metrics can be combined. A stepwise process is followed:

- (i) calculation of the face value (e.g. percentage cover of AIH) for each metric
- (ii) normalisation and rescaling to convert the face value to an equidistant metric score (0-1 value) for each metric.
- (iii) calculation of OMBT(average of equidistant metric scores).

To calculate the individual metric face values:

- **Percentage cover of AIH (%)\*** = (Total % Cover / AIH) x 100

where Total % cover = Sum of ((patch size) / 100) x average % cover for patch

- **Affected Area, AA (ha)** = Sum of all patch sizes
- **Biomass of AIH (gm<sup>-2</sup>)** = Total biomass / AIH

where Total biomass = Sum of (patch size x average biomass for the patch)

- **Biomass of Affected Area (gm<sup>-2</sup>)** = Total biomass / AA

where Total biomass = Sum of (patch size x average biomass for the patch)

- **Presence of Entrained Algae\*** = (No. quadrats with entrained algae / total no. of quadrats) x 100 x patch size (averaged for all patches)
- **Size of AA in relation to AIH (%)** = (AA/AIH) x 100

\*Note: these metrics are calculated per patch.

### ***Normalisation and rescaling of face values to metric range.***

The face values are converted to an equidistant EQR scale to allow combination of the metrics. Initially this was carried out in a two-step process by normalisation of face values to an EQR (0-1) scale (non-equidistant class boundaries) and then rescaling to an equidistant class EQR scale. These steps have now been mathematically combined in the following equation:

$$\text{Final Equidistant metric score} = \text{Upper Equidistant Class range value} - ((\text{Face Value} - \text{Upper Face value range}) * (\text{Equidistant class range} / \text{Face Value Class Range}))$$

Table 4 give the critical values at each class range required for the above equation. The first three numeric columns contain the face values (FV) for the range of the index in question, the last three numeric columns contain the values of the equidistant 0 - 1 scale and are the same for each index. The face value class range is derived by subtracting the upper face value of the range from the lower face value of the range.

Note: the table is “simplified” with rounded numbers for display purposes. The face values in each class band may have greater than (>) or less than (<) symbols associated with them, for calculation a value of < 5 is actually a value of 4.9999’.

**Table 4: Values for the normalisation and rescaling of face values to EQR metric ranges.**

		Lower Face Value range value (the measurements towards the "bad" end of this class range)	Upper FV range value (the measurements towards the "High" end of this class range)	FV class range	Lower 0-1 equidistant range value	Upper 0-1 equidistant range value	Equidistant class range
<b>% Cover of Available Intertidal Habitat (AIH)</b>	High	≤5	0	5	≥0.8	1	0.2
	Good	≤15	>5	9.999	≥0.6	<0.8	0.2
	Moderate	≤25	>15	9.999	≥0.4	<0.6	0.2
	Poor	≤75	>25	49.999	≥0.2	<0.4	0.2
	Bad	100	>75	24.999	0	<0.2	0.2
<b>Average biomass of AIH (g m<sup>-2</sup>)</b>	High	≤100	0	100	≥0.8	1	0.2
	Good	≤500	>100	399.999	≥0.6	<0.8	0.2
	Moderate	≤1000	>500	499.999	≥0.4	<0.6	0.2
	Poor	≤3000	>1000	1999.999	≥0.2	<0.4	0.2
	Bad	≤6000	>3000	2999.999	0	<0.2	0.2
<b>Average biomass of Affected Area (AA) (g m<sup>-2</sup>)</b>	High	≤100	0	100	≥0.8	1	0.2
	Good	≤500	>100	399.999	≥0.6	<0.8	0.2
	Moderate	≤1000	>500	499.999	≥0.4	<0.6	0.2
	Poor	≤3000	>1000	1999.999	≥0.2	<0.4	0.2
	Bad	≤6000	>3000	2999.999	0	<0.2	0.2
<b>Affected Area (Ha)</b>	High	≤10	0	10	≥0.8	1	0.2
	Good	≤50	>10	39.999	≥0.6	<0.8	0.2
	Moderate	≤100	>50	49.999	≥0.4	<0.6	0.2
	Poor	≤250	>100	149.99	≥0.2	<0.4	0.2
	Bad	≤6000	>250	5749.999	0	<0.2	0.2
<b>AA/AIH [ % ]</b>	High	≤5	0	5	≥0.8	1	0.2
	Good	≤15	>5	9.999	≥0.6	<0.8	0.2

		Lower Face Value range value (the measurements towards the "bad" end of this class range)	Upper FV range value (the measurements towards the "High" end of this class range)	FV class range	Lower 0-1 equidistant range value	Upper 0-1 equidistant range value	Equidistant class range
	Moderate	≤50	>15	34.999	≥0.4	<0.6	0.2
	Poor	≤75	>50	24.999	≥0.2	<0.4	0.2
	Bad	100	>75	27.999	0	<0.2	0.2
% Entrained Algae	High	≤1	0	1	≥0.0	1	0.2
	Good	≤5	>1	3.999	≥0.2	<0.0	0.2
	Moderate	≤20	>5	14.999	≥0.4	<0.2	0.2
	Poor	≤50	>20	29.999	≥0.6	<0.4	0.2
	Bad	100	>50	49.999	1	<0.6	0.2

### 3.8 Water body level classification

Opportunistic macroalgae are monitored, and the OMBT applied, at water body level. For any one year's survey the EQR is the average of the metrics. The final water body EQR for a reporting period is the average of all survey years' EQRs for that period.

### 3.9 Understanding the certainty of the assessment

Providing an estimate of the statistical uncertainty of water body assessments is a statutory requirement of the WFD (Annex V, 1.3). In an ideal world of comprehensive monitoring data containing no errors, water bodies would always be assigned to their true class with 100% confidence. However, estimates of the truth based on monitoring are subject to error because monitoring is not done everywhere and all the time, and because monitoring systems, equipment and people are less than perfect. Understanding and managing the risk of misclassification as a result of uncertainties in the results of monitoring is important on two counts; first, because of the potential to fail to act in cases where a water body has been wrongly classified as being of better status than it is, and secondly because of the risk of wasting resources on water bodies that have been wrongly classified as worse than they are.

A methodology for calculating a measure of the confidence of class (CofC) for the Opportunistic Macroalgal Blooming tool, 'Confidence And Precision Tool Aids aNalysis' (CAPTAIN), was developed by WRc (Davey, 2013).

CAPTAIN calculates CofC at three levels: metric, survey (single sampling event) and water body over the reporting period (potentially several surveys):

- The CofC for each metric in each survey is based on the metric EQR and takes account of sampling error plus any error in the measurement. This aspect describes how each metric score is derived, and its corresponding standard error is calculated to give a metric CofC.
- The CofC for each survey is based on the Survey EQR and takes account of combined uncertainty in the five metrics. This part of the system considers how the metric scores are combined to yield an EQR and CofC for each survey
- The CofC for the water body is based on the Final EQR and takes account of the temporal variation among the EQR results from replicate surveys. This part of the CofC assessment is performed for the water body as a whole.

For the CofC of each of the five metric scores and metric EQRs the level of standard error can be calculated incorporating all variables including measurement error. This can be converted to a confidence of class using a normal distribution approach. The confidence of class for the survey EQR is calculated using the average of the five metric EQRs. As the standard errors of the five metrics cannot be assumed to be independent because they are based on data from the same quadrats, they will share any errors in the measurement of patch area and AIH. Therefore the system calculates a further standard error of the whole survey EQR which is also converted to a confidence of class following the same normal distribution approach.

The standard error is calculated as an approximation due to the normalised EQR scale. This is achieved by estimating the 95% confidence interval around each metric score and normalising the upper and lower confidence limits.

Finally the standard error of the final EQR measures the uncertainty in the final status assessment. However, where only one survey is undertaken with a single EQR result, the variability cannot be measured directly; it has to be estimated indirectly using data from other

water bodies. Therefore, the standard deviation is instead estimated from the mean EQR using an approach developed by Ellis & Adriaenssens (2006) to estimate the likely spatio-temporal variability in Survey EQR as a function of the mean Survey EQR in a water body. Variability is expected to be greatest in water bodies of moderate status ( $\text{EQR} \approx 0.5$ ), and to get progressively smaller as the mean EQR tends towards 0 or 1 e.g. to have a mean EQR of exactly 0 (or 1), all surveys must yield EQR values of 0 (or 1) – i.e. there must be no variation among surveys. The Final EQR and its standard error are then converted to a confidence of class following the t-distribution approach.

#### 4. Worked example

A water body with an available intertidal habitat of 1481.8 ha has four discrete patches. Quadrat results were obtained for percentage cover and biomass from each patch. No entrainment of macroalgae was determined. The results are given in the tables below for each of the algal patches (Tables 5, 6).

**Table 5: Face value biomass and percentage cover data for four discrete patches in the water body**

Patch no.	Patch area (ha)	Average % cover in quadrats	Average biomass in quadrats (gm <sup>-2</sup> )	Actual cover (patch area * % cover)	Actual weight (patch area * biomass)
1	92.70	11.00	56.80	10.20	5265.36
2	97.30	63.33	376.00	61.62	36584.80
3	153.70	70.50	302.15	108.36	46440.76
4	104.20	92.00	1278.95	95.86	133266.28
<b>Totals</b>	<b>447.90</b>			<b>276.04</b>	<b>221557.20</b>

**Table 6: Water body face value results for the analysis of opportunistic macroalgae cover and biomass.**

Totals	
Cover of algae (ha)	276.04
Biomass of algae (gm <sup>-2</sup> )	221557.2
Affected intertidal area (ha)	447.9
Available intertidal habitat (ha)	1481.8

#### Calculation of the metric EQR values

The critical values to calculate the EQRs are taken from table 4 using the equation:

*Final Equidistant metric score = Upper Equidistant Class range value – ((Face Value - Upper Face value range) \* (Equidistant class range / Face Value Range))*

**Percentage cover of AIH (%)** = (Total % Cover / AIH) x 100

= (276.04 / 1481.8) \* 100 = 18.629

This value is in the Moderate band of Table 4: substituting into the Equation above gives:

Final Equidistant index score = 0.5999 – ((18.6286 – 15.0001) \* (0.2 / 9.9999))  
= 0.5273

**Biomass of AIH (gm<sup>-2</sup>)** = Total biomass / AIH

= 221557.2 / 1481.8

= 149.52

This value is in the Good band of Table 4: substituting into the Equation above gives:

Final Equidistant index score = 0.7999 – ((149.52 – 100.0001) \* (0.2 / 399.9999))  
= 0.7751

**Biomass of Affected Area (gm<sup>-2</sup>)** = Total biomass / AA

= 221557.2 / 447.9

= 494.6577

This value is in the Good band of Table 4: substituting into the Equation above gives:

$$\text{Final Equidistant index score} = 0.7999 - ((494.6577 - 100.0001) * (0.2 / 399.9999))$$

$$= 0.6026$$

**Affected Area, AA (ha)** = Sum of all patch sizes

$$= 447.9$$

This value is in the Bad band of Table 4: substituting into the Equation above gives:

$$\text{Final Equidistant index score} = 0.199 - ((447.9 - 250.001) * (0.2 / 5749.999))$$

$$= 0.1930$$

**Size of AA in relation to AIH (%)** = (AA/AIH) x 100

$$= (447.9 / 1481.8) * 100$$

$$= 30.23\%$$

This value is in the Moderate band of Table 4: substituting into the Equation above gives:

$$\text{Final Equidistant index score} = 0.599 - ((30.23 - 15.001) * (0.2 / 34.999))$$

$$= 0.5120$$

*Note:* in this example this value will not be used as the final calculation uses the lower value of AA or AA / AIH

**Presence of Entrained Algae** = (No. quadrats with entrained algae per patch / total no. of quadrats per patch) x 100.

As there are no quadrats with entrainment this is 0.00% which is in the High band and will give an EQR value of 1.0.

The overall EQR for this survey is:

$$= (0.5273 + 0.7751 + 0.6026 + 0.1930 + 1.0) / 5$$

$$= 0.6196$$

= **Good** status

## 5. References

- Abbott, I. A. & Hollenberg, G. J. (1976). *Marine Algae of California* Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 827.
- Carletti, A., & Heiskanen, A-S. (2009). Water Framework Directive Intercalibration technical report Part 3: Coastal and transitional waters. JRC Report EUR 23838 EN/3 – 2009.
- Davey, A. (2013). Confidence of Class for WFD Marine Plant Tools. (Update) WRC Report EA7954. 34 pp.
- DETR. (2001). Development of ecological quality objectives with regard to eutrophication. Workshop note, unpublished.
- Ellis, J. & Adriaenssens, V. (2006). Uncertainty estimation for monitoring results by the WFD biological classification tools. Environment Agency.
- Fletcher, R. L. (1996a). The occurrence of “green tides” – a review. In *Marine benthic vegetation: recent changes and the effects of eutrophication*, (W.Schramm, & P.H. Nienhuis, eds.), pp. 7-43. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York.
- Fletcher, R. L. (1996b). The British Isles. In ‘*Marine benthic vegetation: recent changes and the effects of eutrophication*’, (W.Schramm, & P.H. Nienhuis, eds.), pp. 223-150. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York.
- Habitats Directive (1992). Council Directive 92/43/EEC on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora. European Communities Official Journal L206, 22.07.1992 p. 0007-0050
- Hoffmann, A. J. & Ugarte, R. (1985). The arrival of propagules of marine macroalgae in the intertidal zone. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 92(1), 83-95.
- Hull, S. (1987). Macroalgal mats and species abundance: a field experiment. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 25, 519-532.
- Kolbe, K. (2007). Assessment of German Coastal Water (NEA1/26, NEA 3/4) and Transitional Waters (NEA 11) by Macroalgae and Angiosperms. Intercalibration Report (NEAGIG).
- Kruk-Dowgiallo, L. (1991). Long-term changes in the structure of underwater meadows of the Puck lagoon. *Acta Ichthyologica et Piscatoria, Supplement*, 22, 77-84.
- Lowthion, D., Soulsby P. G., & Houston M. C. M. (1985). Investigation of a eutrophic tidal basin: part 1 – factors affecting the distribution and biomass of macroalgae. *Marine Environmental Research*, 15, 263-284.
- MPTT (2013). A field guide to genera of blooming macroalgae in the British Isles. <http://www.nmbagcs.org/media/13020/mw's%20fucus%20id%20corrected%20v2.pdf>
- Nitrates Directive (1991). Directive 91/676/EEC, Council Directive of the 12<sup>th</sup> December 1991 concerning the protection of waters against pollution caused by nitrates from agricultural sources. European Communities Official Journal L375, 31.12.1992.
- OSPAR (2003). OSPAR integrated report 2003 on the eutrophication status of the OSPAR maritime area based upon the first application of the Comprehensive Procedure. OSPAR Eutrophication Series, publication 189/2003. OSPAR Commission, London.

Raffaelli, D., Hull, S. & Milne, H. (1989). Long-term changes in nutrients, weedmats and shore birds in an estuarine system. *Cahiers de Biologie Marine*, 30, 259-270.

Rees-Jones, S. (2006). E.A. unpubl. Investigation into the impact of macroalgae on intertidal macrobenthos in Kent estuaries. *Habitats Directive Stage 3 Review of Consents, Draft Technical Report*

Scanlan, C. M., Foden, J., Wells, E. & Best, M. A. (2007). The monitoring of opportunistic macroalgal blooms for the water framework directive. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 55, 162-171.

Urban Waste Water Treatment Directive (1991). Directive 91/271/EEC, Council Directive of 21<sup>st</sup> May 1991 concerning urban waste water treatment. *European Communities Official Journal L135*, 30.5.1991 p.40

Wallentinus, I. (1984). Comparisons of nutrient uptake rates for Baltic macroalgae with different thallus morphologies. *Marine Biology*, 80, 215-225.

Wells, E., Best, M., Scanlan, C., & Foden, J. (2010). Water Framework Directive development of classification tools for ecological assessment: Opportunistic Macroalgae Blooming. *UK TAG Report for Marine Plants Task Team*, 2010, Publ. UK TAG.

Wither, A. (2003). *Habitats Directive: Sites impacted by algal mats (green seaweed)*. Environment Agency. *Habitats Directive Technical Advisory Group on Water Quality*.

Water Framework Directive (2000). Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and the Council of 23<sup>rd</sup> October 2000 establishing a framework for Community action in the field of water policy. *European Communities Official Journal L327*, 22.12.2000 pp.1-72.

WFD CIS Guidance Document No. 5 (March 2003). *Rivers and Lakes – Typology, Reference Conditions and Classification Systems*. Published by the Directorate General Environment of the European Commission, Brussels, ISBN No. 92-894-5614-0, ISSN No. 1725-1087.