

Coastal Zone '78

Symposium on Technical,
Environmental, Socioeconomic and
Regulatory Aspects of
Coastal Zone Management

Sponsored By:

American Society of Civil Engineers
Waterway, Port, Coastal and Ocean Division
and San Francisco Section
The Conservation Foundation
U.S. Department of Commerce
Office of Coastal Zone Management

In Cooperation With:

U.S. Department of Commerce
National Ocean Survey
U.S. Department of Defense
Army Corps of Engineers
U.S. Department of the Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
Geological Survey
Bureau of Land Management
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
State of California
California Coastal Commission
San Francisco Bay Conservation and
Development Commission
Department of Water Resources
Department of Navigation and Ocean Development
Marine Technology Society
American Shore and Beach Preservation Association
The Urban Land Institute
The Coastal Society

San Francisco, California
March 14-16, 1978



NITROGEN AND PHOSPHORUS MOVEMENT IN A FRESHWATER TIDAL WETLAND RECEIVING SEWAGE EFFLUENT

Dennis F. Whigham¹ and Robert L. Simpson²

ABSTRACT

Recent work on nutrients in tidal wetlands has led to the suggestion that they can be managed for treatment of sewage effluent. In this paper we report some results of a three year study on the effects of spraying chlorinated secondarily treated sewage effluent on a Delaware River freshwater tidal wetland near Trenton, New Jersey. Biomass and standing crops of N and P at the end of the 1975 and 1976 growing seasons did not differ between experimental areas and control sites. The only consistent response of the aboveground vegetation was that plant material in areas receiving effluent had significantly greater %N and % P concentrations. Total N, %N, Total P and %P of plant litter was significantly greater in the experimental areas. There were no significant substrate responses due to spray irrigation. Tide cycle studies showed that the irrigated wetland was a sink for N and an exporter of P.

INTRODUCTION

Eutrophication of our inland and near shore waters, largely from sewage, is a major environmental problem. While nutrient removal from sewage is possible using a variety of chemical treatment methods, the cost of such treatment is often prohibitive leading in recent years to the consideration of biological alternatives for treatment of nutrient rich effluent (Tourbier and Pierson, 1976). Among the wetland ecosystems suggested as possible nutrient filters are cypress domes (Ewel, 1976), northern peatlands (Richardson et al, 1976), salt marshes (Valiela et al, 1976), swamps (Boyt et al, 1977; Brinson, 1977; Kitchens et al, 1975) and artificial wetlands (Small, 1976; Spangler et al, 1976; Stanlick, 1976). Recent reviews on the subject of marsh management (Sloey et al, in press; Stearns, in press; Tilton et al, 1976) indicate that wetlands may efficiently trap nutrients, particularly nitrogen, but caution that they should not be routinely used for sewage effluent disposal until natural processes in those systems are better understood.

¹Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies, Smithsonian Institution, Route 4, Box 622, Edgewater, Md. 21140

²Department of Biology, Rider College, Lawrenceville, NJ 08648

In this paper we consider the potential use of freshwater tidal wetlands for tertiary treatment of municipal wastes. Those wetlands are highly productive (Whigham et al, in press) and cover extensive areas in the freshwater portions of most eastern U.S. estuaries. Grant and Patrick (1970) have reported that Tinicum Marsh, a Delaware River freshwater tidal wetland located immediately south of Philadelphia, acts as a water purifier and we have noted similar processes occurring in the Hamilton Marshes, the northernmost freshwater tidal wetland in the Delaware River estuary (Simpson et al, in press; Whigham and Simpson, 1976a). In 1975 we initiated experiments to assess the potential of freshwater tidal wetlands to remove nitrogen and phosphorus from chlorinated secondarily treated sewage effluent. In this paper, we summarize experiments that focused on the following ecosystem responses: 1) aboveground biomass; 2) storage of nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) in aboveground biomass; 3) nitrogen and P storage in confined and unconfined litter; 4) storage of N and P in the substrate; 5) N and P dynamics of surface water. More detailed reports of our work are currently in preparation and will be forthcoming.

METHODS

The experimental area and treatment regimes that were used during these experiments have been described (Whigham and Simpson, 1976a and 1976b) and will only be briefly outlined here. The study site was located in the Hamilton Marshes, a 500 ha freshwater tidal wetland connecting with the Delaware River estuary near Trenton, New Jersey. The experiments were conducted on a high marsh site that had been previously studied (Whigham and Simpson, 1975). The site was chosen because it was representative of the most widespread habitat in the wetland and it was located near the Hamilton Township Sewage Treatment Plant which discharges approximately 7.5 million gallons of secondarily treated effluent daily. Chlorinated secondarily treated effluent was screened to remove large suspended particles and pumped to the wetland where it was sprayed into 12 three-sided enclosures (20 m X 10 m). Four enclosures were irrigated continuously, four during 2 three hour periods coinciding with high tide and four during 2 nine hour periods coinciding with the drawdown period of each tide cycle. Two enclosures from each set received 5 cm of effluent daily and two received 12.5 cm daily. Two control enclosures received tap water applied continuously at 12.5 cm per day and two control enclosures received no treatment. Application of effluent to the high and low tide enclosures was accomplished with an electronically timed switching mechanism synchronized to tide level indicators. Effluent was applied continually throughout the 1975 and 1976 growing seasons except during the winter when it was impossible to spray because of freezing conditions and on occasions when the system did not operate because of vandalism or equipment malfunction.

Biomass and production estimates were determined by periodically harvesting aboveground biomass from 50 cm X 50 cm quadrats during each growing season. Six quadrats were harvested from each enclosure. The plants were separated by species, dried at 80 C, weighed and analyzed for N and P. Litter decomposition experiments were performed in 1975 and 1976 by confining dried plant material in 2 mm mesh litter bags. Litter bags were placed on the wetland surface in the two control areas and in the treatment enclosures that received 12.5 cm of effluent

per day. In 1975, we examined decomposition of Arrow arum (Peltandra virginica) and Bur marigold (Bidens laevis) leaves and stems and in 1976 we used leaf material of Arrow arum, Bur marigold, Tearthumb (Polygonum arifolium), Arrowhead (Sagittaria latifolia) and Sweet flag (Acorus calamus). In 1975, duplicate litter bags were collected at 7, 15, and 30 days and monthly thereafter for 9 months. In 1976, duplicate samples were collected at 3, 7, 14, 30, 60, 90 and 120 days. Dry weight %N and %P were determined for each sample. Five 5 cm² samples of unconfined litter were collected from each enclosure between April 1976 and May 1977 and analyzed for N and P. The upper 50 cm of substrate, not including litter, was sampled from June 1975 until October 1976 at approximately monthly intervals. Duplicate samples were collected from each enclosure and divided into 0-20 cm and 20-50 cm depth intervals prior to drying and analysis for N and P. Nitrogen and P determinations on plant, soil and litter samples were performed using micro-Kjeldahl (Amer. Soc. Agr. 1965) and tube digestion techniques (Sommer and Nelson, 1972) respectively.

To assess the fate of effluent applied to the wetland, a series of tide cycle studies were conducted during the summers of 1976 and 1977. In addition, we monitored the effects of irrigation within the watershed that contained the enclosures by measuring water quality parameters at a number of locations for one year. In this paper, we only report results of the 1977 experiments and only include data for selecting areas. Water was collected at the low point of each enclosure beginning when flood tide water reached the surface of the high marsh and continued hourly until the next flood tide reached the marsh surface. Simultaneous samples of effluent and water in the stream channel immediately downstream from the study area were also collected. Samples were analyzed for reactive nitrate (NO₃-N), reactive nitrite (NO₂-N) ammonia plus amino acids (NH₃-N) and reactive phosphorus (PO₄-P) following Strickland and Parsons (1968). Total N and Total P were determined using a single sample wet digestion procedure outlined by Golterman (1969). For the purpose of developing nutrient budgets, the effluent entering each experimental enclosure was metered and each enclosure was mapped so that the volume of water entering with the flood tide could be accurately determined. It was assumed that the volume of water in an enclosure at high slack water plus the volume of effluent applied to that enclosure during the study period equalled the total output from the enclosure in a tide cycle. This assumption seemed justified because there was little lateral movement of water through the enclosures and the marsh surface drained completely during each tide cycle. Mean nutrient concentrations of effluent applied during the study period and mean concentrations of stream flood tide water during the period between when the high marsh was first flooded and high slack water were used to calculate input budgets. Output budgets were based on mean nutrient concentrations of water leaving the enclosures between high slack water and when the marsh was reflooded.

RESULTS

Aboveground Vegetation (Biomass, N and P)

Aboveground biomass at the end of the 1975 and 1976 growing seasons ranged from 1021.6 gm² to 533.2 gm² and 475.4 gm² to 743.5 gm²

respectively (Table 1). There were no significant differences between the 3 treatments during either year. In 1975, the controls were significantly different while in 1976 the enclosures receiving effluent continuously had significantly less biomass than the control that was not irrigated.

Plant %N and %P were significantly greater in the treatment enclosures but there were no differences between treatments. Percent N in the treatment enclosures ranged from 3.19% to 2.77% in 1976 and 3.37% to 3.13% in 1975. The mean %N in the tap water control was 2.54% during both years and was 2.31% (1976) and 1.99% (1975) in the other control. Percent P in the treatment areas ranged from .385% to .364% in 1976 and .378% to .332% in 1975. Percent P of vegetation in the control enclosures did not differ significantly and were .314% and .280% in 1975. Percentage P in the controls was slightly less in 1976.

Although %N and %P differences were significant, Total N and Total P in the aboveground standing crop did not follow the same pattern. In 1975, there were no significant differences in Total N and Total P. In 1976, vegetation in the enclosures that received effluent during the high tide had significantly more Total N and Total P than did the tap water control. None of the experimental enclosures were, however, significantly different than the other control. Total N ranged from 21.7 to 11.8 gm² and 20.9 gm² to 16.4 gm² in 1976 and 1975 respectively. Total standing crop P ranged from 2.3 gm² to 1.4 gm² in 1976 and 2.7 gm² to 2.0 gm² in 1975.

N and P in Confined and Unconfined Litter

Results of the litter decomposition experiments are shown in Table 2. Almost all of significant effects were due to species differences. There were no significant species-site interactions and only %N, %P, and Total P of the confined litter were affected by site. In 1975, the species effects were caused by higher %N, %P, Total N and Total P in Arrow arum litter even though it decayed at a significantly faster rate. Site responses were due to higher %P and Total P in the three areas receiving effluent. Although only leaf material was used in 1976 experiments, the results were very similar. For every variable measured there were species effects. There were no significant species-site interactions, but %N, %P, and weight loss were affected by site. Percent N of Bur marigold and Arrow arum and %P of Arrowhead and Arrow arum leaves was higher in the treatment enclosures. After 120 days, Arrowhead leaves exposed to effluent weighed significantly less than leaves exposed to tap water. The %N and %P of unconfined litter was greater in the experiment areas (Table 3). In contrast to confined litter, Total N and Total P of unconfined litter were significantly greater in virtually all treatment enclosures.

Substrate N and P

Substrate Total N, %N, Total P and %P were not affected by treatment. The only significant differences were due to depth where both %N and Total N were significantly greater at the 0-20 cm depth interval. There were, however, no depth site interactions. Percent N averaged 1.23% in the 0-20 cm depth interval and 0.85% in the 20-50 cm depth interval.

Table 1. The response of aboveground vegetation to sewage spray irrigation. All values in the table are means. Means that are significantly different ($\alpha = .01$) from the tap water control are indicated with * while means significantly different from the no water control are shown with +.

| | TREATMENTS | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|------------|-----------|-----|----------|-----|------------|-----|-------------------|-----|------------------|
| | (N) | HIGH TIDE | (N) | LOW TIDE | (N) | CONTINUOUS | (N) | TAP WATER CONTROL | (N) | NO WATER CONTROL |
| 1976 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Biomass (gm ²) | 23 | 672.800 | 24 | 531.100 | 24 | 563.600 | 12 | 475.400 | 12 | 743.500 |
| Total N (gm ²) | 23 | 21.70* | 24 | 16.800 | 24 | 18.000 | 12 | 11.800 | 12 | 15.800 |
| %N | 93 | 3.130*+ | 88 | 3.26*+ | 90 | 3.370*+ | 42 | 2.540 | 64 | 2.310 |
| Total P (gm ²) | 23 | 2.300* | 24 | 2.000 | 24 | 2.000 | 12 | 1.400 | 12 | 1.900 |
| %P | 93 | 0.336*+ | 88 | 0.385*+ | 90 | 0.364+ | 42 | 0.314 | 64 | 0.280 |
| 1975 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Biomass (gm ²) | 24 | 598.400 | 24 | 703.200 | 24 | 533.200 | 12 | 794.400 | 12 | 1021.600 |
| Total N (gm ²) | 24 | 16.900 | 24 | 20.900 | 24 | 16.400 | 12 | 18.100 | 12 | 17.300 |
| %N | 88 | 2.77+ | 74 | 3.06+ | 70 | 3.19+ | 55 | 2.540 | 54 | 1.990 |
| Total P (gm ²) | 24 | 2.100 | 24 | 2.700 | 24 | 2.000 | 12 | 2.000 | 12 | 2.500 |
| %P | 88 | 0.332*+ | 74 | 0.378*+ | 70 | 0.368 | 55 | 0.251 | 54 | 0.287 |

Table 2. Results of the confined litter experiments. Values are means of 48 samples for 1975 data and 70 samples for 1976 data. Weight represents the mean amount of material in the litter bag during the experiment. Means significantly different from the tap water control ($\alpha = .01$) are indicated with * while means significantly different ($\alpha = .01$) from the no water control are shown by +

| | TREATMENTS | | | | |
|-------------|------------|----------|------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | HIGH TIDE | LOW TIDE | CONTINUOUS | TAP WATER CONTROL | NO WATER CONTROL |
| 1976 | | | | | |
| Weight (g) | 4.830+ | 5.020+ | 4.800+ | 5.230 | 5.600 |
| Total N (g) | 0.170 | 0.163 | 0.164 | 0.157 | 0.145 |
| %N | 3.950*+ | 3.650*+ | 3.750*+ | 3.350 | 3.650 |
| Total P (g) | 0.011 | 0.013 | 0.013 | 0.013 | 0.013 |
| %P | 0.233+ | 0.279 | 0.276+ | 0.236 | 0.229 |
| 1975 | | | | | |
| Weight (g) | 4.550 | 4.120 | 4.240 | 4.370 | 4.670 |
| Total N (g) | 0.118 | 0.119 | 0.126 | 0.120 | 0.124 |
| %N | 2.970 | 3.300 | 3.320 | 3.020 | 3.130 |
| Total P | 0.010*+ | 0.010*+ | 0.010*+ | 0.007 | 0.007 |
| %P | 0.247*+ | 0.273*+ | 0.255*+ | 0.117 | 0.173 |

Table 3. Results of unconfined litter experiments. Values are means of 11 samples. Both Total N and Total P means are gm². Treatments significantly different from the tap water control are indicated by * ($\alpha = .05$) and ** ($\alpha = .01$). Treatments significantly different from the no water control are indicated by + ($\alpha = .05$) and ++ ($\alpha = .01$).

| | TREATMENTS | | | | |
|---------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | HIGH TIDE | LOW TIDE | CONTINUOUS | TAP WATER CONTROL | NO WATER CONTROL |
| Total N | 57.900 | 65.200**++ | 73.300**++ | 53.100 | 54.800 |
| %N | 01.970+ | 02.290**++ | 02.160**++ | 01.810 | 01.730 |
| Total P | 15.100*++ | 17.400**++ | 17.000**++ | 12.400 | 09.400 |
| %P | 00.491*++ | 00.576*++ | 00.497*++ | 00.423 | 00.294 |

N and P Flux in Water

Results of some of the tide cycle nutrient budget studies are given in Table 4. Except for $\text{NO}_2\text{-N}$, nutrient flux patterns were basically the same for the two experimental sites receiving effluent and the control. The input of $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$, $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ and Total N was greater than the outputs, while $\text{PO}_4\text{-P}$ and Total P were the opposite with a net flux from all sites. These patterns hold even though the high flow experimental site received almost twice as much water as the other experimental site and from ten to 100 fold more water than the untreated control. While the daily net fluxes were quite variable, it does appear that the wetland may assimilate up to 40% of the Total N and, at times, well over half of the $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ it receives. These results are consistent with other studies of this wetland (Simpson et al, in press) which showed that $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ levels in water running off of the marsh surface were lower than adjacent stream waters while $\text{PO}_4\text{-P}$ levels were higher.

DISCUSSION

Generalized results of our analyses are shown in Table 5. Although the aboveground biomass has significantly greater %N and %P, Total N and Total P are not different because one of the control enclosures had more aboveground standing crop at the end of the growing season. Percent N, Total N, %P and Total P of the unconfined litter was significantly greater in the enclosures that received effluent but N and P did not accumulate in the substrate. Results of the decomposition experiments with confined litter showed similar results but also demonstrated that the Total N and Total P in the unconfined litter are due to the continuous fall of leaves to the wetland surface during the growing season.

Nutrient budget studies showed that this wetland acted as a sink for N, particularly Total N. However, only the litter compartment showed a significant increase in Total N. This suggests that denitrification was occurring which eliminated N at approximately the rate it was being accumulated by the marsh. Certainly conditions on the wetland surface where oxygen levels approach zero when the high marsh is drained (Simpson et al., in press; Whigham and Simpson, 1976b) favored denitrification. While the high marsh does have the ability to assimilate some of the N from effluent, it is not particularly effective. Coupled with the fact that there is a net movement of P from the high marsh as the wetland drains, it would appear that the high marsh habitat is not capable of efficient removal of nutrients from large volumes of sewage. However, where it is desirable to remove some N from sewage it does appear that freshwater tidal wetlands with sufficient aerial extent may be important because they mix and redistribute N rich sewage over a considerable area of high marsh where conditions strongly favor denitrification.

Table 4. Flux of N and P for two experimental enclosures and one control enclosure during complete tide cycles on five dates in 1977. All values for the effluent treated enclosures are grams (g) while data for the control enclosure are milligrams (mg). Parenthesis around flux values indicate a net loss from the enclosure during the study interval.

| PART 1. CONTINUOUS SPRAY ENCLOSURE: HIGH FLOW | | | | | |
|--|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 7 June | 21 June | 22 June | 5 July | 6 July |
| NH ₃ -N | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | 30.309 | 27.295 | 17.820 | 20.743 | 25.042 |
| Tide water | 0.007 | 0 | 2.675 | 3.208 | 4.967 |
| Output | 32.256 | 40.470 | 14.425 | 16.649 | 19.497 |
| Net flux | (-1.940) | (-13.075) | 6.070 | 7.402 | 10.512 |
| NO ₂ -N | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | 0.265 | 0.157 | 0.152 | 0.124 | 0.108 |
| Tide water | 0.047 | 0.067 | 0.048 | 0.082 | 0.065 |
| Output | 0.373 | 0.787 | 0.671 | 0.959 | 0.701 |
| Net flux | (-0.061) | (-0.563) | (-0.471) | (-0.753) | (-0.528) |
| NO ₃ -N | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | 6.172 | 6.654 | 6.509 | 2.914 | 2.292 |
| Tide water | 0.633 | 1.151 | 0.769 | 1.018 | 0.754 |
| Output | 4.955 | 7.310 | 7.141 | 6.489 | 5.937 |
| Net flux | 1.850 | 0.495 | 0.237 | (-2.557) | (-2.891) |
| TOTAL N | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | 520.096 | 637.553 | 575.488 | 647.472 | 746.306 |
| Tide water | 12.828 | 17.702 | 15.153 | 18.898 | 18.089 |
| Output | 531.655 | 724.161 | 566.898 | 549.842 | 643.448 |
| Net flux | 1.269 | (-68.906) | 23.743 | 116.528 | 110.943 |
| PO ₄ -P | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | 5.074 | 5.577 | 5.598 | 4.994 | 6.085 |
| Tide water | 0.053 | 0.109 | 0.088 | 0.110 | 0.189 |
| Output | 1.745 | 7.698 | 6.438 | 7.175 | 7.608 |
| Net flux | 3.382 | (-2.012) | (-0.752) | (-2.071) | (-1.334) |
| TOTAL P | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | 80.215 | 100.673 | 112.269 | 96.564 | 107.346 |
| Tide water | 2.231 | 5.338 | 3.427 | 5.673 | 4.224 |
| Output | 83.323 | 144.523 | 130.631 | 134.598 | 130.054 |
| Net flux | (-0.877) | (-38.512) | (-14.935) | (-32.361) | (-18.483) |
| Water entering the enclosure (m ³) | | | | | |
| Effluent | 19.3149 | 24.7200 | 24.8182 | 23.2853 | 22.7706 |
| Tide water | 6.1975 | 13.8300 | 9.2625 | 12.6075 | 9.2625 |

SEWAGE EFFLUENT

2197

Table 4. Cont'd.

PART II. CONTINUOUS SPRAY ENCLOSURE: LOW FLOW

| | 7 June | 21 June | 22 June | 5 July | 6 July |
|--|---------|-----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| NH ₃ -N | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | 19.992 | 18.674 | 12.610 | 14.099 | 17.537 |
| Tide water | 0.002 | 0 | 0.998 | 0.386 | 1.011 |
| Output | 16.460 | 26.899 | 12.623 | 9.312 | 12.850 |
| Net flux | 3.534 | (-8.225) | 0.985 | 5.173 | 5.698 |
| NO ₂ -N | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | 0.174 | 0.107 | 0.107 | 0.085 | 0.075 |
| Tide water | 0.014 | 0.051 | 0.018 | 0.010 | 0.013 |
| Output | 0.095 | 0.191 | 0.142 | 0.269 | 0.269 |
| Net flux | 0.093 | (-0.033) | (-0.017) | (-0.174) | (-0.181) |
| NO ₃ -N | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | 4.072 | 2.862 | 4.606 | 1.980 | 1.605 |
| Tide water | 0.193 | 0.885 | 0.287 | 0.122 | 0.153 |
| Output | 0.918 | 1.054 | 0.911 | 1.061 | 1.151 |
| Net flux | 3.347 | 2.493 | 3.982 | 1.041 | 0.607 |
| TOTAL N | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | 343.058 | 434.598 | 406.007 | 440.029 | 552.636 |
| Tide water | 3.901 | 13.609 | 5.656 | 2.274 | 3.681 |
| Output | 317.632 | 490.714 | 401.308 | 307.512 | 407.032 |
| Net flux | 29.327 | (-42.507) | 10.355 | 134.791 | 119.285 |
| PO ₄ -P | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | 3.347 | 3.802 | 3.961 | 3.394 | 4.262 |
| Tide water | 0.016 | 0.084 | 0.033 | 0.013 | 0.024 |
| Output | 1.069 | 5.791 | 4.713 | 3.821 | 4.969 |
| Net flux | 2.294 | (-1.905) | (-0.719) | (-0.414) | (-0.683) |
| TOTAL P | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | 52.910 | 68.616 | 79.434 | 66.308 | 75.170 |
| Tide water | 0.678 | 4.104 | 1.279 | 0.682 | 0.859 |
| Output | 48.696 | 109.699 | 95.957 | 69.682 | 86.553 |
| Net flux | 4.892 | (-36.979) | (-15.244) | (-3.374) | (-10.524) |
| Water entering the enclosure (m ³) | | | | | |
| Effluent | 12.7403 | 16.8508 | 17.5624 | 15.8250 | 15.9462 |
| Tide water | 1.8850 | 10.6325 | 3.4575 | 1.5175 | 1.8850 |

Table 4. Cont'd.

| PART III. NO WATER CONTROL ENCLOSURE | | | | | |
|--|----------|------------|------------|----------|----------|
| | 7 June | 21 June | 22 June | 5 July | 6 July |
| NH ₃ -N | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tide water | 0.733 | 0 | 319.902 | 20.355 | 6.702 |
| Output | 0.129 | 0.725 | 70.873 | 7.678 | 2.092 |
| Net flux | (-0.604) | (-0.725) | 249.029 | 12.677 | 4.610 |
| NO ₂ -N | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tide water | 0.898 | 15.419 | 5.745 | 0.518 | 0.088 |
| Output | 0.363 | 5.638 | 2.118 | 0.124 | 0.028 |
| Net flux | 0.535 | 9.781 | 3.627 | 0.394 | 0.060 |
| NO ₃ -N | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tide water | 12.004 | 266.800 | 92.038 | 6.457 | 1.017 |
| Output | 3.688 | 48.318 | 2.073 | 1.258 | 0.213 |
| Net flux | 8.688 | 218.482 | 89.965 | 5.119 | 0.804 |
| TOTAL N | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tide water | 243.225 | 4102.400 | 1811.870 | 119.920 | 24.412 |
| Output | 141.979 | 3620.047 | 1303.749 | 83.216 | 25.782 |
| Net flux | 101.246 | 482.353 | 508.121 | 36.704 | (-1.369) |
| PO ₄ -P | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tide water | 1.013 | 25.335 | 10.550 | 0.695 | 0.160 |
| Output | 1.099 | 37.593 | 13.574 | 1.038 | 0.293 |
| Net flux | (-0.086) | (-12.258) | (-3.024) | (-0.343) | (-0.133) |
| TOTAL P | | | | | |
| Input | | | | | |
| Effluent | - | - | - | - | - |
| Tide water | 42.3 | 1237.130 | 409.775 | 36.000 | 5.700 |
| Output | 37.6 | 1415.808 | 522.659 | 39.549 | 10.221 |
| Net flux | 4.7 | (-178.678) | (-112.884) | (-3.549) | (-4.521) |
| Water entering the enclosure (m ³) | | | | | |
| Effluent | | | | | |
| Tide water | 0.1175 | 3.2050 | 1.1075 | 0.0800 | 0.0125 |

Table 5. Summary of treatment effects for the variables discussed. All information in the table compares the effects of effluent application to the experimental enclosures against the controls.

| | Total N | %N | Total P | %P |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| Aboveground biomass | No change | Increases | No change | Increases |
| Unconfined surface litter | Increases | Increases | Increases | Increases |
| Confined surface litter | No change | Increases | No change | Increases |
| Substrate (0-20 cm) | No change | No change | No change | No change |
| Substrate (20-50 cm) | No change | No change | No change | No change |
| Nutrient flux | No change* | | No change* | |

*While there was no change in the patterns of nutrient flux between treatment and control sites, absolute nutrient levels were higher in the experimental enclosures.

Our results contrast with those of workers in other wetland systems. Boyt et al (1977) found that a Florida mixed hardwood swamp affected 87% removal of P from treated municipal wastewater. Nitrogen concentrations were also greatly reduced. They found no buildup of nutrients in the sediments, but suggested that increased productivity was responsible for most of the reduction in nutrients. Similarly, Kitchens et al (1975) has concluded that the vegetation, not sediments, acted as a sink for nutrients moving through the Santee Swamp in South Carolina. Klopatek (1975, in press) has also suggested that emergent macrophytes in a Wisconsin riverine marsh effectively remove nitrogen and phosphorus from the water during the growing season. Marshall (1970) has reported that salt marsh cord grass (*Spartina alterniflora*) productivity increased significantly in a North Carolina salt marsh with the experimental addition of municipal wastewater. His study would also suggest that salt marsh macrophytes can act as nutrient sinks. Brinson (1977) has found immobilization of N and P beyond values added by leaf fall in a North Carolina swamp and concluded that the litter, not vegetation or sediments, compartment acted as a nutrient sink. Studies of a northern Michigan peatland (Richardson et al, in press) have shown that wetland sediments may also effectively remove N and P from domestic sewage. They found a dramatic decline in nutrient concentrations occurring within a few meters of the discharge point. Their budget studies clearly show that most of the N and P was trapped in the sediments (peat). Indeed, Stanlich (1976) has shown that peat can be used as an effective nutrient trap for wastes from campground treatment facilities.

Artificially created marshes have also been shown to remove N and P from sewage. An artificial pond/marsh system described by Woodwell (1977) reduced inorganic N by at least 84% and PO_4 -P by at least 94% when primary-treated sewage was introduced into the marsh, trickled into an adjoining pond and then recirculated through the marsh. Spangler et al (1976) using an artificial marsh with a gravel bottom also effected substrate removal of P from sewage with most being trapped in the sediments. In that study, however, a spring flush removed most of the P suggesting that a gravel substrate is not appropriate for long term storage of P.

Unlike the wetlands described above, the marsh we studied did not accumulate N or P in the vegetation or sediments, but did accumulate both N and P in the litter. Three factors may have been operative in our system. First, the effluent we applied was chlorinated as required by the State of New Jersey. Observations of the emergent vegetation clearly showed that prolonged contact with chlorinated effluent reduced the vigor of certain species and completely eliminated sensitive species (Whigham and Simpson, 1976b). Thus, while the vegetation in the experimental enclosure did show elevated %N and %P when compared with controls, the chlorine stress was just too great for plants to overcome. Second, litter decomposition rates in the Hamilton Marshes are extremely high (Simpson and Whigham, 1976a and 1976b; Simpson et al, in press). Nutrients stored in the vascular plants are leached rapidly following senescence and death and, for most species studied, decomposition is essentially complete before the onset of the next growing season. Because litter turnover is almost complete on an annual basis, we wouldn't expect that the litter compartment would ever become extensive enough to account for long-term storage of large amounts of N and P as Brinson (1977) has found in a North Carolina swamp and Richardson et al (in press) found in a northern bog wetland. Third, the wetland we studied was a pulsed system with the high marsh being flooded and drained twice daily. While the flood and ebb tide waters tended to move over the wetland surface as a slow sheet water movements were substantially greater than that normally encountered in most southern swamp forests, peatlands, or for that matter, artificial marshes. This, combined with the high rate at which we applied effluent and its resultant rapid drainage from the high marsh surface may have prevented efficient uptake of nutrients. Pond-like areas of the same wetland (Whigham and Simpson, 1976a) which are drained only at very low tide, where water movement is much slower and where there is an accumulation of litter from one growing season to the next, may be more efficient at nutrient removal than the high marsh. Water quality studies (Simpson et al, in press) indeed suggest that the pond-like habitat does act as a nutrient sink throughout the year. On the basis of our preliminary analysis of the data, it would appear that the high marsh habitat of freshwater tidal wetlands does not have the tremendous nutrient removal characteristics of other wetlands. However, where limited removal of N from sewage is a management goal, freshwater tidal wetlands can play an important role.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was supported by grants from Hamilton Township and the Office of Water Research and Technology (#B-060-NJ). The research was performed while Dennis F. Whigham was associated with Rider College and written while Robert L. Simpson was on sabbatical leave from Rider College and working at the Smithsonian Institution's Chesapeake Bay Center for Environmental Studies. We thank our student assistants without whose efforts this work would have been impossible. Special thanks are extended to Hamilton Township officials Art Harrison, Jerry Herrera, Art Julian and Richard Klockner and the Hamilton Township Environmental Commission for their support and encouragement throughout this study. Finally, the support and encouragement of our wives, Janice Whigham and Penelope Simpson, has been most appreciated and needed.

LITERATURE CITED

- American Society of Agronomy, Inc. 1965. Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2. Chemical and Microbiological Properties. Amer. Soc. Agronomy. Madison, Wisconsin. 801 p.
- Boyt, F. L., S. E. Bayley, and J. Zoltek, Jr. 1977. Removal of Nutrients from Treated Municipal Wastewater by Wetland Vegetation. Jour. Water Poll. Control Fed. 49:789-799.
- Brinson, M. N. 1977. Decomposition and Nutrient Exchange of Litter in an Alluvial Swamp Forest. Ecology 58: 601-609.
- Ewel, K. 1976. Effects of Sewage Effluent on Ecosystem Dynamics in Cypress Domes. In: Freshwater Wetlands and Sewage Effluent Disposal. (D. Tilton, J. Kadlec and C. J. Richardson, eds.) pp. 169-196. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Golterman, H. L. 1969. Methods for Chemical Analysis of Freshwaters. IBP Handbook No. 8. Blackwell Scientific Publications, Oxford, England. 172 pp.
- Grant, R. R. Jr. and R. Patrick. 1970. Tinicum Marsh as a Water Purifier. In: Two Studies of Tinicum Marsh, Delaware and Philadelphia Counties, Pa. (J. McCormick, R. R. Grant Jr. and R. Patrick) pp. 105-123. The Conservation Foundation, Washington, D.C.
- Kitchens, W. M., Jr., J. M. Dean, L. H. Stevenson and J. H. Cooper. 1975. The Santee Swamp as a Nutrient Sink. In: Mineral Cycling in Southeastern Ecosystems. (F. G. Howell, J. B. Gentry and M.H. Smith, eds.) pp. 349-366. ERDA Symposium Series Conference - 740513.
- Klopatek, J. 1975. The Role of Emergent Macrophytes in Mineral Cycling in a Freshwater Marsh. In: Mineral Cycling in Southeastern Ecosystems (F. G. Howell, J. B. Gentry and H. M. Smith, eds.) pp 367-393. ERDA Symposium Series (CONF-740513).

- Klopatek, J. 1977. Nutrient Dynamics of a Freshwater Riverine Marsh and the Role of Emergent Macrophytes. In: *Freshwater Wetlands: Ecological Processes and Management Potential* (R. E. Good, D. F. Whigham and R. L. Simpson, eds.). Academic Press, New York.
- Marshall, D. E. 1970. Characteristics of *Spartina* Marsh which is Receiving Treated Municipal Sewage Wastes. In: *Studies of Marine Estuarine Ecosystems Developing with Treated Sewage Wastes*. (H. T. Odum and A. F. Chestnut, eds.), pp. 317-359. Inst. Mar. Sci. Univ. No. Carolina. Ann. Rept. 1969-70.
- Richardson, C. J., W. A. Wentz, J.P. Chamie, J.A. Kadlec, and D. L. Tilton. 1976. Plant Growth, Nutrient Accumulation and Decomposition in a Central Michigan Peatland used for Effluent Treatment. In: *Freshwater Wetlands and Sewage Effluent Disposal*. (D. Tilton, J. Kadlec and C.J. Richardson, eds.), pp. 77-118. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Richardson, C.J., D. J. Tilton, J. A. Kadlec, J.P.M. Chamie and W. A. Wentz. In Press. Nutrient Dynamics of Northern Wetland Ecosystems. In: *Freshwater Wetlands: Production Processes and Management Potential*. R. E. Good, D. F. Whigham and R.L. Simpson, eds.). Academic Press.
- Simpson, R. L., D.F. Whigham and R. Walker. In Press. Seasonal Patterns of Nutrient Movement in a Freshwater Tidal Marsh. In: *Freshwater Wetlands: Production Processes and Management Potential*. R. E. Good, D. F. Whigham and R.L. Simpson, eds.). Academic Press.
- Sloey, W. E., F.L. Spangler and C.W. Fetter, Jr. In press. Management of Freshwater Wetlands for Nutrient Assimilation. In: *Freshwater Wetlands: Production Processes and Management Potential*. R.E. Good, D.F. Whigham and R.L. Simpson, eds.). Academic Press.
- Small, M. 1976. Marsh/Pond Sewage Treatment Plants. In: *Freshwater Wetlands and Sewage Effluent Disposal*. (D. Tilton, J. Kadlec and C. J. Richardson, eds.), pp. 197-214. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Sommers, L.E. and D. W. Nelson. 1972. Determination of Total Phosphorus in Soils: A Rapid Perchloric Acid Digestion Procedure. *Soil. Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc.* 36: 902-904.
- Spangler, F. L., W. E. Sloey and C. W. Fetter. 1976. Wastewater Treatment by Natural and Artificial Marshes. EPA-600/2-76-207. Technology Series. Washington, D.C.
- Stanlick, H.T. 1976. Treatment of Secondary Effluent Using a Peat Bed. In: *Freshwater Wetlands and Sewage Effluent Disposal*. (D. Tilton, J. Kadlec and C.J. Richardson, eds.), pp 257-268. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

- Stearns, F. In Press. Management Potential: Summary and Recommendations. In: Freshwater Wetlands: Production Processes and Management Potential. R.E. Good, D.F. Whigham and R.L. Simpson (eds.), Academic Press.
- Strickland, J.D.H., and T.R. Parson. 1968. A Practical Handbook of Seawater Analysis. Fish. Res. Bd. Can. Ottawa. 311 pp.
- Tilton, D., J. Kadlec and C.J. Richardson (eds.). 1976. Freshwater Wetlands and Sewage Effluent Disposal. University of Michigan Ann Arbor, Michigan. 343 pp.
- Tourbier, J. and R. Pierson, Jr. (eds.). 1976. Biological Control of Water Pollution. University of Pennsylvania Press. Philadelphia, Pa. 340 pp.
- Valiela, I., J.M. Teal and N. Y. Persson. 1976. Production and Dynamics of Experimentally Enriched Salt Marsh Vegetation: Below-ground Biomass. Limnol. Oceanogr. 21:245-252.
- Whigham, D.F. and R. L. Simpson. 1975. Ecological Studies of the Hamilton Marshes Progress Report for the Period June 1974 - January 1975. Rider College, Lawrenceville, N.J.
- Whigham, D.F. and R.L.Simpson.1976a. The Potential Use of Tidal Marshes in the Management of Water Quality in the Delaware River. In: Biological Control of Water Pollution. Tourbier, J. and R. Pierson, Jr., (eds.), pp. 173-186. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Whigham, D. F. and R. L. Simpson. 1976b. Sewage Spray Irrigation in a Delaware River Freshwater Tidal Marsh. In: Freshwater Wetlands and Sewage Effluent. (D. Tilton, J. Kadlec and C. J. Richardson (eds), pp. 119-144. University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Whigham, D.F., J. McCormick, R.L. Good and R.L. Simpson. In press. Biomass and Primary Production in Freshwater Tidal Wetlands of the Middle Atlantic Coast. In: Freshwater Wetlands: Production Processes and Management Potential. R.E. Good, D.F. Whigham, and R.L. Simpson, eds.), Academic Press.