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Phytoplankton not only form the base of the oceanic food web, but also act as mediators for a majority of biogeochemical fluxes in aquatic environments. Their functional importance in all natural waters, and especially in coastal areas, is paramount. Consequently much research has concentrated on the physiology, primary production, and distribution of coastal phytoplankton groups. Unfortunately, much of this work has focused on a few major phytoplankton groups while many other taxa of potential significance have been overlooked. One such overlooked group of coastal phytoplankton are the cryptomonads. This thesis clarifies our understanding of the physiological ecology of the Cryptomonads and thus serves as the basis for understanding and forecasting the stability and resilience of coastal ecosystems.

Cryptophytes have an exclusive combination of photosynthetic pigments and, under low light conditions, the ability to mixotrophically exploit available inorganic as well as organic nutrients. This makes them a unique group able to take advantage of several niches in the coastal environment. Specifically, cryptophytes are able to
maximize light absorption and utilization by varying pigments concentrations and PSII:PSI stoichiometry, to use alternative fuel sources such as organic nutrients under low light conditions when photosynthetic rates may not be sufficient to support strictly autotrophic growth, and to use their swimming ability to control their proximity to light and nutrients in the water column. These distinctive strategies allow cryptophytes to rival more customary bloom forming algae under certain conditions. Principally, cryptophytes are most prevalent in areas marked by low light and high concentrations of organic matter. In these areas, their physiological capabilities allow them to potentially out-compete traditional phytoplankton groups. As more coastal areas move towards these types of organically laden, low light environments we should expect to see a proliferation of cryptophyte algae as they exploit their lifestyle to contest other coastal phytoplankton. In order to comprehend the changes this shift in phytoplankton community composition will have on coastal ecosystems, it is essential to understand the current physiological ecology and distribution patterns of cryptophyte algae. This work begins to illuminate the functional importance of cryptophyte algae in coastal areas.
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1.0 Introduction

1.1 Coastal phytoplankton community composition

Phytoplankton in aquatic environments play a critical role in biogeochemical cycles and serve as the base of the aquatic food web. This role is especially important in coastal areas where phytoplankton are central to material transformations and primary production rates are very high. Phytoplankton are often categorized into groups based on their primary role in biogeochemical material fluxes and/or primary production. For example, diatoms are considered the principal phytoplankton group contributing to primary production and carbon export in coastal areas; dinoflagellates are often important contributors to biomass in stratified or silica limited areas and are well examined in harmful algal bloom literature; and cyanobacteria are the dominant algal group in offshore continental shelf and oceanic waters (Margalef 1978; Glover et al. 1986; Smayda 1989). Consequently, the majority of oceanographic phytoplankton research has largely focused on prolific groups such as diatoms, dinoflagellates, and cyanobacteria. The abundance of these organisms in natural waters and the availability of laboratory strains for research make them obvious choices for both field and laboratory studies. However, phytoplankton community composition in coastal areas is extremely heterogeneous and these well studied groups are often out-competed by alternative phytoplankton groups. Despite this, the importance of these alternative groups to coastal ecosystems and to material transformation rates has yet to be explored. One such under-appreciated phytoplankton group is the Cryptomonads, which are numerically and functionally significant in many aquatic environments.
Cryptophytes are an adaptable group that thrive at depth in oligotrophic waters (Ilmavirta 1988), the Southern Ocean (Fiala et al. 1998), the coastal ocean (Tamigneaux et al. 1995), estuaries (Pinckney et al. 1998), and inland lakes (Klaveness 1988; Higashi and Seki 2000). Despite their abundance, their importance is often under-appreciated and the amount of research conducted on them is small, especially when compared to the more classic phytoplankton groups (Fig. 1.1). The lack of understanding of cryptophyte significance and physiological ecology is particularly unfortunate as in turbid, coastal waters cryptophytes are a quantitatively dominant group and can have a significant impact on biogeochemical transformation rates and food web cycling.

1.2 Cryptophyte morphology

Cryptophytes evolved from a secondary endosymbiotic event involving an ancestral rhodophyte-like eukaryotic cell and a phagotrophic eukaryotic organism (Douglas 1992; Moreira et al. 2000). Despite their common ancestry, cryptophytes are distinctly morphologically and physiologically different from other phycobilin containing phytoplankton groups and other secondary endosymbionts.

Cryptophytes are eukaryotic phytoplankton found in both marine and freshwater ecosystems. They are mostly biflagellated and autotrophic, although there are some colorless, heterotrophic species (Davis and Sieburth 1984; Hill and Rowan 1989). The cryptophytes contain two major light harvesting systems – the phycobilin complex which is located in the intra-thylakoid space and a chlorophyll protein complex located in the thylakoid membrane (Gantt et al. 1971). The presence of phycobilin pigments in cryptophytes and their integral role in light harvesting for photosynthesis was first
discovered in 1959 (Allen et al. 1959; Haxo and Fork 1959; ÓhEocha and Ratery 1959). Unlike other phycobilin containing phytoplankton groups, cryptophyte phycobilins are not arranged into phycobilisome protein complexes and their thylakoids are most often in pairs or stacks (Lucas 1970; Maccoll and Guard-Friar 1987; Vesk et al. 1992). Phycobilins in cryptophytes are located within the intra-thylakoidal (lumenal) space (Gantt et al. 1971) and are not bound to the thylakoid membrane (Spear-Bernstein and Miller 1989) as is observed in cyanobacteria. Additionally, cryptophytes contain either phycoerythrin or phycocyanin, but never both in the same species, and often have several chromophores associated with their phycobilins (Kobayashi et al. 1979). They are the only phytoplankton group to contain this unique arrangement of photosynthetic pigments.

Most phytoplankton with complex plastids as a result of secondary endosymbiosis exhibit limited evidence of the engulfed phototroph [these groups are identified by four plastid surrounding membranes (Wastl and Maier 2000)]. However, cryptophytes are unique in that the cytoplasm and nucleus of the eukaryotic phototrophic endosymbiont endures as the periplastidal space and the nucleomorph respectively (Hansmann, 1988; Gillott and Gibbs, 1990). The nucleomorph contains both DNA and RNA and encodes some plastid genes (McKerracher and Gibbs 1982; Fraunholz et al. 1998; Wastl et al. 2000). The true functionality of the nucleomorph is an active area of research and sets the cryptophytes apart from other secondary endosymbionts as a unique evolutionary intermediate.
1.3 Cryptophyte distribution in nature

Cryptophytes are eucaryotic flagellates ranging in size from 3 – 50 µm and are found worldwide from inland lakes, to estuaries and coastal areas, to the open ocean. The available information about cryptophytes is minimal as they are typically a background ephemeral phytoplankton group and are difficult to preserve and identify in natural samples (Gieskes and Kraay 1983). Cryptophytes are an opportunistic group and do not follow the traditional paradigms for bloom forming phytoplankton. In general, cryptophytes thrive under dim light conditions and are commonly found at depth (Ilmavirta 1988). In these areas, cryptophytes are considered a permanent presence throughout the year, are often major contributors to total biomass, and are critical to food web dynamics (Klaveness 1988).

Cryptophyte blooms tend to follow perturbations in the system, due either to natural cycles, episodic events, or after the bloom of another phytoplankton group (Dokulil 1988). In many cases, cryptophyte blooms emerge during the decline of the spring diatom bloom as dissolved silica levels reach a concentration limiting to diatom growth (Dokulil and Skolaut 1986). The net result is that diatom and cryptophyte abundances are often inversely correlated, temporally and/or spatially, in many coastal areas (Figs. 1.2 & 1.3). Diatoms and cryptophytes are the only phytoplankton groups that exhibit this tight coupling across a wide range of coastal environments. The only coastal areas where this relationship does not hold are clear, oligotrophic, coastal waters (Fig. 1.3d).

These clear waters are optically deep and high levels of both photosynthetically available radiation (PAR) and ultraviolet radiation (UVR) penetrate into the water.
column. Cryptophytes are highly sensitive to both PAR and UVR and are not able to produce photoprotective compounds to shield themselves from damaging irradiances (Vernet et al. 1994). In response to increased levels of UVR cryptophytes exhibit a decrease in motility and carbohydrate reserves and a bleaching of pigments (Plante and Arts 2000). Phycobilin pigments are readily cleaved by exposure to UVR and are broken down faster than chlorophyll and carotenoid pigments making phycobilin containing groups more susceptible to damage by UV exposure than many other phytoplankton groups (Hader et al. 1998). The vulnerability of phycobilin pigments to UV damage may prevent cryptophytes from growing in areas with high, potentially damaging irradiances such as surface waters.

1.4 Physiological strategies of the cryptophytes

The constantly fluctuating conditions in aquatic ecosystems present a dynamic and unstable environment for growth. In natural waters, phytoplankton will often be at an irradiance or nutrient level that is not optimal for growth. Phytoplankton groups have developed mechanisms for dealing with these perturbations in their surroundings and different phytoplankton groups have developed distinctive strategies to take advantage of available niches. Surely cryptophyte algae are no exception and have developed several mechanisms that allow them to adapt to and exploit particular niches in aquatic environments. Specifically, they may be able to adjust cellular concentrations and composition of photosynthetic pigments and photochemical machinery and may use organic nutrients to supplement their growth. These strategies would allow them to continue growth under conditions unfavorable for most photosynthetic organisms and
will each be addressed in greater detail in this thesis. The ways in which cryptophyte algae respond to a changing environment needs to be a research focus in order to begin predicting how they will affect population dynamics, food webs, and cycling of nutrients within aquatic systems.

1.5 Objectives of Thesis Research

The overall objective of this thesis is to define the environmental niche for cryptophyte algae. The work is focused specifically on quantifying how light and nutrient distributions impact growth through an analysis of natural and laboratory, freshwater and marine cryptophyte populations. This combined analysis was designed to clarify the fitness and competitive ability of cryptophyte algae under varying environmental factors. I hypothesize that cryptophyte algae have unique adaptation strategies for exploiting coastal aquatic environments and in certain areas this will afford them a competitive advantage over other more prolific phytoplankton groups. This competitive advantage will have a pronounced affect on phytoplankton community composition as well as aquatic food webs and material transformations in coastal waters. Specific questions which were addressed are as follows:

**Question 1**) *What are some of the defining parameters controlling the temporal and spatial distribution of cryptophytes in natural aquatic environments?* Are cryptophyte distributions defined by their absorption qualities in nature and how does their ability to harvest light at depth differ from other algal groups? Can we use available information to determine a range of ‘habitable zones’ for cryptophytes?
**Question 2**) Are cryptophytes significantly affected by the presence of Ultraviolet Radiation (UVR)? Will their photosynthetic efficiency and/or growth potential be compromised by exposure to UVR? I hypothesize that cryptophytes are extremely sensitive to UVR and their growth will be significantly impaired by the presence of high amounts of UV light.

**Question 3**) How do cryptophytes acclimate to a changing light environment (changes in both light intensity and spectral quality)? Specifically, do they adjust the concentration and/or ratio of pigments in response to the incoming light field? Are they afforded a competitive advantage in spectrally skewed light environments due to the presence of phycobilin pigments? I hypothesize that cryptophytes will be afforded an advantage in areas of low light availability and areas of spectrally restricted light fields with mostly green and blue-green wavelengths of light. Additionally, I believe cryptophytes will be able to exhibit control over their photosynthetic machinery such that their growth rate and photosynthetic ability is maximized in areas of low light.

**Question 4**) Does the uptake of organic matter enhance cryptophyte growth or make them otherwise more competitive against other phytoplankton groups? Are photoautotrophic cryptophytes capable of heterotrophy and if so how much of an advantage does this provide them over more traditional photoautotrophic algae. I hypothesize that cryptophyte populations grown in the presence of supplemental organic substrates will have higher growth rates than control populations. This increase in
growth potential will translate to an increased prevalence of cryptophyte species in areas with high concentrations of organic matter that may supplement growth in low light environments.
Figure 1.1: Available citations for major phytoplankton taxa (from Web of Science journal search).
Figure 1.2: Relationship between proportion of total biomass (as chlorophyll a) associated with cryptophytes versus the proportion of biomass associated with diatoms in a) the Mid-Atlantic Bight, b) coastal Antarctica, and c) Lake Michigan. Teflon-coated Niskin bottles, lowered to selected depths, were used to collect water for assessment of phytoplankton photopigments. Phytoplankton biomass, as chlorophyll a, and phylogenetic group dynamics were calculated using chemotaxonomic pigments measured by High Performance Liquid Chromatography as outlined in (Millie et al. 2002). Cryptophytes and diatoms were identified by the presence of the carotenoids alloxanthin and fucoxanthin respectively.
Figure 1.3: Relationship between all major taxa (as $R^2$ of linear correlation between proportion of total biomass of groups shown) in a) coastal Antarctic, b) coastal Lake Michigan, c) coastal Mid-Atlantic Bight, and d) Coastal Gulf of Mexico. Data were collected as in Fig. 1.2.
2.0 Assessing the relative impact of resuspended sediment and phytoplankton community composition on remote sensing reflectance

Abstract

In order to characterize the impact of turbidity plumes on optical and biological dynamics, a suite of environmental parameters were measured in southern Lake Michigan during the springtime recurrent sediment plume. In-water measurements of inherent optical properties (IOPs) were entered into Hydrolight 4.2 radiative transfer model and the output was compared with measured apparent optical properties (AOPs) across a wide range of optical conditions. Hydrolight output and measured underwater light fields were then used to clarify the effects of the sediment plume on phytoplankton community composition and nearshore remote sensing ocean color algorithms. Our results show that the suspended sediment in the plume did not seriously impact the performance of ocean color algorithms. We evaluated several currently employed chlorophyll algorithms and demonstrated that the main factor compromising the efficacy of these algorithms was the composition of phytoplankton populations. As phycobilin-containing algae became the dominant group, chlorophyll algorithms that use traditional blue/green reflectance ratios were compromised due to the high absorption of green light by phycobilin pigments. This is a notable difficulty in coastal areas, which have highly variable phytoplankton composition and are often dominated by sharp fronts of phycobilin and non-phycobilin containing algae.
2.1 Introduction

The main circulation patterns in Lake Michigan are primarily wind driven. This is an energetic and dynamic environment and it is often seriously affected by short-term episodic events. In the Great Lakes, episodic events are most frequent in the late winter/early spring when high winds and storms are prevalent and thermal stratification is low (Lee and Hawley 1998; Lou et al. 2000; Beletsky and Schwab 2001). These events have been hypothesized to play a disproportionately large role in structuring physical and biological systems, but investigating their importance is difficult given the limitations of traditional sampling techniques.

One annual event that occurs in southern Lake Michigan each spring is a recurrent turbidity plume that extends up to 200 km alongshore (Mortimer 1988). Spring in Lake Michigan is marked by frequent, highly energetic storms, turbulent shoreline erosion, and high river runoff. These forces lead to significant resuspension of particles, which are then transported to the southern basin of the lake. The erosive forces in Lake Michigan are episodic in nature and for many biogeochemically important materials this resuspension and transport of sediments in the Southern Basin is greater than external inputs from rivers (Eadie et al. 1984; Hawley 1991; Eadie et al. 1996). Particles resuspended during the plume event may comprise up to 25% of the total transport of sediment to the southern part of the Lake (Eadie et al. 1996; Lou et al. 2000). This resuspension and transport of concentrated sediment loads is coincident with the spring phytoplankton bloom (Mortimer 1988). The spring bloom is a crucial time for the ecology of Lake Michigan as it may contribute up to 50% of the total annual primary production in the Lake and is a major source of carbon to higher trophic levels.
The physical processes associated with these coastal plumes were believed to be critical in controlling biogeochemical cycling, shaping the light environment, altering available nutrient concentrations, establishing conditions for the spring bloom, and structuring biological communities (Mortimer 1988).

The recurrent turbidity event was first observed in remote sensing data as a highly reflective band nearshore (Mortimer 1988). At that time, Mortimer noted the difficulty in using optical and remote sensing techniques in areas of strong optical gradients and highly variable concentrations of suspended particulate material (SPM), colored dissolved organic matter (CDOM), and chlorophyll such as that observed in coastal areas. Since that time there has been much debate over the utility of such techniques in dynamic coastal environments. Recent efforts have focused on remote sensing techniques in order to increase sampling resolution to ecologically relevant scales for investigation into the effects of short-term episodic events. As part of the Episodic Events – Great Lakes Experiment (EEGLE), we wanted to quantify the effects of the episodic recurrent turbidity plume on optical parameters, phytoplankton dynamics, remote sensing techniques, and the performance of currently employed coastal algorithms.

2.2 Methods

2.2.1 Sampling

Sampling was conducted in the southeastern portion of Lake Michigan (Fig. 2.1) from 24-26 March 1999, 14-15 and 22-24 April 1999, and 18-19 March 2000 onboard the R/V Laurentian. Sampling stations were established both inside and outside of the sediment plume along historic transect lines perpendicular to the coast. Vertical profiles
of physical and optical parameters were performed at each station and supplemented with
discrete water samples that were taken to the laboratory for more in depth analysis.

2.2.2 Optical Measurements

At each station, hydrographic profiles of the water column were measured with a SeaBird CTD. Optical measurements included surface and vertical profiles of both apparent and inherent optical properties. Inherent optical properties (IOPs) were measured with a dual-path absorption and attenuation meter (AC-9; Wetlabs Inc.). The AC-9 measures both absorption and attenuation at 9 wavelengths of light (412, 440, 488, 510, 532, 555, 630, 676, and 715 nm). The AC-9 was factory calibrated between sampling years and calibrated daily using ultra-clean water from a Barnstead E-Pure water purification system. Absorption data were integrated with concurrently collected CTD data and were temperature (Pegau et al. 1997) and scattering [subtraction of a715 from all a channels (Zaneveld and Kitchen 1994)] corrected and binned to 0.25m depth intervals.

Apparent optical properties (AOPs) were collected using a profiling spectral radiometer (Ocean Color Radiometer 200; Satlantic Inc.) and a hyperspectral radiometric buoy (HTSRB; Satlantic Inc.). The OCR-200 measures downwelling irradiance (E_d) and upwelling radiance (L_u) in-situ as well as downwelling surface irradiance [E_d(0^+)] at 14 wavelengths (305, 324, 339, 380, 406, 412, 443, 490, 510, 555, 619, 665, 670, and 705 nm). The TSRB measures E_d(0^+) and L_u at 0.7m at 123 visible wavelengths. All Satlantic sensors were factory calibrated prior to each sampling year. Collected radiometric data were processed using Satlantic’s Prosoft software package according to
manufacturer protocols. No dark corrections or self shading corrections were applied to these data. Diffuse attenuation coefficient \((K_d)\) values were calculated as

\[
K_d = \ln \left( \frac{E_{d2}}{E_{d1}} \right) \frac{1}{\Delta z}
\]

where \(E_{d2}\) is the downwelling irradiance at depth 2, \(E_{d1}\) is downwelling irradiance at depth 1, and \(\Delta z\) is the change in depth between these two measurements. Remote sensing reflectance \((Rrs)\) values were calculated using Prosoft as

\[
Rrs(0^+,\lambda) = \frac{L_w(0^+,\lambda)}{E_d(0^+,\lambda)}
\]

where \(L_w\) is upwelling radiance propagated up through the surface of the water as

\[
L_w(0^+,\lambda) = 0.54L_w(0^-,\lambda)
\]

Remote sensing reflectance outputs from Prosoft calculations were subsequently used for calculation of chlorophyll \(a\) concentrations using an array of remote sensing chlorophyll algorithms [Table 1 (O'Reilly et al. 1998; O'Reilly et al. 2000)].

2.2.3 Discrete Sample Measurements

Teflon-coated Niskin bottles, lowered to selected depths, were used to collect water for assessment of phytoplankton photopigments, photosynthesis-irradiance parameters, and SPM concentrations. Phytoplankton biomass, as chlorophyll \(a\), and phylogenetic group dynamics were characterized using chemotaxonomic pigments derived using High Performance Liquid Chromatography as outlined in (Millie et al. 2002). Photosynthesis-irradiance parameters were measured as in (Fahnenstiel et al. 2000). SPM concentrations were determined gravimetrically after drawing 0.2- to 0.3-L
aliquots under low vacuum onto pre-rinsed, tared 47 mm diameter Poretics 0.4-μm polycarbonate filters. The filters were dried in a dessicator to constant weight. When necessary, SPM concentrations were estimated from AC-9 collected data based upon the relationship established between suspended material concentration and attenuation at 650nm (Fig. 2.2).

2.2.4 Solving the Radiative Transfer Equation

In order to evaluate the dynamic response of primary producers to the highly variable in-situ light environment, we needed to spectrally characterize the underwater light field under a wide range of conditions. Establishing a solid relationship between the IOPs and AOPs provides confidence that a full set of radiometric parameters can be calculated given in situ measurements of the IOPs. A subsection of our data set (n=41 profiles) was input into Hydrolight 4.2 (Sequoia Scientific Inc.) to numerically solve the radiative transfer equation for a realistic radiance distribution. Hydrolight requires four basic input parameters; the IOPs of the water body, wind speed, sky spectral radiance distribution, and water column bottom boundary conditions. In this study we supplied Hydrolight with measured IOPs (a and c) from an AC-9 and measured wind speeds from an anemometer aboard the research vessel. The sky spectral radiance distribution is calculated within Hydrolight via RADTRAN based upon user-supplied date, time of day, location on the globe, and cloud cover at each station. Reflectance of the bottom boundary was set at 20% without spectral dependence for all calculations. In this study, Hydrolight output was obtained solely to determine scalar irradiance values, therefore we wanted to ensure that Hydrolight output closely reflected conditions at the time of
sampling. To this end, the backscatter fraction ($b_b/b$) was optimized at each individual station to minimize the difference between the output and measured values and was input as a Fournier–Fourand (FF) phase function. In the absence of a measured particle phase function, the FF is an acceptable replacement as the exact shape of the phase function is not as critical as the magnitude of the backscatter ratio for calculations of the AOPs (Mobley et al. 2002).

To validate our results from Hydrolight, modeled values were compared to concurrently measured AOPs at 41 stations in our sampling area over the course of two years in the spring and summer. These stations encompassed a wide variety of optical and physical environments. $K_d$ and $R_{rs}$ values were used for the comparisons as they are not extremely sensitive to the geometric distribution of the light field. To correlate $K_d$, we incorporated 435 data points over spatial and temporal gradients and directly compared the Hydrolight output with measured values (Fig. 2.3a). The correlation was strong with a slope of 0.88 indicating that modeled values were slightly underestimating measured $K_d$ values. $R_{rs}$ correlations were also strong (average $R^2 = 0.94$) although spectrally dependent (Fig. 2.3b). The slope was very close to 1.0 at lower wavelengths and dropped off towards the red wavelengths (slope range = $0.68 – 1.2$). This is not surprising as the magnitude of the $R_{rs}$ signal is much lower in the red wavelengths of light, therefore part of the error in this part of the spectrum is a signal to noise problem.

Hydrolight output was used to quantify the amount of light available to phytoplankton. Phytoplankton populations are able to use light from all directions for photosynthesis. This light field is represented by the scalar irradiance ($E_o$). $E_o$ is the integral of the radiance over all angles around a point. This differs from the downwelling
irradiance ($E_d$), which is the traditionally measured irradiance term. $E_d$ accounts only for light propagating in the downward direction and proportionally weights the contribution of radiation at different incidence angles. The $E_o$ output from Hydrolight calculations allowed us to use this $E_o$ term, which we were unable to measure, to examine light utilization by phytoplankton. $E_o$ values were used to calculate the scalar diffuse attenuation coefficient ($K_o$),

$$K_o = \ln \left( \frac{E_{o_2}}{E_{o_1}} \right) \frac{1}{\Delta z} \quad (2.5)$$

the scalar optical depth ($\zeta_o$),

$$\zeta_o = K_o z \quad (2.6)$$

and the average cosine,

$$\overline{\mu} = \frac{E_d - E_u}{E_o} \quad (2.7)$$

where $E_u$ is the upwelling irradiance.

2.3 Results

2.3.1 Optical dynamics

The springtime recurrent turbidity plume in Lake Michigan strongly impacted the optical environment in the southern portion of the Lake. The plume can easily be observed in remote sensing reflectance imagery during the spring months (Fig. 2.4a). The spatial extent of the plume can be seen in March 1999, followed by confinement to the coastline in April, and then dissipation in the summer months with thermal stratification (Fig. 2.4). The three major optical zones along a transect line in April 1999 extending 32 km offshore St. Joseph, MI, through the sediment plume area, can readily
be observed in collected data. The optical gradients in this area were large over short
distances reflecting the interaction of the turbidity plume and outflow from the St. Joseph
River. The three distinct water types along this transect line included an onshore
river/plume region that extended to roughly 10 km offshore, plume dominated water that
extended approximately 10 to 20 km offshore, and offshore stations further than 20 km.
Data collected along this transect line in April of 1999 were representative of conditions
during the spring of all sampling years for the duration of the sediment plume and were
used as a case example during this study.

Nearshore stations were strongly influenced by both the sediment plume and the
outflow from the St. Joseph River. Although absorption and scattering were both
increased at nearshore stations, spectral changes in the optical signal were controlled by
absorption. Concentrations of highly absorbing CDOM and chlorophyll \( a \) were increased
in onshore stations relative to offshore areas. CDOM absorbs light mostly in the blue
wavelengths, which was apparent as an increase in the absorption spectra in the blue
wavelengths (Fig. 2.5a). These high nearshore CDOM concentrations were probably due
to both river outflow and \textit{in-situ} production. Chlorophyll \( a \) concentrations at onshore
stations were relatively high and diatoms dominated the phytoplankton community
adding to the high blue light absorption values (Fig. 2.6d-f). The effects of in-water
constituents were also apparent in the Rrs spectra. Onshore stations had a proportional
decrease in Rrs in the 400-500 nm region relative to stations further offshore due to
absorption of light by both CDOM and chlorophyll \( a \) at these wavelengths. A peak in
Rrs due to chlorophyll fluorescence at 676 nm is also evident (Fig. 2.6b, red line). The
available light field at the 1% light level was predominately green and red as all of the shorter wavelengths of light were absorbed in the water column (Fig. 2.6c).

Moving offshore into waters impacted less by the river, the effects of the sediment plume became more apparent. Absorption values decreased relative to onshore stations while scattering stayed high resulting in a significant increase in measured b/a ratios (Fig. 2.6a). This high scattering to absorption ratio was used as the primary optical signature of the sediment plume. The proportional decrease in absorption and increase in scattering was reflected in higher Rrs signals as more light was scattered up through the water column (Fig. 2.6b, green line). Chlorophyll values decreased in plume dominated stations and the composition of the phytoplankton community began to change (Fig. 2.6d-f). Further offshore, the optical signature was dominated by phytoplankton absorption. Both absorption and scattering were low relative to onshore waters and Rrs spectra were comparatively low and spectrally flat (Fig. 2.6b, blue line). Available light at the 1% light level was mostly blue-green and the phytoplankton community became dominated by cryptophyte algae in these offshore waters (Fig. 2.6c&e).

The changes in the concentrations of optically active constituents altered the light climate of the different water types. The high blue absorption at onshore stations resulted in the selective removal of blue wavelengths and a red shift of the available light field, while offshore stations had proportionally more blue and green light (Fig. 2.6c). In addition to these spectral changes in light quality, the quantity of available light at depth was decreased in onshore stations. The relationship between scalar optical depth and physical depth was steeper at onshore stations than in plume-dominated and offshore waters (Fig. 2.7a). A deeper optical depth corresponding to the same physical depth
indicates that onshore waters were more attenuating than offshore waters. Additionally, the scattering/absorption ratio was higher in plume dominated stations as compared to both onshore and offshore waters, resulting in a change in the diffusivity of the underwater light. The average cosine provides a simple description of the angular radiance distribution of the underwater light field. Average cosine values range from 0 for isotropic light fields to 1 in a collimated beam of light; a lower average cosine value indicates a more diffuse light field. In regions affected by the turbidity plume, the increased scattering resulted in a lower average cosine (Fig. 2.7b). The average cosine was lowest in areas most optically impacted by the plume and highest in clearer, offshore waters.

2.3.2 Biological dynamics

Phytoplankton physiology and community composition were notably impacted by both seasonal changes in the light environment and the optical gradients observed in the spring. The phytoplankton photosynthetic physiology reflected the seasonal variations in the light climate. The irradiance levels corresponding to the photoacclimation parameter (Ek) and the light saturated photosynthetic rate (Pb\text{max}) were relatively constant at 77 (±16) µmol photons m\textsuperscript{-2} s\textsuperscript{-1} and 0.61 (±0.28) µg C µg chl\textsuperscript{-1} h\textsuperscript{-1} respectively in both the spring months and during the summer in deeper waters (Fig. 8). Ek values were not dependent on in-situ E\textsubscript{o} at the time of sample collection in these data. However, summer surface samples, which were collected at a shallower scalar optical depth (samples collected above the thermocline), were dependent on in-situ E\textsubscript{o} values. As relative E\textsubscript{o} at the time of sample collection increased due to the change in season and the shallowing of
the mixed layer depth with the onset of stratification, the associated $E_k$ and $P_{\text{max}}^b$ values increased. These populations were consistently exposed to higher light levels in surface waters and acclimated to their growth conditions. There was no correlation between SPM concentrations and $E_k$ for any of the samples collected, thus changes in the photoacclimation parameter were not associated with the sediment plume (Fig. 2.8).

The distribution of total chlorophyll and the composition of phytoplankton communities also varied as the optical environment changed during the spring sampling period. Diatoms consistently comprised a higher proportion of chlorophyll $a$ onshore and in surface waters, while cryptophytes comprised a higher proportion offshore and in deeper waters (Fig. 2.6d-e). This resulted in a strong inverse relationship between diatom and cryptophyte abundances (Fig. 2.9).

2.4 Discussion

The springtime recurrent turbidity plume observed in southern Lake Michigan established a strong gradient ideal for assessing the utility of optical techniques in coastal waters. The location and extent of the plume could be determined through both remote sensing and in-situ sampling techniques (Figs. 2.4 and 2.6). The plume region, delineated by high reflectance values, extended approximately 20 km offshore for much of the EEGLE study. As seen in previous years, the sediment plume began in the early spring and lasted until early summer.

The sharp optical gradients encountered in the sampling area allowed the impact of variable in-water constituents on remote sensing reflectance to be characterized. Remote sensing reflectance offshore of the St. Joseph River showed the characteristic
low blue reflectance due to high concentrations of CDOM and chlorophyll $a$ that is common in areas offshore of large rivers (Fig. 2.6b). The St Joseph River drains a watershed area of 694,000 acres mainly through agricultural areas of Indiana and is considered a significant source of dissolved organic carbon (Mortimer 1988). Conversely, in offshore waters, reflectance was greatest in the blue wavelengths as absorption by phytoplankton and water dominated light attenuation. The sediment plume was characterized by high blue and green Rrs values due to the reflective materials in Lake Michigan which are eroded from either alongshore bluffs or shallow water glacial deposits; the sediment composition in the southeastern part of the Lake is dominated by these silts and fine sands (Fahnenstiel and Scavia 1987; Eadie et al. 1996; Barbiero and Tuchman 2000). This reflective material effectively scatters all of the available light and absorbs very little, resulting in high Rrs values.

It was initially believed that the high sediment concentrations associated with the turbidity plume would significantly affect the magnitude of the underwater light field resulting in light-limited phytoplankton populations leading to a decrease in primary productivity (Millie et al. 2002). However, in plume-dominated stations, the incident integrated flux of light was not significantly different than clearer, non-plume offshore waters which had deep mixed layer depths (Fig 2.6c). The increased concentration of particles in the sediment plume resulted in increased scattering (Fig. 2.5) which led to a more diffuse light field (Fig. 2.7b). This scattered light is simply redirected and may still be available for absorption by photosynthetic organisms.

Measured photosynthesis irradiance parameters suggested that phytoplankton populations in plume waters were not significantly more low-light acclimated than
phytoplankton in offshore stations (Fig. 2.8). $E_k$ values were fairly uniform throughout the spring bloom and plume events; furthermore the $E_k$ values were not significantly correlated with either suspended particulate material concentrations or light attenuation measurements. Thus there was no observed gradient in phytoplankton photoacclimation between plume and non-plume stations in the spring. However, the significant increase in $E_k$ and $P_{max}^b$ with summer stratification indicated that these populations were capable of photoacclimation; springtime populations were low-light acclimated compared to summer populations. This low-light acclimation reflected the deep mixing of springtime populations.

The actual light field available to a phytoplankton cells is the depth integrated light field as they vertically cycle through the water column (Cullen and Lewis 1988). Under these conditions, cells may photoacclimate to the average light intensity encountered over time. The increase in light attenuation in the plume was balanced offshore where the mixed layer depth was deeper so that phytoplankton populations in these two areas had similar total amounts of light available to them over time. However, the photoacclimation observed in spring populations changed as stratification developed in the summer which is consistent with the historical model for Lake Michigan phytoplankton (Fahnenstiel et al. 1989). Summer samples showed a distinct difference in photoacclimation between deep water and surface stations (Fig. 2.8). Surface samples were more acclimated to the incident light field at the time of sample collection whereas photoacclimation parameters for deep water samples collected below the thermocline were independent of the incident light field (Fig. 2.8c&d). Deep water samples collected below the thermocline (thermocline at approximately 20m; Fig. 2.4d) and spring samples
were being mixed over a wide vertical range of varying light intensity. The rate of mixing was most likely faster than the rate of photoacclimation and these samples were unable to acclimate to the ever-changing light intensity.

The observed shifts in phytoplankton community composition impacted remote sensing reflectance and thus ocean color algorithms. There was a strong correlation between measured and calculated chlorophyll concentration at most stations (Table 2.2). However, the absorption of green light by cryptophytes selectively removes these wavelengths from the light field. Chlorophyll algorithms utilize Rrs band ratios, which include 550, 555, 560, and 565 nm green light reflectance. These ratios assume case 1 waters where the *in-situ* absorption and water leaving radiance ($L_w$) signal in the blue wavelengths is dominated by chlorophyll absorption while $L_w$ in the green wavelengths is insensitive to chlorophyll concentrations (Gordon and Morel 1983). However, in Lake Michigan, cryptophyte absorption selectively removed the green light from the reflectance signal. Areas that were not dominated by cryptophytes (those with less than 40% of total chlorophyll contributed by cryptophytes) showed good agreement between measured and satellite estimated chlorophyll concentrations (Fig. 2.10; Table 2.2). In regions with high concentrations of phycobilin containing algae, remotely estimated chlorophyll concentrations were underestimated by an average of 45% for all algorithms tested. Thus contrary to previous beliefs, the sediment plume had little affect on the utility of ocean color remote sensing efforts. The critical parameter impacting the performance of ocean color algorithms in this area was the community composition of phytoplankton.
2.5 Summary and Conclusions

Our results illustrate the minimal effect of the sediment plume on the quantity of available light for phytoplankton populations. There was no significant change in the photosynthetic characteristics between plume and non-plume populations. The phytoplankton plume populations were not significantly low-light acclimated compared to populations in clearer waters offshore. The composition of phytoplankton communities may have been impacted by the spectral quality of light, which was a function of the mixed layer depth and the in-water constituents. In the deep, well-mixed water columns, the average spectral light field was increasingly spectrally skewed which is not uncommon in freshwater systems (Kirk 1994). As the average light distribution becomes restricted, the ability of phytoplankton to absorb light is directly related to their light-harvesting capabilities. In Lake Michigan this may account for the distribution of diatoms nearshore and cryptophytes offshore where phycobilin pigments efficiently absorb the available green light. Surprisingly variability in CDOM and SPM concentrations had no effect on estimating chlorophyll using current satellite algorithms. Changes in the phytoplankton community structure did impact chlorophyll remote sensing algorithms. This suggests that currently employed reflectance algorithms may be compromised in regions of highly variable phytoplankton community composition.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sensor</th>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SeaWiFS/OC2</td>
<td>( C = 10.0^{(0.341-3.001R+2.811R^2-2.041R^3)} - 0.04 )</td>
<td>490/555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTS/OC4O</td>
<td>( C = 10.0^{(0.405-2.900R+1.690R^2-0.530R^3-1.144R^4)} )</td>
<td>443&gt;490&gt;520/565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIS/OC3M</td>
<td>( C = 10.0^{(0.2830-2.753R+1.457R^2-0.659R^3-1.403R^4)} )</td>
<td>443&gt;490/550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZCS/OC3C</td>
<td>( C = 10.0^{(0.362-4.066R+5.125R^2-2.645R^3-0.597R^4)} )</td>
<td>443&gt;520/550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERIS/OC4E</td>
<td>( C = 10.0^{(0.368-2.814R+1.456R^2+0.768R^3-1.292R^4)} )</td>
<td>443&gt;490&gt;510/560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaWiFS/OC4v4</td>
<td>( C = 10.0^{(0.366-3.067R+1.930R^2+0.649R^3-1.532R^4)} )</td>
<td>443&gt;490&gt;510/555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaWiFS/OC2v4</td>
<td>( C = 10.0^{(0.319-2.336R+0.879R^2-0.135R^3)} - 0.071 )</td>
<td>490/555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Algorithms used to calculate chlorophyll \( a \) from remote sensing reflectance. R is determined as the maximum of the values shown. Sensor algorithms shown are for SeaWiFS (Sea-viewing Wide Field of view Sensor), OCTS (Ocean Color and Temperature Scanner), MODIS (Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer), CZCS (Coastal Zone Color Scanner), and MERIS (Medium Resolution Imaging Spectrometer).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sensor/algorithm</th>
<th>slope-all stations</th>
<th>$R^2$-all stations</th>
<th>slope- non cryptophyte dominated stations</th>
<th>$R^2$- non cryptophyte dominated stations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SeaWiFS/OC2</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTS/OC4O</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODIS/OC3M</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZCS/OC3C</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERIS/OC4E</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaWiFS/OC4v4</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SeaWiFS/OC2v4</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Correlation results for the calculation of chlorophyll from remote sensing reflectance measurements. The slope and $R^2$ for the linear correlation between measured and calculated chlorophyll is shown (as in Fig. 12) for all stations and for a subset of stations where the phytoplankton community composition is not dominated by cryptophytes (less than 40% of total chlorophyll $a$ attributed to cryptophytes). All of the algorithms perform better in areas that were not significantly influenced by cryptophyte absorption.
Figure 2.1: Sampling locations in southeastern Lake Michigan occupied in 1998 - 2000.
Figure 2.2: Relationship between attenuation at 630nm as measured by an AC-9 and suspended particulate material (SPM).

\[ y = 1.8828x - 0.5047 \]

\[ R^2 = 0.9019 \]
Figure 2.3: Relationship between measured and modeled apparent optical properties.

Measured values are from a Satlantic profiling radiometer and modeled values are from Hydrolight output.  

a) diffuse attenuation coefficient ($K_d$) for PAR. The solid line is the best fit line with an intercept at the origin.  
b) remote sensing reflectance ($R_{rs}$) - $R^2$ are represented by closed symbols and the slopes are represented by open symbols.
Figure 2.4: The temporal evolution of the southern Lake Michigan recurrent turbidity plume. a) AVHRR remote sensing reflectance and b) absorption, c) scattering, and d) temperature along the transect line shown extending 30km offshore St. Joseph, MI. Red circles on figure b represent station locations of the six sampling stations (stations were located approximately 2, 5, 10, 16, 26, and 30 km from shore). Note the change in scale for the temperature plot associated with June 1999.
Figure 2.5: Spectral a) absorption and b) scattering coefficients at three stations along an April 1999 cross shelf transect offshore St. Joseph, MI measured with and calculated from an AC-9. Stations are located onshore (circles, 2km offshore), in plume-dominated waters (triangles, 10km offshore), and offshore (stars, 30km offshore).
Figure 2.6: Optical and biological properties associated with an April 1999 cross shelf transect offshore St. Joseph, MI - a) scattering/absorption ratio at 488nm, b) remote sensing reflectance at an onshore station (red line, 2km offshore), a plume dominated station (green line, 10km offshore), and an offshore station (blue line, 30km offshore), c) fraction of available light at the 1% light level, as $E_o$ at depth normalized to $E_d$ at the surface (station colors as in c), d) HPLC measured chlorophyll a concentrations, e) percent of total chlorophyll a associated with cryptophytes, and f) percent of total chlorophyll a associated with diatoms. Sampling locations are as in Figure 3.
Figure 2.7: Vertical light properties at April 1999 sampling stations onshore (circles, 2km offshore), in plume-dominated waters (triangles, 10km offshore), and offshore (stars, 30km offshore) - a) scalar optical depth ($\zeta_o$) for PAR and b) average cosine (µ) at depth for PAR. A steeper scalar optical depth represents clearer waters. A lower average cosine indicates a more diffuse light field.
Figure 2.8: Seasonal variability in physiological parameters - a) variability in $E_k$ with scalar optical depth, b) relationship between $E_k$ and suspended particulate material, c) relationship between $P_{b,\text{max}}$ and in-situ $E_o$ at the time of sample collection, and d) relationship between $E_k$ and in-situ $E_o$ at the time of sample collection. During the winter, mixed months $E_k$ and $P_{b,\text{max}}$ values were relatively constant at 77 ($\pm$ 16) $\mu$mol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ and 0.61 ($\pm$ 0.27) $\mu$g C $\mu$g chl$^{-1}$ h$^{-1}$ respectively and did not depend on available irradiance ($E_o$) at the sampling depth (plus symbols). During the summer, stratified months $E_k$ and $P_{b,\text{max}}$ remained low in bottom waters below the thermocline (closed circles), but were much higher in surface waters (open circles). SPM values were much higher during the spring turbidity event (2.01 ± 1.33 mg l$^{-1}$) compared to summer time values (0.79 ± 0.12 mg l$^{-1}$), but there was no significant relationship between measured SPM values and $E_k$. 
Figure 2.9: Percentage of total chlorophyll $a$ associated with cryptophytes vs. percentage of total chlorophyll $a$ associated with diatoms from CHEMTAX output for all available data from 1998 and 1999.
Figure 2.10: Relationship between measured chlorophyll a (HPLC) and calculated chlorophyll a from three currently used ocean color algorithms - a) SeaWiFS OC2, b) SeaWiFS OC4v4, and c) MODIS OC3M. The relationship is strong until the optical signal is affected by cryptophyte absorption. The circled stations are those where cryptophytes make up 40% or more of the total chlorophyll a. The solid line is the best fit line through data not including cryptophyte dominated stations; reported slope and R² values are for this best fit line (also see Table 2). To verify the significance of this difference, a series of t-tests were run to compare measured and calculated chlorophyll values for all algorithms tested for the same subset of stations where the phytoplankton community composition is not dominated by cryptophytes and also for the remaining stations which are dominated by cryptophytes. P values for stations dominated by cryptophytes were all <0.0001. These results show that there is a statistically significant difference between measured and calculated chlorophyll concentrations in areas that were dominated by cryptophytes.
3.0 Synergy of light and nutrients on the photosynthetic efficiency of phytoplankton populations from the Neuse River Estuary, North Carolina

Abstract

A series of mesocosm studies were conducted using natural phytoplankton communities isolated from the Neuse River Estuary in the spring of 1998 and 1999 to assess the interactions between nutrient limitation and ultraviolet (UV) radiation on photosynthetic parameters. Treatments consisted of the addition of different forms of nutrients typically found in estuarine environments and the exclusion of ambient UV radiation (wavelengths < 400 nm). The quantum yield of photochemistry (Fv/Fm), phytoplankton community composition, and photosynthesis irradiance parameters were measured repeatedly over the course of 4 days. Spring samples in this area were dominated by a combination of phycobilin containing groups (cyanobacteria or cryptophytes) and diatoms. In spring 1998, during a period of stratification and low runoff, nutrient limitation was observed in the Neuse River. Fv/Fm parameters in all the mesocosm treatments responded to the addition of nitrogen. The form of the nitrogen addition (nitrate, ammonium, or urea) was insignificant and the addition of phosphorous had no observable effect. Conversely, during a period of high mixing in spring 1999, there was no nutrient addition effect on Fv/Fm. During both experiments Fv/Fm exhibited midday light-driven depressions in response to high irradiances with complete recovery at night. UV radiation accounted for a significant fraction of the midday depression seen in Fv/Fm. Samples treated with the D1 protein synthesis inhibitor lincomycin showed that the midday decrease in photochemical efficiency was mostly due to photoinduced
damage to the D1 protein. As an upper limit estimate, 80% of the decrease in $F_v/F_m$ centered around local noon appears to be related to this damage. The decrease in photochemical efficiency seen at high light levels in both UV exposed and UV excluded treatments was not correlated with a decrease in carbon fixation parameters.

3.1 Introduction

Estuarine phytoplankton are subject to many interacting and competing stressors and they must compete for available resources to maximize their photosynthetic rates and growth (Petersen et al. 1997). Characterizing the physiological response of phytoplankton to interacting environmental variables is essential to anticipating changes that might occur due to anthropogenic disturbances. This is fundamental to the formation of effective coastal nutrient management practices (Cloern 1996). These human-induced impacts include enhanced nutrient loading (Hobbie and Smith 1975; Paerl et al. 1995), modified nutrient ratios (Quian et al. 2000), altered flow regimes (Rudek et al. 1991), and enhanced ultraviolet radiation (Hader and Worrest 1991). Given this, developing a non-intrusive means to characterize the physiological state of phytoplankton communities and to predict their response to interacting anthropogenic disturbances has long been a goal of environmental scientists. Work over the last two decades by plant scientists and oceanographers (Kolber et al. 1988; Schreiber et al. 1995) has demonstrated the utility of chlorophyll $a$ fluorescence measurements as a sensitive indicator of the physiological state of phytoplankton populations under erratic conditions.

Estuaries are highly variable environments; estuarine populations are exposed to a widely fluctuating light environment and exhibit a broad range of physiological
acclimation strategies. These acclimation strategies allow the cells to maximize photosynthetic rates given light levels that range from limiting to photodamaging (Cullen and Lewis 1988; Cullen and MacIntyre 1998). The actual target site for damage due to visible wavelengths is a subject of considerable debate; however, nearly all of the proposed damage sites are primary components of the photosystem complex II (PS II; Telfer and Barber 1994). During periods of acute light stress, light-saturated photosynthetic rates will be impacted if PSII is damaged (Osmond 1994).

Laboratory studies on higher plants and green algae suggest that UV radiation also inhibits the photosynthetic machinery at PS II (Iwanzik et al. 1983; Kulandaivelu and Noorundeen 1983; Renger et al. 1989; Jordan 1996). Specifically, UVB radiation appears to degrade the D1/32 kDa protein complex within PSII (Greenberg et al. 1989; Richter et al. 1990; Melis et al. 1992; Jansen et al. 1993). Prolonged exposure to UV light will result in damage to the photosynthetic reaction centers and the cell will experience a decrease in the efficiency of photochemistry and ultimately a decrease in productivity (Smith et al. 1980; Booth et al. 1997). Furthermore, UV exposure may lead to changes in pigment concentration, inhibition of phosphorylation, loss of specific enzyme activity, and decreased carbon and nitrogen assimilation (Worrest et al. 1981; Dohler et al. 1995; Goes et al. 1995; Lohmann et al. 1998; Wangberg et al. 1998).

Photoinhibition in estuarine phytoplankton may be expected to be minimal due to the increased attenuation of light, especially in the UV wavelengths, associated with high turbidity and colored dissolved organic matter (CDOM) in these systems (Kirk 1994; Arrigo and Brown 1996). However, in the case of UV, there is evidence that there is an enhanced sensitivity to photoinhibition even in turbid environments (Kaczamarska et al.
2000; Banaszak and Neale 2001). Even if light-induced damage is minimal, light levels in these systems may still be sufficient to saturate photosynthesis resulting in physiologically induced depressions in Fv/Fm. The significance of any potential damage will be more pronounced in nutrient limited cells due to the impaired synthesis or repair of photosynthetic proteins (Prézelin et al. 1986; Lesser et al. 1994; Hunt and Mc Neil 1998).

As part of a larger study on the structure and function of phytoplankton communities in the Neuse river, this work focused on characterizing variability in Fv/Fm in natural populations over a range of nutrient and light regimes (Richardson et al. 2001). The degree to which Fv/Fm is determined by nutrient limitation, physiological down-regulation and/or light-induced damage, the effects of the interactions between light levels and nutrient concentrations, and the relative importance of UV radiation to total irradiance was examined.

3.2 Methods

3.2.1 Water Collection

Water for mesocosm bioassays was collected from 1 m depth along the southwestern shore (35.08 °N, 77.00 °W) of the Neuse River Estuary in June 1998 and May 1999. Water was pumped into a pre-cleaned (flushed with river water) trailer-mounted 4500 liter polyethylene tank using a nondestructive diaphragm pump and transported to the Institute of Marine Sciences (IMS) in Morehead City, NC. Water was transferred within 2 h of collection to translucent (85% PAR transmittance) fiberglass tanks (55 L) arranged in an outdoor, flow-through seawater pond at IMS. The pond was
continually flushed with seawater from the adjacent Bogue Sound for temperature control.

3.2.2 Mesocosm Experimental Design

Each tank was randomly assigned one of ten replicated treatment designs consisting of a combination of mixing and nutrient regimes. Tanks were either mixed by gentle bubbling with a slow flow of air or left static. Nutrients, including a control (no additions), +Nitrate (N), +Ammonium (A), +NA, +NAP (Nitrate + Ammonium + Phosphate) in 1998 and +N, +A, +U (Urea), +NAU, +NAP in 1999, were added to the respective treatment tanks in the early morning (0800) of days 0, 1, and 2 and gently mixed thoroughly (see Table 3.1 for concentrations). To assess the importance of UV radiation in the Neuse River, a set of mesocosms were added in 1999 and modified so as to allow penetration of photosynthetically available radiation (PAR) only. Mesocosm tanks were covered with UF3 plexiglass to screen out all UV radiation (referred to as UV excluded samples). These tanks were then mixed by gentle bubbling and had either no nutrients added or were supplemented with + NAP at the same time as the main tanks. Each tank was repeatedly sampled over a four-day period. Measured parameters include phytoplankton pigments, photosystem II quantum yields, and photosynthesis-irradiance parameters. Incident irradiance (PAR only) was measured over the duration of the experiment using a LiCor Li-1000 with a 4π sensor. Irradiance measurements inside the tanks were conducted with a Satlantic OCE 200 spectral radiometer. The OCE-200 measures downwelling irradiance (Ed) and upwelling radiance (Lu) in-situ as well as downwelling surface irradiance (Es) at 14 wavelengths (305, 324, 339, 380, 406, 412,
443, 490, 510, 555, 619, 665, 670, and 705 nm). All Satlantic sensors were factory
calibrated prior to sampling for quality assurance. Collected radiometric data were
processed using Satlantic’s Prosoft software package according to manufacturer
protocols. No dark corrections were applied to these data.

3.2.3 Photochemical Quantum Yield

Chlorophyll fluorescence data for each sample was collected six times per day
using a Pulse Amplitude Modulation Fluorometer (PAM; Heinz-Walz, Germany).
Samples were dark adapted for five minutes to allow for relaxation of nonphotochemical
quenching and then minimal fluorescence ($F_o$) was measured. A 600 ms flash from a
Schlott saturation flash lamp (Schlott Inc., Germany) was administered to measure
maximum fluorescence ($F_m$). Increasing flash intensity or duration did not result in
higher fluorescence values indicating that PSII was saturated. These values were then
used to calculate the maximum quantum yield for charge separation at PSII as

$$\frac{F_v}{F_m} = \frac{(F_m - F_o)}{F_m}$$

(3.1)

where $F_v/F_m$ is the maximum quantum yield of photochemistry at photosystem II, $F_o$ is
the minimum fluorescence measured after a short (5 minute) dark period, $F_m$ is the
maximum fluorescence measured after a saturating flash of light, and $F_v$ is the variable
fluorescence calculated as $F_m - F_o$. $F_o$ is a measure of fluorescence at photosystem II
when all the reaction centers are open and can accept incoming electrons for
photosynthesis whereas $F_m$ is measured when the reaction centers are closed and the
plastoquinone pool is reduced.
On day 2 of the 1999 experiment a subset of samples were incubated with lincomycin which specifically blocks the synthesis of only the D1 protein in photosystem II. Water was drawn from the control and nutrient enhanced (both UV exposed and UV excluded) tanks before sunrise and lincomycin was added to a final concentration of 150µg ml\(^{-1}\). The lincomycin spiked samples were then enclosed in polyethylene Whirl-Pak (NASCO) bags, returned to the tank from which they were collected, and sampled over the course of the day with the same frequency as control samples.

### 3.2.4 Phytoplankton Photopigments

Phytoplankton community composition was characterized using high-performance liquid chromatographic (HPLC) derived pigment data. The major phylogenetic groups of interest in the Neuse River were chlorophytes (with corresponding diagnostic pigment chlorophyll \(b\)), cyanobacteria (zeaxanthin), diatoms (fucoxanthin), dinoflagellates (peridinin), and cryptomonads (alloxanthin) (Pinckney et al. 1997; Pinckney et al. 1998). Aliquots (0.2 to 1.0 L) of water were filtered under a gentle vacuum (<50 kPa) onto 4.7 cm dia. glass fiber filters (Whatman GF/F), immediately frozen, and stored at \(-80^\circ\text{C}\). Frozen filters were placed in 100% acetone (3 mL), sonicated, and extracted at \(-20^\circ\text{C}\) for 12 - 20 h. Filtered extracts were injected into a Spectra-Physics HPLC equipped with a single monomeric (Rainin Microsorb-MV, 0.46 x 10 cm, 3 µm) and two polymeric (Vydac 201TP, 0.46 x 25 cm, 5 µm) reverse-phase C\(_{18}\) columns in series. This column configuration was devised to enhance the separation of structurally similar photopigments and degradation products. A nonlinear binary gradient was used for pigment separations (for details, see (Pinckney et al. 1996)).
Solvent A consisted of 80% methanol:20% ammonium acetate (0.5 M adjusted to pH 7.2) and Solvent B was 80% methanol:20% acetone. Absorption spectra and chromatograms (440 nm) were acquired using a Shimadzu SPB-M10av photodiode array detector. Pigment peaks were identified by comparison of retention times and absorption spectra with pure crystalline standards, including chlorophylls \( a, b, \) \( \beta \)-carotene (Sigma Chemical Company), fucoxanthin, and zeaxanthin (Hoffman-LaRoche and Company). Other pigments were identified by comparison to extracts from phytoplankton cultures and quantified using published extinction coefficients (Jeffrey et al. 1999).

The concentrations of algal photopigments were analyzed using CHEMTAX (Chemical Taxonomy), a matrix factorization program, to determine best-fit pigment ratios for the five major algal groups present in the Neuse River (Pinckney et al. 1998). This program uses steepest descent algorithms to determine the best fit based on an initial estimate of pigment ratios for algal classes. Both the absolute and relative contributions of algal groups to the total biomass can be calculated. The absolute contribution of any algal group is the concentration of chl \( a \) (in \( \mu g \ L^{-1} \)) that is contributed by that group. Relative contributions are calculated as the proportion of total chl \( a \) that is accounted for by the group, such that the sum of contributions of all groups equals 1. Evaluations of the CHEMTAX method have shown it to be generally insensitive to values chosen for the initial pigment ratio matrix (Mackey et al. 1996; Schluter et al. 2000). Full discussions, validation, and sensitivity analyses of CHEMTAX are provided in Mackey et al. (1996) and Wright et al. (Wright et al. 1996).
3.2.5 Photosynthesis vs. Irradiance

The relationship between photosynthesis and irradiance (P-E) was determined using the small volume \(^{14}\)C incubation method of Lewis and Smith (Lewis and Smith 1983). Ten ml of estuary water taken from the surface or bottom of the water column was spiked with \(^{14}\)C-bicarbonate (Amersham, Inc.) to a final concentration of 29600 Bq ml\(^{-1}\). Triplicate samples for \(T_0\) counts (containing 500 \(\mu l\) of sodium borate-buffered formalin in 10 ml of sample) were collected to correct for any uptake of \(^{14}\)C label that occurred during the distribution process. Samples collected for total counts (\(T_c\)) were prepared by adding 500 \(\mu l\) of phenethylamine (PEA) into a 20 ml scintillation vial and then adding 10 ml of Ecolume scintillation cocktail. During incubation, a range of irradiances was provided from the side by a Cool-Lux 75 W projector lamp directed through a heat filter of circulating water. Incubations were performed for 45 min, after which 500 \(\mu l\) of formalin was added to each vial to terminate the experiment. Samples were then acidified directly with 1 ml of 50% HCl and were placed on a shaker table overnight to allow for purging of unincorporated label. After purging, an additional 10 ml of scintillation cocktail was added to each vial. Vials were allowed to sit overnight, then counts per minute were enumerated with a Beckman model LS 5000TD liquid scintillation counter. Counts per minute were converted to disintegrations per minute using quench curves constructed from a calibrated \(^{14}\)C-toluene standard. Dissolved inorganic carbon in estuary water was determined by using a LiCor model LI6252 CO\(_2\) analyzer.

Quantum scalar irradiance (\(\mu\)moles photons m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)) in each position of the photosyntheticron was measured using a Biospherical Instruments Model QSL-100.
irradiance meter with a QSL-101 4 π sensor. For each measurement, the sensor was inserted into a 20 ml glass scintillation vial that contained 10 ml of estuary water. Temperature was kept constant during the incubations with a circulating water bath. The temperature was set to the ambient temperature at the time of collection.

Results were modeled using the equation of Platt et al. (1980):

\[ P^B = P^b_s \left[ 1 - e^{\left(-\alpha E/P^B_s\right)} \right] e^{\left(-\beta E/P^B_s\right)} \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2)

where \( P^B \) is the rate of photosynthesis normalized to chlorophyll (\( \mu g \text{C g Chl}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1} \)), \( P^b_s \) is the maximum rate of photosynthesis in the absence of photoinhibition (\( \mu g \text{C g Chl}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1} \)), \( E \) is irradiance (\( \mu \text{mol photons m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \)), \( \alpha \) is the initial slope of the P-E curve (\( (\mu g \text{C g Chl}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1})(\mu \text{mole photons m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1})^{-1} \)), and \( \beta \) is a parameter that characterizes photoinhibition (\( \mu g \text{C g Chl}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}(\mu \text{mole photons m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1})^{-1} \)). Curves were fit to P-E data using a least-squares non-linear curve fitting routine in Kaleidagaph. Values for \( P^B_{\text{max}} \), the realized maximum rate of photosynthesis, and \( E_k \), the conventional index of light saturation, were calculated by the method of Platt et al. (1980) from values of \( P^b_s \), \( \alpha \), and \( \beta \) determined from curve fits. Measurements of total chl \( a \) for P-E experiments were done fluorometrically using a Turner Designs model TD-70 fluorometer after grinding and extraction of triplicate samples in ice-cold 90% acetone for at least 24h in the dark at –10°C.

3.3 Results

The maximum quantum yield of photochemistry (\( F_v/F_m \)) varied over hourly and daily time scales and between years. However, the diurnal trends in \( F_v/F_m \) were consistent between sampling years, treatment conditions, and phytoplankton community
composition. The diurnal variability in Fv/Fm was highly dependent on incident irradiance (Fig. 3.1). There was an inverse relationship between quantum yield and irradiance with minimum Fv/Fm values corresponding to local noon (maximum incoming PAR between 1500-2000 µmol photons m^-2 s^-1) and complete recovery at night.

The 1998 experiment was marked by low overall Fv/Fm values (initial value of 0.102). All samples exhibited daily decreases in Fv/Fm values coincident with local noon (Fig. 3.1a). The diel variation resulted in a 54% change (average for all samples) in Fv/Fm over the course of the day. The decreases in Fv/Fm were more dependent on lower Fm values rather than an increase in Fo. A night-time recovery phase was observed for all treatment conditions, however the recovery phase was more rapid for samples which were provided nutrients (see Fig. 3.1a). All nutrient additions resulted in a significant increase in Fv/Fm (Fig 3.2a); however there was no significant impact associated with phosphorus (one way anova, p<0.05).

Similar diurnal trends were observed in 1999 as in 1998 with an inverse relationship between quantum yield and irradiance. Likewise, changes in Fv/Fm were dependent on Fm rather than Fo values. In 1999, Fv/Fm values were higher at the start of the sampling period (initial value of 0.204) than in the 1998 experiment and also increased within the mesocosms during the experiment (Fig. 3.1b). This increase was seen in both the control and all of the nutrient treatments. In contrast to 1998, there was no observable increase in Fv/Fm in response to any of the nutrient additions in 1999 (Fig. 3.2b).

Disparities in Fv/Fm values between sampling years may be due to a shift in phytoplankton community composition. The 1998 sampling period was marked by an
abundance of cyanobacteria (Table 3.2). In 1999, the mesocosms began dominated by cryptophytes which were quickly replaced by diatoms. This succession is probably due to both competitive and grazing pressures within the mesocosms, which is not unusual for the Neuse River Estuary. The summer months in this area are typically dominated by diatoms with sporadic cryptophyte blooms throughout the year (Pinckney et al. 1998).

UF3 covers on select tanks in 1999 altered both the quality and quantity of the surface light field in the tanks (Fig. 3.3). UV exposed samples were subject to an average 64 µmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ of UVB wavelengths (305-400 nm). UV excluded samples were subject to an average 6.4 µmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ of UVB light. Diurnal trends in F$_{v}$/F$_{m}$ are the same for UV exposed and UV excluded tanks, however exclusion of UVB alleviates a significant fraction of the midday depression in F$_{v}$/F$_{m}$ (Fig. 3.1b, Fig. 3.4). UV exposed samples had an average 57% decrease in F$_{v}$/F$_{m}$ values from morning to noon (similar to results from 1998) while UV excluded samples had only a 42% average change.

The exclusion of UV light did not produce a concomitant decrease in photosynthesis-irradiance parameters (Fig. 3.5). There was no significant change in P$_{max}$, $\alpha$, or E$_{k}$ between UV exposed and UV excluded samples (paired t-test, p<0.01; Fig. 3.5a). Additionally, there was no change in total chlorophyll a concentrations between UV exposed and UV excluded samples in either the control or nutrient enhanced samples (Fig. 3.5b).

The addition of lincomycin greatly diminished the ability of all samples to recover from a proportion of the midday depression observed in F$_{v}$/F$_{m}$ values by blocking the synthesis of the D1 protein. Lincomycin treated samples recovered approximately 10% of their initial photochemical quantum yield as measured by F$_{v}$/F$_{m}$ (Fig. 3.4). F$_{v}$/F$_{m}$
values began at 0.527 ± 0.013 (average for all data shown) at 0600 of our sampling day. Control samples (no lincomycin added) increased slightly to 0.547 ± 0.032 while lincomycin treated samples decreased significantly to 0.065 ± .010 at 2110 (Fig. 3.4).

3.4 Discussion

Phytoplankton from the Neuse River have been shown to exhibit symptoms of nitrogen limitation (Rudek et al. 1991; Boyer et al. 1994; Mallin 1994). Nutrient limitation was demonstrated in the \( \frac{F_v}{F_m} \) data, but only during periods of prolonged stratification after nutrients had been depleted from the water column. The Neuse River tends to undergo periods of intense stratification due to freshwater runoff and low turbulent mixing, as in 1998 (Paerl et al. 1995; Robbins and Bales 1995). The marked decrease in vertical mixing allows surface depletion of nutrients resulting in a state of nutrient limitation. During these times phytoplankton populations respond by a shift in community composition (Pinckney et al. 1998) and will exhibit increases in photochemical quantum yields with nutrient additions as seen during the 1998 experiment (Fig. 3.2). The 1998 data reflect the stratified and nutrient limited state of the water column at the time of water collection. Nitrate and phosphate levels were one half and one third lower than in 1999 (Table 3.3). The increases in \( \frac{F_v}{F_m} \) in 1998 suggest nitrogen limitation in the Neuse River as additions of phosphate did not change \( \frac{F_v}{F_m} \) values. In 1999, there was no significant response in \( \frac{F_v}{F_m} \) with the addition of nutrients. However, nutrient additions did result in an increase in overall biomass (Fig. 3.5) indicating that these samples were somewhat limited in nutrients.
The diurnal variability seen in $F_v/F_m$ is dependent upon the incoming irradiance; midday depressions reflect the light saturation of the photosynthetic reaction centers and subsequent oxidation of the plastoquinone pool (Falkowski and Raven 1997). Historically, midday decreases in $F_v/F_m$ have been linked to the inactivation of the photosystem II reaction centers. Despite protective mechanisms, high light will still damage some PSII reaction centers which can then lead to a reduction in carbon fixation (Renger et al. 1989; Jordan 1996). In our experiment, midday light levels (up to 1200 $\mu$mol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ at the tank surface at noon) were always higher than $E_k$ (average $E_k$ value 300 $\mu$mol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$; see Figs. 3.1 & 3.5). At these irradiance levels the system is light saturated and $F_v/F_m$ values decrease as light intensities approach $E_k$. The decreases in $F_v/F_m$ were due mainly to decreases in $F_m$. A decrease in $F_m$ is most often interpreted as a non-functional form of the primary electron acceptor, Quinone a ($Q_a$) as incoming light energy is irreversibly passed to $Q_a$ resulting in a stable charge separation (Styring and Jegerschold 1994). This is a slow reaction with very little chance for a back reaction resulting in fluorescence, thus decreasing total fluorescence ($F_m$).

The observed photoinhibition in this experiment reflects damage from both UV radiation (Smith et al. 1980; Goes et al. 1995) and visible light (Prézelin et al. 1986). Approximately 12-15% of the midday drop in $F_v/F_m$ in 1999 was associated with UVB radiation. This significant UV inhibition was not entirely expected given the high loads of CDOM that are traditionally found in rivers such as the Neuse River, which strongly absorb at UV wavelengths (Kirk 1994). This supports the idea that UV radiation can be a significant factor for surface or well mixed populations even in highly turbid waters (Cullen and Lewis 1988). These environments are particularly inhibiting for cryptophyte
algae which are very sensitive to UV radiation (Vernet et al. 1994) and were the dominant phytoplankton group in our samples (Table 3.2). Phytoplankton have several physiological strategies allowing them to thrive in super saturating light environments. At high levels of incoming irradiance, photosynthetic algae are not able to utilize all of the incoming light energy for photosynthesis; the rate of electron transport through PSII is no longer dependent on light absorption (Falkowski et al. 1994). This was the case in our experiment as evidenced by the decrease in Fv/Fm. However, this decrease in photochemical efficiency seen at high light levels was not reflected in the carbon fixation potential (Pmax). Since light-saturated carbon fixation remains unaffected by super saturation at PSII this indicates that there has been an increase in the turnover rate of electrons through PSII as

\[ \frac{P_{\text{max}}}{n(1/\tau_{\text{PSII}})} \]  

(3.3)

where \(1/\tau_{\text{PSII}}\) = electron turnover through PS II reaction centers and \(n\) is the number of photosynthetic units (Kolber et al. 1988; Behrenfeld et al. 1998). Under these conditions, as Fv/Fm decreases with no concomitant change in Pmax, the instantaneous rate of photosynthesis is limited by the dark reactions as electron turnover through PSII (1/\(\tau\)) has increased to keep up with the demand for electrons through the light reactions. These results support the findings of Behrenfeld et al. (1998) who hypothesized that decreases in productivity are not necessarily proportional to photoinhibition.

The lack of photoinhibition at supersaturating light levels has also been attributed to increased turnover of the D1 protein (Aro et al. 1993; Rintamaki et al. 1994; Park et al. 1995). As light exposure increases, the PSII reaction center proteins are damaged and must be synthesized and replaced in order to restore photosynthetic operation (Aro et al.
The actual amount of measurable (net) damage is a balance between damage and synthesis and repair rates. The protein synthesis inhibitor lincomycin specifically blocks the synthesis of the D1 protein (Osmond 1994). The difference between lincomycin treated and non-lincomycin treated samples provides an upper limit estimate of the light induced loss of the D1 protein. Our results show that preventing D1 turnover by blocking its synthesis almost completely eliminates the pool of PSII capable of recovery from light induced inhibition. The disparity in recovery rates between lincomycin treated and non-treated samples implies that a significant fraction of the decline in the photochemical efficiency at high light levels reflects damage to the D1 protein and illustrates how the balance between damage, synthesis and repair is critical to maintaining photosynthetic functionality of the cell.

In this study, an increased availability of nutrients afforded a more rapid recovery in photochemical efficiency, but did not protect against photoinduced impairment and downregulation of PSII. Nitrogen starved cultures have been shown to be more susceptible to photoinhibition both by excess PAR and UV radiation as compared to nutrient replete cells (Prézelin et al. 1986; Kolber et al. 1988; Lesser et al. 1994; Hunt and Mc Neil 1998). This may be due to changes in D1 protein concentration or turnover (Kolber et al. 1988; Renger et al. 1989), changes in rubisco functioning (Jordan 1996; Yin and Johnson 2000), or decreased ability to uptake N (Lohmann et al. 1998). The variations in UV sensitivity for natural phytoplankton assemblages under nutrient limited conditions have yet to be fully explored. Our results demonstrate that nitrogen limited phytoplankton do not appear more susceptible to photoinduced impairment. Alternatively their repair/recovery processes are adversely affected. Thus, nutrient
limited samples cannot recover from photoinduced damage as quickly as nutrient replete samples. Over time, this will emerge as a decrease in photosynthetic ability leading to a decrease in carbon fixation.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrient Additions (µM)</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ammonium</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₃ + NH₄</td>
<td>5+5</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urea</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₃ + NH₄ + urea</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.3+3.3+3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO₃ + NH₄ + PO₄</td>
<td>3+3+5</td>
<td>3+3+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1: Nutrient treatments for the 1998 and 1999 experiments. Nutrient concentrations represent amount added to collected water samples. All concentrations are µmol N or µmol P. Nitrate = N, ammonium = A, urea = U, phosphate = P. n/a = not applicable, not all nutrient treatments were used each sampling year.
Table 3.2: The phytoplankton community composition over the course of the experiment for both 1998 and 1999 as determined from HPLC measurements. The dominant group is in boldface. There were not any significant alterations in phytoplankton community structure in response to nutrient or light treatments. Total chlorophyll $a$ concentrations are $\mu$g L$^{-1}$. Note that values are an average for all treatments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1998</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chlorophytes</td>
<td>Cryptophytes</td>
<td>Cyanophytes</td>
<td>Total Chl a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 0</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>68.24</td>
<td>28.64</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>68.54</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>64.04</td>
<td>30.45</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 0</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>51.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>26.36</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 1</td>
<td>16.35</td>
<td>32.86</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>41.68</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day 3</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>57.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuse River Conditions</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature (°C)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinity (ppt)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C:N</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOx (ug N L⁻¹)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NH₄ (ug N L⁻¹)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO₄ (ug P L⁻¹)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chl a (ug L⁻¹)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K_d (m⁻¹)</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Conditions in the Neuse River prior to mesocosm water collection. NOx and PO₄ levels were significantly higher in 1999, due to a storm mixing event, than in 1998. These data were collected during routine water quality monitoring in the Neuse River.
Figure 3.1: The diurnal pattern in Fv/Fm values for both A) 1998 and B) 1999 (note the change in scale for Fv/Fm values). Light treatments were added in 1999. ▲ control, UV exposed; ● NAP addition, UV exposed; Δ control, UV excluded; ○ NAP addition, UV excluded. Each point represents the average of triplicate measurements and error bars represent standard deviation from the mean. Superimposed is the amount of available light (PAR).
Figure 3.2: Four day average change in $F_v/F_m$ values for the different nutrient treatments in a) 1998 and b) 1999 for both mixed (■) and static (○) incubations. Stars represent nutrient addition treatments that are significantly different from the control ($p<0.05$). None of the nutrient addition treatments were significantly different from the control in 1999.
Figure 3.3: Average spectral irradiance in the mesocosm tanks. Irradiance measurements were taken just above the surface (♦), just below the surface (△), and at the bottom of the tanks (●) in A) tanks with UV exclusion and B) tanks receiving incident light. UV radiation propagated 0.65m into tanks receiving incident sunlight (to the 1% light level).

UV excluded tanks received PAR only while UV exposed samples received 64 µmol photons m⁻² day⁻¹ of UV radiation.
Figure 3.4: The diurnal pattern in Fv/Fm values for day 2 of the 1999 experiment for both control samples (solid line) and a subsample that has been treated with the inhibitor lincomycin (dotted line). Symbols are as in Figure 1. Error bars have been omitted for clarity; see Fig. 1 for error associated with control samples. Each point represents the average of triplicate measurements. Superimposed is the amount of available light (PAR).
Figure 3.5: Top: Photosynthesis – Irradiance curves over the course of one day of the 1999 experiment for a) UV exposed and b) UV excluded samples. Measurements were conducted at 0600 (●), 1200 (■), 1500 (△), and 1730 (X). There is no significant difference in PE curve parameters between UV exposed and UV excluded samples (paired t-test, p<0.01). Bottom: Total HPLC derived chlorophyll a concentrations over the course of the 1999 experiment; control, UV exposed (vertical bars); control, UV excluded (white); +NAP, UV exposed (diagonal bars); +NAP, UV excluded (black). The exclusion of UV radiation did not effect chlorophyll a concentrations in either the control or nutrient addition treatments.
4.0 Cryptomonads Survival Strategies at Low Light

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 Photoacclimation to low light

Phytoplankton have developed a suite of strategies to maintain their growth potential in a range of irradiances and nutrient concentrations (Falkowski 1980; Richardson et al. 1983). The exponential extinction and sharp spectral changes of the light field at depth in aquatic habitats makes for a dynamic light environment. Algal groups which are highly adapted to living in the range of available irradiances will be strongly favored. Much work has focused on the many light harvesting and photoacclimation strategies of diatoms, dinoflagellates, cyanobacteria, and green algae. Additionally, the morphology and functionality of phycobiliproteins has been well documented (Gantt 1977; Glazer 1981; MacColl 1982; Maccoll and Guard-Friar 1987; Sidler 1994). Little effort has focused on the specific strategies of cryptophyte algae under varying light conditions.

Cryptophytes are the only phytoplankton group to contain both chlorophylls \(a\) and \(c\) in addition to phycobilins and carotenoids (alloxanthin; Fig. 4.1). This unique pigment system allows cryptophytes to absorb a wide range of wavelengths and is optimized for the blue and green wavelengths of light found at depth in natural waters. This is advantageous in coastal and estuarine ecosystems where high concentrations of colored dissolved organic matter (CDOM) significantly reduce available irradiance and skew the light field at depth to the green wavelengths of light [(Kirk 1994; Cauwet 2002) Fig. 4.2]. Under these conditions, cryptophytes may have an advantage over other phytoplankton groups as their absorption potential is well suited to utilizing dim, green light. The
diminished quantity and spectral quality of the light field in turbid areas and in deep water alters the competitive ability of phytoplankton groups. In these areas, cryptophytes have much higher potential absorption efficiencies than other prevalent coastal phytoplankton groups and are able to outcompete more traditional bloom forming algae (Bergmann et al. 2003). This work focuses on cryptophyte photoacclimation under light limited conditions which are often found in turbid, organically laden coastal waters.

Phycobilin containing phytoplankton have evolved several strategies to maximize cellular absorption in order to increase their photosynthetic potential under low light conditions. For example, phycobilin containing algae have the ability to respond to the incoming light field by altering the composition of chromophores associated with their phycobilins (Tandeau de Marsac 1977), the concentrations of intracellular pigments (Faust and Gantt 1973; Mackey et al. 1998), the distribution of excitation energy between photosystem I (PSI) and photosystem II [PSII (Bonaventura and Myers 1969; Murata 1969)], or the stoichiometry of PSII:PSI (Falkowski et al. 1981; Dubinsky et al. 1986; Fujita et al. 1987).

All photosynthetic phytoplankton have the ability to increase intracellular concentrations of photosynthetic pigments in response to low growth irradiances (Richardson et al. 1983; Falkowski and LaRoche 1991). In phycobilin containing algae, maximizing the intracellular phycobilin concentration increases overall cellular absorption but can also alter photosynthetic efficiency (Fujita et al. 1994). Efficient carbon fixation in any photoautotrophic organism is dependent upon the coordinated excitation of two different photosystems (Hill and Bendall 1960; Duysens and Amesz 1962). Any light field that preferentially excites one photosystem more than the other
will decrease photosynthetic efficiency. At low light, phycobilin containing algae can adjust this disequilibrium by increasing the light transfer to or increasing the concentration of the understimulated photosystem (Fujita et al. 1994; Grossman et al. 1994; Campbell 1996). Light absorbed by phycobilins in cryptophytes is primarily used to drive photochemical reactions at PSII (Haxo and Fork 1959) while chl a preferentially excites PSI (Lichtlé et al. 1980). High phycobilin absorption will cause an overstimulation of PSII and the phytoplankton will compensate by decreasing the PSII:PSI ratio in order to maintain the balance between photosystems and keep photosynthetic quantum efficiency high (Melis 1991). The ability of phycobilin containing organisms to modify their chromophoric composition and alter the stoichiometry of their photosystems makes them highly adaptable to changes in available irradiance. A considerable amount of work has focused on these strategies in cyanobacteria (Bryant 1994), however very little research has examined if these strategies exist in cryptophytes and if so what impact they have on photosynthesis and growth potential.

4.1.2 Mixotrophy

Mixotrophy occurs in species with heterotrophic capabilities that have maintained functional chloroplasts. There are many species of heterotrophic algae which do not require light for growth; these groups are capable of utilizing preformed organic compounds as a nutrient and/or energy source (Danforth 1962). While previous research has focused on strictly heterotrophic plankton groups (Danforth 1962; Lloyd and Cantor 1979; Hobbie and Williams 1984; Tuchman 1996; Sanders et al. 2000), only few studies
have examined the importance of mixotrophy in coastal phytoplankton. Mixotrophy can be a critical survival strategy for algal populations growing in sub-saturating light. It has been suggested that some phytoplankton groups which are generally considered autotrophic may be able to resort to heterotrophy under severe light limitation (Tuchman 1996). Cryptophytes may be one such group with mixotrophic potential under light limiting conditions.

In inland lakes, estuaries, and many coastal zones where cryptophytes thrive, significant amounts of dissolved organic nutrients are available (Cauwet 2002). These organic compounds are strongly absorbing and although they may serve as an energy source for some plankton, they also serve to reduce the amount of available light. The ability to use these organic compounds as an energy source to supplement photosynthetic growth under low light conditions may provide a competitive advantage over strictly autotrophic phytoplankton groups and effectively expand the depth of the cryptophyte euphotic zone. Organic molecules may be an especially important nutrient source for cryptophytes as this group has high nutrient requirements (Someer, 1983) and slow nutrient uptake rates (Cloern 1977; Plante and Arts 2000). Given this, although cryptophytes are not phagotrophic (Salonen and Jokinen 1988; Gervais 1997a), several studies have shown photoautotrophic species of cryptophytes have enhanced growth in the presence of organic nutrients (Faust and Gantt 1973; Lewitus et al. 1991). Under limiting irradiances too low to support strictly photoautotrophic growth, cryptophytes have been shown to sustain limited growth by the uptake of organic compounds (Lewitus et al. 1991; Gervais 1997a). Cryptophyte cultures incubated in the laboratory with ecologically relevant concentrations of organic nutrients will continue growth for a short
time in complete darkness (Gervais 1997a) and have enhanced rates of growth and respiration when cultured in the light (Antia et al. 1969). In addition to the mixotrophic potential exhibited by many cryptophytes, cultures grown in the lab may also produce high levels of starch reserves resulting in large, dense cells (Morgan and Kalff 1975; Lichtlé 1979; Lewitus and Caron 1990; Sciandra et al. 2000). These starch reserves are then respired as fuel under times of light limitation such as at night (Gasol et al. 1993) and during the winter months (Marshall and Laybourn-Parry 2002). Furthermore, cryptophyte cultures grown for several generations in complete darkness will continue to produce phycobilin pigments (Antia et al. 1969) perhaps solely as a nutrient store (Ojala 1993b); under times of macronutrient limitation, cryptophytes will use their phycobilins as a nutrient storeroom (Rhiel et al. 1985; Lewitus and Caron 1990). Although mixotrophic potential has been documented in several species of cryptophytes, few studies have examined the implication of this beneficial strategy in competing with more prevalent coastal phytoplankton groups. If the mixotrophic contribution to cryptophyte growth is significant, it may impact the ecological range of this phytoplankton group.

4.1.3 Motility

Cryptophytes are biflagellated organisms and are strong swimmers that can cross ecologically significant density gradients (Jones 1988). On the cellular level, motility is beneficial if organisms can cross light or nutrient gradients (Sommer 1988) and in nature, the vertical migration observed in cryptophytes leads to increases in their growth rates (Ojala et al. 1996). In most natural waters cryptophytes undergo diel vertical migration
in response to changes in both light and nutrient levels (Burns and Rosa 1980; Smolander and Arvola 1988). Cryptophytes contain a photoreceptor that is highly sensitive to green light (Erata et al. 1995) which allows them to respond very quickly to changes in underwater irradiance (Watanabe and Furuya 1978) and migrate in response to light fields to effectively control their place in the vertical light gradient thereby maintaining optimal placement in the water column. For example, in inland lakes cryptophytes will migrate to the surface during the day in brown lakes with high light attenuation and deeper in the water column during the day in clear water lakes where surface light levels would be potentially damaging (Arvola et al. 1991).

This observed vertical movement is a function of both available light and nutrient concentrations. Under nutrient replete conditions, cryptophytes will move into areas of higher light while avoiding saturating irradiances when nutrient limited (Arvola et al. 1991). Also, cryptophytes are more motile at low irradiances (Brown and Richardson 1968) presumably to look for areas with more favorable light and/or nutrient concentrations. For example, cryptomonas species exhibit positive chemotaxis towards amino acids (Lee et al. 1999) and may be able to use these amino acids as a nitrogen source (Wheeler et al. 1974).

In most cases, cryptophytes will swim to avoid surface waters midday and at night (Olli 1999). This midday response is to avoid damaging light intensities as cryptophytes prefer dimly lit environments and can be significantly damaged by high irradiances. At night, cryptophytes swim deeper in the water column to utilize available nutrients below the chemocline or to avoid predators (Smolander and Arvola 1988). The ability to
control their placement in the water column is a significant advantage for cryptophyte algae especially in areas of stratification and low nutrient concentrations.

The ability to adjust their photosynthetic machinery, to supplement their nutritional needs, and to control their location in the water column may allow cryptophytes to compete with more traditional bloom forming algae in coastal areas. The mechanisms and benefits of cryptophyte motility have been well documented in both natural environments and laboratory experimentation (Jones 1988; Smolander and Arvola 1988; Arvola et al. 1991). In this study, we examine the effects of both photoacclimation strategies and mixotrophic ability on photosynthetic efficiency and growth for both cryptophytes and diatoms and speculate about their potential for success in coastal waters.

4.2 Methods

4.2.1 Laboratory Methods

Cultures of Cryptomonas erosa were isolated from Lake Michigan and cultured in modified MBL media. Cyclotella meneghiniana (CCAP # 1070/5) was cultured in DM media. Cultures were unialgal, but not axenic. C. erosa cultures were grown at a range of temperatures at both high (80 µmol photons m^{-2} s^{-1}) and low (15 µmol photons m^{-2} s^{-1}) light under a 12:12 light dark regime and sampled to assess optimum growth conditions. Each experiment was performed with at least three replicates for each treatment condition per species. After six days of incubation, growth of the population was measured as total cells ml^{-1} by repeated counts with a hemacytometer. Each subsample was counted a minimum of six times. Chlorophyll fluorescence data for each
sample was measured using a Fast Repetition Rate Fluorometer [FRR-F (Kolber et al. 1998)]. Samples were dark adapted for five minutes before sampling.

After these preliminary observations, further experiments were all conducted at 20°C and measurements concentrated on intermediate and lower irradiance levels (less than 180 µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹). *C. erosa* and *C. meneghiniana* cultures were incubated in 250 ml flasks as semi-continuous cultures for 8-10 days at a range of irradiances (2.5, 3.5, 8, 22, 45, 97, and 180 µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹) with and without addition of 100 µM glucose. Irradiance measurements inside the flasks were conducted with a HobiLabs Hydrorad hyperspectral radiometer. The Hydrorad measures irradiance (E) every 0.3nm. All Hydrorad sensors were factory calibrated prior to sampling for quality assurance and each measurement was the average of 4 scans taken in each flask. Irradiance values were then interpolated for continuous data and binned to every 2 nm. For PAR values, measurements were integrated over the visible spectrum (400-700 nm). Over the course of the experiment, light levels were monitored by repeated measurements every 5-8 days. Cultures were sampled every two days; aliquots were removed and cultures were replenished with fresh inorganic media either supplemented with 100 µM glucose or Milli-Q water (control). Aliquots were tested for growth rates and Fᵥ/Fₘ. Fᵥ/Fₘ measurements have been used as an indicator of cell health and nutrient limitation in phytoplankton and higher plants (Kolber et al. 1988; Schreiber et al. 1995). Fᵥ/Fₘ values remained constant over the course of the experiment indicating that samples were not nutrient limited (data not shown).

At the end of the experiment cultures were counted for growth rates and sampled for Fᵥ/Fₘ, chlorophyll concentration, spectral absorption, and spectral fluorescence
parameters. Chlorophyll concentrations were assessed by filtering a known volume under low pressure onto Whatman GF/F filters. Filters were quick frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at −80°C until extraction (usually about 1 week). Chlorophyll was extracted in either 100% acetone (for *C. erosa*) or 90% acetone (for *C. meneghiniana*) overnight. Absorption values were measured with a Hewlett Packard 8451A spectrophotometer and chlorophyll *a* and *c* concentrations were calculated as per (Jeffrey and Humphrey 1975). Spectral absorption measurements were conducted on an Aminco DW-2a split beam spectrophotometer using sterile media as a blank. Spectral fluorescence data were collected both at room temperature and at 77K with an SLM Aminco Bowman series 2 luminescence spectrometer. 77K samples were collected and quick frozen in liquid nitrogen. The cuvette chamber of the spectrometer was cooled and maintained at liquid nitrogen temperatures for the duration of the measurements. Respiration measurements were taken on the last day of the experiment. Cultures were concentrated, counted, and placed on a silver platinum oxygen electrode. Oxygen evolution was recorded over time, the rate of oxygen evolution was calculated, and normalized to either cell number (µmol O₂ cell⁻¹ hr⁻¹) or intracellular chlorophyll concentration (µmol O₂ chl⁻¹ hr⁻¹). CHN measurements were conducted by filtering a known sample volume onto precombusted 25mm GF/F filters under low vacuum pressure. Filters were then dried and analyzed for carbon and nitrogen content using a Carlo Erba Instruments Eager 200.
4.2.2 Field Methods

Teflon-coated Niskin bottles, lowered to selected depths, were used to collect water for assessment of phytoplankton photopigments and microphotometry assays. Phytoplankton biomass, as chlorophyll $a$, and phylogenetic group dynamics were characterized using chemotaxonomic pigments derived using High Performance Liquid Chromatography as outlined in (Millie et al. 2002).

For microphotometry analysis, raw water samples were filtered under low vacuum (<50 mm Hg) onto 1.0 $\mu$m Nuclepore filters with GF/A backing filters. When the last 1-2 ml of water was still in the filtering funnel, vacuum pressure was released, and the filter, along with a few drops of water, was transferred to a gelatin slide. It is critical not to filter all of the water, as delicate cells are likely to rupture if some water is not retained on the filter. The back of the filter was gently swiped with a damp cotton swab and then removed from the gelatin slide. One to two drops of a 30% glycerol solution was placed on the transferred samples along with a coverslip. The slide was then immediately frozen by placing it on an aluminum block that had been previously immersed in liquid nitrogen. The frozen slides were placed in a slide box and kept frozen ($-20^\circ$ C) until analysis.

The absorption efficiency factor, $Q_a$, can be measured on individual cells using a microphotometric technique (Itturriaga and Siegel 1989; Stephens 1995). This absorption efficiency factor is defined as the ratio of light absorbed by a cell to the light impinging on the cell’s geometrical cross section. Microphotometric measurement of $Q_a$ requires direct measurement of spectral transmittance of a cell or particle relative to a blank.
\[ Q_a(\lambda) = \frac{I_b(\lambda) - I_s(\lambda)}{I_b(\lambda)} \]  

(4.1)

where \( I_s(\lambda) \) = the radiant flux or transmittance for the sample, and \( I_b(\lambda) \) = the radiant flux or transmittance for the blank. The raw data were smoothed by averaging over five wavelength bins. To correct for any light that might have been lost by scattering, which in our system was likely minimal (Itturriaga and Siegel 1989), the mean \( Q_a \) value at 750-760 nm was subtracted from all other measurements.

A Leica DMR HC microscope system equipped with an optic coupler was used for microphotometric measurements. An Ocean Optics, Inc. collimating lens (74-VIS) was used to couple light from the microscope head to a 400 um patch silica optical fiber which was interfaced with an Ocean Optics, Inc. miniature spectrometer (S2000) interfaced with a 500 KHz ADC board. The optical configuration provided an effective resolution of approximately 2 nm at FWHM (full width half maximum). The CCD array of the spectrometer consisted of a 2048-element linear detector extending over a wavelength range of 350-1000 nm. Ten scans were averaged for each measurement, and the sampling rate was such that the total scan time was approximately 10 seconds.

4.3 Photoacclimation Strategies

4.3.1 Photoacclimation to available light

Preliminary experiments were conducted to find the optimum growth conditions for \( C. eros \). Growth rates (represented as total biomass) were higher at high light and intermediate temperatures (Fig. 4.3 and Table 4.1). However, cryptophytes are considered a shade adapted group as they are typically found in dim light conditions and have a lower optimum growth irradiance than other groups of phytoplankton (Morgan
In general, algae with more accessory pigments have lower optimum growth irradiances and phycobilin containing groups are the most dim light adapted phytoplankton group (Brown and Richardson 1968). Research with natural populations has shown that cryptophytes respond to low light by increasing both chloroplast area and intrathylakoidal width indicating that they are capable of increasing both the number and size of the photosynthetic unit (Thin 1983). Further, deep water cryptophyte populations are capable of extreme low light acclimation and have much lower $E_k$ and $P_{\text{max}}$ parameters compared with populations found closer to the surface (Gasol et al. 1993). Further experiments focused on photoacclimation under low light conditions.

After 8-10 days of growth under different treatment conditions (Table 4.2), each culture was examined to determine the ability to adapt to varying irradiance levels. $77K$ fluorescence spectra show the primary energy transfer from chl $c$ and phycoerythrin to PSII and from chl $a$ to PSI in C. erosa (Fig. 4.4). In cryptophytes, the phycobilins (here phycoerythrin) are the primary light harvester for photochemistry at PSII while chl $a$ is primarily responsible for funneling absorbed energy to PSI.

Under low light conditions the transfer of energy absorbed by phycoerythrin to PSII is more efficient than at high light (Fig. 4.5). Energy transfer between the chromophores and from the phycobilin complex to PSII is extremely efficient in cryptophytes (Kobayashi et al. 1979; Wedemayer et al. 1991). This efficiency of energy transfer allows them to maintain photosynthetic potential at lower light levels than many other phytoplankton groups as much of the absorbed light is channeled to PSII. However, the act of photosynthetic carbon fixation is dependent upon the coordinated
transfer of electrons through two photosystems and the primary light harvesting pigments are different for the two photosystems. Thus different wavelengths of light can unevenly stimulate the photosystems so that one is preferentially excited; this will lead to an unbalanced system and a decrease in the photosynthetic efficiency. Phytoplankton and higher plants have adapted mechanisms to adjust the functionality of the two photosystems in order to maintain photosynthesis at its maximum potential and increase the quantum efficiency of carbon fixation (Chow et al. 1990). Similarly, cryptophytes can shift the stoichiometry of PSII:PSI in response to their growth irradiance. Cultures grown in low light conditions produce more PSI thereby decreasing the PSII:PSI ratio (Fig. 4.6 top).

In cyanobacteria, high light conditions mimic an increase in PSI light (blue and far-red light) while low light conditions overstimulate PSII leading to an increase in PSI synthesis (Fujita et al. 1994; Samson and Bruce 1995). In nature, phytoplankton populations found at depth will experience both low intensities of light and a spectral skewing of the light field limited to the green and blue-green wavelengths. This will lead to a marked overstimulation of PSII in phycobilin containing organisms and to a decrease in the photosynthetic activity at limiting light levels. Under these conditions, PSI synthesis will increase due to the overstimulation of PSII and the need for extra ATP to supplement the energy requirements of the cell. In this study, C. erosa populations increased PSI synthesis in response to low light conditions.

In contrast, diatoms have more PSII than PSI and under low light conditions responded by increasing PSII:PSI (Fig. 4.6 bottom). Diatoms grown at low light increase concentrations of PSII in concert with increases of cellular chlorophyll (Falkowski et al.)
This increase in pigment concentration is a well known photoacclimation strategy under sub-saturating light intensities. However, it only affords an advantage to a point as with an increase in pigment concentration, each molecule of pigment becomes less efficient at absorbing available light (Duysens 1956). Conversely, the ability of cryptophytes to alter the stoichiometry of PSII:PSI in response to both light intensity and spectral irradiance is an efficient photoacclimation mechanism to balance electron flow through the two photosystems and maintain optimal levels of carbon fixation at very low light levels.

4.3.2 Implications of photoacclimation for natural populations

Photosynthetic organisms in natural waters have to contend with a highly variable light environment. It has been proposed that phytoplankton populations are capable of adjusting the structure of community composition in response to both the quality (Engelmann 1883; Kirk 1994) and quantity (Berthold 1882) of available light. As a case study, field populations of cryptophytes and diatoms were examined in southern Lake Michigan during a spring turbidity plume which strongly affected both the quality and intensity of available light (Bergmann et al. 2003). Total light availability was decreased in plume dominated stations due to the high attenuation properties of the water column. Similarly, phytoplankton populations in the well mixed offshore stations had less total light available to them due to the deep mixing depth (up to 120m). In well mixed areas, phytoplankton will acclimate to the average light intensity encountered over time, i.e. the depth integrated light field as they vertically cycle through the water column (Cullen and
Lewis 1988). The increase in light attenuation in the plume and the deep mixed layer depth in offshore stations resulted in similar total amounts of available light.

Although the intensity of light in both plume dominated and offshore stations in spring was similar when averaged over the depth of the water column, the average light field for a deep water station was spectrally different than a shallower station. Deep water stations had a distinct spectral shift in available light with green light dominating at depth. This greening of the water altered the competitive ability of the two main phytoplankton classes encountered in Lake Michigan. The observed shift in the phytoplankton community from diatoms onshore to cryptophytes offshore was controlled in part by the spectral shift in the available light field (Fig. 4.7) and led to a strong inverse correlation between these two groups (Fig. 4.8).

Although the absorption efficiencies for a representative diatom (*Melosira islandica*) and cryptophyte (*Rhodomonas lens*) were equal when integrated under PAR, they were distinctly spectrally different (Fig. 4.9). *M. islandica* and *R. lens* are prevalent species in Lake Michigan that significantly contribute to total phytoplankton biomass (Holland 1969; Danforth and Ginsburg 1980; Makarewicz *et al.* 1994). The primary photosynthetic pigments for diatoms are chlorophyll and fucoxanthin, which absorb maximally in the blue and red wavelengths of light while the cryptophytes primarily utilize phycobilin pigments, which have an absorption maximum in the green wavelengths. The growth potential for photosynthetic organisms is dependent upon their ability to absorb the spectra of light that is available.

The incoming irradiance at the sea surface is spectrally flat (Fig. 4.10 top, shaded area). Potential absorption for *M. islandica* and *R. lens* was calculated based upon their
measured absorption efficiencies and the available irradiance at both the surface (Fig. 4.10 top) and for the average light field throughout the mixed layer depth at an offshore station (Fig. 4.10 bottom). In surface waters with a spectrally unrestricted light field (white light) potential absorption efficiencies for *M. islandica* and *R. lens* were approximately equal when integrated under the visible light curve (Fig. 4.10 top). Under these conditions, all phytoplankton groups are at their maximum potential for light absorption.

Assuming that the isothermal water columns were completely vertically mixed during the spring months, an average light field was computed based upon the spectral light availability in the mixed layer depth. This average light field is spectrally skewed as the blue and red wavelengths of light are selectively removed leaving mostly green light (Fig. 4.10 bottom). Although the potential absorption for both species was equal at the surface, the cryptophytes had a higher potential for absorption in the average mixed layer depth light field. The chlorophyll and fucoxanthin pigments of the diatom were less effective than the cryptophyte’s phycobilin pigments as the light field became more restricted to the green wavelengths of light. Additionally, cryptophytes often have multiple accessory chromobilins associated with their phycobilin pigments that extends their range of absorption (Kobayashi *et al.* 1979; Wedemayer *et al.* 1991). They can alter the concentration of these photosynthetic pigments in response to both the intensity and the spectral quality of the available light field (Kamiya and Miyachi 1984) thus allowing them to maintain higher levels of cellular absorption as the quality of the light field changes. Given the spectral quality of light at depth in the lake, the cryptophytes were better suited to utilize the available irradiance. This spectral selection for cryptophytes
may explain the offshore distribution observed in phytoplankton populations. This is consistent with the idea that absorption of green light by phycobilins in cyanobacteria may allow them to be superior competitors at depth in spectrally skewed light fields (Huisman et al. 1999).

4.4 Mixotrophic Potential

*C. erosa* and *C. meneghiniana* cultures grown under a range of irradiances both with and without the addition of glucose showed a striking difference between these two groups. Growth rates for *C. meneghiniana* were unaffected by the addition of glucose, while *C. erosa* growth was significantly enhanced by glucose supplementation (Fig. 4.11 and Table 4.2). The addition of organic nutrients also affected the carbon:chlorophyll ratio such that low light samples with added glucose had higher C:Chl ratios than samples grown on inorganic nutrients alone (Table 4.3). C:Chl ratios for *C. meneghiniana* were not significantly different for samples grown with and without glucose (data not shown). This observed increase in C:Chl ratios for *C. erosa* samples supplemented with glucose reflects an increase in intracellular carbon without the advantage afforded by a concomitant increase in cellular pigment concentrations. The difference between +glucose and control *C. erosa* cultures indicates that *C. erosa* carbon fixation and growth was benefited by the presence of an organic carbon source. Laboratory studies with cryptophytes have demonstrated their potential for mixotrophy when grown in the presence of organic substrates (Antia et al. 1969; Lewitus et al. 1991; Gervais 1997a). Cryptophytes have the ability to supplement their photosynthetic growth at low light levels when available irradiances may not be sufficient to support growth.
Additionally, both *C. erosa* treatments were able to sustain growth at lower irradiances than *C. meneghiniana* (Fig. 4.11). The +glucose *C. erosa* treatment continued to grow at a faster proportional rate than *C. meneghiniana* up to approximately 40 µmol photons m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\). At higher growth irradiances all cultures were growing close to their maximum; the addition of glucose had no effect at these light levels.

Photosynthetic growth as a function of the growth irradiance can be estimated (Laws and Bannister 1980; Kiefer and Mitchell 1983; Falkowski *et al.* 1985). At a given irradiance

\[
\mu = E \times \frac{Chl}{C} \times a^* \times \Phi_p
\]

(4.2)

where \(\mu\) is growth rate (day\(^{-1}\)), \(E\) is available irradiance (µmol photons m\(^{-2}\) day\(^{-1}\)), Chl:C is the cellular chlorophyll \(a\) to carbon ratio (mg mg\(^{-1}\)), \(a^*\) is the chlorophyll specific absorption coefficient (m\(^2\) mg chl \(a\) \(^{-1}\)), and \(\Phi_p\) is the quantum yield of carbon fixation (mg C µmol photons\(^{-1}\)). In this study each of the above parameters were measured with the exception of the quantum yield of carbon fixation which was assumed to be variable between 0.0015 mg C µmol photons\(^{-1}\) (0.125 mol C mol photons\(^{-1}\)) at low light and 0.00015 mg C µmol photons\(^{-1}\) (0.0125 mol C mol photons\(^{-1}\)) at high light. Under nutrient replete conditions \(\Phi_p\) is primarily determined by variations in available irradiance.

Chosen values approach the theoretical maximum under low light conditions and vary inversely with irradiance as cryptophytes are less efficient carbon fixers at high light.

Calculating growth rates using equation 4.2 leads to an underestimation of growth for samples grown at low light and an overestimation of growth for high light samples (Table 4.4). Growth rate calculations for low light samples showed the most error for those treatments that received supplemental glucose. Low light, + glucose treatments had
significantly higher growth rates than would be expected based upon the available irradiance. The enhanced growth afforded by the ability to uptake organic nutrients was not accounted for by equation 4.2. Conversely, at high light, equation 4.2 overestimated actual growth rates, especially for the + glucose treatments, due to a decrease in measured growth rates caused by competition for available resources by bacteria. Cultures used in this study were not axenic and therefore the addition of organic nutrients to the growth media led to an abundance of bacteria in the growth chamber. Over time, phytoplankton populations were adversely affected by competition with the rapidly growing bacteria for both organic and inorganic nutrients.

Equation 4.2 may also be used to back-calculate $\Phi_p$ (Table 4.5). These calculated values for $\Phi_p$ showed that low light, +glucose samples had a higher quantum yield for growth than control samples. The addition of organic nutrients allowed these cultures to fix more carbon per photons absorbed as compared to cultures grown with only inorganic nutrients at the same light level. Under light saturating conditions, the addition of organic nutrients had little effect on $\Phi_p$. The increased quantum yield for growth observed at low light in response to supplemental organics may have a significant effect in natural waters with sub-saturating irradiances and high levels of organic material.

Additionally, respiration rates were higher in + glucose treated samples (Table 4.5). Respiration rates were concurrently measured with growth rates and may explain some of the variability seen between measured and calculated growth rates. All samples had increased respiration when supplemented with organic nutrients (Table 4.6); however C. erosa samples most significantly affected were low light, + glucose samples corroborating that the addition of organic nutrients increases respiration more than
photosynthesis at low irradiances (Lewitus and Kana 1995). This increase in respiration can be directly linked to respiration of the available organic carbon allowing cells to increase energy stores and growth potential without a concomitant increase in photosynthesis and carbon fixation.

Coastal aquatic habitats are often turbid areas laden with organic material. The combination of river runoff and in-situ production leads to elevated concentrations of dissolved organics (Cauwet 2002). These high concentrations of strongly absorbing dissolved organics act as an energy source for mixotrophic phytoplankton and serve to reduce the amount of available light in the water column. Coastal waters are characterized by high concentrations of dissolved organic matter and low light levels where available light is confined to the blue-green and green wavelengths. Cryptophytes are successful in these areas because they have developed three main strategies for maintaining growth in these low light settings; these include 1) maximizing light absorption and utilization by altering pigment concentration, pigment ratios, and PSII:PSI stoichiometry, 2) using alternative external and internal fuel sources to supplement cellular energy requirements at low light when photosynthetic rates are not sufficient to fuel growth, and 3) strong swimming allows them to control their proximity to light and nutrient sources. The ability to utilize organic nutrients as an energy source under sub-saturating light levels and to acclimate to available irradiances allows cryptophyte algae to outcompete more traditional bloom forming phytoplankton under some conditions. In optically shallow, organically laden water columns, the window of cryptophyte dominance will be greatest.
4.5 Implications for future change in coastal zones

The coastal ocean plays a pivotal role in marine systems. Coastal zones provide a link between terrestrial and oceanic nutrient cycling, are extremely active areas for primary production, and are an important link in global biogeochemistry. These areas are delicately balanced and are strongly affected by anthropogenic alterations and climatic changes to the ecosystem (Zimmerman and Canuel 2000). For example, eutrophication of coastal areas due to river runoff and atmospheric deposition of nutrients alters the supply and distribution of nutrients and increases primary production and phytoplankton and bacteria turnover in affected areas (Meybeck 1982; Cornell et al. 1995; Ortner and Dagg 1995). This increase in primary productivity of the water column affects the transfer of material to higher trophic levels and the deposition, burial, and degradation of organic matter (Deuser et al. 1981; Asper et al. 1992). The anthropogenic addition of highly concentrated nutrients into coastal waters will have long ranging effects on nutrient cycling and carbon sequestration as well as reverberating through the marine food web. In addition to obviously increasing the availability of organic nutrients in coastal areas, this will also increase water column turbidity leading to decreased light levels at depth.

Climatic change has far reaching effects in estuaries (Sullivan et al. 2001), coastal areas (Paerl 1998), and inland lakes (Schindler et al. 1990; Ducrotoy 1999). These changes will alter marine community composition, biogeochemical cycles, and food web structure (Roemmich and McGowan 1995) especially in coastal areas which are very biologically diverse (Gray 2001). Oceanic warming trends will alter biological community composition, especially of primary producers, and will lead to the preferential
extinction of predators (Petchey et al. 1999). Increased temperatures will also intensify erosion, river runoff, and flooding of dry lands and wetlands leading to increased organic matter concentrations and light attenuation in affected coastal waters (Titus et al. 1991; Gornitz 1995; Gregory and Oerlemans 1998; Oppenheimer 1998; Pethick 2001). These coastal areas will be marked by a significant change in the quantity and quality of available light as the introduction of high levels of suspended matter and organics leads to an increase in total light attenuation, especially in the UV region, and a spectral skewing to predominantly green and blue-green wavelengths of available light at depth. Additionally, the increased concentration of organic material will enhance the competitive potential for phytoplankton groups capable of using these newly available resources for growth.

As coastal ecosystems are disrupted by climatic and anthropogenic alterations, these impacted areas are the principal locations where shifts in community composition will be most apparent. I hypothesize an increase in the prevalence of cryptophyte algae which are uniquely suited for growth in these organically laden, dim light, coastal waters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Light Level</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
<th>Biomass (cells ml(^{-1}) X 10,000)</th>
<th>Biomass standard deviation</th>
<th>F(_v/F_m)</th>
<th>F(_v/F_m) standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>15.17</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>15.18</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>20.09</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>20.90</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>16.87</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>17.02</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Biomass and F\(_v/F_m\) results for preliminary experiments with *C. erosa*.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. erosa</th>
<th>Nutrient Treatment</th>
<th>Irradiance (µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹)</th>
<th>Irradiance standard deviation</th>
<th>Growth Rate (day⁻¹)</th>
<th>Growth Rate standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>22.51</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>44.15</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>96.88</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>180.15</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus glucose</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus glucose</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus glucose</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus glucose</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus glucose</td>
<td>42.55</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus glucose</td>
<td>95.01</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus glucose</td>
<td>181.93</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. meneghiniana</th>
<th>Nutrient Treatment</th>
<th>Irradiance (µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹)</th>
<th>Irradiance standard deviation</th>
<th>Growth Rate (day⁻¹)</th>
<th>Growth Rate standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>8.18</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>22.51</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>44.15</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>96.88</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>180.15</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus glucose</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus glucose</td>
<td>8.64</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus glucose</td>
<td>22.18</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus glucose</td>
<td>42.55</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus glucose</td>
<td>95.01</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plus glucose</td>
<td>181.93</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2 Irradiance levels and growth rates for *C. erosa* and *C. meneghiniana* grown both with and without the addition of 100 µmol glucose.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C (ng cell⁻¹)</th>
<th>N (ng cell⁻¹)</th>
<th>C:Chl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C. erosa LL Control</td>
<td>0.074 ± 0.007</td>
<td>0.018 ± 2.838</td>
<td>32.81 ± 0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. erosa LL + glucose</td>
<td>0.081 ± 0.002</td>
<td>0.019 ± 0.001</td>
<td>38.01 ± 2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. erosa HL Control</td>
<td>0.071 ± 0.005</td>
<td>0.016 ± 0.001</td>
<td>32.73 ± 1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. erosa HL + glucose</td>
<td>0.077 ± 0.003</td>
<td>0.018 ± 0.001</td>
<td>32.19 ± 1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. erosa control</td>
<td>0.075 ± 0.006</td>
<td>0.016 ± 0.001</td>
<td>40.24 ± 5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. erosa + glucose</td>
<td>0.066 ± 0.007</td>
<td>0.014 ± 0.002</td>
<td>36.05 ± 5.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. meneghiniana control</td>
<td>0.235 ± 0.020</td>
<td>0.013 ± 0.001</td>
<td>184.45 ± 15.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. meneghiniana + glucose</td>
<td>0.253 ± 0.013</td>
<td>0.014 ± 0.001</td>
<td>184.94 ± 17.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3  Carbon, nitrogen, and C:Chl ratios for top: *C. erosa* samples grown at low light (12 µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹) and high light (90 µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹) and bottom: *C. erosa* and *C. meneghiniana* samples grown at medium light (45 µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹) both with and without the addition of 100 µM glucose. C per cell and C:Chl ratios are highest for low light samples grown with the addition of organic nutrients. At medium and high light levels C:Chl ratios are not significantly different for samples with added organic nutrients.
Table 4.4 Measured and calculated growth rates, growth irradiance, chlorophyll specific absorption coefficient ($a^*$), and Chl:C ratio for *C. erosa* samples grown at low light (12 µmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) and high light (90 µmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) both with and without the addition of 100 µM glucose. The quantum yield of carbon fixation was estimated and held constant for low light and high light samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Treatment</th>
<th>growth rate (measured; day$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>E (µmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$a^*$ (m$^2$ mg chl a$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Chl:C</th>
<th>Φ (mg C µmol phot$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>growth rate (estimated; day$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LL, Control</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.0305</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL, + Glucose</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.0266</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL, control</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>89.75</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.0306</td>
<td>0.00015</td>
<td>0.659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL, + Glucose</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>89.75</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.0300</td>
<td>0.00015</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Treatment</th>
<th>growth rate (measured; day⁻¹)</th>
<th>E (µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹)</th>
<th>a* (m² mg Chl a⁻¹)</th>
<th>Chl:C</th>
<th>Calc Φ (mg C µmol phot⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LL, Control</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>0.0305</td>
<td>0.0015 ±0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL, + Glucose</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.0266</td>
<td>0.0019 ±0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL, control</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>89.75</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.0306</td>
<td>0.00013 ±0.000026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HL, + Glucose</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>89.75</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.0300</td>
<td>0.00012 ±0.000016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5  Measured growth rate, growth irradiance, chlorophyll specific absorption coefficient (a*), and Chl:C ratio, for *C. erosa* samples grown at low light (12 µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹) and high light (90 µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹) both with and without the addition of 100 µM glucose. The quantum yield of carbon fixation (Φ) has been back-calculated using equation 4.2. The slightly higher Φ for low light, +glucose samples indicates that these cultures are capable of fixing more carbon per photons absorbed due to the additions of organic nutrients to supplement their photosynthetic growth. Note that calculated values for Φᵦ were not used to calculate growth rates in Table 4.4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>species</th>
<th>treatment</th>
<th>$R$ (µmol O₂ chl$^{-1}$ hr$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$R$ (µmol O₂ cell$^{-1}$ hr$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>C. erosa</em></td>
<td>LL, control</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>7.32E-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LL, +glucose</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>9.88E-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>C. erosa</em></td>
<td>HL, control</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>4.65E-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HL, +glucose</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>5.64E-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>C. erosa</em></td>
<td>control</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>9.45E-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>glucose</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>9.88E-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>C. meneghiniana</em></td>
<td>control</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>1.19E-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>glucose</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>1.29E-07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6  Respiration measurements for top: *C. erosa* samples grown at low light (12 µmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) and high light (90 µmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) both with and without the addition of 100 µM glucose and bottom: *C. erosa* and *C. meneghiniana* samples at medium light (45 µmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$) both with and without the addition of 100 µM glucose. The increase in respiration was most significant for *C. erosa* samples grown at low light with the addition of glucose. At low light *C. erosa* was supplementing photosynthetic growth with energy from available organic nutrients.
Figure 4.1 Cryptophyte absorption spectra. Cryptophytes are the only phytoplankton group to contain both chlorophyll $a$ and $c_2$ as well as carotenoids and phycobilins.
Figure 4.2: Spectral distribution of available light in a) a water column comprised of pure water alone and b) a water column with high concentrations of dissolved organic matter.

Irradiance values are output from Hydrolight 4.2 radiative transfer model.
Figure 4.3: Biomass (top) and Fv/Fm (bottom) for *C. erosa* at a range of temperatures.

Cultures were grown at a series of light and temperature treatments and sampled for biomass (cell counts with a hemacytometer) and Fv/Fm (Fast Repetition Rate Fluorometer). Growth was fastest at high light levels and intermediate temperatures. Photochemical efficiency was consistently higher at low light and was independent of temperature.
Figure 4.4: 77K fluorescence emission spectra for *C. erosa*. Cultures were excited at chl *a* (435nm), chl *c* (462nm), and phycoerythrin (566nm). All fluorescence curves were normalized to 720nm. Emission at 690nm corresponds to PSII and at 720nm to PSI. Phycoerythrin and chl *c* are the primary light harvesters for PSII while chl *a* is the primary light harvester for PSI.
Figure 4.5: 77K fluorescence excitation spectra for *C. erosa* cultures grown in high light (top) and low light (bottom). Fluorescence emission is at 690nm (solid line) or 720nm (squares) and data have been normalized to 435nm. Cultures grown at low light show much higher fluorescence from PSII than PSI when excited at phycoerythrin compared to high light grown cultures indicating more efficient transfer from PE to PSII under low light conditions.
Figure 4.6: 77K fluorescence emission (excitation at 435nm) for *C. erosa* (top) and *C. meneghiniana* (bottom) cultures grown at low light (closed symbols) or high light (open symbols). At low light, *C. erosa* responds by decreasing the stoichiometry between PSII:PSI, while *C. meneghiniana* increases this ratio. Under low light conditions, light is preferentially absorbed by the phycobilins and transferred to PSII and cultures are light limited. PSI synthesis is stimulated by both high levels of PSII absorption and by the need for extra ATP under these conditions.
Figure 4.7 Cross shelf transects of the distributions of diatoms (left) and cryptophytes (right) in southern Lake Michigan.
Figure 4.8  Proportion of chlorophyll $a$ associated with cryptophytes Vs. Proportion of chlorophyll $a$ associated with diatoms in coastal Lake Michigan.
Figure 4.9: Microphotometry absorption efficiency ($Q_a$) for a representative diatom (*Melosira islandica*, gray line) and cryptophyte (*Rhodomonas minuta*, black line) collected offshore St. Joseph, MI. Total integrated potential absorption is equal for the two species.
Figure 4.10: Product of the absorption efficiency ($Q_a$) for a representative diatom (gray line) and cryptophyte (black line) and the scalar irradiance ($E_o$), normalized to the downwelling irradiance at the surface - a) scalar irradiance at the surface $E_o(0^-)$ and b) scalar irradiance for the average light field experienced by a phytoplankton cell over the mixed layer depth assuming total mixing of the water column. Superimposed is the available light field shaded in gray.
Figure 4.11: Growth rates for *C. erosa* (top) and *C. meneghiniana* (bottom). Cultures were incubated in 250ml flasks at 20°C at a range of irradiance values under a 12:12 light:dark cycle either with (+ glucose) or without (control) the addition of 100 µM glucose. At low light levels the growth of *C. erosa* is enhanced by the addition of glucose. Samples under the arrow show a statistically significant difference between control and +glucose treatments (light levels = 3.5, 8.5, 22, and 43 µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹) for *C. erosa*. None of the samples were significantly different between the control and +glucose treatments for *C. meneghiniana*. All growth rates have been normalized to the maximum growth rate for each species.
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