Mercury biomagnification through food webs along a salinity gradient down-estuary from a biological hotspot

Darren G. Rumbold^{1*}, Ted R. Lange², Doug Richards², Gina DelPizzo², and Nicole Hass¹

¹Florida Gulf Coast University, 10501 FGCU Blvd. South. Fort Myers, FL 33965. USA

²Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, 601 W. Woodward Avenue, Eustis, FL 32726. USA

* Corresponding author: drumbold@fgcu.edu; 239 590-7527

Ted Lange: ted.lange@MyFWC.com

Doug Richard: douglas.richard@MyFWC.com

Gina DelPizzo: Gina.DelPizzo@MyFWC.com

Nicole Hass: nicole10@gmail.com

Abstract: To examine down-estuary effects and how differences in food webs along a salinity gradient might influence mercury (Hg) biomagnification, we conducted a study from 2010-2015 in an estuary with a known biological hotspot at its headwaters. Over 907 samples of biota, representing 92 different taxa of fish and invertebrates, seston and sediments were collected from the upper, middle and lower reach for Hg determination and for stable nitrogen and carbon isotope analyses. Trophic magnification slopes (TMS; log Hg versus $\delta^{15}\text{N}$), as a measure of biomagnification efficiency, ranged from 0.23 to 0.241 but did not differ statistically among reaches. Hg concentrations were consistently highest, ranging as high as 4.9 mg/kg in top predatory fish, in the upper-reach of the estuary where basal Hg entering the food web was also highest, as evidenced by methylmercury concentrations in suspension feeders. Top predatory fish at the mouth of the estuary contained relatively low [THg], likely due to lower basal Hg. This was nonetheless surprising given the potential for down-estuary biotransport.

Keywords: trophic magnification slope; basal mercury; carbon and nitrogen stable isotopes

Regional index terms: USA; Everglades National Park; Shark River Estuary

1. Introduction

Mercury (Hg) is a pollutant of global concern due to its potential for long-range atmospheric transport and subsequent microbial methylation (Driscoll et al. 2013). The neurotoxic effects of methylmercury (MeHg), the form of Hg that biomagnifies through food webs, are well documented (NRC 2000). The principal pathway for MeHg exposure to humans is through the consumption of marine fish (Sunderland 2007). This is of particular importance in the Gulf of Mexico (GOM) because its seafood is known to have elevated Hg levels prompting consumption advisories by all five U.S. Gulf states (Harris et al. 2012). Recent surveys have identified south Florida's coastal environment as a regional "hotspot" where fish have higher Hg concentrations than surrounding areas (Adams et al. 2003; Evans et al. 2015; Evans and Crumley 2005; Rumbold et al. 2014). One such hotspot is the headwaters of the Shark River Estuary in Everglades National Park where largemouth bass (*Micropterus salmoides*) have consistently had some of the highest Hg levels in Florida for more than a decade (Gu et al. 2012), invariably exceeding benchmarks for the protection of both piscivorous wildlife and humans (USEPA 1997; 2001).

Yet, many uncertainties remain regarding the relative importance of the different factors controlling Hg entry and biomagnification through marine food webs (Chen et al. 2008), particularly in the GOM (Harris et al. 2012). Differences in inorganic Hg loading, its bioavailability to Hg methylating bacteria, and rates of bacterial activity are all thought to be sources of the extreme spatial variability that can result in hotspots (Chen et al. 2012; Heyes et al. 2006). Additionally, the natural variation in trophic structure among communities (e.g., food chain length, linkage strength, etc.), degree of openness, and primary and secondary productivity can also influence the rate of MeHg biomagnification (Chen et al. 2008; Kidd et al. 2012a). The effect

that community structure has on MeHg biomagnification efficiency in GOM food webs remains poorly characterized.

Recently, several investigations have quantified loads of both total-Hg (THg) and MeHg through estuaries to the GOM (Bergamaschi et al. 2012; Buck et al. 2015; Rumbold et al. 2011). While these studies have revealed important information that will improve and constrain models, they have focused on advection in water or on sediment. Little attention has been given to the potential importance of biological transport or “bioadvection” of Hg through estuaries (Chen et al. 2008; Harris et al. 2012). There is also growing interest in how differences in food web structure among different habitats, as might be expected along an estuarine salinity gradient (Bulger et al., 1993; Ley et al. 1999; Cloern et al. 2017), influence Hg biomagnification (Jardine et al. 2006; Lavoie et al. 2013).

The purpose of our study was twofold: (1) determine if the Hg hotspot known to occur at the headwaters extends down-estuary and, (2) by using a stable isotope analysis approach, assess the relative importance of basal Hg and food web structure along the salinity gradient as drivers of Hg biomagnification. Additionally, there was also a desire to generate a data set that could be used, in the future, to improve existing food web models (Harris et al. 2012; Evans et al. 2015).

2. Methods

2.1. Study Area

The study took place in the Shark River Estuary (SRE) within Everglades National Park (ENP) located in south Florida, USA (Fig. 1). The SRE is located at the terminus of the major historical flow pathway through the Everglades Ecosystem (Childers et al. 2006) and, as part of a national park, remains relatively undisturbed. Yet, since the late 1980s fish and wildlife from ENP and the

rest of the Everglades have been known to contain high Hg levels (Ware et al. 1990). More recent surveys of Hg in ospreys (*Pandion haliaetus*) and dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) from this area continue to report higher levels than conspecifics from other parts of North America (Rumbold et al. 2016; Damseaux et al. 2017). Multi-agency research indicates the source of the Hg is from high atmospheric deposition, reflecting a combination of high rainfall with high inorganic Hg concentrations (Guentzel et al. 2001; Gu et al. 2012). The upstream slough of the SRE is dominated by freshwater marsh and splits into a wide band of mangrove-dominated creeks within 15 km of the GOM. Although microtidal, a large expanse of mangrove-dominated ecotone is inundated and drained during each tide due to the low topography. Species of fish are known to form distinct assemblages along salinity gradients of southwest Florida estuaries due to taxon-specific (and life stage) salinity tolerances (Ley et al. 1999; Green et al. 2006). Yet mobile animals may move with the natural isohaline movement along the main stem of the river and/or move in and out of marshes and creeks or “backwaters” as water levels and salinity permits (Boucek and Rehage 2013; Green et al. 2006; Rehage and Loftus 2007). Boucek and Rehage (2013), for example, have tracked fish and invertebrates that move down into the upper SRE from adjacent drying marshes, returning to the marshes when they flood.

SRE has been characterized as a relatively oligotrophic, upside down estuary with total phosphorus (as the limiting nutrient) increasing down-estuary (Childers et al. 2006). Salinity, total nitrogen (TN) and total phosphorus (TP) for the different reaches are summarized in Supplemental Table S1.

Fig. 1. Map and satellite image showing approximate sampling areas in upper, middle and lower reach of Shark River Estuary (since they share the same watershed, the mouth of the Harney River was included in the lower reach).

2.2. Sampling Protocol

Sampling took place from September 2010 through May 2015 (semi-annually during the first 4 years and quarterly in the final year) in three reaches (upper-, mid- and lower-estuary). This protracted sampling period was necessary to allow for the collection of sufficient samples from representative trophic levels, particularly invertebrates; while largemouth bass are sampled at the upstream site as part of the state's long-term monitoring program, temporal trend analysis was not a primary objective of this study. Over the study period, over 907 samples were collected for analyses (i.e., small organisms were occasionally composited into a single sample to increase mass); 73% of the samples (including all sediment, seston and invertebrates except oysters) were collected during the final year of the study, when additional funding became available. Of these, 893 samples were biota from 92 different taxa (most identified to species but a few only to genera or family). While the vast majority of the biota were fish, 11% were comprised of 23 different macroinvertebrate taxa; common names and species of collected fish and macroinvertebrates are summarized, by reach, in Supplemental Tables S2-S4.

Fish were collected primarily using hook and line, seine nets, minnow traps and, where conductivity was low (upper- and mid-reach during the wet season), using boat-mounted, pulsed DC electro-fishing equipment. Macroinvertebrates were also collected in seine nets, crab traps and occasionally during electrofishing. Three top predatory fish species: 1) largemouth bass, 2) common snook, and 3) mangrove snapper were more heavily targeted than other fishes for several reasons. First, snook and mangrove snapper were relatively abundant within all three reaches. Second, snook were the focus of other studies in SRE, which should provide additional life-history information. Third, as mentioned above, largemouth bass have been used as sentinels for long-term Hg monitoring throughout south Florida (Gu et al. 2012).

Seston samples (n=10) and sediment samples (n=14) were collected during the final year. Seston was collected using a plankton net at each station (30 cm dia. 5:1, 35 μ m mesh net with Stainless Steel ring; SEA-GEAR Corporation, Melbourne, FL). Sediment samples were collected most often using a clean butyrate core tube (from approximately the top 4 cm). Occasionally, where the sediment layer was thin over rock, it was collected by simply scooping the top 4 cm into a clean sampling jar or, on two occasions, by using a plastic bag as a glove. Both seston and sediments were stored frozen (for < 6 months) in glass jars or scintillation vials until processing.

Field collection and sample processing were conducted with great care to minimize sample contamination by exogenous Hg (particularly of inorganic Hg due to its numerous sources) and from sample carryover (i.e., from one sample to the next during processing). This was a particular concern for seston given their low THg concentrations. Accordingly, patterns of Hg in sediments, invertebrates and seston were evaluated based on measured MeHg (which has fewer contamination sources) rather than THg.

2.3. Processing Samples

Total length and weight of individual fish were determined using a measuring board or tape (± 0.1 cm) and digital balance (± 0.1 g) or Pesola spring scale (± 10 g). Invertebrates were also weighed and measured prior to soft muscle tissue removal from exoskeleton or shell. All invertebrates and smaller species of prey fish were processed as whole body homogenates using a commercial meat grinder (Hobart Meat Chopper, Beltram South, Fort Myers, FL), laboratory grinder (Grindomix GM200, Retsch, U.S.), hand-held homogenizer (Tissue Master 125, Omni International, Kennesaw, GA) or some combination. Alternatively, due to the impracticalities of homogenizing larger samples, only a portion of the fillet was analyzed for larger sport fish species.

Sediment and seston were oven-dried at 60°C with percent solids determined. Dried sediments were then combusted at 550°C for 4 hours to determine percent organics.

All equipment (cutting board, knife, grinders) were washed with ambient water (if processed in the field) or tap water between each use to avoid cross-contamination. The vast majority of samples were analyzed individually; however, small organisms (e.g., shrimp, snails, small prey fish) were occasionally composited into a single sample to increase mass; all bivalve species (e.g., oysters, clams, mussels, etc.) were also composite samples of up to 10 individuals. All samples were stored in scintillation vials at -20°C and analyzed within six months.

Several previous studies have similarly used whole-body concentrations of invertebrates and small prey fish species at the bottom of the food web in combination with muscle tissues of larger organisms at the top of the food web (Chumchal et al. 2011; Riget et al. 2007; Thera and Rumbold 2014). This introduces uncertainty because, although highly correlated, Hg concentration in whole-body tends to be lower than muscle tissue alone (Bank et al. 2007; Peterson et al. 2005). Nonetheless, in accordance with previous studies, adjustments were not made based on tissue type.

2.4. Analytical Methods

Total-Hg concentration (includes all Hg species; hereafter designated as [THg]) was determined in all matrices (e.g., fish, invertebrates, and sediment) at Florida Gulf Coast University via thermal decomposition, gold amalgamation, and atomic absorption spectrometry (EPA method 7473) with a direct Hg analyzer (Nippon Model MA-2000 from 2010-2103 and Milestone DMA-80 from 2014-2015). Calibration curves were generated using varying masses of Certified Reference Materials (CRMs; National Research Council Canada, Institute for National

Measurement Standards, Ottawa, ON, Canada): DOLT-3 (Dogfish Liver), DORM-3 (Fish Protein) or DORM-4 (Fish Protein) and BCR-463 and ERM-CE464 (LGC Standards USA, 276 Abby Road, Manchester, NH). These same CRMs were also used for continuing calibration verification at the start and at the end of every batch of 20 samples; laboratory duplicates were also run during each batch.

Because the vast majority of THg in the muscle tissue of fish is in the form of MeHg (Grieb et al. 1990), the analysis of fish for THg is interpreted as being equivalent to MeHg. Alternatively, the percentage of THg present as MeHg is more variable in invertebrates (Thera and Rumbold 2014). Accordingly, MeHg was also determined for all sediments, seston, most bivalves and representative samples of other invertebrate taxa (summarized in Table S5, Supplemental Information) by the USGS Wisconsin Mercury Research Laboratory (Middleton, Wisconsin). For those few invertebrates where [MeHg] was not measured, it was estimated based adjusting measured [THg] by %MeHg determined in representative invertebrates. Quality assurance of Hg analysis is reviewed in Supplemental Information.

For determination of stable nitrogen ($\delta^{15}\text{N}$) and carbon ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$) isotopes, subsamples of tissues (i.e., homogenates or fillets) and seston were dried at 60°C to constant weight (> 48 hrs), and then ground to a fine powder using a mortar and pestle. Dried samples were later acidified with 10% hydrochloric acid to remove carbonates and re-dried; lipids were not removed from samples. Aliquots of the final powder were then weighed into tin capsules (Costech, Valencia, CA) and shipped to a contract laboratory for analyses. The vast majority of samples for isotope analysis were shipped to the University of California Davis' Stable Isotope Facility (Davis, California, USA; 33 samples were sent to the Yale Stable Isotope Facilities in 2012 and 20 samples were sent

to University of South Florida Stable Isotope Lab in 2013). Quality assurance of the isotope analysis is reviewed in Supplemental Information.

Stable isotope analysis (SIA) of nitrogen and carbon has been employed to investigate trophic position and community dynamics in a variety of ecosystems including estuaries and, more recently, utilized to assess both the efficiency by which Hg biomagnifies through different food webs (for review, see Jardine et al. 2006). Because $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ ratios can vary over space or time due to anthropogenic inputs, previous studies have sometimes standardized $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ based on basal values in a local, primary consumer (for review, see Jardine et al. 2006). These studies often then used an average diet-tissue discrimination factor (or enrichment factor) to translate $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ to trophic level to estimate a food web magnification factor (FWMF). This allowed for estimation of basal Hg entering the food web based on the y-intercept. There is a growing debate, however, about the choice of an “averaged” diet-tissue discrimination factor (Wolf et al. 2009) and, therefore, some recent studies have explicitly not translated $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ into trophic level (Kidd et al. 2012b). Standardizing the $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ changes the intercept but does not change the slopes (i.e., TMS). Accordingly, we did not standardize or adjust $\delta^{15}\text{N}$. Rather than estimating basal Hg from the y-intercept of a FWMF, which is very sensitive to the slope, we relied on [MeHg] measured in primary consumers and to a lesser extent seston and sediments.

2.5. Data Analysis

Patterns of Hg in sediments, seston and bivalves from different reaches were based on measured [MeHg]. Where comparisons were made to THg in fish (i.e., the relation between log [THg] and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ for entire food web), THg in invertebrates were adjusted to estimate MeHg so as

to be equivalent to fish (i.e., adjusting THg concentrations determined by the DMA-80 using %MeHg in representative species).

Unless otherwise noted (as above), all [THg] were reported in ng/g on a wet weight basis. [THg] in top predatory fish caught from different reaches were compared using parametric and nonparametric tests. Because [THg] often increases with increasing fish size (within species), analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), with size as a covariate, was used to assess differences in [THg] where average size (i.e., total length) of sampled fish populations differed. However, ANCOVA use is predicated on several critical assumptions including sufficient sample size and range in the covariate, and homogeneity of slopes (Zar 1999) that was not always achieved in this study. In those cases, we resorted to using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Simple linear regression analysis was used to describe the relationship between log[THg] versus $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ for food webs in each of the reaches. ANCOVA was used to determine if slopes of these relationships (hereafter termed trophic magnification slope or TMS) differed.

3. Results

3.1. [THg] in Top Predatory Fish

[THg] in individual samples of fish collected from 2010-2015 spanned four orders of magnitude and ranged from 0.45 ng/g in a mullet to 4,946 ng/g in a bowfin. Although temporal trend analysis was not a primary objective, because samples were collected over a 5 year period, possible temporal trends in [THg] were first assessed using the three fish species caught most frequently (results presented in Supplemental Information). Because there was no clear temporal trends, data were pooled across years.

[THg] differed among top predator fish in the upper reach (Fig. 2; Kruskal-Wallis $H=53.3$, $df=2$, $p<0.001$) with [THg] in bass>snook>snapper (all pairwise comparisons were significant, $p<0.05$). More importantly, [THg] declined markedly in these fish down-estuary (Fig. 2). For instance, [THg] was significantly higher in snook from the upper reach as compared to snook from mid-estuary (2.2x higher) and from the mouth (2.7x higher, Fig. 2; Kruskal-Wallis; $H = 10.6$; $df = 2$; $p=0.005$ with post-hoc, pairwise comparisons between upper estuary versus both the other reaches significant, Dunn's test, $p<0.05$); these snook did not differ in size (Kruskal-Wallis; $H = 1.32$; $df = 2$; $p=0.52$).

Fig. 2. Boxplot of [THg] (ng/g wet wt.) in predatory fish from different reaches of the estuary. Note, bass were only caught in the upper reach. The boundary of the box closest to zero indicates the 25th percentile, the line within the box, the median, and the boundary of the box farthest from zero, the 75th percentile. Whiskers above and below the box indicate the 90th and 10th percentiles with symbols representing outliers.

Likewise, upper-reach snappers contained significantly higher [THg] than snappers from mid-estuary (1.8x) or the mouth (4.5x, Kruskal-Wallis; $H = 93.9$; $df = 2$; $p < 0.001$; Dunn's post-hoc $p < 0.05$ all pairwise comparisons); size differences among these fish were only minor ($H = 5.9$; $df = 2$; $p = 0.052$) and involved snappers from mid-estuary versus lower estuary.

3.2. Basal Hg: Suspension Feeders, Seston, and Sediment

Because the same bivalve species were not found in all three reaches, oysters represented primary consumers in the lower estuary while mussels and clams were utilized in the mid and upper estuary, respectively. [MeHg] measured in dried samples (determined by USGS) were much higher in Carolina marsh clams from the upper reach than bivalves from the other two reaches (Kruskal-Wallis, $H = 7.6$, $df = 2$, $p = 0.006$; Dunn's pairwise comparisons all significant, Table 1). In general, [MeHg] in bivalves exhibited similar spatial patterns. The Carolina marsh clams from the upper estuary contained higher [MeHg] than conspecific clams and Scorched mussels from mid-estuary and oysters from the lower estuary (Fig. 4, Supplemental Tables S2-S4). Alternatively, Ribbed mussels from the mid-estuary had higher [MeHg] than either the clams or oysters (Fig. 4, Supplemental Tables S2-S4).

Similar to the Carolina marsh clams, seston collected in the upper reach contained the highest [MeHg] compared to other areas, although small sample size does not allow for robust statistical analysis. [MeHg] also declined down-estuary in seston (Table 1).

Table 1

Average [MeHg] (dry wt., measured by USGS), $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ (mean, $\pm 1\text{SD}$, n) in seston and suspension feeders from different reaches of Shark River Estuary; range given where n=2.

Reach	Common name	MeHg (ng/g)	$\delta^{15}\text{N}$ (‰)	$\delta^{13}\text{C}$ (‰)
Upper	Seston	14.1 (± 3.4 , 2)	5.9 (± 1.2 , 3)	-30.6 (± 0.6 , 3)
	Carolina Marsh Clam	207.7 (± 15.9 , 3)	10.4 (± 0.14 , 3)	-33.7 (± 0.1 , 3)
Mid-estuary	Seston	8.4 (± 2.5 , 2)	5.5 (± 0.6 , 3)	-30.1 (± 0.6 , 3)
	Scorched mussels	29.7 (± 8.1 , 3)	7.9 (± 0.4 , 3)	-35.7 (± 0.46 , 2)
Lower	Seston	4.4 (± 2.2 , 3)	4.5 (± 2.1 , 3)	-28.3 (± 2.0 , 3)
	Eastern Oyster	34.9 (± 3.5 , 6)	5.9 (± 0.7 , 13)	-29.1 (± 1.2 , 13)

Sediment samples from the upper reach had relatively high [MeHg] but not as high as sediments from the mid-estuary (Table 2). Both were much higher in [MeHg] than sediments from the lower estuary that contained much less organic matter (Table 2).

Table 2

Average [THg], [MeHg] (dry wt, measured by USGS; $\pm 1SD$, n), %MeHg and % organics in sediments (i.e., loss of mass from combusting dried sediment for 4 hours at 550°C) collected from the different reaches of Shark River Estuary.

Reach	n	THg (ng/g)	MeHg (ng/g)	%MeHg	% organics
Upper	6	301.4 (± 147.4)	2.55 (± 0.83)	1.1% (± 0.9)	75.8% (± 12.4)
Mid-estuary	4	98.7 (± 37.8)	6.11 (± 2.37)	6.4% ($\pm 1.7\%$)	77.7% ($\pm 4.4\%$)
Lower	4	23.1 (± 22.7)	0.67 (± 0.41)	4.6% ($\pm 2.4\%$)	18.0% ($\pm 15.9\%$)

3.3. Spatial Patterns in $\delta^{15}N$ and $\delta^{13}C$

Cross-plots of $\delta^{15}N$ versus $\delta^{13}C$ revealed interesting isotope ratios in biota from the three reaches (Fig. 3). $\delta^{15}N$ values generally declined down-estuary (Fig. 3, Table 1 and Supplemental Fig. S2). The $\delta^{13}C$ of the food web also shifted down-estuary with biota from the lower estuary less negative as compared to biota from the upper reach (Fig. 3, Supplemental Fig. S2 and Tables S2-S4). While seston and oysters collected from the lower reach had similar $\delta^{13}C$ ratios, values differed between seston and clams or mussels from other reaches with clams and mussels less enriched in ^{13}C than corresponding seston (Fig. 3, Table 1). Correlations between $\delta^{15}N$ and $\delta^{13}C$, and between stable isotopes and fish size were evaluated only for top predatory fish (e.g., bass, snook and snapper; results reported in Supplemental Information).

Fig. 3. Cross-plots of $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ versus $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ (species means $\pm 1\text{SD}$ unless $n < 3$ where range is shown) for upper (top panel), middle and lower reaches (bottom panel) of the Shark River Estuary (for detailed analysis of cross-plots for bass, snook and snapper, see Supplemental Information); blue symbols represent fish, red inverts and black seston.

It was noteworthy that the range of $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values was narrowest in bass (found only in the upper estuary) whereas both snook and snappers showed more overlap in $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values from the upper- and mid-reaches than the lower reach (Supplemental Fig. S2).

3.4. Trophic Magnification Slopes

While generally fish had higher average [THg] and were more enriched in ^{15}N than macroinvertebrates (Fig. 4, Supplemental Tables S2-S4), there were some notable exceptions. For example, several of the crab species (particularly blue crabs, Supplemental Tables S2-S4) had [THg] and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values similar or higher than some of the forage fish (Fig. 4). But even more noteworthy was that suspension feeders (e.g., clams and mussels) from the upper- and mid-estuary had $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values higher than several fish species (Fig. 3 and 4).

Macroinvertebrates were caught and sampled more heavily in the lower reach (Fig. 4). To avoid any potential bias, regressions of $\log[\text{THg}]$ versus $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ were based on species means for fish only (using means rather than individual data points should also avoid bias due to uneven sampling of fish species). The resulting regressions were statistically significant in all three reaches (Fig. 4; upper: $F=11.5$; $df=1,24$; $p=0.002$; mid: $F=8.8$; $df=1,17$; $p=0.009$; lower: $F=52.8$; $df=1,37$; $p<0.001$). While TMS decreased down-estuary (Fig. 4) the differences were not statistically significant (ANCOVA interaction: $F=0.008$; $df = 2, 78$; $p = 0.9$). To improve statistical power, the regressions were re-calculated and slopes defined for each reach based on raw, individual data points (fish only) rather than means (Supplemental Fig. S1). The resulting slopes based on individual data points were generally similar to those based on means and again did not differ among reaches (ANCOVA interaction: $F=0.935$; $df = 2, 592$; $p = 0.39$).

Fig. 4. The relation between Log[THg] and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ (species means $\pm 1\text{SD}$ or range where $n < 3$; coefficient of determination and TMS $\pm 95\% \text{CI}$ based on fish only shown) for upper (top), mid (middle) and lower estuary (bottom) of Shark River Estuary (for summaries for each species by reach and symbol legend, see Supplemental Tables S2 – S4).

4. Discussion

4.1. [THg] in Top Predatory Fish

The high [THg] in bass, snook and snapper from the upper reach were consistent with the results of the state's long-term monitoring program of THg in fish at the headwaters of SRE (Gu et al. 2012). The lack of a clear temporal trend (see, Supplemental Information) was also consistent with the results of that monitoring program which has found no significant trend in annual median [Hg] over the past 23 years (Gu et al. 2012). The concentrations in these fish and several others in the upper reach (e.g., bowfin, Florida gar and bluegill) were some of the highest levels recently reported for these species in south Florida (Adams et al. 2003, Evans 2009, Gu et al. 2012). Levels were much higher than concentrations reported for conspecifics from the upper reaches of other GOM estuaries (Farmer et al. 2010, Fry and Chumchal 2012).

The inter-specific differences in [THg] among fish species at the upper reach were not surprising given their different life-histories. As previously discussed the bass likely spend much of their time in the marsh but move down to deeper estuarine creeks along with other mobile species when the marsh dries (Boucek and Rehage 2013). By comparison, while snook in the upper SRE are thought to be almost completely subsidized by freshwater prey that moved down during the dry season (Boucek and Rehage 2013), they must switch and rely more heavily on estuarine prey during the wet season (either in the upper estuary or by moving down-estuary). Consequently, they are diluting the exposure of Hg bioadvected from the marsh as compared to the species that returned to the freshwater marshes. Considering the lower reach is located down-estuary from this hotspot and, thus, primed to receive biota moving down stream or, as discussed below, receive inputs of high water-column [MeHg], it was expected to have biota with higher [THg]. Yet, the

observed trend of decreasing [THg] down-estuary was consistent with previous reports that [THg] in fish communities tend to be lower in the lower reaches of estuaries (Farmer et al. 2010; Fry and Chumchal 2012).

Although caution must be used when making comparisons to levels reported in the published literature (due to possible differences in size and age), fish from the lower reach had [THg] similar or lower than fish from other Florida estuaries (Adams et al. 2003; Evans 2009; Evans and Crumley 2005; Hong et al. 2013) but much higher than conspecifics in other estuaries of the GOM (Farmer et al. 2010; Fry and Chumchal 2012; Showalter 2010).

4.2. Basal Hg: Suspension Feeders, Seston and Sediment

Basal Hg entering the food web was gauged by [MeHg] measured in the suspension-feeding bivalves as primary consumers. This was further assessed by evaluating [MeHg] measured in seston and sediments. The much higher [MeHg] in the Carolina marsh clams from the upper reach were interpreted as an indication of higher basal Hg entering the food web of the upper reach. The [MeHg] in these clams were among the highest [MeHg] reported in oysters from estuaries around the GOM collected as part of NOAA's Mussel Watch program (i.e., 211 ng MeHg/g dry wt., Apeti et al. 2012). Alternatively, [MeHg] in the oysters from the mouth of SRE were generally similar or lower than concentrations reported in oysters from other areas in southwest Florida, including Charlotte Harbor, Rookery Bay, Faka Union Bay and Florida Bay (Apeti et al. 2012). Still, it is important to note that all of these Florida locations are characterized as hotspots by NOAA (based on comparisons to [MeHg] in oysters from estuaries in the central and western GOM and as compared to the national median concentrations; Apeti et al. 2012).

Seston from the upper reach also contained the highest [MeHg] relative to seston from the other reaches (Table 1). Although comparable data are sparse, the [MeHg] in seston in the present study were markedly lower than concentrations in seston collected along a transect through Guanabara Bay, Brazil and out into the Atlantic (ranging from 22.8 ng/g to 204.9 ng/g; Kehrig et al. 2009). [MeHg] in seston from the lower estuary was only slightly lower than values in zooplankton from nearby Sarasota Bay (3.7 ± 2.2 ng/g wet wt., mean ± 1 SD, Hong et al. 2013).

Sediment [MeHg] concentrations in the present study were within the range reported from marsh and bay sediments from Florida Bay (Rumbold et al. 2011) and from lower reaches of other estuaries around the GOM (Apeti et al. 2012). The higher [MeHg] in sediments with increased organic content was consistent with previous reports (for review, see Chen et al. 2008). It is noteworthy that organic matter in sediments has also been reported to reduce MeHg bioavailability to benthic fauna (Chen et al. 2008). The mid-estuary maximum in sediment [MeHg] was interesting in light of findings of a study, which was complementary to the present study, that measured [THg] and [MeHg] in the water column along this salinity gradient in 2010 and 2011 (Bergamaschi et al. 2012). That study observed a mid-estuary maximum in water-column concentrations and concluded the mangrove ecotone was a major zone of MeHg production (Bergamaschi et al. 2012), which was also consistent with spatial patterns observed in a previous study in Florida Bay (Rumbold et al. 2012).

The relatively low basal Hg in primary consumers from the lower estuary was surprising given the potential for biotransport from the headwaters and given the previous finding of extraordinarily high water-column [MeHg] (as high as 26.8 ng MeHg/L) in SRE by the complementary study that sampled water (Bergamaschi et al. 2012). However, they also found a very strong relationship between filtered [MeHg] and filtered dissolved organic material (DOM;

and specific UV absorbance, SUVA₂₅₄). That strong statistically relationship may suggest that the DOM was ‘complexed’ with the MeHg and served as a carrier (i.e., colloidal transport; *cf.*, Stordal et al. 1996). A number of studies have shown that DOM can modify, often reducing, MeHg bioavailability (for review, see Chen et al. 2008; Gorski et al. 2008). Differences in bioavailability of MeHg, as it relates to its carrier, such as DOM, were also invoked to explain differences in bioaccumulation observed in two adjacent watersheds delivering water to northeastern Florida Bay (Rumbold et al. 2011).

4.3. Spatial Patterns in $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$

In general, taxon-specific stable isotopes values and their gradients down-estuary (Fig. 3, Supplemental Fig. S2) were in good agreement with results of previous studies done in SRE (Fry and Smith 2002; Matich and Heithaus 2013; Pineda 2003; Wozniak et al. 2012). Based on samples collected along a transect through SRE, Fry and Smith (2002) reported higher $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ in mussels collected up estuary as compared to mussels from the lower estuary. Wozniak et al. (2012) investigated nitrogen cycling in ENP, which they characterized as being derived mostly from Lake Okeechobee and the Everglades Agricultural Area, reported higher $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values in macrophytes near canals in the ENP than the estuarine ecotone. They speculated the lower $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values in the estuary were due to new N from N₂-fixation by cyanobacterial periphyton mats (Wozniak et al. 2012).

The down-estuary shift in $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ observed in the present study was also consistent with the study by Fry and Smith (2002) that found $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ in mussels from SRE (with values similar to the present study) became less negative from freshwater to marine habitats. Matich et al. (2011) reported a similar $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ gradient in consumers down the SRE. Likewise, Pineda (2003) also found

macroinvertebrates in upper SRE to have very depleted ^{13}C , particularly if collected within the mangroves. These down-estuary patterns suggest a shift in carbon source from terrestrial vegetation to mangroves and benthic microalgae mid-estuary to a mixture of seagrass and phytoplankton signatures in the lower reaches (Fry and Smith 2002; Pineda 2003).

4.4. Trophic Magnification Slopes

As expected, the higher trophic-level piscivorous fish generally had higher average [THg] and were more enriched in ^{15}N than fish species with an increasing invertebrate diet (e.g., redear sunfish, hogchoker, sheepshead, etc.) and as compared to most macroinvertebrates. The relatively high [THg] and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values in several of the crab species as compared to forage fish is consistent with omnivorous and scavenger diet of crabs (Laughlin 1982) and was comparable to previous Hg surveys that included crabs (Adams and Engel 2014; Lewis and Chancy 2008; Thera and Rumbold 2014). In general, the [MeHg] and %MeHg (Supplemental Table S5) in macroinvertebrates in the present study were consistent with results of the limited number of previous studies in the GOM that included invertebrates (Cunningham 2003; Lewis and Chancy 2008; Farmer et al. 2010; Apeti et al. 2012; Thera and Rumbold 2014; Adams and Engle 2014). Lower $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values of some of the fish species, particularly mullet, as compared to invertebrates likely demonstrates “telescoping of the food chain” where even large fish can feed directly on first trophic level (Odum 1970).

The relationship between $\log [\text{THg}]$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$, i.e., TMS, was consistent with earlier studies (Fry and Chumchal 2012; Kidd et al. 1995). As mentioned previously, we had expected that the biological communities to be structured by salinity gradients along the estuarine axis (Bulger et al., 1993; Ley et al. 1999; Green et al. 2006). Further, because many fish species can change their diet in response to prey availability, this was expected to result in variations in food

webs. Yeager et al. (2014), for example, analyzed 267 stomachs from mangrove snappers along a salinity gradient in a Florida east-coast estuary and found their diets shifted from a dominance by low quality, intertidal crabs in the upper estuary to an increased reliance on higher quality shrimp, fishes and benthic crabs in the lower estuary. While we observed a shift in $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ (and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$) across the salinity gradient (as discussed above), the TMS, as an indication of biomagnification efficiency, did not statistically differ among the reaches.

The values of the TMS in the present study were slightly steeper than the average TMS reported for tropical marine food webs from a world-wide meta-analysis (i.e., 0.16 ± 0.08 ; Lavoie et al. 2013) but clearly had overlapping confidence intervals. The slopes from the present study were shallower than a recently reported TMS for a food web from nearby Sarasota Bay (i.e., 0.27, Hong et al. 2013) but were slightly steeper than a TMS reported for a study completed just offshore of southwest Florida (i.e., 0.207, Thera and Rumbold 2014) and a recent study of tropical coastal food webs in Guanabara Bay and Ilha Grande Bay (ranged as high as 0.22) in Brazil (Bisi et al. 2012).

Early literature reviews also found TMS similar among habitats which led some authors to suggest that spatial variation observed in biomagnified Hg may largely be a result of variability in basal Hg rather than differences in food web structure (Campbell et al. 2005; Chasar et al. 2009; Chumchal et al. 2011; Kidd et al. 2003; Riget et al. 2007). Yet, as pointed out by Ward et al. (2010) and others, this may have been because variation in food webs in those studies were relatively small compared to the differences in basal Hg. This was likely the case in the present study. More recent studies have had the power to discern differences in slopes between habitats (Clayden et al. 2013; Kidd et al. 2012b; Lavoie et al. 2013; Swanson and Kidd 2010) and attributed those differences to a number of different factors possibly acting individually or in combination.

Appendix A. Supplementary Information

Supplementary data related to this article (Tables S1–S5 and Figures S1–S2) can be found in Appendix 1.

Acknowledgments:

We would like to thank FGCU staff L. Haynes and B. Wasno and all the FGCU students that assisted on this project as paid interns or volunteers, including: H. Benedict, B. Morris, J. Neurohr, M. Nicholson, K. Ribble, J. Schoonover, M. Scroggin, and K. Workinger. Likewise, we thank S. Niemczyk who also helped in the field. Finally, we would also like to thank D. Krabbenhoft (USGS) and J. Ogorek (USGS) who stepped in after the untimely death of D. Evans (NOAA) and ran the MeHg analyses. We would like to thank D. Evans (NOAA) for being a great collaborator. Finally, we thank two anonymous reviewers for their comments that improved this manuscript. Funding for this work was provided by two congressionally-directed grants from the US Department of Education (P116Z090117 and P116Z100149 from 2009-2013) and a grant from the Gulf of Mexico Alliance (121128-00 in 2014). However, the contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the US Department of Education or GOMA and do not indicate endorsement by the federal government.

References

- Adams, D.H., R.H. McMichael, Jr., and G.E. Henderson. 2003. Mercury Levels in Marine and Estuarine Fishes of Florida 1989-2001, ed. F.F.a.W.C. Commission, 57: Florida Marine Research Institute.
- Apeti, D., G. Lauenstein, and D. Evans. 2012. Recent status of total mercury and methyl mercury in the coastal waters of the northern Gulf of Mexico using oysters and sediments from NOAA's mussel watch program. *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 64: 2399-2408.
- Bank, M.S., E. Chesney, J.P. Shine, A. Maage, and D.B. Senn. 2007. Mercury bioaccumulation and trophic transfer in sympatric snapper species from the Gulf of Mexico. *Ecological Applications* 17: 2100-2110.
- Bergamaschi, B.A., D.P. Krabbenhoft, G.R. Aiken, E. Patino, D.G. Rumbold, and W.H. Orem. 2012. Tidally driven export of dissolved organic carbon, total mercury, and methylmercury from a mangrove-dominated estuary. *Environmental Science & Technology* 46: 1371-1378.
- Bisi, T.L., G. Lepoint, A.d.F. Azevedo, P.R. Dorneles, L. Flach, K. Das, O. Malm, and J. Lailson-Brito. 2012. Trophic relationships and mercury biomagnification in Brazilian tropical coastal food webs. *Ecological Indicators* 18: 291-302.
- Boucek, R.E., and J.S. Rehage. 2013. No free lunch: displaced marsh consumers regulate a prey subsidy to an estuarine consumer. *Oikos* 122: 1453-1464.
- Buck, C.S., C.R. Hammerschmidt, K.L. Bowman, G.A. Gill, and W.M. Landing. 2015. Flux of Total Mercury and Methylmercury to the Northern Gulf of Mexico from U.S. Estuaries. *Environmental Science & Technology* 49: 13992-13999.
- Campbell, L.M., R.J. Norstrom, K.A. Hobson, D.C.G. Muir, S. Backus, and A.T. Fisk. 2005. Mercury and other trace elements in a pelagic Arctic marine food web (Northwater Polynya, Baffin Bay). *Science of The Total Environment* 351-352: 247-263.
- Chasar, L.C., B.C. Scudder, A.R. Stewart, A.H. Bell, and G.R. Aiken. 2009. Mercury Cycling in Stream Ecosystems. 3. Trophic Dynamics and Methylmercury Bioaccumulation. *Environmental Science & Technology* 43: 2733-2739.
- Chen, C., A. Amirbahman, N. Fisher, G. Harding, C. Lamborg, D. Nacci, and D. Taylor. 2008. Methylmercury in marine ecosystems: spatial patterns and processes of production, bioaccumulation, and biomagnification. *EcoHealth* 5: 399-408.
- Chen, C.Y., C.T. Driscoll, and N.C. Kamman. 2012. Mercury hotspots in freshwater ecosystems: drivers, processes, and patterns. . In *Mercury in the environment*, ed. B. MS, 143-166. Berkeley University of California Press.
- Childers, D.L., J.N. Boyer, S.E. Davis, C.J. Madden, D.T. Rudnick, and F.H. Sklar. 2006. Relating precipitation and water management to nutrient concentrations in the oligotrophic "upside-down" estuaries of the Florida Everglades. *Limnology and Oceanography* 51: 602-616.
- Chumchal, M.M., T.R. Rainwater, S.C. Osborn, A.P. Roberts, M.T. Abel, G.P. Cobb, P.N. Smith, and F.C. Bailey. 2011. Mercury speciation and biomagnification in the food web of Caddo Lake, Texas and Louisiana, USA, a subtropical freshwater ecosystem. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 30: 1153-1162.
- Clayden, M.G., K.A. Kidd, B. Wyn, J.L. Kirk, D.C. Muir, and N.J. O'Driscoll. 2013. Mercury biomagnification through food webs is affected by physical and chemical characteristics of lakes. *Environmental Science & Technology* 47: 12047-12053.

- Damseaux, F., J.J. Kiszka, M.R. Heithaus, G. Scholl, G. Eppe, J.-P. Thomé, J. Lewis, W. Hao, M.C. Fontaine, and K. Das. 2017. Spatial variation in the accumulation of POPs and mercury in bottlenose dolphins of the Lower Florida Keys and the coastal Everglades (South Florida). *Environmental Pollution* 220: 577-587.
- Driscoll, C.T., R.P. Mason, H.M. Chan, D.J. Jacob, and N. Pirrone. 2013. Mercury as a Global Pollutant: Sources, Pathways, and Effects. *Environmental Science & Technology*: 47 (10), pp 4967–4983.
- Evans, D.W. 2009. Assessment of mercury bioaccumulation in sentinel fish in South Florida. Final Report to CERP/RECOVER/MAP Project. NOS Agreement Code MOA-204-191/6945. NOAA Center for Coastal Fisheries and Habitat Research. Beaufort, NC.
- Evans, D.W., M. Cohen, C.R. Hammerschmidt, W. Landing, R. D.G., J. Simons, and S. Wolfe. 2015. White Paper on Gulf of Mexico Mercury Fate and Transport: Applying Scientific Research to Reduce the Risk from Mercury in Gulf of Mexico Seafood. NOAA Technical Memorandum NOS NCCOS 192. 54 p.
- Evans, D.W., and P.H. Crumley. 2005. Mercury in Florida Bay Fish: spatial distribution of elevated concentrations and possible linkages to Everglades restoration. *Bulletin of Marine Science* 77: 321-346.
- Farmer, T.M., R.A. Wright, and D.R. DeVries. 2010. Mercury Concentration in Two Estuarine Fish Populations across a Seasonal Salinity Gradient. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* 139: 1896-1912.
- Fry, B., and M.M. Chumchal. 2012. Mercury bioaccumulation in estuarine food webs. *Ecological Applications* 22: 606-623.
- Fry, B., and T.J. Smith. 2002. Stable isotope studies of red mangroves and filter feeders from the Shark River estuary, Florida. *Bulletin of Marine Science* 70: 871-890.
- Gorski, P., D. Armstrong, J. Hurley, and D. Krabbenhoft. 2008. Influence of natural dissolved organic carbon on the bioavailability of mercury to a freshwater alga. *Environmental Pollution* 154: 116-123.
- Grieb, T.M., C.T. Driscoll, C.L. Schofield, G.L. Bowie, and D.B. Porcella. 1990. Factors affecting mercury accumulation in fish in the upper Michigan peninsula. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 9: 919-930.
- Gu, B., D. Axelrad, and T. Lange. 2012. Chapter 3B: Regional mercury and sulfur monitoring and Environmental Assessment. In Pages 3B-1 to 3B-45 in 2012 South Florida Environmental Report. South Florida Water Management District and Florida Department of Environmental Protection. West Palm Beach, FL. Available online at: http://apps.sfwmd.gov/sfwmd/SFER/2012_SFER/v1/chapters/v1_ch3b.pdf.
- Guentzel, J.L., W.M. Landing, G.A. Gill, and C.D. Pollman. 2001. Processes influencing rainfall deposition of mercury in Florida. *Environmental Science & Technology* 35: 863-873.
- Harris, R., C. Pollman, W. Landing, D. Evans, D. Axelrad, D. Hutchinson, S.L. Morey, D. Rumbold, D. Dukhovskoy, D.H. Adams, K. Vijayaraghavan, C. Holmes, R.D. Atkinson, T. Myers, and E. Sunderland. 2012. Mercury in the Gulf of Mexico: Sources to receptors. *Environmental Research* 119: 42-52.
- Heyes, A., R.P. Mason, E.H. Kim, and E. Sunderland. 2006. Mercury methylation in estuaries: Insights from using measuring rates using stable mercury isotopes. *Marine Chemistry* 102: 134-147.

- Hong, Y.-S., P. Hull, E. Rifkin, and E.J. Bouwer. 2013. Bioaccumulation and biomagnification of mercury and selenium in the Sarasota Bay ecosystem. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 32: 1143-1152.
- Jardine, T.D., K.A. Kidd, and A.T. Fisk. 2006. Applications, considerations, and sources of uncertainty when using stable isotope analysis in ecotoxicology. *Environmental Science & Technology* 40: 7501-7511.
- Kidd, K.A., H.A. Bootsma, R.H. Hesslein, W. Lyle Lockhart, and R.E. Hecky. 2003. Mercury concentrations in the food web of Lake Malawi, East Africa. *Journal of Great Lakes Research* 29: 258-266.
- Kidd, K.A., M. Clayden, and T.D. Jardine. 2012a. Bioaccumulation and Biomagnification of Mercury through food webs. In *Environmental Chemistry and Toxicology of Mercury*, John Wiley & Sons Inc, ed. G. Liu, Y. Cai and N. O'Driscoll, 455-499.
- Kidd, K.A., R.H. Hesslein, R.J.P. Fudge, and K.A. Hallard. 1995. The influence of trophic level as measured by $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ on mercury concentrations in freshwater organisms. *Water, Air, & Soil Pollution* 80: 1011-1015.
- Kidd, K.A., D.C. Muir, M.S. Evans, X. Wang, M. Whittle, H.K. Swanson, T. Johnston, and S. Guildford. 2012b. Biomagnification of mercury through lake trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*) food webs of lakes with different physical, chemical and biological characteristics. *Science of the Total Environment* 438: 135-143.
- Lavoie, R.A., T.D. Jardine, M.M. Chumchal, K.A. Kidd, and L.M. Campbell. 2013. Biomagnification of Mercury in Aquatic Food Webs: A Worldwide Meta-Analysis. *Environmental Science & Technology* 47: 13385-13394.
- Ley, J., C. McIvor, and C. Montague. 1999. Fishes in mangrove prop-root habitats of northeastern Florida Bay: distinct assemblages across an estuarine gradient. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 48: 701-723.
- Matich, P., and M.R. Heithaus. 2013. Multi-tissue stable isotope analysis and acoustic telemetry reveal seasonal variability in the trophic interactions of juvenile bull sharks in a coastal estuary. *Journal of Animal Ecology*.
- NRC (National Research Council). 2000. Toxicological effects of Methylmercury. Committee on the Toxicological Effects of Methylmercury, Board on Environmental Studies and Toxicology, Commission on Life Sciences, National Research Council, National Academy Press, Washington, DC, USA.
- Odum, W., 1970. Utilization of the direct grazing and plant detritus food chains by the striped mullet *Mugil cephalus*. Pages 222–240 in H. Steele (ed.). *Marine Food Chains*. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh.
- Peterson, S.A., J. Van Sickle, R.M. Hughes, J.A. Schacher, and S.F. Echols. 2005. A biopsy procedure for determining file and predicting whole-fish mercury concentration. *Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology* 48: 99-107.
- Pineda, J.E.M. 2003. The contribution of mangrove outwelling to coastal food webs as a function of environmental settings. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Louisiana at Lafayette USA.
- Rehage, J.S., and W.F. Loftus. 2007. Seasonal fish community variation in headwater mangrove creeks in the southwestern Everglades: an examination of their role as dry-down refuges. *Bulletin of Marine Science* 80: 625-645.
- Riget, F., P. Møller, R. Dietz, T. Nielsen, G. Asmund, J. Strand, M. Larsen, and K. Hobson. 2007. Transfer of mercury in the marine food web of West Greenland. *J. Environ. Monit.* 9: 877-883.

- Rumbold, D., R. Wasno, N. Hammerschlag, and A. Volety. 2014. Mercury Accumulation in Sharks From the Coastal Waters of Southwest Florida. *Arch Environ Contam Toxicol* 67: 402–412.
- Rumbold, D.G., D.W. Evans, S. Niemczyk, L.E. Fink, K.A. Laine, N. Howard, D.P. Krabbenhoft, and M. Zucker. 2011. Source Identification of Florida Bay's Methylmercury Problem: Mainland Runoff Versus Atmospheric Deposition and In situ Production. *Estuaries and Coasts* 34: 494–513.
- Rumbold, D.G., K.E. Miller, T.A. Dellinger, and N. Haas. 2016. Mercury Concentrations in Feathers of Adult and Nestling Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) from Coastal and Freshwater Environments of Florida. *Arch Environ Contam Toxicol* 72: 31–38.
- Showalter, L.M. 2010. Mercury bioaccumulation in the biota of Mobile Bay, Alabama, Unpublished master's thesis. The University of Alabama.
- Stordal, M., G. Gill, L. S. Wen, and P. Santschi. 1996. Mercury phase speciation in the surface waters of three Texas estuaries: Importance of colloidal forms. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 41:52–61.
- Sunderland, E.M. 2007. Mercury exposure from domestic and imported estuarine and marine fish in the US seafood market. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 115: 235–242.
- Swanson, H.K., and K.A. Kidd. 2010. Mercury Concentrations in Arctic Food Fishes Reflect the Presence of Anadromous Arctic Charr (*Salvelinus alpinus*), Species, and Life History. *Environmental Science & Technology* 44: 3286–3292.
- Thera, J.C., and D.G. Rumbold. 2014. Biomagnification of mercury through a subtropical coastal food web off Southwest Florida. *Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry* 33: 65–73.
- USEPA. 1997. Mercury Study Report to Congress. Volume VI: An Ecological Assessment for Anthropogenic Mercury Emissions in the United States. EPA-452/R-97-008. Office of Air Quality Planning and Standards and Office of Research and Development, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. December 1997. Available online at www.epa.gov/ttn/atw/112nmerc/volume6.pdf.
- USEPA. 2001. Water Quality Criteria: Notice of Availability of Water Quality Criterion for the Protection of Human Health: Methylmercury. Federal Register: January 8, 2001, 66(5): 1341- 1359. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, D.C. Available online at www.epa.gov/fedrgstr/EPA WATER/2001/January/Day-08/w217.htm.
- Ward, D.M., K.H. Nislow, and C.L. Folt. 2010. Bioaccumulation syndrome: identifying factors that make some stream food webs prone to elevated mercury bioaccumulation. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1195: 62–83.
- Ware, F.J., H. Royals, and T. Lange. 1990. Mercury contamination in Florida largemouth bass. In *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the Southeast Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies*, 5–12.
- Wolf, N., S.A. Carleton, and C. Martínez del Río. 2009. Ten years of experimental animal isotopic ecology. *Functional Ecology* 23: 17–26.
- Wozniak, J.R., W.T. Anderson, D.L. Childers, E.E. Gaiser, C.J. Madden, and D.T. Rudnick. 2012. Potential N processing by southern Everglades freshwater marshes: Are Everglades marshes passive conduits for nitrogen? *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 96: 60–68.
- Zar, J. 1999. Biological statistics: Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.