


## Responses of carbonate system and CO<sub>2</sub> flux to extended drought and intense flooding in a semiarid subtropical estuary

Hongming Yao, Xinping Hu \*

Department of Physical and Environmental Science, Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi, Corpus Christi, Texas

### Abstract

Globally, estuaries are considered important CO<sub>2</sub> sources to the atmosphere. However, estuarine water carbonate chemistry and CO<sub>2</sub> flux studies have focused on temperate and high latitude regions, leaving a significant data gap in subtropical estuaries. In this study, we examined water column carbonate system and air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux in the Mission-Aransas Estuary, a subtropical semiarid estuary in the northwestern Gulf of Mexico, by collecting samples at five System Wide Monitoring Program stations from 05/2014 to 04/2015. The carbonate system parameters (total alkalinity [TA], dissolved inorganic carbon [DIC], pH, CO<sub>2</sub> partial pressure [*p*CO<sub>2</sub>], and carbonate saturation state with respect to aragonite [ $\Omega_{Ar}$ ]) and air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux all displayed substantial seasonal and spatial variations. Based on freshwater inflow conditions, a drought period occurred between 05/2014 and 02/2015, while a flooding period occurred from 03/2015 to 04/2015. Average DIC was  $2194.7 \pm 156.8 \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$  and  $2132.5 \pm 256.8 \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$ , TA was  $2497.6 \pm 172.1 \mu\text{mol}\cdot\text{kg}^{-1}$  and  $2333.4 \pm 283.1 \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$ , *p*CO<sub>2</sub> was  $477 \pm 94 \mu\text{atm}$  and  $529 \pm 251 \mu\text{atm}$ , and CO<sub>2</sub> flux was  $28.3 \pm 18.0 \text{ mmol}\cdot\text{C}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{d}^{-1}$  and  $51.6 \pm 83.9 \text{ mmol}\cdot\text{C}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{d}^{-1}$  in the drought and flooding period, respectively. Integrated annual air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux during our studied period was estimated to be  $12.4 \pm 3.3 \text{ mol}\cdot\text{C}\cdot\text{m}^{-2}\cdot\text{yr}^{-1}$ , indicating that this estuary was a net CO<sub>2</sub> source. High wind speed, warm climate, riverine input, and estuarine biogeochemical processes all contributed to the high CO<sub>2</sub> efflux despite the modest *p*CO<sub>2</sub> levels year round.

Human activities have significantly increased atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration since the Industrial Revolution. Although occupying a small area (approximately 0.3%) of the global ocean, estuaries play a disproportionately important role in the global CO<sub>2</sub> budget (Bauer et al. 2013). In general, estuaries are a net CO<sub>2</sub> source due to net heterotrophy. For example, Frankignoulle (1998) suggested that CO<sub>2</sub> efflux from European estuaries represents 5–10% of anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions throughout Europe. Global estuarine CO<sub>2</sub> emissions could reach an approximate rate of 0.1–0.25 Pg·C·yr<sup>-1</sup>, which is on the same order of magnitude as continental shelf CO<sub>2</sub> uptake and equivalent to as much as 30% of total riverine carbon export (Zhai et al. 2007; Cai 2011; Bauer et al. 2013; Chen et al. 2013; Regnier et al. 2013; Laruelle

et al. 2015). Large CO<sub>2</sub> release from estuaries could be attributed to hydrologic conditions (i.e., due to higher dissolved inorganic carbon [DIC] to alkalinity ratio in river waters than the receiving seawater) and intensive biological activities. For example, Joesoef et al. (2015) found that more CO<sub>2</sub> is released into the atmosphere in the upper Delaware estuary than the lower estuary, and Guo et al. (2009) reported that CO<sub>2</sub> flux in the Pear River Estuary is dominated by aerobic remineralization of organic matter.

There are many uncertainties in estimating CO<sub>2</sub> flux in an estuary. A major reason for such uncertainty is temporal variation of riverine fluxes (Abril et al. 2004; Crosswell et al. 2014) that are not easily captured in estuarine studies, which tend to have low temporal sampling resolution. On the other hand, despite that lagoonal estuaries are generally recognized as important CO<sub>2</sub> sources particularly in tropical and temperate areas (Laruelle et al. 2010), whether the existing global estimate in those studied areas can represent all estuarine types is unknown given the drastically different hydrologic conditions of these estuaries. As one of the world's largest subtropical lagoonal estuary systems (Dürr et al. 2011), the northwestern Gulf of Mexico (GOM) estuaries lack data for studying the CO<sub>2</sub> source/sink issue. Located in a semiarid subtropical region, south Texas has been

\*Correspondence: xinping.hu@tamucc.edu

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**Special Issue:** Headwaters to Oceans: Ecological and Biogeochemical Contrasts Across the Aquatic Continuum  
Edited by: Marguerite Xenopoulos, John A. Downing, M. Dileep Kumar, Susanne Menden-Deuer, and Maren Voss

experiencing prolonged drought with intense flooding occurring intermittently, thus estuaries in this area receive generally low riverine inflows, punctuated by large storms (Milliman et al. 2008; Mooney and McClelland 2012). How the changing hydrologic state alters CO<sub>2</sub> flux and its magnitude is unclear.

In an estuary, carbonate system parameters are usually controlled by mixing and biogeochemical processes. An estuary that receives variable nutrient and organic matter input from a river will have altered metabolic processes, which will affect the carbonate system (Doney et al. 2009; Feely et al. 2010). For example, in the Chwaka Bay of Tanzania, due to the presence of seagrass, pH increases and total DIC decreases through enhanced photosynthesis and calcification (Semesi et al. 2009); while in the Long Island Sound, significant pH reduction could occur when enhanced respiration in subsurface water is coupled with CO<sub>2</sub> production (Wallace et al. 2014). In estuaries with significant freshwater influence, carbonate saturation state with respect to aragonite ( $\Omega_{Ar}$ ) is strongly correlated with salinity. For example, in Glacier Bay in the eastern Gulf of Alaska, low total alkalinity (TA) concentration, resulting from glacier discharge, decreases  $\Omega_{Ar}$  substantially to below aragonite undersaturation (Reisdorph and Mathis 2014). The carbonate system parameters in high latitude estuaries have large fluctuations due to significant seasonal changes in freshwater flux, nutrient delivery, and light intensity (Cross et al. 2013; Reisdorph and Mathis 2014). Even in a single estuary, carbonate system parameters could change quickly because of varying riverine input and strength of biological activities, as well as weather conditions (Mooney and McClelland 2012).

In this study, we characterized carbonate chemistry and CO<sub>2</sub> flux in the Mission-Aransas Estuary (MAE). Our primary goals were to understand how the carbonate system in MAE responded to freshwater input, and to study the air-water CO<sub>2</sub> flux in this estuary and understand its control(s).

## Materials and methods

### Field sampling

MAE is a shallow lagoonal estuary located along the south Texas coast in the northwestern GOM (Fig. 1). It consists of three connected water bodies: Aransas Bay is defined as a primary bay and is connected to the GOM via the Aransas ship channel; Copano and Mesquite are secondary bays closer to riverine input (Kim and Montagna 2012). Copano Bay receives freshwater inflows directly from the Mission and Aransas Rivers, the two major freshwater sources for the entire estuary. Mesquite Bay receives inflow from adjacent San Antonio Bay during flooding periods.

Five long-term System Wide Monitoring Program (SWMP) stations were established in the MAE by the Mission-Aransas National Estuarine Research Reserve (MA-NERR) in 2007 (Fig. 1, <https://sites.cns.utexas.edu/manerr>). The SWMP program is a nationally coordinated and standardized program and is

used for tracking short-term variability and long-term changes in a host of biological, physical, and chemical parameters. The five stations were designed to represent key estuarine conditions that range from freshwater inflow (station CW in Fig. 1) to hydrologic connection between the estuary and the GOM (SC; Evans et al. 2015). Water depths at these sampling stations ranged from 1.2 m (MB) to 6.2 m (SC).

Surface and bottom water samples were taken by a Van Dorn water sampler during the 05/2014–04/2015 period following the standard protocol for ocean CO<sub>2</sub> studies (Dickson et al. 2007). From 11/2014 to 03/2015, samples were taken monthly, and sampling occurred biweekly during the warmer months in the rest of our sampling year. All field samplings were done between 09:00 h and 14:00 h. Briefly, 250 mL narrow-neck borosilicate glass bottles were used to collect water samples for TA, DIC, and pH analyses. 100  $\mu$ L of saturated HgCl<sub>2</sub> was added to the water sample to arrest biological activity. The samples were stored at 4°C in the dark until analysis, usually within 2–3 weeks of sample collection. One hundred twenty-five milliliters polypropylene bottles were used to collect Ca<sup>2+</sup> samples. In the study by Bockmon and Dickson (2014), filtration for coastal water carbonate system characterization was recommended. However, we did not find significant difference between filtered and unfiltered samples in this estuary (also see Hu et al. 2015), thus we used unfiltered samples for this study. A calibrated YSI 6600 V2 data sonde was used to obtain in situ temperature, pressure, and dissolved oxygen (DO) concentration at each station.


To examine the effect of freshwater inflow on the estuarine carbonate system, we imported daily discharge data from the United States Geological Survey (USGS) real-time stream flow record (<http://waterdata.usgs.gov/tx/nwis/rt>) for Mission (USGS #08189500) and Aransas Rivers (USGS #08189700), then calculated monthly riverine discharge. Wind speed and barometric pressure were obtained every 30 min from the weather station at Copano East (CE) (<http://lighthouse.tamucc.edu/pq>), and daily mean wind speed was applied to sampling days. Wind speed data collected from the weather station (3 m) was converted to 10 m above the water surface using the wind profile power law,

$$\frac{u_1}{u_2} = \left(\frac{z_1}{z_2}\right)^P \quad (1)$$

here  $u_2$  is the wind speed at height  $z_2 = 10$  m,  $u_1$  is the collected wind speed data at height  $z_1 = 3$  m, the exponent  $P$  (0.11) around GOM area is extracted by Hsu et al. (1994;  $p = 0.11$ ).

### Chemical analyses

All water samples were analyzed for DIC, TA, pH, and salinity. Ca<sup>2+</sup> was analyzed for surface water only. For DIC analysis, 0.5 mL water sample was acidified by 0.5 mL 10% H<sub>3</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> using a 2.5 mL syringe pump. The released CO<sub>2</sub> was




**Fig. 1.** The map of the Mission-Aransas Estuary (MAE) and the five System Wide Monitoring Program stations.

analyzed on an AS-C3 DIC analyzer (Apollo SciTech). To analyze TA, 25 mL water sample was titrated with a 0.1 M HCl solution (in 0.5 M NaCl) using an AS-ALK2 alkalinity titrator (Apollo SciTech). Temperature of the titration vessel was maintained at  $22 \pm 0.1^\circ\text{C}$  using a water-jacketed circulation system. Certified Reference Material or CRM (Dickson et al. 2003) was used to construct the standard curve for the DIC analysis and to calibrate the acid used for TA titration. DIC and TA analyses had a precision of  $\pm 0.1\%$ .

A spectrophotometric method (Carter et al. 2013) using purified m-cresol purple (mCP) obtained from Dr. Robert Byrne's lab (University of South Florida) was used for pH analysis on total scale (Liu et al. 2011). The indicator was adjusted to  $\text{pH } 7.92 \pm 0.01$  every time before sample analysis with the aid of a calibrated Orion<sup>TM</sup> Ross<sup>TM</sup> glass electrode. A 10-cm water-jacketed absorbance cell used for pH measurements (Carter et al. 2013) was kept at  $25 \pm 0.01^\circ\text{C}$ . The dye

effect was corrected via duplicate runs of each sample by adding two volumes ( $30 \mu\text{L}$  and  $60 \mu\text{L}$ ) of mCP following the procedure in Clayton and Byrne (1993). This method had a precision of  $\pm 0.0004$  pH unit. Because of salinity limitations of the spectrophotometric method (20–40, Liu et al. 2011), for lower salinity samples we used the calibrated pH electrode to measure pH at  $25^\circ\text{C}$ . All pH values obtained using the potentiometric method were converted to total scale using temperature and salinity (Millero 2001).

Salinity was measured using a benchtop salinometer (Orion Star<sup>TM</sup> A12, Thermo Scientific), which was calibrated using MilliQ water and known salinity CRM seawater each time before sample analysis. The salinometer was also regularly calibrated with 0.5 M KCl at  $25^\circ\text{C}$ .  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  concentration was determined by potentiometric titration (Kanamori and Ikegami 1980) using EGTA as the titrant. The end-point was detected using a Metrohm<sup>®</sup> calcium-selective electrode on a



**Fig. 2.** The difference between measured and calculated TA (from pH and DIC) and its relationship with salinity.

semi-automated titration system. This method had a precision of  $\pm 0.5\%$  for estuarine waters.

Water  $p\text{CO}_2$  and  $\Omega_{\text{ar}}$  at field conditions were calculated using the program CO2SYS (Lewis and Wallace, 1998) based on DIC and lab measured pH. We used measured pH and DIC as input variables instead of the pH/TA combination to calculate  $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{water}}$  to avoid possible errors that were resulted from organic alkalinity component (Abril et al. 2015). In fact, we found that the difference between titration alkalinity and calculated alkalinity (with pH and DIC) showed strong salinity dependence in the MAE (Fig. 2). Although calculated  $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{water}}$  was subject to some degree of uncertainty, previous studies showed an 1 : 1 linear relationship between measured and calculated  $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{water}}$  over a range of 300–4000  $\mu\text{atm}$  in estuarine and coastal waters (Frankignoulle and Borges 2001).

Calculated  $\Omega_{\text{ar}}$  from CO2SYS output was corrected using measured  $\text{Ca}^{2+}$  concentration, which was a near perfect linear function of salinity throughout the year ( $r^2 = 0.99$ , data not shown). Carbonic acid dissociation constants ( $K_1$ ,  $K_2$ ) in Millero (2010), bisulfate dissociation constant in Dickson (1990) were used in this calculation. In the MAE (<http://missionaransas.org/science/download-data>), the soluble reactive phosphorous concentration was on the order of  $\sim 2.0 \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$  or less, and silicate concentration was on the order of  $\sim 200 \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$ . The effect of nutrients on calculated  $\Omega_{\text{ar}}$  and  $p\text{CO}_2$  was minimal. For example,  $p\text{CO}_2$  would only differ by 0.2  $\mu\text{atm}$  with or without nutrients in the CO2SYS

program. Because not all water samples that were characterized for carbonate chemistry had concurrent nutrient information, nutrients were omitted in all carbonate speciation calculations.

#### Air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux calculation

The air–water flux of CO<sub>2</sub> was calculated using the following equation:

$$F = kK_0(p\text{CO}_{2,\text{water}} - p\text{CO}_{2,\text{air}}) \quad (2)$$

where  $k$  ( $\text{m}\cdot\text{d}^{-1}$ ) is the gas transfer velocity calculated from wind speed,  $K_0$  ( $\text{mol}\cdot\text{m}^{-3}\cdot\text{atm}^{-1}$ ) is the gas solubility at measured in situ temperature and salinity (Weiss 1974),  $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{water}}$  and  $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{air}}$  are partial pressure of CO<sub>2</sub> in surface water and the atmosphere, respectively. Positive  $F$  value means CO<sub>2</sub> degassing to the atmosphere.  $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{air}}$  can be calculated from:

$$p\text{CO}_{2,\text{air}} = x\text{CO}_{2,\text{air}} \times (P_b - P_w) \quad (3)$$

Here  $P_b$  (atm) is the barometric pressure, which was downloaded from the weather station at Copano East (CE),  $P_w$  (atm) is the water vapor pressure calculated using salinity and temperature (Weiss and Price 1980), and  $x\text{CO}_{2,\text{air}}$  (ppm) is the mole fraction atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> in dry air. We did not measure air  $x\text{CO}_2$  directly but chose to download monthly averaged  $x\text{CO}_2$  data from <http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/gmd/ccgg/trends>. We recognized the spatial difference in  $x\text{CO}_2$  on

the global scale. However, compared to the xCO<sub>2</sub> data from a coastal CO<sub>2</sub> monitoring site in eastern GOM (<https://www.pmel.noaa.gov/co2/story/Coastal+MS>), monthly average xCO<sub>2</sub> is no more than 15 ppm greater in the GOM than the Mauna Loa site in winter and the two xCO<sub>2</sub> records generally agree with each other to within ± 2 ppm in summer. Therefore the subsequently calculated CO<sub>2</sub> flux would differ by a few percent using either xCO<sub>2</sub> record (or the actual xCO<sub>2</sub> at MAE). Given that the GOM site does not have a continuous dataset, we used the Mauna Loa data for our calculation.

Gas transfer velocity ( $k$ ) would differ depending on wind speed, tidal current, and bottom topography (Wanninkhof 1992; Raymond and Cole 2001). Unfortunately, there is no widely accepted  $k$  formulation in shallow estuary regions, and the carbon cycle community still has to rely on wind speed dependence to estimate gas exchange rates. Because the equation in Raymond and Cole (2001) was mainly based on relatively low wind speed (< 7 m·s<sup>-1</sup>) estuarine data, here we used the equation in Jiang et al. (2008), which covered larger amount of high wind speed data (up to 12 m·s<sup>-1</sup>) and was more appropriate to our studied area:

$$k = (0.314 \cdot U^2 - 0.436 \cdot U + 3.99) \times (Sc_{SST}/600)^{-0.5} \quad (4)$$

where  $U$  is the wind speed at 10-m height (m·s<sup>-1</sup>),  $Sc_{SST}$  indicates Schmidt number of CO<sub>2</sub> at the in situ temperature from the freshwater (flooding period) and seawater (drought period) equations, respectively (Wanninkhof 1992). This equation has also been adopted in recent estuarine studies (Bozec et al. 2012; Crosswell et al. 2012).

The total surface area of Aransas and Copano bays is 452 km<sup>2</sup> based on Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) record. Aransas Bay occupies 181 km<sup>2</sup> with estimated 10% of its area in the Aransas Ship Channel where the station SC is located, and Copano Bay is 271 km<sup>2</sup>. There is no published record on the area of Mesquite Bay. We estimated its area using a closet rectangle on Google Earth<sup>®</sup> and calculated its area as 75 km<sup>2</sup>. Due to relatively limited sampling stations, we decided to use area-weighted average method to calculate CO<sub>2</sub> flux in the MAE instead of taking arithmetic mean of the individual stations. Our results showed that the difference between these two methods for each trip was 2.5 ± 7.0 mmol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·d<sup>-1</sup>, and integrated annual CO<sub>2</sub> flux is 12.4 mol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·yr<sup>-1</sup>, compared with 11.4 mol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·yr<sup>-1</sup> using the arithmetic mean. We first calculated area-weighted CO<sub>2</sub> flux using CO<sub>2</sub> flux values at the five sampling stations and the respective areas above. Then to estimate seasonally (drought and flooding periods) or annually averaged CO<sub>2</sub> flux, we used the following equation:

$$F_{avg} = \frac{\sum F_i \times d_i}{\sum d_i} \quad (5)$$

$F_{avg}$  is area-weighted CO<sub>2</sub> flux and has a unit of mmol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·d<sup>-1</sup> or mol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·yr<sup>-1</sup>,  $F_i$  is air-water CO<sub>2</sub> flux of each

sampling trip,  $d_i$  indicates days in between two consecutive trips. Note in our CO<sub>2</sub> flux calculations we did not consider diel effect. Given that our sampling always took place during the middle of the day (09:00–14:00 h) when  $pCO_2$  was likely the lowest due to photosynthesis, calculated fluxes may represent lower estimates of the actual values (Baumann et al. 2014).

### Thermal and non-thermal effects on $pCO_2$ variations

Thermal and non-thermal effects on  $pCO_{2,water}$  variations were evaluated using the method in Takahashi et al. (2002, Eqs. 5–9). To remove the temperature effect, we normalized  $pCO_{2,water}$  to annual mean temperature of 23.0°C ( $T_{mean}$ , Eq. 6). In surface seawater  $pCO_2$  doubles for every 16°C increase in the oceanic waters ( $\partial \ln pCO_2 / \partial T = 0.0423$ ; Takahashi et al. 1993). However, the average  $\partial \ln pCO_2 / \partial T$  of MAE water was calculated to be slightly lower ( $0.0411 \pm 0.0068$ ) than open ocean water. To evaluate the effect of temperature change on  $pCO_2$ , we used Eq. 7.

$$pCO_{2,non-thermal} = pCO_{2,obs} \times \exp[\delta \times (T_{mean} - T_{obs})] \quad (6)$$

$$pCO_{2,thermal} = pCO_{2,mean} \times \exp[\delta \times (T_{obs} - T_{mean})] \quad (7)$$

where  $\delta$  is  $\partial \ln pCO_2 / \partial T$ , subscripts mean and obs stand for annual mean and observed values, respectively.

To understand relative contributions of thermal and non-thermal effects on temporal  $pCO_2$  changes, we applied the following equations:

$$\Delta pCO_{2,thermal} = \text{Max}(pCO_{2,thermal}) - \text{Min}(pCO_{2,thermal}) \quad (8)$$


$$\Delta pCO_{2,non-thermal} = \text{Max}(pCO_{2,non-thermal}) - \text{Min}(pCO_{2,non-thermal}) \quad (9)$$

$$T/B = \Delta pCO_{2,thermal} / \Delta pCO_{2,non-thermal} \quad (10)$$

Both  $\Delta pCO_{2,thermal}$  and  $\Delta pCO_{2,non-thermal}$  were calculated from the difference between the maximum and the minimum  $pCO_2$  effects during either the drought or the flooding period. The T/B ratio illustrated the relative importance of thermal vs. non-thermal effects. In MAE, non-thermal effect indicated the combination of biogeochemical processes and physical mixing. Thermal effect on surface  $pCO_{2,water}$  would exceed non-thermal if T/B ratio was greater than 1; conversely, non-thermal effect would dominate if T/B ratio was less than 1.

### Data analysis

A two-factor analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the effects of hydrologic condition and sampling locations on carbonate variables and CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes. Probabilities ( $p$ ) of < 0.05 were considered as significant. Normality and homogeneity of variance were ensured before ANOVA was conducted and there was no need to transform the data.



**Fig. 3.** Monthly freshwater discharges from two major rivers into the MAE from 05/2014 to 04/2015 (data source, USGS).

## Results

### Hydrologic conditions

During our sampling year, the drought period (05/2014–02/2015, 18 trips in total) was much longer than the flooding period (03/2015–04/2015, four trips in total; Fig. 3). Annual discharge for Mission River was  $8.29 \times 10^7 \text{ m}^3 \cdot \text{yr}^{-1}$  while discharge for Aransas River was  $1.88 \times 10^7 \text{ m}^3 \cdot \text{yr}^{-1}$ . Aransas River had more discharge during the drought period (07/2014–02/2015), in which the month with the least discharge was recorded in August 2014 for Aransas and Mission Rivers ( $97.40 \times 10^3$  and  $0 \text{ m}^3 \text{ month}^{-1}$ , respectively). However, Mission River had more freshwater input during the flooding period (03/2015–04/2015). The MAE was affected by two strong storms in late 03/2015 and 04/2015 (Fig. 3). During this period, Mission River discharge was almost twice as much as Aransas River. The highest discharge from Aransas River ( $51.25 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) was recorded in 03/2015 and discharge from Mission River was the highest ( $118.93 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) in 04/2015.

The average values of all physical and chemical parameters for the five stations during the drought and the flooding periods are listed in Table 1 and Fig. 4. The average water temperature during our study period was  $23.0 \pm 6.3^\circ\text{C}$  ( $N = 216$ ), with the highest temperature (average  $29.3 \pm 0.7^\circ\text{C}$ ;  $N = 20$ ) observed in 08/2014 and the lowest (average  $10.0 \pm 1.0^\circ\text{C}$ ;  $N = 10$ ) in 01/2015. High temperatures ( $> 25^\circ\text{C}$ ) lasted from mid-spring to fall (05/2014–10/2014), a period much longer than low temperature conditions ( $< 15^\circ\text{C}$ , 11/2014, 01/2015 – early 03/2015). Temperature

fluctuated between  $15^\circ\text{C}$  and  $25^\circ\text{C}$  for the remainder of the sampling period (12/2014, late 03/2015 – 04/2015).

During the entire sampling period, average DO concentration was  $212.5 \pm 33.7 \mu\text{mol} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$  ( $N = 216$ , Fig. 4). Higher DO concentrations occurred during cold months (11/2014 ~ 02/2015). Slight DO stratification occurred in Copano Bay (CW and CE) mostly in spring and summer. In particular, there was a sharp decrease in DO (from  $249.8 \mu\text{mol} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$  to  $70.4 \mu\text{mol} \cdot \text{kg}^{-1}$ ) in CW bottom waters after the first storm event in late 03/2015.


Average salinity was  $33.0 \pm 5.4$  ( $N = 216$ , Fig. 4) during our sampling period. During the drought period there was a gradient from lowest salinity ( $33.6 \pm 2.2$ , SC;  $N = 35$ ) in the lower primary bay to highest salinity ( $36.9 \pm 2.4$ , CW;  $N = 36$ ) in the upper secondary bays. Hypersaline conditions ( $S > 36.4$ ) occurred at all five stations from 06/2014 to 09/2014, and persisted particularly long at CW (late 06/2014–01/2015). In early 09/2014, the average salinity of the entire estuary was  $38.7 \pm 0.8$  ( $N = 9$ ), which was the highest during our study period. On the contrary, during the flooding period, there was a salinity gradient (surface and bottom average) across the estuary from the lowest ( $18.9 \pm 10.4$ , CW;  $N = 8$ ) to the highest ( $29.0 \pm 3.2$ , SC;  $N = 8$ ). Salinity stratification was only observed in Copano Bay. Salinity decreased sharply at CW after the flood (from 30.1 to 5.1 for surface water).

### Carbonate chemistry

All carbonate system parameters displayed significant spatial (station) and temporal differences (between the drought

**Table 1.** Physical and chemical conditions of MAE during drought and flooding periods in MAE. D and F indicate drought and flooding period, respectively.

Station	Period	Temp (°C)	Salinity	DO (μmol·kg <sup>-1</sup> )	DO%	pH	DIC (μmol·kg <sup>-1</sup> )	TA (μmol·kg <sup>-1</sup> )	pCO <sub>2,water</sub> (μatm)	Ω <sub>ar</sub>
Total	D	23.6 ± 6.6	34.7 ± 2.9	208.0 ± 31.8	97.2 ± 5.23	8.018 ± 0.080	2194.7 ± 156.8	2497.6 ± 172.1	477 ± 49	3.3 ± 0.6
	F	20.4 ± 4.3	24.5 ± 6.6	232.3 ± 34.8	95.1 ± 12.1	8.013 ± 0.149	2132.5 ± 256.8	2333.4 ± 283.1	529 ± 251	2.4 ± 0.7
CW	D	23.4 ± 6.9	36.9 ± 2.4	207.2 ± 29.3	97.9 ± 4.3	8.046 ± 0.042	2271.3 ± 199.3	2626.2 ± 234.5	450 ± 62	3.8 ± 0.9
	F	20.6 ± 4.3	18.9 ± 10.4	221.4 ± 65.0	87.3 ± 23.7	7.909 ± 0.269	1870.9 ± 390.0	2012.4 ± 414.6	709 ± 481	1.5 ± 0.8
CE	D	23.7 ± 6.9	35.0 ± 2.4	206.9 ± 31.7	97.2 ± 5.5	7.960 ± 0.084	2157.9 ± 180.2	2429.2 ± 174.8	542 ± 105	2.9 ± 0.3
	F	20.9 ± 4.7	23.7 ± 5.4	231.9 ± 28.8	97.2 ± 8.8	7.990 ± 0.112	2056.4 ± 136.6	2239.1 ± 134.1	529 ± 180	2.2 ± 0.4
AB	D	23.6 ± 6.6	34.4 ± 2.6	205.5 ± 32.3	95.9 ± 4.8	8.034 ± 0.044	2193.4 ± 94.6	2506.8 ± 77.9	453 ± 50	3.4 ± 0.7
	F	20.3 ± 4.6	26.1 ± 3.8	235.2 ± 24.4	96.8 ± 5.0	8.018 ± 0.064	2237.3 ± 88.4	2445.5 ± 107.6	507 ± 88	2.6 ± 0.4
SC	D	23.9 ± 5.5	33.6 ± 2.2	206.5 ± 28.3	96.3 ± 5.9	8.051 ± 0.069	2103.9 ± 54.5	2402.4 ± 47.4	423 ± 70	3.4 ± 0.4
	F	19.2 ± 4.2	29.0 ± 3.2	243.3 ± 18.6	98.7 ± 6.2	8.109 ± 0.048	2091.0 ± 25.1	2342.6 ± 36.7	368 ± 48	2.9 ± 0.2
MB	D	23.6 ± 7.3	33.6 ± 3.5	214.4 ± 38.2	98.9 ± 5.4	7.998 ± 0.109	2248.8 ± 149.6	2522.7 ± 157.5	521 ± 110	3.2 ± 0.3
	F	20.9 ± 4.5	24.5 ± 4.2	230.1 ± 21.1	95.7 ± 4.2	8.038 ± 0.086	2407.0 ± 52.2	2627.4 ± 50.7	530 ± 106	2.8 ± 0.3



**Fig. 4.** Seasonal variations of temperature, dissolved oxygen, and salinity in the MAE. The gray and black lines indicate surface and bottom water conditions, respectively.

**Table 2.** Temporal and spatial analysis of the carbonate system tested by two-way ANOVA. “√” denotes a significant main factor interaction between sampling time (i.e., drought–flooding cycle) and sampling location.

Parameter	Significant interaction	df	F	p
pH	√	4	5.522	<0.001
DIC	√	4	12.124	<0.001
TA	√	4	18.060	<0.001
pCO <sub>2,water</sub>	√	4	6.430	<0.001
Ω <sub>ar</sub>	√	4	11.953	<0.001

Both main factors (drought vs. flooding, sample stations) were significant.

and flooding periods) with two-way ANOVA *p* values < 0.001 for all cases (Table 2). Average pH in MAE was 8.017 ± 0.096 (*N* = 216) with relatively small seasonal and spatial variations compared with many estuarine studies to date. Nevertheless, pH was generally lower (average 7.983 ± 0.064; *N* = 49) when the temperature was high from late 07/2014 to 09/2014, during hypersaline conditions. Higher pH values (average 8.114 ± 0.046; *N* = 50) were observed at low temperature conditions from 11/2014 to early 03/2015, although pH decreased when the estuary switched from the drought to the flooding period, and a very sharp decline of pH at CW ( $\Delta = -0.536$  pH units) occurred right after the late 03/2015 storm event.

Annual DIC concentration averaged at 2183.2 ± 180.4 μmol·kg<sup>-1</sup> (*N* = 216, Fig. 5). Average DIC concentration was 2194.7 ± 156.8 μmol·kg<sup>-1</sup> (*N* = 176) during the drought period, and was lower from summer to early fall (2106.8 ± 100.6 μmol·kg<sup>-1</sup>, 06/2014–10/2014; *N* = 109) but higher in winter (2230.6 ± 96.0 μmol·kg<sup>-1</sup>, 11/2014–02/2015; *N* = 40). CW had the highest DIC concentration and SC had the lowest in drought condition. DIC concentrations during the flooding period (with an average of 2132.5 ± 256.8 μmol·kg<sup>-1</sup>; *N* = 40) were lower than the drought period. There was a large decrease in the surface waters at CW after the first storm event in late 03/2015 with DIC concentrations decreasing from 2239.4 μmol·kg<sup>-1</sup> (prior to the storm) to 1227.3 μmol·kg<sup>-1</sup> (after the storm). During the flooding period, MB had the highest DIC concentration, CW the lowest. Along with salinity stratification in Copano Bay during the flooding period, DIC concentration was lower in surface waters than the bottom water.

TA followed a temporal pattern similar to DIC (Fig. 5). Average TA concentration was 2467.2 ± 206.7 μmol·kg<sup>-1</sup> (*N* = 216) across the five stations during the entire sampling period. Average TA concentration was 2497.6 ± 172.1 μmol·kg<sup>-1</sup> (*N* = 176) and 2333.4 ± 283.1 μmol·kg<sup>-1</sup> (*N* = 40) during the drought and the flooding period, respectively.

For the entire estuary, average pCO<sub>2,water</sub> was 487 ± 138 μatm (*N* = 216, Fig. 5). It was 477 ± 94 μatm (*N* = 176) during the drought period, and 529 ± 251 μatm (*N* = 40) during the flooding period. During the drought period, the highest average pCO<sub>2,water</sub> occurred at CE (542 ± 105 μatm, *N* = 36) and lowest at SC (423 ± 70 μatm, *N* = 35). During the flooding period, pCO<sub>2,water</sub> in most stations increased, and CW had the highest average pCO<sub>2,water</sub>, and SC had the lowest. At the same time, calculated pCO<sub>2,air</sub> in MAE area during our study period averaged at 391 ± 6 μatm using observed monthly xCO<sub>2,air</sub> at the Mauna Loa site.

Annual average Ω<sub>ar</sub> was 3.2 ± 0.7 in the MAE (*N* = 216; Fig. 5). Average Ω<sub>ar</sub> first increased ( $\Delta = 0.7$ ) and then decreased ( $\Delta = -1.4$ ) in drought season, with both the highest (3.8 ± 0.9 at CW, *N* = 36) and lowest (2.9 ± 0.3 at CE, *N* = 36) average Ω<sub>ar</sub> values observed in Copano Bay. Average Ω<sub>ar</sub> decreased significantly during the transition from the drought period (average 3.3 ± 0.6; *N* = 176) to the flooding period (average 2.4 ± 0.7; *N* = 40). During the latter period, SC had the highest Ω<sub>ar</sub> (2.9 ± 0.2, *N* = 8) value and CW had the lowest (1.5 ± 0.8, *N* = 8).

#### Air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux

Average wind speed in the MAE was 6.2 ± 2.6 m·s<sup>-1</sup> (*N* = 17,520, Fig. 6) during our sampled period. The highest average (9.7 ± 0.9 m·s<sup>-1</sup>; *N* = 48) was observed in 08/2014 and lowest (2.1 ± 0.8 m·s<sup>-1</sup>; *N* = 48) was observed in 01/2015. During our study period, higher wind speed was recorded in summer (06/2014–08/2014, average 7.1 ± 2.3 m·s<sup>-1</sup>; *N* = 288) and winter had relatively lower wind speed (12/2014–02/2015, average 3.4 ± 1.6 m·s<sup>-1</sup>; *N* = 143).


Overall, annual average air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux was 12.4 ± 3.3 mol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·yr<sup>-1</sup> (*N* = 110, Fig. 6), and the entire estuary released CO<sub>2</sub> during most of our sampled period. Further, the air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux pattern displayed significant seasonal and spatial variations (*p* < 0.05 tested by two-way ANOVA; Fig. 6). Throughout the drought period, air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux varied between -13.5 ± 7.6 mmol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·d<sup>-1</sup> and 109.4 ± 71.3 mmol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·d<sup>-1</sup> (02/2015 and 08/2014, respectively; *N* = 5 for each average value). The estuary was a CO<sub>2</sub> source in the drought period during warm months (05/2014–10/2014) and was a sink during cold months (11/2014–02/2015). Moreover, there was an overall increase in CO<sub>2</sub> efflux from the drought to the flooding period mostly due to large increase of CO<sub>2</sub> emission at CW. In particular, there was a drastic increase (from 3.4 mmol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·d<sup>-1</sup> to 380.3 mmol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·d<sup>-1</sup>) at CW in late 03/2015 right after the first storm event.

## Discussion

### DIC and TA dynamics during the dry-wet cycle

Many Texas rivers have high levels of bicarbonate ion (HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>) as a result of high weathering rates of the drainage basins (Zeng et al. 2010) and generally high evaporation






**Fig. 5.** Seasonal variations of pH (total scale), DIC, TA,  $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{water}}$ , and  $\Omega_{\text{Ar}}$  in MAE. The gray and black lines indicate surface and bottom water conditions, respectively, and the straight lines in the  $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{water}}$  panels indicates  $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{air}}$ .

rates in the area (<http://www.twdb.texas.gov/surfacewater/conditions/evaporation/>). To unravel the factors that contributed to estuarine DIC and TA variations, we used the water chemistry data to construct two-endmember mixing diagrams for DIC and TA in the MAE during the drought and flooding periods, respectively (Figs. 7,8); we also investigated the effect of precipitation and evaporation. Note for the river endmembers, we did not take river endmember during the 2014–2015 boat trips. Since we did not have concurrent river chemistry data during our estuarine sampling period, to best estimate the river chemistry during the flooding and drought conditions, we collected river samples at Mission and Aransas rivers bimonthly between December 2015 and December 2016 (Table 3). Six trips were conducted

during a drought period, and one trip was conducted at the end of May 2016 after significant flooding in south Texas.


As discussed in Hu et al. (2015), along a river-ocean mixing line, the lowest solute to salinity ratio (i.e., the slope of the evaporation line) would be at the ocean endmember if there were no reactions that consumed this solute. Clearly, all the data points to the right of the dotted line (i.e., the precipitation–evaporation line for seawater endmember, Fig. 7) during the drought period reflected net removal of DIC (panels *a*, *b*, and *c*) and TA (panels *d*, *e*, and *f*), and the Copano Bay stations (CE and CW) also showed larger extent of DIC and TA consumption under hypersaline conditions (panels *a* and *d*). Furthermore, because the Mission River



**Fig. 6.** Air–water CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes at the five stations and wind speed (location) from 05/2014 to 04/2015.

had higher DIC and TA concentrations than the Aransas River (Table 3), the mixing line between the Mission River (the dashed line in Fig. 7) and the ocean water endmember (values in Table 3) should have a slightly steeper slope than that between the Aransas River and the ocean endmember (the solid line in Fig. 7). Therefore, all the data points that are bracketed by the river–ocean mixing lines and the left of the precipitation–evaporation line (to the lower of the plot) also indicated removal.

Normally in an estuarine mixing zone, data points that appear above a mixing line would indicate in situ production as many estuarine studies have indicated (Raymond et al. 2000). However, for lagoonal estuaries with prolonged residence time under drought conditions (Montagna et al. 2012), significant evaporation could increase solute concentration and salinity simultaneously based on the original river–ocean mixing line (*see* Hu et al. 2015 for a detailed discussion). Therefore, it is likely that evaporation may have




**Fig. 7.** DIC, TA vs. salinity during the drought period (05/2014–02/2015) in Copano Bay (a and d), Aransas Bay (b and e), and Mesquite Bay (c and f), respectively. The solid and dashed lines represent mixing lines between Aransas and Mission rivers and the Gulf of Mexico (GOM) coastal water, respectively, and the dotted line represents the evaporation line of the GOM coastal water.

played an important role in the water chemistry during the drought period (Fig. 7a,d). Our results could not rule out in situ production of DIC and TA in Copano Bay, although as one moves to Aransas Bay, consumption clearly dominated DIC and TA changes (Fig. 7b,e).

In the literature, alkalinity reduction has not been commonly reported in coastal estuaries (other than in coral reefs). Instead, alkalinity production due to net anaerobic reactions (pyrite burial and net denitrification) is often suggested as an important process (Dollar et al. 1991; Smith et al. 1991; Hu and Cai 2011). Alkalinity consumption due to calcification clearly is a possible mechanism as the MAE has abundant oyster reefs, representing the southernmost location for viable commercial production (Pollack et al. 2012). While not directly observed in the MAE, sulfate concentration in the adjacent Corpus Christi Bay immediately to the south of the MAE appeared to show excess relative to a conservative mixing during the drought

period (D. Murgulet pers. comm.), indicating possible external reduced sulfur contribution that was oxidized to sulfuric acid. In addition, Benoit et al. (1994) also observed high levels suspended matter that contains Fe in San Antonio Bay and Corpus Christi Bay, both of which “bracket” the MAE. It is known that oxidation of reduced sulfur and iron would produce  $\text{H}^+$  that titrates TA (Chen 2002). Given the shallow depth of the MAE and windy conditions in this area, significant benthic contribution (i.e., reoxidation of reduced sedimentary compounds) is likely, especially during high wind conditions that could cause abundant sediment resuspension. More detailed studies, such as examining sulfur and metal dynamics under different hydrologic conditions, are needed.

During the flooding period, DIC and TA concentrations in the river endmembers decreased (Table 3) presumably due to the dilution effect. Apparently, it became more difficult to explain the DIC and TA variations using the simple mixing



**Fig. 8.** DIC, TA vs. salinity during the flooding period (03/2015–04/2015) in Copano Bay (a and d), Aransas Bay (b and e), and Mesquite Bay (c and f), respectively. The solid and dashed lines represent mixing lines between Aransas and Mission rivers and the Gulf of Mexico (GOM) coastal water, respectively, and the dotted line represents the evaporation line of the GOM coastal water.


**Table 3.** Salinity, DIC, TA in the riverine and oceanic input endmembers.

	GOM*	Aransas River		Mission River	
		Drought (N=6)	Flooding	Drought (N=6)	Flooding
Salinity	36.4 ± 0.3	0.7 ± 0.1	0.1	0.7 ± 0.2	0.1
DIC (μmol·kg <sup>-1</sup> )	2063.4 ± 11.4	4345.1 ± 509.2	1841.7	4856.7 ± 761.5	2291.3
TA (μmol·kg <sup>-1</sup> )	2424.6 ± 12.7	4450 ± 542.0	1832.9	4843.1 ± 798.8	2265.0

\* Gulf of Mexico endmember was the average of the upper 30 m water column on the Texas shelf (N = 106; Hu, unpublished data); river end member was decided by our survey between December 2015 and December 2016, in which six trips were taken in drought periods and one trip was taken in wet period with similar water discharge condition based on the USGS gages data.

lines derived from the local rivers. However, a closer examination of the CW station data suggested that both surface (TA and DIC) and bottom waters (TA only) showed excellent mixing behavior while DIC in the bottom water showed slight respiration signal during the 2-month floodwater-

dominated period. For example, intercepts of TA-salinity regressions were 1207 μmol kg<sup>-1</sup> (r<sup>2</sup> = 0.95) for surface and 1449 μmol kg<sup>-1</sup> (r<sup>2</sup> = 0.99) for bottom water respectively; those of DIC-salinity regressions were 1123 μmol kg<sup>-1</sup> (r<sup>2</sup> = 0.98) for surface and 1374 μmol kg<sup>-1</sup> (r<sup>2</sup> = 0.89) for



**Fig. 9.** Seasonal variations of observed  $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{water}}$  ( $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{obs}}$ ), thermal  $p\text{CO}_2$  ( $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{thermal}}$ ), and non-thermal  $p\text{CO}_2$  ( $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{non-thermal}}$ ). The horizontal lines represent annual average values.

bottom water, respectively (Fig. 8a,d, regression lines not shown). Therefore, the stagnant endmember values (Table 3) were likely not accurate during the high freshwater inflow season, and the different regression intercepts between the surface and bottom waters may reflect changing freshwater endmember compositions (Cifuentes et al. 1990). Furthermore, Mesquite Bay (MB) (surface and bottom) and the Aransas Bay (bottom) showed “excess” DIC and TA compared to the river mixing line (Fig. 8b,c,e,f). This was likely caused by overflow of high alkalinity San Antonio River (up to  $5500 \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$ , Hu, unpublished data) water through Mesquite Bay (Evans et al. 2015) during the flooding period. This high alkalinity water influence decreased from Mesquite Bay to Aransas Bay.

#### Controlling factors on the $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{water}}$ variations during the dry-wet cycle

Carbonate system speciation in estuarine waters is controlled by various factors such as temperature, biological

processes (primary production, calcification, etc.), and river-ocean mixing (Bozec et al. 2012; Hu and Cai 2013; Hunt et al. 2014; Joesoef et al. 2015). Here we evaluated the effect of temperature and riverine inputs during the drought and flooding periods.

During the drought period, the mean amplitude of thermal effect on water  $p\text{CO}_2$  ( $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{thermal}} - p\text{CO}_{2,\text{water}}$ ) was  $\sim 190 \mu\text{atm}$ , which was partially compensated ( $\sim 100 \mu\text{atm}$ ) by counteractive non-thermal effect ( $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{non-thermal}} - p\text{CO}_{2,\text{water}}$ ), thus a net  $\sim 100 \mu\text{atm}$  of seasonal amplitude on  $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{water}}$  was observed when there was a warming effect from spring to summer or a cooling effect from summer to winter (Fig. 9). During the flooding period however, mean thermal effect declined to  $\sim 90 \mu\text{atm}$  as water temperature increased slightly in 03/2015, whereas there was a large fluctuation of non-thermal effect in 03/2015–04/2015. In particular, sharp increases in  $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{water}}$  was observed in Copano Bay (CW and CE, respectively, Fig. 9), and  $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{non-thermal}}$  reached its

**Table 4.** Thermal vs. non-thermal effects on pCO<sub>2</sub> variations in MAE.

Bay	Station	$\Delta p\text{CO}_{2,\text{thermal}} (\mu\text{atm})$		$\Delta p\text{CO}_{2,\text{non-thermal}} (\mu\text{atm})$		T/B	
		Drought	Flooding	Drought	Flooding	Drought	Flooding
Copano Bay	CW	371	194	335	991	1.11	0.20
	CE	379	206	309	361	1.23	0.57
Aransas Bay	AB	399	185	391	180	1.02	1.02
	SC	339	181	221	101	1.53	1.79
Mesquite Bay	MB	389	208	277	245	1.40	0.85

**Table 5.** Air–water CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes in different estuaries.

Estuary	Average air–water CO <sub>2</sub> flux (unit: mol·C·m <sup>-2</sup> ·yr <sup>-1</sup> for annual; mmol·C·m <sup>-2</sup> ·d <sup>-1</sup> for seasonal)					Latitude	Reference
	Annual	Spring (Mar–May)	Summer (Jun–Aug)	Fall (Sep–Nov)	Winter (Dec–Feb)		
<sup>a</sup> Kennebec (US)	3.5 ± 1.0	31.7	–	–	–11.5	44°48' N	Hunt et al. (2011)
<sup>a</sup> Delaware (US)	2.4 ± 4.8	–13.7 ± 16.4	13.4 ± 22.2	2.7 ± 6.6	15.6 ± 5.2	38°42'–39°18' N	Joesoef et al. (2015)
<sup>a</sup> Neuse River (US)	4.7	1.73	–0.84	38.4	12.1	34°40'–35°30' N	Crosswell et al. (2012)
<sup>b</sup> Florida Bay (US)	1.7	–	–	–	–	25°N	Millero et al. (2001)
<sup>b</sup> Kaneohe Bay (US)	1.5	–	–	–	–	21°24' N	Fagan and Mackenzie (2007)
<sup>b</sup> Loire (FR)	8.3 ± 15.5	–	–	–	–	46°30'–47°30' N	de la Paz et al. (2010)
<sup>b</sup> Changjiang (CN)	–1.9 ± 1.3	–8.8 ± 5.8	–4.9 ± 4.0	2.9 ± 2.5	–10.4 ± 2.3	29°30'–32°30' N	Zhai and Dai (2009)
<sup>b</sup> Pearl River (CN)	6.9 ± 2.6	12.2~79.4	5.3~108.2	15.4~24.9	–1.09~22.6	21°30'–23°30' N	Guo et al. (2009)
<sup>b</sup> Chalakudi (IN)	4.7	–	12.86	–	–	10°41' N	Sarma et al. (2012)
<sup>b</sup> Piaui River estuary (BR)	15.0	–	–	–	–	11°30' S	Souza et al. (2009)
<sup>a</sup> Mission-Aransas (US)	12.4 ± 3.3	41.8 ± 35.0	74.5 ± 41.1	23.8 ± 16.4	–8.9 ± 5.1	27°50'–28°08' N	This study

Superscripts a,b indicate different tidal types, a - microtidal estuary and b - macrotidal estuary.

highest concentration (1211  $\mu\text{atm}$ ) when the first storm came in late 03/2015. These increases indicated that the storm event caused a dramatic increase in non-thermal pCO<sub>2</sub> (biological and/or mixing). According to Bruesewitz et al. (2013), community respiration in Copano Bay would greatly increase following a storm (thus increasing pCO<sub>2</sub>). In addition, high river inflow resulted from storm event also brought in high pCO<sub>2</sub> water. The appearance of peak pCO<sub>2,non-thermal</sub> (715  $\mu\text{atm}$ , early 04/2015) was delayed at CE compared to CW (Fig. 9) and the value was lower, indicating that the non-thermal effect became less pronounced with freshwater inflow propagating along the estuary.

Overall, thermal effect dominated the drought period from 05/2014 to 02/2015 for all stations except in AB (Table 4), where thermal and non-thermal effects were about the same. However, during the flooding period, Copano and Mesquite Bay had much lower T/B ratio, indicating that non-thermal effect played a dominant role in controlling pCO<sub>2,water</sub> variation, consistent with the discussion above. In addition, AB and SC exhibited similar T/B ratios across the

dry/wet cycle, indicating that hydrologic state probably did not have a significant effect on the relative importance of thermal vs. non-thermal effect, at least during our sampled time. Considering that station AB is located in the primary bay that has direct exchange with the GOM through the ship channel, and that both AB and SC had smaller salinity variations during the annual cycle (Table 1), these stations clearly were less influenced by river inflow but more by exchange with the GOM.


#### Air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux dynamics and controlling factors during the dry-wet cycle

Although accounting for 41% of world's estuarine area, average CO<sub>2</sub> flux in North American estuaries accounts for only 12% of global estuarine CO<sub>2</sub> emission, at a moderate value of 2.2 mol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·yr<sup>-1</sup>, according to a recent synthesis (Chen et al. 2013). However, the average annual air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux from MAE reached 12.4 ± 3.3 mol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·yr<sup>-1</sup> based on our study. Even though this flux was consistent with results obtained in a limited number of tropical lagoons

**Table 6.** Estimated average air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux (mmol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·d<sup>-1</sup>) distribution in the MAE\*.

	Copano Bay		Aransas Bay		Mesquite Bay	Average
	CW	CE	AB	SC	MB	
Drought	18.2 ± 24.2	47.0 ± 53.2	18.7 ± 24.4	11.7 ± 34.5	45.7 ± 64.4	28.3 ± 18.0
Flooding	147.9 ± 218.4	40.9 ± 69.3	28.7 ± 19.5	-15.1 ± 20.3	55.7 ± 36.0	51.6 ± 83.9
Annual	35.7 ± 144.8	46.2 ± 86.0	20.0 ± 37.7	8.1 ± 45.5	47.1 ± 76.4	33.8 ± 9.0

\* Two-way ANOVA suggests that both “dry-flooding cycle” and “stations” had significant effect on CO<sub>2</sub> flux, and the two main effects also had significant interaction (df = 4,  $F = 2.538$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ).

**Fig. 10.** TA/DIC ratio vs. salinity in the MAE.

(Laruelle et al. 2010), it was significantly higher than many other North American estuaries and even some macrotidal estuaries in Europe (Table 5).

As an important factor that determines gas transfer velocity (Eq. 4), wind speed plays an important role in estuarine CO<sub>2</sub> flux. According to Chen et al. (2013), the mean air–water  $p\text{CO}_2$  gradient of European estuaries is only about one third of those in Asian estuaries, whereas the mean air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux from European estuaries doubled that in Asia due to much higher wind speed. Similarly, despite a relatively low average  $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{water}}$  ( $487 \pm 138 \mu\text{atm}$ ) in MAE compared with much higher  $p\text{CO}_{2,\text{water}}$  in European and Asian estuaries ( $1600 \mu\text{atm}$  and  $4000 \mu\text{atm}$ , respectively; Chen et al. 2013), high mean wind speed ( $5.4 \pm 2.3 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ , compared with approximately  $4 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  and  $1.6 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$  on European and Asian coasts, respectively; Chen et al. 2013) contributed to a relatively high CO<sub>2</sub> efflux in this estuary. Therefore, it is

desirable to further investigate the role of other low latitude regions, not only within the estuaries, but coastal ocean, in CO<sub>2</sub> budget calculations.

Similar to many other estuaries, air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux in MAE displayed strong temporal changes during our studied period (Tables 2 and 6). During the drought period, CO<sub>2</sub> emission from the estuary was the highest in summer and early fall (06/2014–09/2014, Fig. 6). This is likely a result of high wind speed (average  $6.0 \pm 2.4 \text{ m}\cdot\text{s}^{-1}$ ) and high water temperature, and the latter could enhance community respiration and evaporation, as more concentrated seawater holds less CO<sub>2</sub>. For example, a simulation using CO2SYS suggests that for seawater with salinity 35, total alkalinity  $2270 \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$ , total DIC  $1977 \mu\text{mol kg}^{-1}$ ,  $p\text{CO}_2$  of this seawater would be  $400 \mu\text{atm}$  at 25°C. Then allowing the water evaporate to salinity 40 (hypersaline condition in Copano Bay),  $p\text{CO}_2$  would increase to  $494 \mu\text{atm}$  (Fig. 3). If allowing all

“excess” CO<sub>2</sub> to degas and reach equilibrium with the 400 μatm atmosphere, a degassing process that may take only a few days given the shallow water depth here, this evaporation-concentrated water would hold ~ 50 μmol kg<sup>-1</sup> less DIC than the “concentrated” original seawater. With additional alkalinity reduction, regardless its cause, prolonged water residence time would lead to even more CO<sub>2</sub> loss to the atmosphere. Indeed, TA/DIC ratio in all stations increased with increasing salinity (i.e., average TA/DIC increased from 1.116 ± 0.012 to 1.172 ± 0.024, along with the increase of average salinity from 31.6 ± 1.0 to 38.7 ± 0.8, N = 10; Fig. 10). Part of the TA/DIC increase can be attributed to higher TA/DIC ratio in the ocean endmember, and then further depletion of DIC relative to TA toward hypersaline conditions indicated that evaporation contributed to a net CO<sub>2</sub> loss.

Toward the end of the drought period, pCO<sub>2,water</sub> started to decline with decreasing temperature, and the entire estuary became a weak CO<sub>2</sub> sink from late fall to winter (11/2014–02/2015). Particularly in 02/2015, at all five stations surface water was undersaturated for CO<sub>2</sub> (average pCO<sub>2,water</sub> = 341 ± 49 μatm). This could be attributed to low riverine input and lower water temperature (Hunt et al. 2014). Note this period also had lower wind speed (average 3.7 ± 0.9 m·s<sup>-1</sup>) thus CO<sub>2</sub> uptake was modest.

CO<sub>2</sub> efflux also displayed spatial variations during our sampling period (Table 6). There was a decreasing trend of average CO<sub>2</sub> emission (46.2–8.1 mmol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·d<sup>-1</sup>) from the secondary bays (Copano and Mesquite) to the primary bay (Aransas). Mean air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux at the ship channel (SC) was the lowest (8.1 ± 34.2 mmol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·d<sup>-1</sup>; N = 22). This spatial distribution agrees with other estuarine studies as CO<sub>2</sub> efflux typically decreases toward the ocean (Crosswell et al. 2012; Hunt et al. 2014; Joesoef et al. 2015). However, higher CO<sub>2</sub> emission was observed at mid-estuary (CE and MB) especially in the drought period. This was possibly due to more intense remineralization reactions (Table 1; Fig. 5), which was in favor of CO<sub>2</sub> production. In flooding season, non-thermal effect dramatically increased (Table 4) air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux at CW, whereas CO<sub>2</sub> degassing was maintained at similar level or even decreased in other part of this estuary, due presumably to nutrient-enhanced primary production (Reyna et al. 2017).

## Conclusions

Both carbonate chemistry and CO<sub>2</sub> flux demonstrated substantial temporal and spatial variations in the subtropical MAE, which was affected by strong interannual changes in estuarine hydrologic states. There was a gradient for carbonate variables and CO<sub>2</sub> flux from the secondary bays to the primary bay. We observed significant TA and DIC removal during the drought period and mixing dominated

distribution in the flooding season, although detailed mechanisms for the alkalinity loss still await further investigation.

Overall, the MAE was a CO<sub>2</sub> source with an annual average air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux 12.4 ± 3.3 mol·C·m<sup>-2</sup>·yr<sup>-1</sup>. High wind speed played an important role for this high CO<sub>2</sub> efflux despite the relatively small air–water pCO<sub>2</sub> gradient. This estimate is much higher than existing, yet scarce, estimates in other subtropical estuaries. During the drought and warm period, CO<sub>2</sub> emission was enhanced by increased temperature (hence increased respiration) and evaporation, and highest CO<sub>2</sub> emission (74.5 ± 41.1; N = 30 mmol·m<sup>-2</sup>·d<sup>-1</sup>) was found in summer in the drought period. However, lower temperature in winter would turn the entire estuary into a weak CO<sub>2</sub> sink (−8.9 ± 5.1 mmol·m<sup>-2</sup>·d<sup>-1</sup>; N = 15). In the flooding period, storm events briefly yet significantly enhanced air–water CO<sub>2</sub> flux at CW due to much elevated pCO<sub>2</sub> level there. Overall, our work suggests that global estuarine CO<sub>2</sub> flux estimates need to be improved by incorporating new studies that focus on subtropical and/or windy estuaries.

## References

- Abril, G., M. V. Commarieu, D. Maro, M. Fontugne, F. Guérin, and H. Etcheber. 2004. A massive dissolved inorganic carbon release at spring tide in a highly turbid estuary. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **31**: L09316. doi:10.1029/2004GL019714
- Abril, G., and others. 2015. Technical note: Large overestimation of pCO<sub>2</sub> calculated from pH and alkalinity in acidic, organic-rich freshwaters. *Biogeosciences* **12**: 67–78. doi:10.5194/bg-12-67-2015
- Bauer, J. E., W. J. Cai, P. A. Raymond, T. S. Bianchi, C. S. Hopkinson, and P. A. Regnier. 2013. The changing carbon cycle of the coastal ocean. *Nature* **504**: 61–70. doi:10.1038/nature12857
- Baumann, H., R. B. Wallace, T. Tagliaferri, and C. J. Gobler. 2014. Large natural pH, CO<sub>2</sub> and O<sub>2</sub> fluctuations in a temperate tidal salt marsh on diel, seasonal, and interannual time scales. *Estuaries Coast.* **38**: 220–231. doi:10.1007/s12237-014-9800-y
- Benoit, G., S. D. Oktay-Marshall, A. Cantu, E. M. Hood, C. H. Coleman, M. O. Corapcioglu, and P. H. Santschi. 1994. Partitioning of Cu, Pb, Ag, Zn, Fe, Al, and Mn between filter-retained particles, colloids, and solution in six Texas estuaries. *Mar. Chem.* **45**: 307–336. doi:10.1016/0304-4203(94)90076-0
- Bockmon, E. E., and A. G. Dickson. 2014. A seawater filtration method suitable for total dissolved inorganic carbon and pH analyses. *Limnol. Oceanogr.: Methods* **12**: 191–195. doi:10.4319/lom.2014.12.191
- Bozec, Y., T. Cariou, E. Macé, P. Morin, D. Thuillier, and M. Vernet. 2012. Seasonal dynamics of air–sea CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes in the inner and outer Loire estuary (NW Europe). *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* **100**: 58–71. doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2011.05.015



- Bruesewitz, D. A., W. S. Gardner, R. F. Mooney, L. Pollard, and E. J. Buskey. 2013. Estuarine ecosystem function response to flood and drought in a shallow, semiarid estuary: Nitrogen cycling and ecosystem metabolism. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **58**: 2293–2309. doi:10.4319/lo.2013.58.6.2293
- Cai, W. J. 2011. Estuarine and coastal ocean carbon paradox: CO<sub>2</sub> sinks or sites of terrestrial carbon incineration? *Ann. Rev. Mar. Sci.* **3**: 123–145. doi:10.1146/annurev-marine-120709-142723
- Carter, B. R., J. A. Radich, H. L. Doyle, and A. G. Dickson. 2013. An automated system for spectrophotometric seawater pH measurements. *Limnol. Oceanogr.: Methods* **11**: 16–27. doi:10.4319/lom.2013.11.16
- Chen, C. T. A. 2002. Shelf-vs. dissolution-generated alkalinity above the chemical lysocline. *Deep Sea Res. Part II* **49**: 5365–5375. doi:10.1016/S0967-0645(02)00196-0
- Chen, C. T. A., T. H. Huang, Y. C. Chen, Y. Bai, X. He, and Y. Kang. 2013. Air–sea exchanges of CO<sub>2</sub> in the world's coastal seas. *Biogeosciences* **10**: 6509–6544. doi:10.5194/bg-10-6509-2013
- Cifuentes, L. A., L. E. Schemel, and J. H. Sharp 1990. Qualitative and numerical analyses of the effects of river inflow variations on mixing diagrams in estuaries. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf S.* **30**: 411–427. doi:10.1016/0272-7714(90)90006-D
- Clayton, T. D., and R.H. Byrne. 1993. Spectrophotometric seawater pH measurements: total hydrogen ion concentration scale calibration of m-cresol purple and at-sea results. *Deep-Sea Res. Pt. I* **40**: 2115–2129. doi:10.1016/0967-0637(93)90048-8
- Cross, J. N., J. T. Mathis, N. R. Bates, and R. H. Byrne. 2013. Conservative and non-conservative variations of total alkalinity on the southeastern Bering Sea shelf. *Mar. Chem.* **154**: 100–112. doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2013.05.012
- Crosswell, J. R., M. S. Wetz, B. Hales, and H. W. Paerl. 2012. Air-water CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes in the microtidal Neuse River Estuary, North Carolina. *J. Geophys. Res. Oceans* **117**: C08017. doi:10.1029/2012jc007925
- Crosswell, J. R., M. S. Wetz, B. Hales, and H. W. Paerl. 2014. Extensive CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from shallow coastal waters during passage of Hurricane Irene (August 2011) over the Mid-Atlantic coast of the U.S.A. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **59**: 1651–1665. doi:10.4319/lo.2014.59.5.1651
- de la Paz, M., X. A. Padín, A. F. Ríos, and F. F. Pérez. 2010. Surface *f*CO<sub>2</sub> variability in the Loire plume and adjacent shelf waters: High spatio-temporal resolution study using ships of opportunity. *Mar. Chem.* **118**: 108–118. doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2009.11.004
- Dickson, A. G. 1990. Standard potential of the reaction: AgCl(s) + 12H<sub>2</sub>(g) = Ag(s) + HCl(aq), and the standard acidity constant of the ion HSO<sub>4</sub><sup>-</sup> in synthetic sea water from 273.15 to 318.15 K. *J. Chem. Thermodyn.* **22**: 113–127. doi:10.1016/0021-9614(90)90074-Z
- Dickson, A. G., J. D. Afghan, and G. C. Anderson. 2003. Reference materials for oceanic CO<sub>2</sub> analysis: a method for the certification of total alkalinity. *Mar. Chem.* **80**: 185–197. doi:10.1016/S0304-4203(02)00133-0
- Dickson, A. G., C. L. Sabine, and J. R. Christian. 2007. Guide to best practices for ocean CO<sub>2</sub> measurements. PICES Special Publication 3.
- Dollar, S. J., S. V. Smith, S. M. Vink, S. Obrebski, and J. T. Hollibaugh. 1991. Annual cycle of benthic nutrient fluxes in Tomales Bay, California, and contribution of the benthos to total ecosystem metabolism. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **79**: 115–125. doi:10.3354/meps079115
- Doney, S. C., I. Lima, R. A. Feely, D. M. Glover, K. Lindsay, N. Mahowald, J. K. Moore and R. Wanninkhof. 2009. Mechanisms governing interannual variability in upper-ocean inorganic carbon system and air–sea CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes: Physical climate and atmospheric dust. *Deep Sea Res. Part II* **56**: 640–655. doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2008.12.006
- Dürr, H. H., G. G. Laruelle, C. M. van Kempen, C. P. Slomp, M. Meybeck, and H. Middelkoop. 2011. Worldwide typology of nearshore coastal systems: Defining the estuarine filter of river inputs to the oceans. *Estuaries Coast.* **34**: 441–458. doi:10.1007/s12237-011-9381-y
- Evans, A., K. Madden, and S. Palmer. 2015. The ecology and sociology of the mission-aransas estuary: An estuarine and watershed profile. University of Texas Marine Science Institute, Port Aransas, Texas.
- Fagan, K. E., and F. T. Mackenzie. 2007. Air–sea CO<sub>2</sub> exchange in a subtropical estuarine-coral reef system, Kaneohe Bay, Oahu, Hawaii. *Mar. Chem.* **106**: 174–191. doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2007.01.016
- Feely, R. A., S. R. Alin, J. Newton, C. L. Sabine, M. Warner, A. Devol, C. Krembs, and C. Maloy. 2010. The combined effects of ocean acidification, mixing, and respiration on pH and carbonate saturation in an urbanized estuary. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* **88**: 442–449. doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2010.05.004
- Frankignoulle, M., G. Abril, A. Borges, I. Bourge, C. Canon, B. Delille, E. Libert, J.-M. Théate. 1998. Carbon dioxide emission from European estuaries. *Science* **282**: 434–436. doi:10.1126/science.282.5388.434
- Frankignoulle, M., and A. V. Borges. 2001. Direct and indirect *p*CO<sub>2</sub> measurements in a wide range of *p*CO<sub>2</sub> and salinity values (the Scheldt estuary). *Aquat. Geochem.* **7**: 267–273. doi:10.1023/A:1015251010481
- Guo, X., M. Dai, W. Zhai, W.-J. Cai, and B. Chen. 2009. CO<sub>2</sub> flux and seasonal variability in a large subtropical estuarine system, the Pearl River Estuary, China. *J. Geophys. Res.* **114**: G03013. doi:10.1029/2008jg000905
- Hsu, S. A., E. A. Meindl, and D. B. Gilhousen. 1994. Determining the power-law wind-profile exponent under near-neutral stability conditions at sea. *J. Appl. Meteorol.* **33**: 757–765. doi:10.1175/1520-0450(1994)033<0757:DTPLWP>2.0.CO;2
- Hu, X., and W. J. Cai. 2011. An assessment of ocean margin anaerobic processes on oceanic alkalinity budget. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **25**: GB3003. doi:10.1029/2010GB003859

- Hu, X., and W.-J. Cai. 2013. Estuarine acidification and minimum buffer zone-A conceptual study. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **40**: 5176–5181. doi:10.1002/grl.51000
- Hu, X., J. B. Pollack, M. R. McCutcheon, P. A. Montagna, and Z. Ouyang. 2015. Long-term alkalinity decrease and acidification of estuaries in northwestern Gulf of Mexico. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **49**: 3401–3409. doi:10.1021/es505945p
- Hunt, C. W., J. E. Salisbury, and D. Vandemark. 2011. Contribution of non-carbonate anions to total alkalinity and overestimation of  $p\text{CO}_2$  in New England and New Brunswick rivers. *Biogeosciences* **8**: 3069–3076. doi:10.5194/bg-8-3069-2011
- Hunt, C. W., J. E. Salisbury, and D. Vandemark. 2014. CO<sub>2</sub> input dynamics and air–sea exchange in a large New England estuary. *Estuaries Coast.* **37**: 1078–1091. doi:10.1007/s12237-013-9749-2
- Jiang, L. Q., W. J. Cai, and Y. Wang. 2008. A comparative study of carbon dioxide degassing in river- and marine-dominated estuaries. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **53**: 2603–2615. doi:10.4319/lo.2008.53.6.2603
- Joesoef, A., W. J. Huang, Y. Gao, and W. J. Cai. 2015. Air–water fluxes and sources of carbon dioxide in the Delaware Estuary: Spatial and seasonal variability. *Biogeosciences* **12**: 6085–6101. doi:10.5194/bg-12-6085-2015
- Kanamori, S., and H. Ikegami. 1980. Computer-processed potentiometric titration for the determination of calcium and magnesium in sea water. *J. Oceanogr. Soc. Jpn.* **36**: 177–184. doi:10.1007/BF02070330
- Kim, H.-C., and P. A. Montagna. 2012. Effects of climate-driven freshwater inflow variability on macrobenthic secondary production in Texas lagoonal estuaries: A modeling study. *Ecol. Model.* **235–236**: 67–80. doi:10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2012.03.022
- Laruelle, G. G., H. H. Dürr, C. P. Slomp, and A. V. Borges. 2010. Evaluation of sinks and sources of CO<sub>2</sub> in the global coastal ocean using a spatially-explicit typology of estuaries and continental shelves. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **37**: L15607. doi:10.1029/2010gl043691
- Laruelle, G. G., R. Lauerwald, J. Rotschi, P. A. Raymond, J. Hartmann, and P. Regnier. 2015. Seasonal response of air–water CO<sub>2</sub> exchange along the land–ocean aquatic continuum of the northeast North American coast. *Biogeosciences* **12**: 1447–1458. doi:10.5194/bg-12-1447-2015
- Lewis, E., and D. Wallace. 1998. Program developed for CO<sub>2</sub> system calculations, p. 18. ORNL/CDIAC-105.
- Liu, X., M. C. Patsavas, and R. H. Byrne. 2011. Purification and characterization of meta-cresol purple for spectrophotometric seawater pH measurements. *Environ. Sci. Technol.* **45**: 4862–4868. doi:10.1021/es200665d
- Millero, F. J. 2001. *The physical chemistry of natural waters*. Wiley-Interscience.
- Millero, F. J. 2010. Carbonate constants for estuarine waters. *Mar. Freshw. Res.* **61**: 139–142. doi:10.1071/MF09254
- Millero, F. J., W. T. Hiscock, F. Huang, M. Roche, and J. Z. Zhang. 2001. Seasonal variation of the carbonate system in Florida Bay. *Bull. Mar. Sci.* **68**: 101–123.
- Milliman, J. D., K. L. Farnsworth, P. D. Jones, K. H. Xu, and L. C. Smith. 2008. Climatic and anthropogenic factors affecting river discharge to the global ocean, 1951–2000. *Global Planet. Change* **62**: 187–194. doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2008.03.001
- Montagna, P., T. A. Palmer, and J. Pollack. 2012. Hydrological changes and estuarine dynamics. Springer.
- Mooney, R. F., and J. W. McClelland. 2012. Watershed export events and ecosystem responses in the mission–Aransas National Estuarine Research Reserve, South Texas. *Estuaries Coast.* **35**: 1468–1485. doi:10.1007/s12237-012-9537-4
- Pollack, J. B., A. Cleveland, T. A. Palmer, A. S. Reisinger, and P. A. Montagna. 2012. A restoration suitability index model for the eastern oyster (*Crassostrea virginica*) in the Mission-Aransas Estuary, TX, USA. *PLoS One* **7**: e40839. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0040839
- Raymond, P. A., J. E. Bauer, and J. J. Cole. 2000. Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> evasion, dissolved inorganic carbon production, and net heterotrophy in the York River estuary. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* **45**: 1707–1717. doi:10.4319/lo.2000.45.8.1707
- Raymond, P. A., and J. J. Cole. 2001. Gas exchange in rivers and estuaries: Choosing a gas transfer velocity. *Estuaries Coast.* **24**: 312–317. doi:10.2307/1352954
- Regnier, P., and others 2013. Anthropogenic perturbation of the carbon fluxes from land to ocean. *Nat. Geosci.* **6**: 597–607. doi:10.1038/ngeo1830
- Reisdorph, S. C., and J. T. Mathis. 2014. The dynamic controls on carbonate mineral saturation states and ocean acidification in a glacially dominated estuary. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* **144**: 8–18. doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2014.03.018
- Reyna, N. E., A. Hardison, and Z. Liu. 2017. Influence of major storm events on the quantity and composition of particulate organic matter and the phytoplankton community in a subtropical estuary, Texas. *Front. Mar. Sci.* **4**. doi:10.3389/fmars.2017.00043
- Sarma, V.V.S.S., and others. 2012. Carbon dioxide emissions from Indian monsoonal estuaries. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* **39**: L03602. doi:10.1029/2011gl050709
- Semesi, I. S., S. Beer, and M. Björk. 2009. Seagrass photosynthesis controls rates of calcification and photosynthesis of calcareous macroalgae in a tropical seagrass meadow. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **382**: 41–48. doi:10.3354/meps07973
- Smith, S. V., J. T. Hollibaugh, S. J. Dollar, and S. Vink. 1991. Tomales bay metabolism: C-N-P stoichiometry and ecosystem heterotrophy at the land-sea interface. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* **33**: 223–257. doi:10.1016/0272-7714(91)90055-G
- Souza, M. F., V. R. Gomes, S. S. Freitas, R. C. Andrade, and B. Knoppers. 2009. Net ecosystem metabolism and

- nonconservative fluxes of organic matter in a tropical mangrove estuary, Piauí River (NE of Brazil). *Estuaries Coast.* **32**: 111–122. doi:10.1007/s12237-008-9104-1
- Takahashi, T., J. Olafsson, J. G. Goddard, D. W. Chipman, and S. Sutherland. 1993. Seasonal variation of CO<sub>2</sub> and nutrients in the high-latitude surface oceans: A comparative study. *Global Biogeochem. Cycles* **7**: 843–878. doi:10.1029/93GB02263
- Takahashi, T., and others. 2002. Global sea–air CO<sub>2</sub> flux based on climatological surface ocean *p*CO<sub>2</sub>, and seasonal biological and temperature effects. *Deep-Sea Res. Part II* **49**: 1601–1622. doi:10.1016/S0967-0645(02)00003-6
- Wallace, R. B., H. Baumann, J. S. Grear, R. C. Aller, and C. J. Gobler. 2014. Coastal ocean acidification: The other eutrophication problem. *Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.* **148**: 1–13. doi:10.1016/j.ecss.2014.05.027
- Wanninkhof, R. 1992. Relationship between wind speed and gas exchange. *J. Geophys. Res.* **97**: 7373–7382. doi:10.1029/92JC00188
- Weiss, R. F. 1974. Carbon dioxide in water and seawater: The solubility of a non-ideal gas. *Mar. Chem.* **2**: 203–215. doi:10.1016/0304-4203(74)90015-2
- Weiss, R. F., and B. A. Price. 1980. Nitrous oxide solubility in water and seawater. *Mar. Chem.* **8**: 347–359. doi:10.1016/0304-4203(80)90024-9
- Zeng, F.-W., C. A. Masiello, and W. C. Hockaday. 2010. Controls on the origin and cycling of riverine dissolved inorganic carbon in the Brazos River, Texas. *Biogeochemistry* **104**: 275–291. doi:10.1007/s10533-010-9501-y
- Zhai, W., M. Dai, and X. Guo. 2007. Carbonate system and CO<sub>2</sub> degassing fluxes in the inner estuary of Changjiang (Yangtze) River, China. *Mar. Chem.* **107**: 342–356. doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2007.02.011
- Zhai, W., and M. Dai. 2009. On the seasonal variation of air – sea CO<sub>2</sub> fluxes in the outer Changjiang (Yangtze River) Estuary, East China Sea. *Mar. Chem.* **117**: 2–10. doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2009.02.008

#### Acknowledgments

We are grateful for the fieldwork assistance provided by the staff and students at both the Mission Aransas National Estuarine Research Reserve and the University of Texas Marine Science Institute. We also thank H. Wang, Q. Liu, Z. Ouyang, and C. J. Staryk for their help with both field sampling and lab analyses, and Lei Jin for the helpful discussion on statistics. The Associate Editor and two anonymous reviewers offered critical comments that helped us to improve the quality of this manuscript significantly. This study was funded by NOAA's NOS National Center for Coastal Ocean Science (Contract No. NA15NOS4780185). Partial funding to this work was provided by the Texas Research Development Fund from the Research and Commercialization Office of Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi. This research was also supported in part by operations grants to the Mission-Aransas National Estuarine Research Reserve from the Office of Coastal Management, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. System-Wide Monitoring Program data were collected by the research staff of the Mission-Aransas NERR and hosted by the Central Data Management Office of the National Estuarine Research Reserve System.

#### Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Submitted 07 November 2016

Revised 04 April 2017; 01 July 2017

Accepted 10 July 2017

Associate editor: M. Dileep Kumar