Supporting Information "**A**" for

Long-term phosphorus mass-balance of Lake Erie (Canada-USA) reveals a major contribution of in-lake phosphorus loading

[published in 2023 in Ecological Informatics (print ISSN: 1574-9541; online ISSN: 1878-0512)]

Serghei A. Bocaniov^{1,3,*}, Donald Scavia², and Philippe Van Cappellen^{1,3}

- ¹Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L3G1, Canada
- ² School for Environment and Sustainability, University of Michigan, 440 Church St., Ann Arbor, MI 48104, USA
- ³ Water Institute, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1, Canada

* Corresponding author email address: sbocaniov@uwaterloo.ca serghei.bocaniov@gmail.com

Contents of this file (32 pages with 10 Tables, 1 Figure, and 7 Appendices):

- 1. Tables (pages A-3 to A-16)
- **Table A1**. Literature derived estimates of mean annual internal phosphorus load in metric tonnes (MT) in lakes St. Clair and Erie scaled up to the basin or whole lake areas.
- **Table A2**. Characterization of Lake Erie Quaternary Watersheds located in Canadian part of Lake Erie system.
- **Table A3**. Characterization of Lake Erie system watersheds located in United States and based on the 6 digit and 8-digit hydrological unit codes (HUC6 and HUC8).
- **Table A4**. Characterization of the water gauging stations in Canadian part of the Lake Erie system.
- **Table A5**. Characterization of water gauging stations in US part of the Lake Erie system
- **Table A6**. List of permanent water level gauges located within the study region, and operated by the Canada's Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) and the United States National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).
- **Table A7**. Water quality stations used in deriving TP Loadings for 2003-2016. Abbreviations for the water quality stations are explained in Table A8.
- **Table A8.** Abbreviations for the water quality monitoring agencies listed in Table A7.
- **Table A9**. Name, location, and characteristics of Canadian ground water monitoring wells with reported concentrations of TP in the ground water and located within 8 km wide band of shoreline surrounding the lake boundaries.
- **Table A10**. Mean over-lake precipitation $(Y; m^3 s^{-1})$, calculated volume-weighted mean total phosphorus (TP) concentration (p^{PR} ; mg L⁻¹) in precipitation, and over-lake TP wet and total deposition rates (*D w* , *D t* ; Metric Tonnes per Annum: MTA) in Lake St. Clair and Lake Erie for each water year during the study period $(2003 – 2016)$.
	- 2. Figures (page A-18)
- **Figure A1**. Map of Lake Erie sub-watersheds (modified from the map courtesy to the Ohio Department of Natural Resource - ODNR map library). The eastern most sub-watershed with identification code 04120004, named "Niagara" and discharging directly to the Niagara River, was not included into the water and phosphorus mass budgets.
	- 3. Appendices (pages A-19 to A-30)

Appendix A1. Defining an appropriate temporal scale for a mass budget construction.

- **Appendix A2**. Estimates of the run-off from the Thames, Sydenham, and Grand Ontario rivers.
- **Appendix A3**. Approach to close the water budget.
- **Appendix A4***.* Water budget.
- **Appendix A5**. Estimates of atmospheric total phosphorus (TP) deposition.
- **Appendix A6***.* On estimates of the TP sedimentation rates in Lake Erie.
- **Appendix A7***.* Total phosphorus (TP) mass balance.

Table A1. Literature derived estimates of mean annual internal phosphorus load in metric tons (MT) in lakes St. Clair and Erie scaled up to the basin or whole lake areas. ID #1-5 indicate annual fluxes of gross internal load, while ID #6-8 indicate annual net internal load.

* Just for a four-day episode only (neither annul nor seasonal load).

- Study period: P1, 2013: Jun 24 & Jul 6, 2014: Jun 27 & Aug 4; P2, spring and summer of 2010 and 2012; P3, August-September of 1985 to 2012; P4, four-day episode in summer 2014; P5, long-term: analysis of *in-situ* collected sediment cores (30 cm long); P6, continuous in-situ nutrient analyzer measurements at 2 sites in summer 2019 and then scaling up to the basin size; P7, Oct 1, 2003 to Sep 30, 2016.
- Data sources: S1, Matisoff et al. (2016); S2, Paytan et al. (2017); S3, Nürnberg et al. (2019); S4, Gibbons & Bridgeman (2020); S5, Wang et al. (2021); S6, Anderson et al. (2021); S7, this study.
- Methods: M1, laboratory incubations scaled up to the basin size; M2, laboratory incubations of sediment cores scaled up to the basin size; M3, as a product of the estimated annual hypoxic factor (HF) values and a phosphorus release rate; M4, *in-situ* core profile analysis; M5, continuous *in-situ* nutrient analyzer measurements at 2 sites and then scaling up to the basin size; M6, Net Mass Balance Approach (NMBA) using steady state formulations (no change in basin concentrations between 2003 and 2016); M7, NMBA using non-steady state formulations (change in basin concentration $\neq 0$ and based on averages between April and August concentrations with difference determined between 2003 and 2016); M8, NMBA using non-steady state formulations (change in basin concentration $\neq 0$ and is based on April concentrations with the difference determined between two 3-year periods 2003-2005 and 2014-2016).

*SCR, St. Clair River; LSC, Lake St. Clair; DR, Detroit River; WB, western basin; CB, central basin; EB, eastern basin.

Table A2. (*Continued*)

*SCR, St. Clair River; LSC, Lake St. Clair; DR, Detroit River; WB, western basin; CB, central basin; EB, eastern basin.

Table A2. (*Continued*)

*SCR, St. Clair River; LSC, Lake St. Clair; DR, Detroit River; WB, western basin; CB, central basin; EB, eastern basin.

Table A3. Characterization of Lake Erie system watersheds located in United States and based on the 6-digit and 8-digit hydrological unit codes (HUC6 and HUC8).

Table A3. (*Continued*)

#	WSC*	Gauge Name		Geographic Coordinates	Area	Tertiary
	Gauge		Latitude	Longitude	(km ²)	Watershed Codes
	Number					
1.	02GG002	Sydenham River Near Alvinston	42.8306	81.8517	701	02GG
2.	02GG003	Sydenham River At Florence	42.6506	82.0083	1150	
3.	02GG006	Bear Creek Near Petrolia	42.9058	82.1189	249	
4.	02GG009	Bear Creek Below Brigden	42.8119	82.2983	536	
5.	02GG010	St. Clair River At Point Edward	42.9803	82.4022	n/a	
6.	02GG011	St. Clair River At Port Lambton	42.6572	82.5069	n/a	
7.	02GG013	Black Creek Near Bradshaw	42.7622	82.2592	213	
8.	02GE002	Thames River At Byron	42.9625	81.3317	3080	02GE
9.	02GE003	Thames River At Thamesville	42.5447	81.9672	4370	
10.	02GE007	McGregor Creek Near Chatham	42.3833	82.0950	204	
11.	02GH002	Ruscom River Near Ruscom Station	42.2114	82.6289	95	02GH
12.	02GH003	Canard River Near Lukerville	42.1589	83.0189	159	
13.	02GH005	Lake St. Clair At Belle River	42.2961	82.7108	n/a	
14.	02GH011	Little River At Windsor	42.3097	82.9283	55.3	
15.	02GC002	KETTLE CREEK AT ST. THOMAS	42.7775	81.2139	331	02 GC
16.	02GC007	BIG CREEK NEAR WALSINGHAM	42.6856	80.5383	567	
17.	02GC008	LYNN RIVER AT SIMCOE	42.8233	80.2894	144	
18.	02GC010	BIG OTTER CREEK AT TILLSONBURG	42.8572	80.7233	354	
19.	02GC014	YOUNG CREEK NEAR VITTORIA	42.7656	80.2944	65.8	
20.	02GC018	CATFISH CREEK NEAR SPARTA	42.7458	81.0569	295	
21.	02GC021	VENISON CREEK NEAR WALSINGHAM	42.6533	80.5483	68.4	
22.	02GC022	NANTICOKE CREEK AT NANTICOKE	42.8097	80.0761	177	

Table A4. Characterization of the water gauging stations in Canadian part of the Lake Erie system.

*The Water Survey of Canada (WSC)

Table A4. (*Continued*)

*The Water Survey of Canada (WSC)

#	USGS	Gauge Name (State)	Geographic Coordinates		Area	Hydrologic Unit
	Gauge Number		Latitude	Longitude	(km ²)	
1.	04159130	St. Clair River At Port Huron (MI)	42°59'13"	82°25'29"	576014*	4090001
2.	04159492	Black River Near Jeddo (MI)	43°09'03"	82°37'29"	1202	4090001
3.	04159900	Mill Creek Near Avoca (MI)	43°03'16"	82°44'05"	438	4090001
4.	04160600	Belle River At Memphis (MI)	42°54'03"	82°46'09"	391	4090001
5.	04165500	Clinton River At Moravian Drive At Mt. Clemens (MI)	42°35'45"	82°54'32"	1901	4090003
6.	04165710	Detroit River At Fort Wayne At Detroit (MI)	42°17'53"	83°05'34"	592590*	4090004
7.	04166500	River Rouge At Detroit (MI)	42°22'23"	83°15'17"	484	4090004
8.	04167000	Middle River Rouge Near Garden City (MI)	42°20'53"	83°18'42"	259	4090004
9.	04168400	Lower River Rouge At Dearborn (MI)	42°18'30"	83°15'10"	236	4090004
10.	04168580	Ecorse River At Dearborn Heights (MI)	42°16'10"	83°17'23"	26	4090004
11.	04174500	Huron River At Ann Arbor (MI)	42°17'13"	83°44'02"	1888	4090005
12.	04174518	Malletts Creek At Ann Arbor (MI)	42°15'53"	83°41'18"	28	4090005
13.	04176500	River Raisin Near Monroe (MI)	41°57'38"	83°31'52"	2699	4100002
14.	04177000	Ottawa River At University of Toledo (OH)	41°39'35"	83°36'45"	388	4100001
15.	04193500	Maumee River At Waterville (OH)	41°30'00"	83°42'46"	16395	4100009
16.	04193999	Wolf Creek At Holland (OH)	41°36'34"	83°41'03"	64	4100009
17.	04195820	Portage River Near Elmore (OH)	41°29'28"	83°13'29"	1279	4100010
18.	04198000	Sandusky River Near Fremont (OH)	41°18'28"	83°09'32	3240	4100011

Table A5. Characterization of water gauging stations in US part of the Lake Erie system.

* including the upper Laurentian Great Lakes.

Table A5. (*Continued*)

* including the upper Laurentian Great Lakes.

Table A6. List of permanent water level gauges located within the study region, and operated by the Canada's Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) and the United States National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

Abbreviations: CA, Canada; US, United States; ON, Ontario; MI, Michigan; OH, Ohio; PA, Pennsylvania; NY, New-York.

Table A7. Water quality stations used in deriving TP Loadings for 2003-2016. Abbreviations for the water quality stations are explained in Table A8.

*UAL, the unit area load (UAL) extrapolation approach used in estimates of loads from unmonitored areas.

Acronym	Description	Agency/Institution
ECCC	Upstream/Downstream Monitoring Program for rivers St. Clair and Niagara	Environment and Climate Change Canada
MIDEQ	Water Resources Division	Michigan Department of Environmental Quality
NCWOR	National Center for Water Quality Research	Heidelberg University
NYDEC	Division of Water	New York Department of Environmental Conservation
OHEPA	Division of Surface Water	Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
PWQMN	Provincial Water Quality Monitoring Network	Ontario Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Parks
STORET/NWIS	Water Quality Portal	United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), USGS
USEPA		United States Environmental Protection Agency
USGS	Water Resources Division - NWIS	United States Geological Survey
WQMSD	Water Quality Monitoring and Surveillance Division	Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC)
WSC	Water Survey of Canada	Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC)

Table A8. Abbreviations for the water quality monitoring agencies listed in Table A7.

Table A9. Name, location, and characteristics of Canadian ground water monitoring wells* with reported concentrations of TP in the ground water and located within 8 km wide band of shoreline surrounding the lake boundaries.

* The Canadian monitoring well data was obtained from the Ontario Provincial Groundwater Monitoring Network: PGMN (PGMN, 2022); the sampling frequency is one sample per year.

Note: Two wet precipitation stations for Lake Erie, at Point Pelee and Rock Point (Fig. 1; Appendix A5), are indicated with symbols <'> and <''>, respectively.

Figure A1. Map of Lake Erie sub-watersheds (modified from the map courtesy to the Ohio Department of Natural Resource - ODNR map library). The eastern most sub-watershed with identification code 04120004, named "Niagara" and discharging directly to the Niagara River, was not included into the water and phosphorus mass budgets.

Appendix A1. *Defining an appropriate temporal scale for a mass budget construction.*

To construct a mass budget based on input-output approach for a given conservative substance (e.g. water) in any system with a significant volume (*V*) compared to its flow-through rate (*Q*) and resulting a high water storage capacity or mean water residence time $(R_w; R_w = V/Q)$, it is important to construct a budget over the period of time appropriate for the transport time scales (e.g. larger than water age for a water parcel at any location in the lake) and which is long enough to minimize the effects of initial conditions, and keep the effect of initial conditions on the results as small as possible.

Rw, a water storage capacity, or also known as a mean water residence time, in Lake Erie System (LES) is primarily determined by Lake Erie's R_w (Bolsenga and Herdendorf, 1993: 1000 days or \sim 2.8 years; this study: 944 days or \sim 2.6 years, Table 4) because of negligible value of R_w for Lake St. Clair (\sim 9 days; Bocaniov et al., 2019), the St. Clair River (0.88 day; Griffiths et al., 1991) and Detroit River (0.83 day; Derecki, 1984). Assuming Lake Erie as an ideally mixed continuous steering tank reactor (CSTR) and considering a Lake Erie's $R_w = 2.8$ years, then 4.6 times of τ or 13 years would be needed for the outflow to contain a 1% of the initial lake concentration. Therefore, in this study we decided to use a period of 14 years which is larger than 4.6 times R_w , so that the lake concentrations will be in full equilibrium (>99%) with the external loads. Over 14 years when the steady state is reached, the in-lake P concentrations must be in equilibrium with the loads, so the left sides in Equations 8 and 10-12 (Table 1) will be zero, so the internal net P load can be estimated for each specific segment.

Appendix A2. *The run-off from the Thames, Sydenham, and Grand Ontario rivers*.

The run-off from the three largest sub-watersheds (the Thames, Sydenham, and Grand Ontario rivers) was estimated using the following approach. For these sub-watersheds, the most downstream gauging stations were relatively far away from the river outlets with significant changes occurring in elevations between river outlet and monitored areas (up to 360 m; for example, the Grand Ontario River: elevations at the source and at the mouth are 525 and 174 m above sea level, respectively) which may affect along-river precipitation pattern. For these three sub-watersheds we calculated the total runoff using the exponential relationship (Eq. A2.1):

$$
R = R_g \cdot K^S \tag{A2.1}
$$

$$
K = \frac{A}{A_g} \tag{A2.2}
$$

$$
S = \frac{\log_{10}\left(\frac{R_1}{R_2}\right)}{\log_{10}\left(\frac{A_1}{A_2}\right)}\tag{A2.3}
$$

where, R is the total runoff into the lake, R_g is the runoff at the furthermost downstream gaging station in the basin, *K* is the ratio of the total area of the drainage basin (*A*) to the drainage area above the gaging station (A_g) , *S* is the basin exponent, R_1 and R_2 are the gauged runoffs from downstream and upstream gauges, A_1 and A_2 are the gauged areas corresponding to R_1 and R_2 .

Appendix A3*. Approach to close the water budget.*

The constructed budget revealed the negative residuals of 6 and $52 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ for lakes St. Clair and Erie, respectively. Though, this is a small amount accounting for less than 1% of the combined flow for connecting channels and tributary, it must be balanced. It was done by correcting flows with the largest uncertainties in estimates and using them as a target for budget closure. Lake water levels as well as flows in connecting channels and water diversions are relatively accurately monitored using a network of landand shoreline based in‐situ gauge measurements. Consumptive water use is also strictly regulated and monitored (GLC, 2019). Precipitation is also measured via a network of land-based and shoreline-based rain gauges. The reported direct groundwater water discharge into the lake is small accounting for not more than $12 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$. The most uncertain element is evaporation which is a simulated value and not a measured one. Moreover, in a recent study, Shao et al. (2020) measured evaporation rates at two stations in the western basin from Sept. 2011 to May 2016 and reported lower values for mean annual evaporation compared to those derived from the GLERL hydrologic database (GLERL, 2020a) which could suggest that the evaporation rates in the database may slightly overestimate the open-lake evaporation results. Therefore, to close the water budget we adjusted our mean annul evaporation rates from 37 to 31 m³ s⁻¹ and from 763 to 715 $m^3 s^{-1}$ in lakes St. Clair and Erie, respectively (Table 6; Fig. 2b).

Appendix A4*. Water budget.*

Over-lake precipitation data were obtained from the NOAA Great Lakes Environmental Research Laboratory (GLERL) Great Lakes Monthly Hydrologic Data base (GLERL, 2020a). Over-lake evaporation data were also obtained from GLERL (2020a), where it is calculated using daily simulations from NOAA-GLERL's one-dimensional Net Basin Supply model (Hunter et al., 2015).

Daily flow rates for the major tributaries were downloaded from the USGS National Water Information System (USGS, 2019) for sites in the US and from the National Water Data Archive HYDAT (HYDAT, 2020) for sites in Canada (Tables A4 & A5), scaled to the entire sub-watershed area to include the unmonitored areas (Tables A2 $\&$ A3) based on area-weighted estimates for the closest monitored areas in most cases. The approach for the three largest sub-watersheds in Canada (the Thames, Sydenham, and Grand Ontario rivers) is described in Appendix A2.

For the connecting channels, the St. Clair and Detroit rivers, we used the USGS station 04159130 at Port Huron and 04165710 at Fort Wayne, respectively (Table A5: #1 and #6) for October 2008 to 2016 and onwards. For October 1 2002 to September 2008, we calculated daily flows based on daily mean water levels and stage-fall-discharge relationships (Fay and Kerslake, 2009) similar to Scavia et al. (2019a, b). To estimate the daily flows for the outflow, the Niagara River (Fig. 1), we used USGS station 04216000 Niagara River at Buffalo NY; Table A5: #36).

Our estimate of direct groundwater inflow to Lake Erie was based on the results of the fullyintegrated surface water-groundwater model (Xu et al., 2021) that estimated an annual average rate to be $11.9 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$.

The outflow through the Welland Canal was estimated as the reported data by WSC (Water Survey of Canada; WLF, 2020) for station 02HA019 (Table A4: #30). Apart from the Welland Canal diversion, there are two small diversions bringing Lake Huron water to the system, bypassing the St. Clair River: water intakes for Detroit, Michigan and London, Ontario. London diverts about $3 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ from Lake Huron and returns it to Lake St. Clair via the Thames River (Quinn and Edstrom, 2000) as treated sewage. The sewage outfall is upstream of the water flow gauging station 02GE003 (Table A4: #9) which means that this diverted amount of water is already accounted for by this gauging station. Detroit also withdraws water from Lake Huron via its Lake Huron WTP water intake and returns it to Lake St. Clair. The rated capacity of the Lake Huron WTP is $17.5 \text{ m}^3 \text{ s}^{-1}$ (DWSD, 2019). However, due to current conditions of treatment facilities and water demand, the maximum and average daily flows of this WTP is only 12.3 m³ s^{-1} and 7.0 m³ s⁻¹, respectively (2003 to 2015 data: DWSD, 2019).

Consumptive water use was defined as the difference between the amount of water withdrawn for all purposes including but not limited to municipal supply, agricultural and industrial uses and the amount of water returned to the system on the annual base, and was estimated for Lake Erie system based on the annual report of the Great Lakes Regional Water Use Database representing water use data 2003 through 2016 and prepared by the Great Lakes Commission (GLC, 2019)

Annual net changes in storage of lakes St. Clair and Erie were calculated as the product of the measured changes in lake stage and surface area of each lake. In large shallow lakes, as our lakes St. Clair and Erie, the water levels are highly sensitive to the wind set-ups (storm surges) and surface seiches which can cause great variability in lake stage at different parts of a lake, we used available measurements of mean daily water levels at multiple locations around lakes obtained from a permanent network of water level gauges operated by the Canada's Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO) and the United States National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and listed in Table A6.

Appendix A5*. Estimates of atmospheric total phosphorus (TP) deposition.*

Within the Great Lakes Basin, Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) maintains a nine-station network of atmospheric deposition stations, named the Great Lakes Precipitation Network (GLPN). Within GLPN, Canada operates one station located on Lake St. Clair, and two stations located on Lake Erie. The St. Clair site is located on the east shore of Lake St. Clair (Fig. 1). The two stations on Lake Erie are located at Point Pelee and Rock Point. Point Pelee station is located at the southwestern end of Lake Erie near the Point Pelee, while Rock Point station is located on the northeastern shore of Lake Erie (Fig. 1). Station locations and sampling protocols are described in Chan et al. (2003). All three stations are downwind of the major industrial centers and heavily industrialized regions of the Detroit, Windsor, Sarnia and Cleveland areas. The sampling sites are located in the close proximity of lake shores and deemed to be regionally representative of each lake atmospheric conditions. These three stations measure total phosphorus concentration in wet/frozen precipitation and can be used for estimates of wet deposition.

The Volume Weighted Mean (p_i^{PR}) concentration in precipitation for each water year for segment *i* (where *i* can stand for either Lake St. Clair or Lake Erie) was calculated as the sum of the masses of TP measured in each sample divided by the sum of the volumes of all the samples of precipitation collected for all samples during the given year:

$$
p_i^{PR} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{j=N} C_j \cdot V_j}{\sum_{j=1}^{j=N} V_j}
$$
 (A5.1)

where, C_i is the concentrations in the sample (mg L^{-1}), V_j is the volume of the sample $j(L)$, j is a rain sample, and *N* is the total number of rain samples taken within a given year.

To determine the wet deposition flux (F_i^w ; mg m⁻² year⁻¹) for segment *i*, we used the annual mass of TP collected at each site, divided by the area $(A; m^2)$ of the collection bucket $(0.0314 m^2)$, corrected for the rain water collection area and difference between the actual precipitation and those captured by the rain collectors.

$$
F_i^W = \frac{p_i^{PR} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{j=N} V_j}{A}
$$
 (A5.2)

For Lake Erie, the average F_{LE}^W was calculated as the mean of two site-specific values measured at Pelee and Rock Point sampling stations ($F_{LE}^{w'}$ and $F_{LE}^{w''}$, respectively). For Lake St. Clair, F_{LSC}^{w} was taken as for the station St. Clair.

Because of one or two contaminated or missing samples within each year, the wet deposition flux was corrected for the difference between collected precipitation and actual over-lake precipitation:

$$
F_i^{w,cor} = \frac{Y_i \cdot A}{\sum_{j=1}^{j=N} V_j} \tag{A5.3}
$$

The annual wet deposition rate $(D^w; MTA)$ over the entire lake was estimated as:

$$
D_i^w = F_i^{w,cor} \cdot A_i \cdot 10^{-9}
$$
 (A5.4)

where, *A* is a lake area (m²; see Table 4: Lake St. Clair: $A = 1114 \times 10^6$ m²; Lake Erie: $A = 25657 \times 10^6$ m^2), 10^{-9} is a coefficient to convert milligrams (mg) into metric tonnes (MT).

Based on the measurements of wet and dry TP deposition in the agricultural regions within the continental United States (Anderson and Downing, 2006), the dry deposition rates over the entire lake (D^d ; MTA) were assumed to be 2.45 times of the D^w rates. The total deposition (D^t ; MTA) determined as the sum of D^w and D^d , was calculated by multiplication of D^w by 3.45.

Appendix A6*. On estimates of the TP sedimentation rates in Lake Erie.*

The current appendix provides a comparison of the sedimentation rates in Lake Erie estimated using the apparent settling velocities reported by Chapra et al. (2016) with those reported by literature.

Our sedimentation rates of TP in the western (3188 MTA) and central (5032 MTA) basins are reasonable and consistent with the previous studies. For example, Kemp et al. (1977) estimated the sediment loads to the western and central basins as 2.681 and 5.866 million Metric Tonnes per Annumn (MTA) per year, respectively. The field observations (Williams et al., 1976) suggest the average values of 1,150 and 0.900 µg of P per g dry weight of sediments in the depositional areas of the western and central basins, respectively. This will give us annual TP sedimentation rates of 3,100 and 5,300 MTA in the western and central basins, respectively.

Our TP sedimentation rate for the eastern basin maybe smaller as can be predicted from the sediment budget for this basin with the sedimentation rate of 5.8 million MTA (Kemp et al., 1977; Mortimer, 1987). Such a sedimentation rate assumes the deficit of 4 million MT (Mortimer, 1987) and sediment budget that is not closed. If someone can assume that the sedimentation rates were somehow overestimated by the amount of the deficit (4 million MTA) so it is not 5.8 million but 1.8 million MTA, then all inputs are balanced with the outputs within the eastern basin. This number (1.8 million MT) is closer to our estimate of the TP sedimentation of 1500 MTA. According to Williams et al. (1976) the average value of 1000 µg of P per g dry weight of sediments in the depositional areas of the eastern basin. This would mean a TP sedimentation flux of 1800 MTA. The difference between this and our estimate can be attributed to the arrival and establishment of mussels and their ability to filter the particulate matter and redirect fluxes of phosphorus from the particulate pool to the dissolved pool.

Our estimate TP sedimentation areal rate in the eastern basin is 0.233 gP m⁻² yr⁻¹ (Table 8). Bloesch (1982) reported mean summer (Jun 28 to Sept 8, 1978) deposition rates of Particulate Phosphorus (PP) for his offshore station (depth $= 40$ m; northern side of the basin) at two depths, 3 m above bottom (hypolimnetic fluxes) and just below epilimnion (epilimnetic fluxes), as 5.44 mgP $m⁻² d⁻¹$

and 1.3 mgP $m² d⁻¹$, respectively. He observed that epilimnetic fluxes of PP were 4-20 times less than the PP fluxes measured in the hypolimnion due to effect of frequent resuspension events at the bottom of the lake. This means that the measured sedimentation rates near the bottom of the eastern basin can be significantly overestimated. This may suggest that the high sedimentation rates of 5.8 million MTA finegraned sediments observed by Kemp et al. (1977) in the eastern basin were overestimated by a factor of 3 as they were not corrected for the bottom resuspension effects, and in this case no deficit of 4 million MT of fine-grained sediments exists in the eastern basin. Moreover, if Bloesch' (1982) summer averaged epilimnetic sedimentation flux of PP (1.3 mgP m⁻² d⁻¹ = 0.0013 gP m⁻² d⁻¹) is assumed to be the same for the entire year (0.0013 gP m⁻² d⁻¹ x 365.25 d yr⁻¹ = 0.475 gP m⁻² d⁻¹) then it will equal to 0.475 gP m⁻² d⁻¹ that is only 2 times higher than our annual rate of 0.233 gP $m^2 d^1$ (Table 8), and it is reasonable to assume that the mean summer sedimentation rates are higher than the mean annual rates, and that the arrival of mussels (~ 1990) resulted in clearing of the water column and reduced standing crop of the detrital carbon and phytoplankton biomass not only nearshore but also offshore (e.g. see Bocaniov et al., 2014, for the nearshore offshore differences in the phytoplankton biomass, and for the effect of the advection of the nearshore waters with lower Chl-a on the offshore biomass of Chl-a). So, the pre-mussel (e.g. 1978 rates) sedimentation rates should be smaller than the after-mussel sedimentation rates (e.g. 2003 to 2016).

There are other indirect indications that the offshore sedimentation rates of TP are relatively small. For example, the biomass of mussels in the deep offshore areas of the eastern basin is large but the population is composed from the large-sized older individuals with the absence of smaller-size

Appendix A7*. Total phosphorus (TP) mass balance.*

Tributaries and Connecting Channels – All tributary and connecting channel nutrient loads were estimated using the Water Regressions on Time, Discharge, and Season (WRTDS) method (Hirsch et al., 2010) based on observed concentrations and flow data. To estimates P loads with three connecting channel flows (rivers St. Clair, Detroit and Niagara) where TP concentrations are not correlated with channel discharges and WRTDS method cannot be applied, similar to other previous studies (Scavia et al., 2019a, b), we used the Generalized Additive Model (Wood, 2011; Wood, 2017) to approximate daily TP concentrations as a function of time, with the smoothing parameters selected by the Restricted Maximum Likelihood (REML) method. The estimated daily TP concentration and associated standard error were multiplied by daily discharge to estimate daily loading. The daily estimates were then aggregated to estimate annual loadings.

TP concentration data were obtained from the United States Water Quality Portal (WQP, 2019), the Provincial (Stream) Water Quality Monitoring Network (PWQMN, 2019), Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), the Great Lakes Intake Program (GLIP, 2019) managed by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment, Conservation and Parks (MECP), and Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC; communication with D. Burniston and A. Dove, 2018).

For the St. Clair River, TP loads were estimated at the river source (Point Edward, Fig. 1: site #1; Port Huron, Fig. 1: site #2), and two sites close to the river mouth (Port Lambton, Fig. 1: site #3; Algonac, Fig. 1: site #4). At some stations (e.g. St. Clair River at Port Huron), similar to Scavia et al. (2019a, b), we removed extreme outliers defined here as concentrations higher than the mean plus four times the standard deviation (SD) and representing less than 0.02% of data.

Due to lower resolution of the water quality and nutrient monitoring activities at the river source (Point Edwards; Port Huron) compared to the timing and duration of the short-lived episodic events (shoreline erosion and resuspension of sediments in the nearshore due to storm surges, searches and surface waves; see Scavia et al., 2019a, b), some of the TP load is missed. To estimate it we calculated as

the difference of the TP load at the St. Clair River downstream location (average of loads calculated at both sites, Point Edwards and Port Huron) and a sum of estimated loads for the St. Clair River upstream location and for the direct river sub-watersheds. The load of the St. Clair River to Lake St. Clair was calculated as the average of loads calculated for both sides of the river, at Port Lambton (Ontario; Fig. 1: site #3) and Algonac (Michigan; Fig. 1: site #4).

For the LSC TP load to Detroit River we used station #21MICH-820414 (USEPA #820017) at the lake outflow (Table A7; Fig. 1: site #5). We estimated the total annual load from the Detroit River to the western basin of Lake Erie as a sum of this LSC load and loads from Detroit River sub-watersheds. This is because water quality measures at the downstream monitoring station (#21MICH-820017; Table A7) can be biased due towards frequent episodes of Lake Erie surface seiches and wind-driven water setups transmitting lake water upstream from the lake to the river.

Point Sources - Point sources identified here are only those with direct inputs downstream of the river mouth monitoring stations. Those discharging upstream of the monitoring stations were included in the tributary loads. Direct annual point TP loads from 2003 to 2016 for each sub-watershed were from Scavia et al. (2019a, b) for the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, and Detroit River. For the three basins of Lake Erie, direct loads were those in Maccoux et al. (2016). The latter study reported those loads for only 2003 to 2013. Because there was very little inter-annual variability, we assumed the loads for 2014 to 2016 to be the same as averaged 2003-2013 values. This assumption should not affect results or conclusions because direct TP loads are a very small compared to the total watershed loads (Maccoux et al., 2016; Scavia et al., 2019a, b).

Groundwater - The volume of direct groundwater to Lake Erie is small (11.9 m³ s⁻¹; Xu et al., 2021) accounting for less than 1% of the combined over-lake precipitation and basin runoff or less than 0.25% of the Detroit River inflow to the lake. In terms of phosphorus concentrations, the direct ground water discharge into Lake Erie can be characterized by chemical composition of ground water in monitoring wells located within 8 km wide band surrounding the lake, because this zone, along with the lake bed, was suggested as the zone most important for ground water – lake water exchange processes

(Xu et al., 2021). The Canadian monitoring well data was obtained from the Ontario Provincial Groundwater Monitoring Network (PGMN) Program (PGMN, 2022) and the U.S monitoring well data was obtained from the USGS National Ground-Water Monitoring Network (USGS, 2022). Within such an 8 km wide band zone, on the Canadian portion of the lake, we identified 19 ground water monitoring wells reporting total phosphorus concentrations (Table A9), and there were no wells found on the USA portion of the lake with reported measurements of water chemistry. Therefore, our estimates of TP concentrations in the direct inputs of deep groundwater were based on Canadian sources. Because of the low frequency of data (one sample per year) and to extend the number of observations, we extended the period of observations to all available data, from 2002 to 2019. To reduce the importance of a few large outliers, present in the dataset, that might result from local contamination, we decided to use a pooled dataset for the entire basin and base our analysis on the most typical value that is median rather than using an average value.

Over-lake atmospheric deposition - Over-lake atmospheric wet deposition of TP for each water year were based on the product of volume-weighted rain water mean concentration (p_i^{PR}) and precipitation. p_i^{PR} was calculated based on the TP concentrations in precipitation by Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) and over-lake precipitation amount obtained from GLERL (2020a) (see Appendix A5 for more details). Total over-lake deposition was assumed to be 3.45 times wet deposition based on estimates of wet and dry depositions for the continental United States (Anderson and Downing, 2006; see Appendix A5 for more details).

Outputs via the Niagara River and Welland Canal - TP losses via the Niagara River was estimated with GAM based on the data for river outflow and nutrient concentrations collected at the ECCC upstream monitoring site at Fort Erie (#ON02HA0045; Table A7; Fig. 1: site #6). Due to close proximity of the sources of the Welland Canal and the Niagara River to each other (Fig. 1), it was assumed that the TP concentrations in the lake water outflowing through the water diversion and lake

outflow are similar. Therefore, the TP loss via the water diversion was estimated as the proportion of the Niagara River TP load related to the differences in flows.

Consumptive use - Contribution of the water consumptive use to the loss of TP was calculated as the annual rate of water taken from the lake and not returned back multiplied by the average annual segment-specific P concentration.

Sedimentation - A certain fraction of a lake's TP loading is retained permanently via settling and permanent burial. While net sedimentation is a delicate balance between sedimentation and resuspension rates, over an annual cycle, it has been parametrized for each of the three Lake Erie basins including Lake St. Clair using long-term, mass balance dynamic modeling (e.g. Chapra et al., 2016). To estimate the P removal in each basin due to net sedimentation, we used the mean annual basin-specific concentrations of TP and apparent settling velocities normalized to the basin surface area for post-1990 rates as in Chapra et al. (2016; see also Tables 1, B5, B7, B9 to B11).

Inter-basin nutrient exchange (bulk mixing) – To characterize the inter-basin nutrient fluxes due to diffusion we used the bulk diffusion coefficients parameterized in Chapra et al. (2016; see their Table 3) and mean annual basin-specific concentrations in the adjacent basins (Tables 1, B9 to B11).

Change in storage - The TP losses because of changes in lakes St. Clair and Erie volumes were calculated as the product of the mean annual difference in lake volume and its average lake-wide annual concentration. For Lake Erie, we used the mean of the observed median values for all three basins from the two spring and summer lake-wide monitoring cruises representing both the isothermal (April) and stratified (August) conditions (GLNPO, 2020). The median values were chosen as a good representation of the most typical nutrient conditions as they are not inflated with potential sources of contamination, with a similar approach undertaken by Chapra et al. (2016). To estimate the mean TP concentration for Lake St. Clair over the study period we used observations of TP concentrations at the lake outflow (#21MICH-820414, USEPA #820017, Fig. 1: site #5, Table A7). Preliminary comparisons of this concentration with the lake averaged concentration determined from all lake loads and water flows, returned similar results, validating the estimated value.

Internal P load – It was determined as the difference between means of all annual loss and input fluxes of TP averaged over 2003 to 2016 using Equation 8 (Table 1) for Lake St. Clair and Equations 10- 12 (Table 1) for the three basins of Lake Erie.

Fay, D., Kerslake, H., 2009. Development of new stage-fall-discharge equations for the St. Clair and Detroit Rivers. International Upper Great Lakes study. Environment Canada Great Lakes Regulation Office, Cornwall, Ontario, Canada.

Hunter, T.S., Clites, A.H., Campbell, K.B., Gronewold, A.D., 2015. Development and application of a North American Great Lakes hydrometeorological database—Part I: Precipitation, evaporation, runoff, and air temperature. J. Great Lakes Res. 41, 65-77.

Quinn, F., Edstrom, J., 2000. Great Lakes diversions and other removals. Can. Water Resour. J. 25, 125-151.

Shao, C., Chen, J., Chu, H., Stepien, C. A., Ouyang, Z., 2020. Intra-annual and interannual dynamics of evaporation over western Lake Erie. Earth and Space Science 7, e2020EA001091.

Testa, J.M., Kemp, W.M., 2012. Hypoxia‐induced shifts in nitrogen and phosphorus cycling in Chesapeake Bay. Limnol. Oceanogr. 57, 835-850.

WLF, 2020. Government of Canada. Water Level and Flow (WLF) dataset. Available at: https://wateroffice.ec.gc.ca/ [accessed 2020 Feb 20].