

Supporting Information

Michalak et al. 10.1073/pnas.1216006110

SI Materials and Methods

In-Lake *Microcystis* Data. *Microcystis* biovolume (milliliters per meter squared) was estimated from six fixed locations in western Lake Erie (1). *Microcystis* colonies were collected in duplicate whole water-column tows at approximate biweekly intervals (April–October) using a 112- μ m mesh plankton net in 2002–2011. Biovolume of *Microcystis* in these tows was determined with a settling method and averaged over all sites on a given date. Annual bloom biovolume of *Microcystis* blooms was determined by calculating the area under the curve for plots of biovolume over time, throughout the growing season (1).

Ambient concentrations of nitrogen, phosphorus, and other algal nutrients were determined at six locations at approximately biweekly intervals in 2011. Vertical tube samplers were used to collect integrated water-column samples that were placed on ice and transported to the laboratory within 5 h of collection. Water samples were filtered on 0.45- μ m Millipore filters and stored frozen until analysis. Concentrations of dissolved nutrients were determined at the National Center for Water Quality Research in Tiffin, Ohio following standard methods (2) and US Environmental Protection Agency protocols.

Molecular fingerprints were used to analyze similarity of *Microcystis* in the western basin during July–September, with those in the central basin on October 10. DNA collected on 0.45- μ m polyvinylidene fluoride filters was extracted using a MoBio Power Water kit (MoBio Laboratories; 14900), and then the 16S–23S rRNA internal transcribed spacer (ITS) gene was PCR amplified following the protocol from ref. 3. The PCR products were visualized on 2% (wt/vol) agarose gel and the *Microcystis* 550-bp band (3) was excised, PCR amplified again, and visualized on a 2% (wt/vol) agarose gel to ensure purity. Molecular fingerprints were generated using denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis with a 30–40% denaturing gradient (3).

Microcystin concentration was determined using ELISA (Abraxis; 520011) following cell lysis (Abraxis; Quik-lyse kit 529911QL) of unfiltered water-column samples, as in ref. 4. This microcystin analysis is congener independent, therefore representing the total microcystin concentration.

Land Use Data. Annual county-level data for corn, winter wheat, and soybean acres planted are available from US Department of Agriculture (USDA)'s National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) using the Quick Stats tool available at <https://explore.data.gov/Agriculture/Quick-Stats/ddcm-63jr>. To generate acreage estimates for the western Lake Erie watershed, county totals were summed across all counties that overlap the watershed.

Data on county-level Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) land area are available online as Excel spreadsheet files from the Farm Service Agency CRP statistics webpage (available at www.fsa.usda.gov). County totals were summed across all counties that overlap the western Lake Erie watershed.

Fertilizer Use Data. Throughout the manuscript, “phosphate” refers to fertilizer applications and “phosphorus” refers to any form of phosphorus in water, including orthophosphate and dissolved organic phosphorus.

Data on crop-level phosphate fertilizer applications for 1997–2010 are from USDA's Agricultural Resource Management Survey (ARMS). The data were compiled from <https://explore.data.gov/Agriculture/Quick-Stats/ddcm-63jr>. The data represent state-level averages from sampled farms. Phosphate data from ARMS are not available for the major crops in the

watershed for 2011; the most recent data are from 2010. Phosphate fertilizer data are reported as amounts of P_2O_5 .

A second source of data on fertilizer use for 2007–2010 is from the International Plant Nutrition Institute. These data were developed for the Nutrient Use Geographic Information System (NuGIS) and represent estimates of farm-level nutrient applications for counties in the western Lake Erie watershed. Whereas the recent data are not publicly available, county-level estimates at 5-y intervals from 1987 to 2007 are available to the public. County totals were summed across all counties that overlap the western Lake Erie watershed to obtain watershed-level estimates.

Precipitation Data. Meteorological analysis for spring 2011 is based on a combination of satellite, radar, and surface analysis from the University Corporation for Atmospheric Research image archive (www.mmm.ucar.edu/imagearchive/) and the College of DuPage (<http://weather.cod.edu/>).

Daily precipitation observations for 1986–2005 (Fig. 4) are based on the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Climate Prediction Center (CPC) daily US Unified precipitation dataset. The CPC daily Unified precipitation is a $0.25^\circ \times 0.25^\circ$ gridded product available from 1948 to 2006 derived from three sources, including National Climatic Data Center (NCDC) station data, the CPC dataset, and daily accumulations of hourly precipitation (data available at www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/data/gridded/data.unified.html). Present-day observations were spatially averaged over the western Lake Erie basin to represent the watersheds of interest ($40\text{--}43^\circ\text{N}$, $85.5\text{--}83^\circ\text{W}$). Observational averages (Fig. 4 and Fig. S9) reflect an average from 1986 to 2005, the defined Climate Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5) present-day analysis time period. Whereas 2011 is not in the Unified CPC dataset, real-time data are available for 2011 and implemented for the May 2011 event analysis as described in the previous paragraph.

Nutrient Loading Data. Analysis of long-term trends and 2011 discharge and phosphorus loading were performed using the Maumee River dataset of the National Center for Water Quality Research at Heidelberg University (NCWQR) and flow data from the US Geological Survey, both from a site at Waterville, Ohio (USGS 04193500). The NCWQR dataset contains near-daily observations of sediment, nutrients, and major ions with two to four observations per day during periods of storm runoff, and contains more than 16,000 samples between 1975 and 2011. Parameters include total phosphorus (TP) and dissolved reactive phosphorus (DRP). Based on results from special studies on a smaller number of samples, particulate phosphorus (PP) was estimated as $PP = TP - 1.1 \times DRP$. Phosphorus loads are reported as metric tons of P.

The Maumee data were converted to a complete daily time series by discharge-weighted averaging of concentrations for days with multiple samples. Daily discharge for 2011 is shown in Fig. S4. Gaps in phosphorus data were filled using linear interpolation if the gap was less than 6 d long or by regression models relating concentration to flow, long-term trend, and seasonality if longer than 6 d long. The daily series were collapsed to monthly series, which are used for trend analysis.

Long-term trends (1995–2011) and net changes were determined by regression of monthly load and discharge-weighted mean concentration (load/discharge) against decimal time. Results were verified using more complex regression models involving ln

(concentration) as a function of $\ln(\text{discharge})$, time, and seasonality represented by sine and cosine terms in $2\pi t$ and $4\pi t$, where t is decimal time (5, 6). Table S2 shows the results of this regression analysis.

Analysis of 2011 loading was performed using a FORTRAN program that steps through the daily time series, computing the total discharge and loads for a specified length of time (111 or 15 d for this study). The results were then sorted from high to low and the corresponding percentile in the overall distribution was computed for the period that ended June 8, 2011, the last day of the period of storm runoff.

Soil and Water Assessment Tool Model. The Soil and Water Assessment Tool (SWAT), developed by the USDA, is a process-based watershed model with spatially explicit parameterization (7, 8). SWAT models forecast hourly, daily, monthly, or annual flow, discharge, sediment, and nutrient loads for each subwatershed (often around 10,000 ha) and for an entire watershed. It is a continuous time and long-term model to predict the impact of agricultural management on flow, discharge, sediment, nutrient, and chemical yields (7). SWAT is driven with weather data (i.e., precipitation and air temperature), and approximates the hydrologic cycle (i.e., surface runoff, infiltration, and evapotranspiration), plant growth, water quality constituents (i.e., nitrogen, phosphorus, pesticides, and bacteria), and agricultural management schemes (i.e., fertilizer/manure application and tillage practices).

Lake Erie Temperature and Wind Data. Wind and temperature data from a buoy located in the central basin of Lake Erie were analyzed to assess in-lake meteorological conditions during the spring and summer in 2011. Hourly data on wind speed and water temperature were downloaded from the NOAA National Data Buoy Center (NDBC) website (www.ndbc.noaa.gov/station_page.php?station=45005) for Station 45005 (41.677° N 82.398° W), a 3-m discus buoy operated in the middle of the central basin of Lake Erie. The data are available for the years 2002–2011.

Wind stress in units of Pascals (τ) is determined from wind speed based on the approach in ref. 9:

$$\tau = \rho \times w^2 \times [0.001 \times (0.69 + 0.081 \times w)],$$

where ρ is the air density, estimated as $1.25 \text{ kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-3}$, w is the mean hourly wind speed in m/s, and the term in square brackets is an empirical drag coefficient. Wind stress and water temperature were daily averaged (i.e., over 24 h).

Days with average wind stress less than 0.05 Pa and average water temperature greater than 15 °C were classified as promoting growth, whereas periods with average wind stress greater than 0.1 Pa and/or average water temperature less than 15 °C were classified as limiting growth (9).

Additionally, three specific time periods were identified for years where the bloom initiation date was known (2002, 2003, 2008, and 2011): prebloom, bloom onset, and postonset. The approximate dates of bloom initiation, determined based on dates reported in the literature (9–12), were August 28, 2002; August 12, 2003; August 14, 2008; and July 15, 2011, respectively.

The prebloom period was defined as the time from the first occurrence of the growth-promoting conditions until two weeks before bloom initiation. The bloom onset period was defined as a four-week window around the date of bloom initiation. The postonset period is defined as starting two weeks after bloom initiation and lasting until the last occurrence of growth-promoting conditions. The percent of time with growth-promoting and growth-limiting conditions was calculated for each of these three periods for the four years with known bloom initiation dates.

Statistical significance was assessed using a difference in sample proportions test, comparing 2011 conditions to pooled statistics from 2002, 2003, and 2008, examining the proportion of days in

each period where conditions were either growth promoting or growth limiting, depending on the analysis. No significant temporal autocorrelation was found in the observations, confirming the validity of this test.

Remotely sensed lake surface temperature data from the NOAA CoastWatch were also examined for all of Lake Erie for 1992–2011 and for the western basin specifically for the years 2009–2011 (data available from <http://coastwatch.glerl.noaa.gov/>; Fig. S5).

Lake Hydrodynamic Model. The 3D hydrodynamic circulation model developed by Beletsky and Schwab (13) was used to represent circulation in Lake Erie. The model is based on the Princeton Ocean Model (14) and is a nonlinear, hydrostatic, fully 3D, primitive equation, finite difference model. The model uses time-dependent wind stress and heat flux forcing at the surface, free-slip lateral boundary conditions, and quadratic bottom friction. The drag coefficient in the bottom friction formulation is spatially variable and is calculated based on the assumption of a logarithmic bottom boundary layer using depth-dependent bottom roughness that varies from 0.1 cm in deep water to 1 cm in shallow water. Horizontal diffusion is calculated with a Smagorinsky eddy parameterization with a multiplier of 0.1 to give a greater mixing coefficient near strong horizontal gradients. The Princeton Ocean Model employs a terrain following vertical coordinate system (sigma-coordinate). The equations are written in flux form, and the finite differencing is done on an Arakawa-C grid using a control volume formalism. The finite differencing scheme is second order and centered in space and time (leap-frog). The model includes ref. 15's level 2.5 turbulence closure parameterization.

The hydrodynamic model of Lake Erie has 21 vertical levels (with equal spacing from surface to bottom) and a uniform horizontal grid size of 2 km (Fig. S6). The model was driven by observed winds and tributary flows. Daily inflows from 22 tributaries and outflows at the Niagara River and Welland Canal were incorporated as boundary conditions (16). The model also incorporates an empirical ice model (16), which reduces momentum flux: wind stress is reduced by 0.5 times the ice concentration. The model was validated with observations of water level and lake surface temperature.

Lake Particle Transport Model. The 3D particle trajectory code is based on the second order accurate horizontal trajectory code described by ref. 17, with the addition of vertical position tracking. It uses currents from the 3D circulation model of Lake Erie. Particles in the model are neutrally buoyant and follow the local currents. Particles are reflected back into the interior after collisions with model boundaries. Horizontal and vertical diffusion was introduced via Smagorinsky (with coefficient of 0.005) and random-walk approaches, respectively. Vertical diffusion was set at $5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$.

Lake Residence Times and River Plume Tracking. Particles were released at lake surface for two cases: (i) monthly basin-wide instantaneous releases and (ii) Maumee River and Detroit River mouth continuous 30-d release for June 2011.

In case i, residence times were investigated as a function of location and month (Fig. S7). In each month, particles were distributed across the western basin (20 particles per grid element) on the first day of each month, and trajectories were computed for each particle until it left the western basin.

In case ii, particles were released hourly from the Maumee and Detroit River mouths for the period June 1 to July 1, 2011 (20 particles per hour for 30 d; Fig. S8). Water originating from the Maumee and Detroit Rivers was tracked separately to elucidate mixing between the two sources and to determine the pathway by which their respective waters leave the basin.

Climate Model Output. Present-day and future climate model analysis was based on the Coupled Model Intercomparison Project Phase 5 (CMIP5) model data archive (18) (data available at <http://cmip-pcmdi.llnl.gov/index.html>). All model output was spatially averaged over the western Lake Erie basin. A total of 20 models in the CMIP5 archive have daily precipitation rates available, and one ensemble member (r11p1) for each model was selected for this analysis. Of these 20 models with daily precipitation rates, only 12 models had available future simulations using the Representative Concentration Pathway (RCP8.5) emissions scenario. The RCP8.5 emissions scenario projects greenhouse gas emissions with a continuous rise in radiative forcing to about 8.5 Watts per square meter in 2100 (19) and therefore represents an aggressive warming scenario. The 12 models selected for this analysis are detailed in Table S3.

SI Results and Discussion

May 25–27 Precipitation Event. The precipitation during May 25–27, 2011 over the Maumee and Sandusky river basins was produced by convective cloud clusters embedded in a synoptic scale low-pressure system. The center of circulation originated over the southern Great Plains on May 25, 2011, and propagated to the north and east over the following 2 d. Convection was concentrated along a lower-tropospheric stationary front that stretched from the low-pressure center to the northeast over the Maumee River watershed (Fig. S3). By 1200 coordinated universal time (UTC) on the 25th, a cluster of convective cells had formed along this boundary and subsequently moved to the north and east, reaching the Maumee basin by 1730 UTC (Fig. S3A). Over the following 10 h, convection continued to develop west and south of Lake Erie, moving in near continuous fashion over the Maumee and Sandusky river basins (Fig. S3B). During this time, a south–north oriented line of intense convective precipitation developed over Illinois associated with very strong south-to-north low level water vapor transport along and ahead of the surface cold front. Precipitation from this convective line reached the western shore of Lake Erie at ~0600 UTC on May 26 (Fig. S3C) and rapidly moved to the northeast, exiting the region by ~0800 UTC. Between 0800 UTC on May 26 and 0400 UTC on May 27, the center of circulation passed south of Lake Erie and produced a final set of relatively unorganized convective precipitation cells between 1600 UTC on May 26 and 0300 UTC on May 27 (Fig. S3D).

Land Use. Three main agricultural crops are grown in the western Lake Erie watershed: soybeans, corn, and winter wheat (Fig. S2). Substantial cropland also resides in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) under contracts that expire in different years (Fig. S2). The national trends in land use, since 2007, show an increase in corn and a decrease in CRP. Specifically, corn cropland grew by over 3.655 million hectares (11%) when comparing average annual area before (1997–2006) and after (2008–2011) the anomalous spike in corn cropland in 2007. CRP land area declined by 2.9 million hectares (20%) since 2007.

Trends in the western Lake Erie watershed, however, deviate sharply from the national trends. Based on county-level data for the watershed from the National Agricultural Statistics Service, average corn area for 2008–2011 decreased slightly relative to 1997–2006, from 959,000–957,000 ha per year. A minor upward trend occurred annually after 2007, with hectares increasing from 944,000 in 2008 to 967,000 in 2011 (2% increase). The watershed did experience the 2007 spike, with 1,114,000 ha planted in corn. A slight downward trend in CRP area occurred in the watershed, with hectares declining from 128,812 in 2007 to 114,806 in 2011 (11% decrease). Fig. S2 illustrates these trends.

Fertilizer Use. Two perspectives are relevant on phosphate fertilizer use: a comparison across the three main crops grown in the wa-

tershed and evidence on recent applications. The data on crop-level phosphate applications for 1997–2010 are from USDA's ARMS. We used state-level data from Ohio farms (the majority of the watershed is in Ohio) because county-level data are not available. ARMS does not collect data on every crop each year. Average phosphate applications are as follows: corn receives $78.7 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{ha}^{-1} \cdot \text{y}^{-1}$ (as P_2O_5) based on 9 y of data; soybeans receive $58.1 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{ha}^{-1} \cdot \text{y}^{-1}$ based on 8 y of data; and wheat receives $72.2 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{ha}^{-1} \cdot \text{y}^{-1}$ based on 7 y of data. Intensification of corn production—for example, (i) extending to 2 y of corn before growing soybeans in a corn–soybean rotation, (ii) moving from a corn–soybean rotation to continuous corn, or (iii) converting CRP land to corn production—would result in higher phosphate applications on farm fields.

Phosphate application data for the three crops are not available from ARMS for 2011 (only barley and sorghum are available for 2011); the most recent data are for 2010. In Ohio and Michigan, annual phosphate applications on corn fields were markedly lower in 2010 than during 1997–2005. The Ohio rate was $71.7 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{ha}^{-1} \cdot \text{y}^{-1}$ versus the 1997–2005 average of $79.6 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{ha}^{-1} \cdot \text{y}^{-1}$, whereas the Michigan rate was $35.9 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{ha}^{-1} \cdot \text{y}^{-1}$ versus the 1997–2005 average of $52.5 \text{ kg} \cdot \text{ha}^{-1} \cdot \text{y}^{-1}$. At the same time, other estimates of phosphate fertilizer applications in 2010 from the International Plant Nutrition Institute were higher than in the three previous years, 2007–2009. An estimated 83,814 tons were applied, in total, to farmland in the western Lake Erie watershed in 2010. The second highest level was 79,246 tons in 2007.

Dominance of Maumee River Nutrient Loading. The nutrient loading analysis was focused on the Maumee River because it dominates nonpoint source loading to the western basin of Lake Erie, where the *Microcystis* algal blooms originate.

The Maumee River contributes about 5% of discharge, but nearly 50% of phosphorus loading to the western basin. The other major loading source to the western basin is the Detroit River, which also contributes almost 50% of the phosphorus load, but more than 90% of the discharge. Because of the difference in discharge, the phosphorus concentrations in the Detroit River plume are much lower than those in the Maumee River plume. This means that the Detroit River concentrations are too low to make a significant contribution to major cyanobacteria blooms in the western basin of Lake Erie. Based on annual loads measured by the NCWQR between 2002 and 2011, the Sandusky River, which enters Lake Erie at the western end of the central basin, had 24% of both the TP and the DRP load of the Maumee River, and the Raisin River, adjacent to the Maumee to the north, had only 5% of the TP load and 6% of the DRP load of the Maumee. During the first half of 2011, the Sandusky River discharge was 30% of the Maumee River discharge, the TP load was 29% of the Maumee River load, and the DRP load was 27%. Cumulative loads of DRP for Maumee and Sandusky during the first half of 2011 are shown in Fig. S4.

Phosphorus loading from the Sandusky River may have helped support the late development of the 2011 bloom in the central basin. However, the Sandusky River discharges to the relatively large Sandusky Bay, where significant processing of phosphorus occurs before the water enters the central basin proper. Sandusky Bay often has its own algal blooms, but these are typically *Planktothrix*, a different alga. The fact that this alga was not detected in the central basin bloom indicates that the influence of the Sandusky River on the 2011 bloom was secondary at best, through phosphorus recycling in the lake.

SWAT Modeling. We model the Maumee watershed to investigate the effect of storm events and agricultural management practices on nutrient delivery to Lake Erie. SWAT was previously calibrated and confirmed for the Maumee watershed for discharge, sediment, and total and dissolved reactive phosphorus from 1998 to 2001 (20). Building on ref. 20, we extended the simulation period

(1970–2011) with calibration (1991–2011) and validation (1975–1990) to further explore the impact of weather and management scenarios on phosphorus loads. Temporal variation of agricultural practices, crop choices, and fertilizer application rates (21, 22) were represented for the 40-y simulation. We use meteorological information from 2011 and agricultural management input to investigate their contributions on nutrient delivery in the 2011 event. Precipitation data were taken from a single representative NOAA station in Fort Wayne, Indiana (Station ID:US1INAL0039) to drive the model scenarios. To enhance or reduce precipitation intensities, we multiplied observed intensities in April and May 2011 by 1.2 or 0.8, respectively. For the agricultural management practices, we assumed that all farmers in the watershed apply fertilizer on either April 15, May 5, or May 21 and select either no till or conventional tillage. Tillage practices in SWAT are represented by modifying the curve number (CN2) and overland roughness (23). The 1970–2011 model simulation includes the parameter changes described above during the whole simulation period.

Lake Erie Temperature and Wind Data. The analysis of bloom-promoting and bloom-limiting conditions shows that 2011 was less warm and quiescent (i.e., less bloom promoting) during the pre-bloom period than other years (51% relative to 64–71% in other years, $p = 0.017$). For the bloom onset period, 2011 was unremarkable with respect to strong wind conditions; it was under bloom-limiting conditions (i.e., high wind stress and/or temperature) 3.5% of the time, compared with 3.3–10.3% in other years ($p = 0.32$).

As an analysis of robustness, different start dates for the pre-bloom period were also tested: from the first time under growth-limiting conditions after April 1, from the mean date of first growth-limiting conditions (May 4), and from 2 and 3 mo before the bloom onset period. The results above are consistent across these pre-bloom period start dates.

Lake-wide summer lake surface temperatures in 2011 were about 3 °C above 1992–2011 climatological average (Fig. S5). In the western basin specifically, the 2011 summer peak temperature values reached 27 °C and exceeded that of 2010 by 1.2 °C for about 2 wk.

Future Land Use. Incentives and opportunities to expand corn production are expected to increase over the next 5 to 10 y. Under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007, the Renewable Fuel Standard program requires blending a certain amount of biofuel with gasoline (data available from www.epa.gov/oms/fuels/renewablefuels/index.htm). Under the standard, the eligible

amount of corn ethanol rises steadily from 9 billion gallons in 2008 to 15 billion gallons in 2015, and it remains there through 2022. (A future rulemaking by the US Environmental Protection Agency will specify conditions after 2022.) Consequently, corn cropland in the United States likely will continue to increase through 2015 and then will (roughly) plateau.

Features of the CRP will tend to support an expansion of crop production in the western Lake Erie watershed. The CRP is a voluntary program in which individual landowners enroll agricultural land in the reserve rather than farming the land. CRP contracts range from 10 to 15 y, and landowners receive payments for their enrolled acreage. CRP contracts continue to expire in the watershed, with 78% of current CRP land (almost 90,000 ha) eligible to return to crop production between 2012 and 2018. Data on contract expirations are available online as Excel spreadsheet files from the Farm Service Agency CRP statistics webpage (available at www.fsa.usda.gov). More generally, the US Congress is considering a new farm bill that would apply through 2017. The leading bills in both houses would shrink the maximum area in the CRP by more than 20%, from 12.9 million hectares in 2012 to 10.1 million hectares in 2017 (for the Senate bill, see <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.112s3240>; and for the House bill, see <http://hdl.loc.gov/loc.uscongress/legislation.112hr6083>). Shrinkage of the program would imply that, through at least 2017, land area in new CRP contracts would not replace the land in expiring contracts. CRP thus will serve as a “new” source of cropland in support of the biofuel boom.

With corn’s requirement for phosphate fertilizer, a credible projection for the next decade is that the agricultural land base will create greater potential for phosphorus loadings in western Lake Erie. The relationship between land use and the near-future scenarios of climate change (2046–2065) is less clear and may depend on changes in biofuel production technology. Whether corn continues as a vital feedstock and the environmental consequences of alternative feedstocks are difficult to forecast accurately for that time period.

Climate Model Output. For future climate scenarios, we define two time periods: the near future (2046–2065) and the end of century (2080–2099). Individual CMIP model daily precipitation rates are shown for the historical and two future time horizons (Fig. S9). Nearly all models (except for the Norwegian Climate Center Earth System Model) overpredict the intensity of precipitation with rates above 10 mm·d^{−1}. The models estimate that intensity will increase in the both the near-future and end-of-century simulations.

- Bridgeman TB, Chaffin JD, Filbrun JE (2013) A novel method for tracking western Lake Erie Microcystis blooms, 2002–2011. *J Great Lakes Res* 39(1):83–89.
- Eaton AD, Franson MAH (2005) *Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater* (Amer Public Health Assn, Washington, DC).
- Janse I, Meima M, Kardinaal WEA, Zwart G (2003) High-resolution differentiation of Cyanobacteria by using rRNA-internal transcribed spacer denaturing gradient gel electrophoresis. *Appl Environ Microbiol* 69(11):6634–6643.
- Poste AE, Hecky RE, Guildford SJ (2011) Evaluating microcystin exposure risk through fish consumption. *Environ Sci Technol* 45(13):5806–5811.
- Cohn TA (2005) Estimating contaminant loads in rivers: An application of adjusted maximum likelihood to type 1 censored data. *Water Resour Res* 41(7):W07003.
- Schwarz GE, Hoos AB, Alexander RB, Smith RA (2006) The SPARROW Surface Water-Quality Model: Theory, Applications and User Documentation. In *US Geological Survey, Techniques and Methods* (US Geological Survey, Reston, VA). Available at <http://pubs.usgs.gov/tm/2006/tm6b3>. Last accessed March 14, 2013.
- Gassman PW, Reyes MR, Green CH, Arnold JG (2007) The soil and water assessment tool: Historical development, applications, and future research directions. *T Asabe* 50(4):1211–1250.
- Tripathi MP, Panda RK, Raghuwanshi NS, Singh R (2004) Hydrological modelling of a small watershed using generated rainfall in the soil and water assessment tool model. *Hydrol Processes* 18(10):1811–1821.
- Wynne TT, Stumpf RP, Tomlinson MC, Dyble J (2010) Characterizing a cyanobacterial bloom in western Lake Erie using satellite imagery and meteorological data. *Limnol Oceanogr* 55(5):2025–2036.
- Millie DF, et al. (2009) Late-summer phytoplankton in western Lake Erie (Laurentian Great Lakes): Bloom distributions, toxicity, and environmental influences. *Aquat Ecol* 43(4):915–934.
- Rinta-Kanto JM, et al. (2005) Quantification of toxic Microcystis spp. during the 2003 and 2004 blooms in western Lake Erie using quantitative real-time PCR. *Environ Sci Technol* 39(11):4198–4205.
- Vincent RK, et al. (2004) Phycocyanin detection from LANDSAT TM data for mapping cyanobacterial blooms in Lake Erie. *Remote Sens Environ* 89(3):381–392.
- Beletsky D, Schwab DJ (2001) Modeling circulation and thermal structure in Lake Michigan: Annual cycle and interannual variability. *J Geophys Res-Oceans* 106(C9):19745–19771.
- Blumberg AF, Mellor GL (1987) A description of a three-dimensional coastal ocean circulation model. In *Three-Dimensional Coastal Ocean Models, Coastal Estuarine Sci.*, ed Heaps NS (American Geophysical Union, Washington, DC), pp. 1–16.
- Mellor GL, Yamada T (1982) Development of a turbulence closure-model for geophysical fluid problems. *Rev Geophys* 20(4):851–875.
- Schwab DJ, Beletsky D, DePinto J, Dolan DM (2009) A hydrodynamic approach to modeling phosphorus distribution in Lake Erie. *J Great Lakes Res* 35(1):50–60.
- Bennett JR, Clites AH (1987) Accuracy of trajectory calculation in a finite-difference circulation model. *J Comput Phys* 68(2):272–282.
- Taylor KE, Stouffer RJ, Meehl GA (2012) An overview of Cmp5 and the experiment design. *Bull Am Meteorol Soc* 93(4):485–498.
- Moss RH, et al. (2010) The next generation of scenarios for climate change research and assessment. *Nature* 463(7282):747–756.

20. Bosch NS, Allan JD, Dolan DM, Han H, Richards RP (2011) Application of the Soil and Water Assessment Tool for six watersheds of Lake Erie: Model parameterization and calibration. *J Great Lakes Res* 37(2):263–271.
21. Han H, Allan JD, Bosch NS (2012) Historical pattern of phosphorus loading to Lake Erie watersheds. *J Great Lakes Res* 38(2):289–298.
22. Ruddy BCL, Lorenz DL, Mueller DK (2006) County-level estimates of nutrient inputs to the land surface of the conterminous United States, 1982–2001 (US Geological Survey, Reston, VA).
23. Arabi M, Frankenberger JR, Enge BA, Arnold JG (2008) Representation of agricultural conservation practices with SWAT. *Hydrol Processes* 22(16):3042–3055.




Fig. S1. Progression of Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS) satellite images of the western basin of Lake Erie. (A) June 1, 2011. This image was taken after the peak of the late May high flow event in the Maumee River and shows the plume of suspended solids and associated nutrients from the river associated with that event. (B) July 19, 2011. This image was taken at the beginning of the *Microcystis* bloom. It shows that the bloom started along the western shore of the western basin, shortly after a moderate wind-driven bottom sediment resuspension event along the western shore. (C) July 31, 2011, approximately 2 wk after the bloom was first initiated. This image shows how the bloom has spread through much of the southern western basin. It also shows how the large flow from the Detroit River is keeping the bloom from spreading to the north. The Detroit River plume is also seen to be short circuiting to the central basin through the north passage between Point Pelee and Pelee Island. (D) August 11, 2011. This image shows the bloom spreading east toward the central basin. It also shows a smaller separate bloom from Lake St. Clair beginning to be transported through the Detroit River to the western basin. (E) September 3, 2011. This image shows the bloom expanding into the central basin and a second phase of the bloom forming along the northern shore of the central basin. (F) October 9, 2011. This image shows the decline of the bloom in the western basin, as it is diluted by the Detroit River plume transporting a whitening event from Lake St. Clair (precipitation of CaCO_3 as pH and temperature increase) into the western basin. The bloom is still evident along both the north and south shorelines of the central basin. [Images courtesy of University of Wisconsin-Madison Space Science and Engineering Center.]

Michalak et al. www.pnas.org/cgi/content/short/1216006110

Table S1. Risk factors for dissolved phosphorus loss from agriculture

Risk factor	Trend	Basis of knowledge of trend	Impact on nutrient loading	Mechanism
Fall fertilizer application rather than spring	+	Impact documented by Ohio Lake Erie Phosphorus Task Force (1); trend documented in neighboring regions (2) and anecdotally confirmed by farmers and certified crop advisors.	++	Longer exposure to precipitation.
Fertilizer broadcast on surface instead of injected or incorporated	+	Anecdotal (based on discussions with farmers and certified crop advisors).	++	More direct exposure to precipitation, lack of binding to soil particles.
Conservation tillage	+ (primarily pre-2000)	Data from Conservation Tillage Information Center, Purdue University.	+	Contribution to phosphorus stratification; incentive to surface-apply nutrients.
			–	Enhanced flow through soil matrix and reduced preferential flow lead to better contact with phosphorus-adsorption sites; enhanced water retention capacity.
Stratification of P in soil	+	Presence documented by NCWQR, trend inferred from conservation tillage trend. Eckert and Johnson (3) showed that stratification sets up quickly (3 y) without inversion tillage.	++	Surface application; breakdown of crop residue; lack of inversion tillage leads to phosphorus concentration near soil surface where leaching is most active.
Extent and efficiency of tile drainage	+	Research of Kevin King, USDA–ARS, The Ohio State University (Columbus, OH); Jane Frankenburg, USDA–NRCS, Purdue University (W. Lafayette, IN).	+	Decrease contact time between phosphorus and soil matrix.
Excessive fertilizer sales	Unknown	Practice documented (4), trend unknown.	+	More fertilizer, more export.
Consolidation of farms	+	Data from Census of Agriculture via National Agricultural Statistics Service.	+	Need for greater efficiency promotes surface application of fertilizers in the fall.
Animal numbers	+	Data from Census of Agriculture via National Agricultural Statistics Service.	+	More nutrients from manure.
Soil phosphorus concentrations	–	Data obtained by NCWQR from major soil-testing laboratories in Ohio (4).	–	Higher soil concentrations correlated with higher losses in runoff.

Impact of factors is based on consensus judgment of personnel involved with agriculture in northwest Ohio (USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service; USDA Agricultural Research Service; Ohio Department of Agriculture; certified crop advisors; The Andersons Inc., Toledo, Ohio; Tom Bruulsema, International Plant Nutrition Institute, Guelph, Ontario, Canada; NCWQR staff). For trend, + indicates an increase and – indicates a decrease. For impact, + indicates an increase in potential for nutrient loading, ++ indicates a large increase, and – indicates a decrease.

1. Strickland T, Fisher L, Korleski C (2010) Ohio Lake Erie Phosphorus Task Force Final Report (Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, Columbus, OH).
2. Napier T & Bridges T (2002) Adoption of conservation production systems in two Ohio watersheds: A comparative study. *J Soil Water Conserv* 57(4):229–235.
3. Eckert DJ, Johnson JW (1985) Phosphorus fertilization in no-tillage corn production. *Agron J* 77(5):789–792.
4. Mullen RW, Dayton EA (2010) Analysis of Soil Testing Laboratories and Data Mining. Final Report - Lake Erie Protection Fund Project TG02-09. Available at <http://lakeerie.ohio.gov/LakeErieProtectionFund/FinalReports.aspx> Last accessed March 14, 2013.

Table S2. Results of discharge and nutrient loading trend analyses, 1995–2011

Parameter	Simple regression			Complex regression <i>P</i> value
	Trend, yr ^{–1}	% change over 1995–2011	<i>P</i> value	
Discharge, 10 ⁶ m ³	9.72	42	0.12	—
TP load, Mg of P	5.01	58	0.14	0.56
PP load, Mg of P	2.28	31	0.39	0.003
DRP load, Mg of P	2.48	218	0.0004	<0.0001
TP DWMC, mg/L of P	4.73 × 10 ^{–4}	2.7	0.82	0.56
PP DWMC, mg/L of P	–2.36 × 10 ^{–3}	–16	0.16	0.003
DRP DWMC, mg/L of P	2.58 × 10 ^{–3}	98	<0.0001	<0.0001

Simple regression refers to regression against time only, complex regression refers to regression of logged parameter against ln (discharge), time, and sinusoidal seasonality factors. DWMC, discharge-weighted mean concentration (load/discharge).

Table S3. CMIP AR5 models used in present-day and future climate precipitation analysis

Model name	Institute	Resolution	Lat/Lon Eqv.
CCSM4	RSMAS	288 × 192	1.25° × 1°
GFDL-ESM2G	NOAA GFDL	144 × 90	2.5° × 2°
HadGEM2-CC	MOHC	192 × 145	1.875° × 1.25°
HadGEM2-ES	MOHC	192 × 145	1.875° × 1.25°
INMCM4	INM	180 × 120	2° × 1.5°
IPSL-CM5-LR	IPSL	96 × 96	3.75° × 1.875°
IPSL-CM5-MR	IPSL	144 × 143	2.5° × 1.25°
MIROC-ESM	MIROC	256 × 128	1.4° × 1.4°
MIROC-ESM-Chem	MIROC	128 × 64	2.8° × 2.8°
MIROC5	MIROC	256 × 128	1.4° × 1.4°
MRI-CGCM3	MRI	320 × 160	1.25° × 1.125°
NorESM	NCC	144 × 96	2.5° × 1.875°

CCSM, Community Climate System Model; ESM, Earth System Model; HadGEM, Hadley Centre Global Environment Model; INM, Institute for Numerical Mathematics; INMCM, INM Climate Model; IPSL, Institut Pierre-Simon Laplace; MIROC, Model for Interdisciplinary Research on Climate Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology; MOHC, Met Office Hadley Centre; MRI, Meteorological Research Institute; MRI-CGCM, MRI Coupled ocean-atmosphere General Circulation Model; NCC, Norwegian Climate Center; NOAA GFDL, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Geophysical Fluid Dynamics Laboratory; NorESM, Norwegian Earth System Model; RSMAS, Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science, University of Miami.