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### 1.0 PROJECT SUMMARY

The Simmons Street / Jack Smith Creek Stormwater Project is a nutrient offset project that involves the creation of 25 acres of planted stormwater wetland areas. As part of the construction, 14 acres of wetlands were impacted and converted into stormwater wetland areas. Approval of this conversion was obtained by providing on-site mitigationfor the impacts. A total of 1.0 acres of wetland creation, 2.3 acres of wetland enhancement, and 10 acres of wetland preservation were proposed and approved to serve as the on-site mitigation. The construction of the stormwater wetland and wetland preservation, creation and enhancement efforts totaled to 38.3 acres. The total urban watershed area treated by the site was approximately 1,534 acres. The purpose of this report is to provide onsite mitigation information, and BMP- related monitoring associated with the project. The goals and objectives of the mitigation areas of the project are provided below.

| Goals | Objectives |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. Improve the quality of stormwater runoff that flows to <br> Jack Smith Creek by reducing nutrient and sediment <br> loadings. | Create 25 acres of stormwater wetlands that will <br> receive and treat stormwater runoff. |
| 2. Reduce the impact of flooding in an urban watershed <br> in New Bern | Utilize created stormwater wetlands for flood control <br> through the use of pumps. |
| 3. Protect and preserve existing bottomland <br> hardwood/headwater forest wetlands along Jack Smith <br> Creek. | Protect existing wetlands in a conservation easement <br> and restore native vegetation where needed. |

This project is a unique water quality partnership between the City of New Bern, the Division of Mitigation Services (DMS, formerly the Ecosystem Enhancement Program), and the NC Clean Water Management Trust Fund. The project is primarily a stormwater wetland designed to capture and treat runoff from a large watershed in New Bern. The wetland is an environmental initiative by the City and is a part of the DMS NutrientOffset Program. The project is unique in both its size and scope, and, at the time of construction, was the largest stormwater retrofit built to date in NC. The site location and contributing watershed represents a rare chance to intercept stormwater before it gets to the Neuse River, less than one mile away. In addition, the site hasbeen used by NC State University as a wetland research park to evaluate the ability of large scale wetlands to improve water quality.

### 2.0 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

### 2.1 Vegetation

An average density of 260 stems/acre must be surviving after five years of monitoring to meet success. Two permanent vegetation plots were established at the project inception.

### 2.2 Hydrology

The wetland enhancement and creation areas will present continuous saturated or inundated hydrologic conditions for at least $12 \%$ of the growing season during normal weather conditions. A "normal" year is based on NRCS climatological data for Craven County, using the 30th to 70th percentile thresholds as the range of normal. The growing season for the site occurs from March 18 to November 14 ( 241 days). Hydrologic performance will be determined through evaluation of automatic recording gauge data supplemented by documentation of wetland hydrology indicators as defined in the 1987 USACE Delineation Manual, daily data will be collected fromautomatic wells over the 5 -year monitoring period. Eight (8) continuous monitoring groundwater gauges were installed to following construction of the project.

### 3.0 MONITORING PLAN

Annual monitoring data will be reported using the DMS monitoring template, with the parameters below.

| Parameter | Quantity | Frequency |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Groundwater <br> Hydrology | 8 (2 reference, 5 creation, 1 enhancement) | annual |
| Vegetation | 2 (1 enhancement, 1 creation) | annual |
| Project boundary <br> \& Visual <br> assessment | N/A | Semi-annual |
| BMP | The Town of New Bern will inspect and maintain stormwater cells and <br> make repairs if necessary as described on the O\&Magreement | As Needed |

### 4.1 MONITORING

Year 5 annual monitoring (MY5) was conducted in November 2017. Monitoring activities included visual monitoring and stem counts of the project vegetation; downloading monitoring gauge data; checking the integrity of the easement; and taking photographs. The creation and enhancement areas have an established stand of obligate wetland grasses and rushes and desirable species of volunteer trees were documented. Both vegetation plots met vegetative success criteria in MY5 (Table 6 and 7).

All groundwater gauges in the creation and enhancement wetlands met hydrologic success criteria for MY5 and achieved a success hydroperiod greater than $12 \%$ of the growing season (Appendix D). When the project was transferred from NC State to DMS for monitoring, it was discovered that one of the reference gauges which has not met hydrology over the entire monitoring, was installed outside the easement in a non-wetland area. Therefore, gauge three should not be evaluated for comparison as a reference.

The stormwater wetland BMP areas do not have vegetative success criteria. However, both planted vegetation and volunteers have developed successfully over the monitoring period. Each wetland cell has been substantially established in desirable stormwater wetland species. While there are areas of cattail growth on the site; these areas contain desirable species as well. Based on visual assessment in MY5, cattail is not a significant threat to the site and was managed appropriately over the monitoring period. The stormwater BMP maintenance is a routine task of the New Bern Stormwater Division in the Public Works department. Monitoring and maintenance occurs at least quarterly, and annual monitoring forms are provided in Appendix F.

Initial estimates of BMP performance indicated that these stormwater wetlands could treat up to 1,000 acres of runoff and that the cells would have a treatment effectiveness of $40 \%$ total nitrogen (TN), $35 \%$ total phosphorus (TP), and $85 \%$ total suspended solids (TSS). Water quality monitoring in MY1 and MY2 conducted by NC State showed that the actual effectiveness resulted in reductions of $76 \% \mathrm{~N}, 91 \% \mathrm{TP}$, and $90 \%$ TSS (Appendix E).

The City of New Bern has conducted regular monitoring at the site, and the project is considered to have a significant benefit to water quality and stormwater storage. DMS recommends closing this project as proposed.

APPENDIX A
BACKGROUND TABLES

Table 1: Project Mitigation Components

| Mitigation Credit Summations |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Nitrogen Nutrient Offset |  |  |  |
| 198,243 lbs* | Area (Ac) | Notes |  |
| Project Components | 25 | BMP |  |
| Project Component | 1.0 | On-Site Mitigation |  |
| Stormwater Wetlands | 2.3 | On-Site Mitigation |  |
| Created Wetland | 10.0 | On-Site Mitigation |  |
| Enhanced Wetland |  |  |  |
| Preserved Wetlands |  |  |  |

*Calculations and justification included in Appendix for $40 \%$ nitrogen reduction.
Based on treatment of stormwater runoff from an urban watershed of approximately 1530 acres.
Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History

| Activity or Deliverable | Data Collection Complete | Completion or Delivery |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Restoration Plan |  | N/A |
| Final Design - Construction Plans | Nov-08 | Nov-10 |
| Construction |  | Dec-12 |
| Bare root plantings for mitigation areas |  | Jan-13 |
| Stormwater wetland planting |  | Jun-13 |
| Mitigation Plan / As-built (Year 0 Monitoring - baseline) |  | Dec-13 |
| Year 1 Monitoring | Nov-13 | Dec-13 |
| *Supplemental Planting |  | Mar-14 |
| **Cattail removal and supplemental plugs in BMP area |  | May-14 |
| Year 2 Monitoring | Feb-15 | May-15 |
| Year 3 Monitoring | Oct-15 | Mar-16 |
| Year 4 Monitoring | Nov-16 | Mar-17 |
| Year 5 Monitoring | Nov-17 | Dec-17 |
| *The created wetland was replanted in with 600 plants in the winter of 2014 due to low stem counts from browse in MY 1 (2013) |  |  |
| ** Cattail removal and supplemental planting of 5,000 plugs occurred in the constructed wetland on May 2014 to for more desirable wetland species. |  |  |

Table 3. Project Contacts Table

| Simmons Street / New Bern Stormwater BMP Project / DMS \# 92646 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Designer <br> Primary project design POC | NCSU Biological and Agricultural Engineering <br> Kris Bass 919.515.8245 |
| Construction Contractor <br> Construction contractor POC | Carolina Environmental Contracting <br> Joanne Cheatham 336.320.3849 |
| Survey Contractor <br> Survey contractor POC | Turner Land Surveying <br> Lissa Turner 919.875.1378 |
| Planting Contractor <br> Planting contractor POC | Carolina Wetland Services <br> Gregg Antemann 866.527.1177 |
| Nursery Stock Suppliers <br> Planting POC | Wetland Plants, Inc. <br> Ellen Colodney 252.482.5707 |
| Monitoring Performers | NC Division of Mitigation Services <br> Lindsay Crocker and Casey Haywood 919-707-8944 |

Table 4. Project Attributes Table

| Project Information |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Name | Simmons Street / New Bern Stormwater BMP |  |  |  |
| County | Craven |  |  |  |
| Project Area (acres) | 40 acres |  |  |  |
| Project Coordinates (latitude and longitude) | 35.1243, -77.0616 |  |  |  |
| Project Watershed Summary Information |  |  |  |  |
| Physiographic Province | Coastal Plain |  |  |  |
| River Basin | Neuse |  |  |  |
| USGS HUC for Project (14 Digit) | 3020204020010 |  |  |  |
| DWQ Sub-basin | 03-04-10 |  |  |  |
| Project Drainage Area (acres) | 1500 |  |  |  |
| Project Drainage Area, \% Impervious | 55\% |  |  |  |
| Wetland Summary Information |  |  |  |  |
| Parameter | Stormwater Wetland | Created Wetland | Enhanced Wetland | Preserved Wetland |
| Size of Wetland (acres) | 25 | 1 | 2.3 | 10 |
| Wetland Type (non-riparian, riparian riverine or riparian non-riverine) | Stormwater | Non-Riparian | Riparian | Riparian |
| Mapped Soil Series | Arapahoe FSL | Arapahoe FSL | Arapahoe FSL | Arapahoe FSL |
| Drainage Class | Very Poorly Drained | Very Poorly Drained | Very Poorly Drained | Very Poorly Drained |
| Soil Hydric Status | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Source of Hydrology | Stormwater | Groundwater | Surface Water | Surface Water |
| Hydrologic Impairment | None | Drained and Graded | Drained | None |
| Regulatory Considerations |  |  |  |  |
| Regulation | Applicable? | Resolved? | Supporting Documentation |  |
| Waters of the U.S. Section 404 | Yes | Yes | NCDENR CAMA Major Permit \#61-10 |  |
| Waters of the U.S, - <br> Section 401 |  |  |  |  |
| Endangers Species Act | Yes | Yes | NCDENR CAMA Major Permit \#61-10 |  |
| Historic Preservation Act | Yes | Yes | NCDENR CAMA Major Permit \#61-10 |  |
| Coastal Area <br> Management Act |  |  |  |  |
| Essential Fisheries Habitat | Yes | Yes | NCDENR CAMA M | or Permit \#61-10 |

## APPENDIX B

VISUAL ASSESSMENT DATA





## Site Photos



Outlet weir looking towards Cell D


Wetland Creation Area


Tidal gates looking towards outlet


APPENDIX C
VEGETATION PLOT DATA

Table 6. Vegetation Plot Summary

| Plot \# | Planted Stems | Avg. Stems per Acre | Success Criteria <br> Met |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 7 | 283 | Yes |
| 2 | 9 | 364 | Yes |

Table 7. Vegetation Density
DMS Project Code 92646. Project Name: BMP (Simmons Street Wetland New Bern)

| Scientific Name | Common <br> Name | Species <br> Type | Current Plot Data (MY5 2017) |  |  |  | Annual Means |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 92646-01-0001 |  | 92646-01-0002 |  | MY5 (2017) |  | MY4 (2016) |  | MY3 (2015) |  | MY2 (2014) |  | MY1 (2013) |  |
|  |  |  | Planted | Total | Planted | Total | Planted | Total | Planted | Total | Planted | Total | Planted | Total | Planted | Total |
| Acer rubrum | red maple | Tree |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |  | 8 |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |
| Ulmus americana | american elm | Tree |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fraxinus pennsylvanica | green ash | Tree |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Morella cerifera | wax myrtle | shrub |  | 13 |  | 5 |  | 18 |  | 18 |  | 18 |  |  |  |  |
| Nyssa aquatica | water tupelo | Tree | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |
| Nyssa biflora | swamp tupelo | Tree | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 |
| Pinus taeda | loblolly pine | Tree |  | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pyrus calleryana | Callery pear | Exotic |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| Taxodium distichum | bald cypress | Tree | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 4 |
| *Liriodendron tulipifera | tulip poplar | Tree |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 6 |  |  |
| Unknown |  | Tree |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| Stem count |  |  | 7 | 26 | 9 | 15 | 16 | 41 | 16 | 43 | 16 | 43 | 24 | 24 | 11 | 15 |
| size (ares) |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 |  | 2 |  |
|  |  | size (ACRES) | 0.025 |  | 0.025 |  | 0.05 |  | 0.05 |  | 0.05 |  | 0.05 |  | 0.05 |  |
| Species count |  |  | 3 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 |
| Stems per ACRE |  |  | 283 | 1053 | 364 | 607 | 324 | 830 | 324 | 870 | 324 | 870 | 486 | 486 | 223 | 304 |

* DMS believes that the MY1 and MY2 plant monitoring misidenfied Nyssa species as Liriodendron, and that initial monitoring efforts were problematic

APPENDIX D HYDROLOGIC DATA

Figure 4. Monthly Rainfall Data BMP (Simmons Street Wetland, New Bern), DMS Project ID\# 92646


Observed rainfall data collected from the State Climate Office of North Carolina, NC State University CRONOS database, Craven County Airport, NC (KEWN) monitoring station. Historic data obtained from the USDA-NRCS Agricultural Applied Climate Information System (Craven County Airport, NC (KEWN) monitoring station).

Figure 5a. Monitoring Gauge \#1
BMP (Simmons Street Wetland, New Bern), DMS Project ID\# 92646


Growing Season Days: 2 (Mar 18 - Nov 14)
Target Hydroperiod Percent: 12\%
Required Number of Days Meeting Requirements: 29
Longest Period Meeting Requirements: 157
Hydroperiod Percent: 65.1\%

Figure 5b. Monitoring Gauge \#2
BMP (Simmons Street Wetland, New Bern), DMS Project ID\# 92646


Growing Season Days: 2 (Mar 18 - Nov 14)
Target Hydroperiod Percent: 12\%
Required Number of Days Meeting Requirements: 29
Longest Period Meeting Requirements: 47
Hydroperiod Percent: 19.5

Figure 5c. Monitoring Gauge \#3
BMP (Simmons Street Wetland, New Bern), DMS Project ID\# 92646


Growing Season Days: 2 (Mar 18 - Nov 14)
Target Hydroperiod Percent: 12\%
Required Number of Days Meeting Requirements: 29
Longest Period Meeting Requirements: 6
Hydroperiod Percent: 2.5\%

Figure 5d. Monitoring Gauge \#4
BMP (Simmons Street Wetland, New Bern), DMS Project ID\# 92646


Growing Season Days: 241(Mar 18 - Nov 14)
Target Hydroperiod Percent: 12\%
Required Number of Days Meeting Requirements: 29
Longest Period Meeting Requirements: 241
Hydroperiod Percent: 100\%

Figure 5 e . Monitoring Gauge \#5
BMP (Simmons Street Wetland, New Bern), DMS Project ID\# 92646


Growing Season Days: 241(Mar 18 - Nov 14)
Target Hydroperiod Percent: 12\%
Required Number of Days Meeting Requirements: 29
Longest Period Meeting Requirements: 61
Hydroperiod Percent: 25.3\%

Figure 5f. Monitoring Gauge \#6
BMP (Simmons Street Wetland, New Bern), DMS Project ID\# 92646


Growing Season Days: 241 (Mar 18 - Nov 14)
Target Hydroperiod Percent: 12\%
Required Number of Days Meeting Requirements: 29
Longest Period Meeting Requirements: 61
Hydroperiod Percent: 25.3\%

Figure 5g. Monitoring Gauge \#7
BMP (Simmons Street Wetland, New Bern), DMS Project ID\# 92646


Growing Season Days: 241 (Mar 18 - Nov 14)
Target Hydroperiod Percent: 12\%
Required Number of Days Meeting Requirements: 29
Longest Period Meeting Requirements: 62
Hydroperiod Percent: 25.7\%

Figure 5h. Monitoring Gauge \#8
BMP (Simmons Street Wetland, New Bern), DMS Project ID\# 92646


Growing Season Days: 241 (Mar 18 - Nov 14)
Target Hydroperiod Percent: 12\%
Required Number of Days Meeting Requirements: 29
Longest Period Meeting Requirements: 141
Hydroperiod Percent: 58.5\%

Table 8. Wetland Hydrology Criteria Attainment

|  | Success Criteria Achieved/Max Consecutive Days During Growing Season |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Percentage) |  |  |  |

1. Growing Season is 241 days. Twelve (12) percent of the growing season is equal to 29 days or more of consecutive readings above 12 inches.
2. None of the gauges provided reliable data during the 2015 monitoring season. All gauges were pulled and replaced March 2016 to capture the 2016 growing season.

## APPENDIX E

## BMP SUPPORTING DATA

| Subwatershed | Residential |  |  |  |  |  | Commercial | Forest | Industrial | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Open } \\ & \text { space } \end{aligned}$ | Road |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 acre | 1/2 acre | 1/3 acre | 1/4 acre | 1/8 acre | 2 acre |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| 0 | 12.49 | 31.01 | 95.08 | 199.85 | 14.28 | 2 acre |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 0.84 | 9.55 | 10.71 | 29.16 | 0.44 | 0 | 88.18 | 81.98 | 82.17 | 43.56 | 148.89 | 797.51 |
| 2 | 6.86 | 67.95 | 45.98 | 18.03 | 1.22 | 35 | 54.25 | 3.22 | 13.01 | 9.44 | 18.01 | 148.62 |
| 3 | 0.56 | 14.55 | 46.09 | 12.95 | 8.96 | 32 | 35.25 | 61.09 | 28.24 | 13.65 | 45.78 | 325.41 |
| Total | 20.75 | 123.07 | 197.86 | 259.99 | 24.89 | , | 241.62 | 48.15 | 8.85 | 27.74 | 30.61 | 262.72 |
|  |  |  |  | 259.93 | 24.89 | 1.68 | 241.62 | 194.45 | 132.26 | 94.39 | 243.3 | 1534.25 |


| Main Watershed | 8.26 | 92.05 | 102.78 | 60.14 | 10.62 | 1.67 | 153.43 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Percent Impervious | 0.2 | 0.25 | 0.3 | 0.38 | 0.65 | 0.12 | 153.43 0.85 | 112.46 | 50.1 | 50.83 | 94.4 |
| Rv | 0.23 | 0.275 | 0.32 | 0.392 | 0.635 | 0.158 | 0.85 | 0 | 0.72 | 0 | 0.95 |
| R | 11.3 | 13.5135 | 15.7248 | 19.26288 | 31.2039 | 7.76412 | 0.815 | 0.05 | 0.698 | 0.05 | 0.905 |
| Load (TP) | 6.33 | 84.3376 | 109.57802 | 78.544239 | 22.467931 | $\frac{7.76412}{}$ | $\frac{40.0491}{416.6129254}$ | $\frac{2.457}{18.73410412}$ | 34.29972 | 2.457 | 44.4717 |
| Load (TN) | 42.2 | 562.251 | 730.52011 | 523.62826 | 149.78621 | 5.8606683 | 2777.419503 | 18.73410412 | 116.5086 | 8.46749522 | 284.6331 |
| Load (TSS) | 1150 | 15321.3 | 19906.673 | 14268.87 | 4081.6742 | 159.70321 | 75684.68145 | 124.8940274 | 776.724 | 56.4499681 | 1897.554 |
| Extra Watershed | 12.49 | 31.01 | 95.08 | 199.85 | 14.28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Impervious | 0.2 | 0.25 | 0.3 | 0.38 | 14.28 | 0 | 88.18 | 81.98 | 82.17 | 43.56 | 148.89 |
| Rv | 0.23 | 0.275 | 0.32 | 0.392 | 0.65 | $\frac{0.12}{0.158}$ | 0.85 | 0 | 0.72 | 0 | 0.95 |
| R | 11.3 | 13.5135 | 15.7248 | 19.26288 | 31.2039 | 7.76412 | 0.815 | 0.05 | 0.698 | 0.05 | 0.905 |
| Load (TP) | 9.571 | 28.4118 | 101.36873 | 261.00875 | 30.211117 | 7.76412 | 40.0491 | 2.457 | 34.29972 | 2.457 | 44.4717 |
| Load (TN) | 63.81 | 189.412 | 675.79152 | 1740.0583 | 201.40744 | 0 | 4377095 | 13.65660551 | 191.0881 | 7.25642518 | 448.9303 |
| Load (TSS) | 1739 | 5161.48 | 18415.319 | 47416.589 | 5488.3529 | 0 | 1596.251396 | 91.04403672 | 1273.92 | 48.3761678 | 2992.869 |



|  | Pre-BMP Loading (Ibs/year) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Main WS | Extra WS | Total | lbs/ac/yr |
| TP | 1,147 | 1,331 | 2,478 | 1.62 |
| TN | 7,647 | 8,873 | 16,520 | 10.77 |
| TSS | 208,389 | 241,788 | 450,176 | 293.42 |


| Removal \% | Removal (lbs/yr) |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Main WS | Extra WS | Total | lbs/ac/yr |
| $35 \%$ | 401 | 466 | $\mathbf{8 6 7}$ | 0.57 |
| $40 \%$ | 3,059 | 3,549 | $\mathbf{6 , 6 0 8}$ | 4.31 |
| $85 \%$ | 177,130 | 205,519 | $\mathbf{3 8 2 , 6 5 0}$ | 249.41 |


| Post-BMP Loads (lbs/yr) |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Main WS | Extra WS | Total | lbs/ac/yr |
| 746 | 865 | 1,611 | 1.05 |
| 4,588 | 5,324 | 9,912 | 6.46 |
| 31,258 | 36,268 | 67,526 | 44.01 |

Since the project activation in early June of 2013, 30 base flow events and 25 storm flow events have been sampled for water quality at six locations in the wetland system. Base flow events are classified as the events that are pumped from Jack Smith Creek to the wetland by the smaller, electric pump. This is typically the actual base flow from the creek and events less than 1.50 inches. The storm events are classified as events where the larger, diesel pumps must turn on to handle the flow of the creek, typically events greater than 1.50 inches (Figure 1).


Figure 1: Schematic of the monitoring set-up and characterization of base flow and storm event cells.

The six monitoring stations consist of ISCO 6712 automated samplers to collect flow-weighted water quality samples. Hydrology is also measured via bubbler and areal velocity meter modules.

Of the events mentioned above, results from 30 base flow and 25 storm event samples have been analyzed (Table 1). The parameters of interest were Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN), Total Ammonical Nitrogen, $\mathrm{NH}_{3}-4$ (TAN), Nitrite-Nitrate Nitrogen (NO2-3), Total Phosphorus (TP), and Total Suspended Solids (TSS). Total Nitrogen (TN) was calculated by the addition of TKN and NO2-3.

Percent reductions are calculated inflow of the wetland vs. outflow of the cell (e.g. SF Inlet vs. SF Middle and SF Inlet vs. Outlet). The first cells tend to have the highest treatment rates for TN, especially for the storm events, and then concentrations increase slightly. This is attributed to the release and irreducible nature of certain organic nitrogen (ON) species in wetland systems; irreducible effluent concentrations typically range from $0.7-0.8 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ (Moore et al. 2011).

Table 8: Mean EMC Concentrations and Percent Reductions for June 2013 - October 2014

|  | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{TKN} \\ (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Red } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TAN } \\ (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Red } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NO2-3 } \\ & (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Red } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{TN} \\ (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Red } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{TP} \\ (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Red } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TSS } \\ (\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \% Red |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Storm Events |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SF Inlet | 1.41 |  | 0.10 |  | 0.14 |  | 1.55 |  | 0.34 |  | 71.21 |  |
| SF Middle | 0.55 | 61 | 0.03 | 66 | 0.04 | 69 | 0.59 | 62 | 0.06 | 82 | 4.20 | 94 |
| Outlet | 0.60 | 58 | 0.03 | 66 | 0.04 | 72 | 0.64 | 59 | 0.04 | 87 | 6.49 | 91 |
| Base Flow Events |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BF Inlet | 1.27 |  | 0.12 |  | 0.20 |  | 1.46 |  | 0.23 |  | 38.17 |  |
| BF Middle | 0.67 | 47 | 0.09 | 31 | 0.06 | 69 | 0.73 | 50 | 0.05 | 77 | 4.35 | 89 |
| BF End | 0.94 | 26 | 0.08 | 36 | 0.06 | 69 | 0.97 | 34 | 0.14 | 40 | 77.48 | -103 |
| Outlet | 0.62 | 51 | 0.04 | 67 | 0.04 | 77 | 0.67 | 54 | 0.05 | 80 | 7.11 | 81 |

The concentration results indicate the wetland is performing exceedingly well with all nutrient and sediment reductions (from inlets to outlet: green values) exceeding $50 \%$. There is a large increase of TSS at the BF End station due to scouring, but treatment occurs prior to reaching the outlet, yielding an average TSS concentration of $7.11 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. The City of New Bern was alerted of the scoured area will maintain the site in the near future.

The inlet (SF Inlet and BF Inlet) and outlet (Outlet) nutrient and sediment loadings will be statistically analyzed when the hydrological analysis and quality check is complete for those stations. This analysis is currently underway.

As mentioned previously, most of the treatment for all nutrients and sediment occurs in the first cells of the system, whether it's a storm event or base flow. This is illustrated in Figures 2 and 3.


Figure 2: Illustrates where the treatment occurs in the base flow cells of the constructed wetland for each pollutant.


Figure 3: Illustrates where the treatment occurs in the storm event cells of the constructed wetland for each pollutant.

Nutrient (TN and TP) and sediment (TSS) loadings were also calculated for the two inlets and the outlet of the wetland system (Table 2). Observations from Table 2 indicate the wetland system has performed very well with all percent loading reductions exceeding state guidelines and relatively small loads exported from the site.

The major differences between the field monitored loading reductions and the predicted loading reductions can be attributed to the prediction of the inlet loadings to the site. The predicted inlet loads were much larger than the field observed loadings to the site. This affects the predicted loading reductions and exported loads from the site that were calculated using state removal guidelines.

Table 9: Predicted and Monitored Nutrient Loadings and Reductions for the Jack Smith Creek Stormwater Wetland
FIELD MONITORED RESULTS

|  | Storm Event Inlet |  |  | Base Flow Inlet |  |  | Outlet of System |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loading Units | TN | TP | TSS | TN | TP | TSS | TN | TP | TSS |
| lb/year | 1,144 | 249 | 47,385 | 3,943 | 607 | 103,517 | 1,202 | 80 | 14,526 |
| lb/ac/year | 0.75 | 0.16 | 30.88 | 2.57 | 0.40 | 67.47 | 0.78 | 0.05 | 9.47 |

FIELD MONITORED LOADINGS

|  | Loading Reductions |  |  | Percent Reductions |  |  | Exported Loads from Site |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loading Units | TN | TP | TSS | TN | TP | TSS | TN | TP | TSS |
| lb/year | 3,885 | 776 | 136,375 | $76 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $90 \%$ | 1,202 | 80 | 14,526 |
| lb/acre/year | 2.53 | 0.51 | 88.88 |  |  |  | 0.78 | 0.05 | 9.47 |

PREDICTED LOADINGS

|  | Loading Reductions |  |  | State Removal <br> Guidelines |  |  | Exported Loads from Site |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loading Units | TN | TP | TSS | TN | TP | TSS | TN | TP | TSS |
| lb/year | 6,608 | 867 | 382,650 | $40 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $85 \%$ | 9,912 | 1,611 | 67,526 |
| lb/acre/year | 4.31 | 0.57 | 249.41 |  |  |  | 6.46 | 1.05 | 44.01 |

## APPENDIX F

BMP ANNUAL MONITORING

## Annual Stormwater BMP Inspection and Reporting Form

Location: __ Simmons Street BMP (New Bern, NC)
Date: $10 / 1 / 2013$ Time: $0730 \quad$ Recent Weather:__Rainy

Inspector: Avery Smith
Type of BMP: $\quad$ Stormwater BMP

Date of Construction: $\qquad$ July 2013

To answer these questions completely and thoroughly, visually inspect the entire BMP as closely as possible. Take notes and photographs on all information below.

Depth of water in forebay: Approx. 1 foot

Is erosion present? _ No If yes, where: $\qquad$
Is the outlet (orifice) obstructed, or can water flow freely out? $\qquad$
Are plants alive and thriving?
Post construction wetland plants have not established themselves.

Are non-native plants present?
No

Is mowing occurring inside the boundaries of the BMP?
No

Are beavers and/or muskrats present?
Yes, in the preserved wetland bordering the constructed wetlands

Is floating trash/debris present?
Yes, at the inlet to the BMP

BMP Maintenance Table

| Task | Completed? |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Clear outlet/orifice so <br> water can exit freely | Y or N | Yotes |
| Remove non-native <br> plants only | Y or N | Not necessary this inspection period |
| Remove beaver dams | Y or N | Yes, we have implemented a pest control program |
| Remove floating <br> trash/debris | Y or N | Yes, we have a maintenance schedule to remove <br> trash from BMP inlet/pump station |
| Remove accumulated <br> sediment from <br> forebay | Yor N |  |

See pictures attached.





## Annual Stormwater BMP Inspection and Reporting Form

Location: __ Simmons Street BMP (New Bern, NC)
Date: $8 / 4 / 2014$ Time: $0800 \quad$ Recent Weather: ___ Rain
$\qquad$
Type of BMP: __ Stormwater BMP

Date of Construction: $\qquad$ July 2013

To answer these questions completely and thoroughly, visually inspect the entire BMP as closely as possible. Take notes and photographs on all information below.

Depth of water in forebay: 1.75 Feet

Is erosion present? No If yes, where: $\qquad$
Is the outlet (orifice) obstructed, or can water flow freely out?
Yes
Are plants alive and thriving?
Yes

Are non-native plants present? $\qquad$

Is mowing occurring inside the boundaries of the BMP?
Yes

Are beavers and/or muskrats present? $\qquad$
Is floating trash/debris present?
Yes, at the inlet to the pump station

BMP Maintenance Table

| Task | Completed? | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clear outlet/orifice so water can exit freely | Y or N | Yes |
| Remove non-native plants only | Y or $\mathbf{N}$ | We are in the process of treating cattails. Also we are starting to see a lot of alligator weed in the inlet waterways |
| Remove beaver dams | Y or N | Only in the inlet waterways and surrounding protected wetlands |
| Remove floating trash/debris | $\mathbf{Y}$ or N | At the inlet to the pump station regularly |
| Remove accumulated sediment from forebay | Y or N | No the presents of sediment is minimal |

See monitoring report pictures.

## Annual Stormwater BMP Inspection and Reporting Form

Location: __Simmons Street BMP (New Bern, NC)
Date: $8 / 7 / 2015$ Time: $0730 \quad$ Recent Weather:__Rain

Inspector:__Avery Smith
Type of BMP: $\quad$ Stormwater BMP

Date of Construction: $\qquad$ July 2013

To answer these questions completely and thoroughly, visually inspect the entire BMP as closely as possible. Take notes and photographs on all information below.
Depth of water in forebay: 2 Feet
$\qquad$ If yes, where: $\qquad$
Is the outlet (orifice) obstructed, or can water flow freely out? Yes

Are plants alive and thriving?
Yes

Are non-native plants present? $\qquad$

Is mowing occurring inside the boundaries of the BMP?
Yes

Are beavers and/or muskrats present? $\qquad$ Yes, in the surrounding areas

Is floating trash/debris present?
Yes, in the waterway suppling the BMP

| Task | Completed? |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Clear outlet/orifice so <br> water can exit freely | Y or N | Yes |
| Remove non-native <br> plants only | Y or $N$ | At this point we are using mechanical methods to <br> remove Alligator weed from the inlet to the pump <br> station, due to its ability to slow supply water to the <br> pumps. |
| Remove beaver dams | Y or N | In the past years we have been trapping beaver, <br> muskrat, and nutria. For the most part we have only <br> had muskrat and nutria inside the BMP, the beaver <br> seem to stay in the surrounding protected wetlands. |
| Remove floating <br> trash/debris | Y or N | Yes, we get a lot of trash from the nearby <br> neighborhoods and it is a routine task to keep under <br> control. |
| Remove accumulated <br> sediment from <br> forebay | Y or N <br> into the forbay has minimal sediment because it is <br> pumped in. Under normal condition trash and <br> sediment are left at the inlet to the pump station. |  |

See monitoring report pictures.

## Annual Stormwater BMP Inspection and Reporting Form

Location: __ Simmons Street BMP (New Bern, NC)
Date: $\quad$ 8/15/2016 Time: $\underline{0900}$ Recent Weather: Sunny

Inspector:__Avery Smith
Type of BMP: $\quad$ Stormwater BMP

Date of Construction: $\qquad$ July 2013

To answer these questions completely and thoroughly, visually inspect the entire BMP as closely as possible. Take notes and photographs on all information below.

Depth of water in forebay: $\qquad$

Is erosion present? $\qquad$ Yes

If yes, where: $\qquad$

Is the outlet (orifice) obstructed, or can water flow freely out? Yes

Are plants alive and thriving? Yes

Are non-native plants present? $\qquad$
Yes

Is mowing occurring inside the boundaries of the BMP?
Yes

Are beavers and/or muskrats present? Yes, in areas that indirectly effect the wetlands
Is floating trash/debris present? Yes, around the inlet to the pump station that
supplies water to the BMP

| Task | Completed? |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Clear outlet/orifice so <br> water can exit freely | Y or $N$ |  |
| Remove non-native <br> plants only | $Y$ or $N$ | We treat invasive with herbicides when possible. <br> Under normal circumstances we remove invasive <br> plants mechanical means. |
| Remove beaver dams | Y or $N$ | Yes, we remove dams from a few areas around the <br> BMP due to the effects they have on drainage of the <br> BMP. |
| Remove floating <br> trash/debris | Y or $N$ | Remove of trash from around the pump area is <br> under a routine schedule |
| Remove accumulated <br> sediment from <br> forebay | Y or N | Still no noticeable built up of sediment. I feel that <br> this will probably take longer due the water being <br> introduces by a pump. |

See monitoring pictures.

## Annual Stormwater BMP Inspection and Reporting Form

Location: __Simmons Street BMP (New Bern, NC)
Date: $\quad 8 / 15 / 2017$ Time: __ Recent Weather: Scattered thunderstorms

Inspector:_Avery Smith
Type of BMP: $\quad$ Stormwater BMP

Date of Construction: $\qquad$ July 2013

To answer these questions completely and thoroughly, visually inspect the entire BMP as closely as possible. Take notes and photographs on all information below.

Depth of water in forebay: $\qquad$

Is erosion present? Yes $\qquad$ If yes, where: A few areas on top of the berms from vehicle and mower traffic.

Is the outlet (orifice) obstructed, or can water flow freely out? Water is flowing freely

Are plants alive and thriving? Yes
Are non-native plants present? Yes
Is mowing occurring inside the boundaries of the BMP?
Yes

Are beavers and/or muskrats present?
Yes, in the surrounding areas

Is floating trash/debris present?
Yes, very little at the inlet structure

| Task | Completed? | Notes |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Clear outlet/orifice so <br> water can exit freely | Y or N | During my inspection I noticed at one of the main <br> crossover pipes some vegetation has grown up and <br> slowed water flow down, I will schedule it to be <br> opened up for water to move freely. |
| Remove non-native <br> plants only | Y or N | It has been observed that some unwanted plants <br> are present. Due to the scale this BMP total removal <br> would be futile. They have been allowed to exist but <br> are being kept under control. |
| Remove beaver dams N | We found a dam downstream of the BMP and is in <br> the process of being remove, only because it is <br> effecting water levels inside the BMP and protected <br> wetlands in the surrounding areas. |  |
| Remove floating <br> trash/debris | Y or N | A normal task under our routine maintenance <br> program. |
| Remove accumulated <br> sediment from <br> forebay | Y or N | Still no noticeable build-up of sediment. |

See attached pictures.




