# ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT WILSON BAY (STURGEON CITY) PHASE I

## WETLAND RESTORATION ONSLOW COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA (EEP Project Number .00090)

Monitoring Year 6 (2006)



Submitted to: North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources Ecosystem Enhancement Program Raleigh, North Carolina

> Prepared by: Axiom Environmental, Inc. 2126 Rowland Pond Drive Willow Spring, North Carolina 27592

Design Firm: BLUE Land, Water, Infrastructure, PA 1271 Old US Highway 1 South Southern Pines, North Carolina 28387





March 2007

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Wilson Bay (Surgeon City) Wetland Restoration Phase I Site (Site) is located within the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Hydrologic Unit 03030001 (North Carolina Division of Water Quality [NCDWQ] subbasin 03-05-02) of the White Oak River Basin. The Site includes approximately 3.5 acres, located at Sturgeon City in Jacksonville, North Carolina in Onslow County (Figure 1). The Site is located adjacent to abandoned drying beds of an inactive municipal wastewater treatment plant. This closeout report summarizes data for year 1 (2001) through year 6 (2006) monitoring. No quantitative data was gathered for vegetation during year 6 (2006) monitoring; however, pictures and gauge data were collected and are included in this report.

The primary goals of the project included the following.

- 1. Reduce nutrient and stormwater inputs to adjacent estaurine waters.
- 2. Stabilize the shoreline through restoration of native vegetation.
- 3. Improve the aesthetics to that of a natural estuarine marsh.
- 4. Enhance wildlife habitat.
- 5. Educate visitors about the importance of coastal wetlands

One 10-meter square shrub/bay forest plot and eight 1-meter square marsh grass plots along two transects were previously established within the Site. No stem counts were performed in year 6 (2006); however, vegetative sampling performed in previous years 3 through 5 (2003 to 2005) supports the successful colonization and continued growth of planted species. Vegetative growth has been excellent in the brackish marsh, with many native volunteer salt marsh species; in addition an organic mat typical of a coastal salt marsh is continuing to develop. Undesirable or invasive species have not been observed within the Site during the entire monitoring period. In summary, the Site is stable, the desired plant communities are developing, the plants are healthy, and the marsh has an aesthetic appeal.

Vegetation problem areas include an area between the drying beds and the boardwalk along the edge of the Site where vegetation had been removed prior to year 6 (2006) monitoring. However, this area is beginning to recover and is expected to recover naturally as long as vegetation removal activities are not resumed.

No wetland problem areas have been identified during the year 6 (2006) monitoring year. Groundwater hydrology within 12 inches of the soil surface occurred for greater than 12.5 percent of the year 6 (2006) growing season. The gauge has met success criteria for the fourth consecutive year since its installation.

In summary, based on available data the site achieved success criteria for hydrology and vegetation over the entire monitoring period, and is expected to do so into the future.

#### **Table of Contents**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND	. 1
1.1 Location and Setting	. 1
1.2 Mitigation Structure and Objectives	
1.3 Project History and Background	
1.4 Monitoring Plan View	.4
2.0 PROJECT CONDITION AND MONITORING RESULTS	.6
2.1 Vegetation Assessment	.6
2.1.1 Soil Data	
2.1.2 Vegetative Problem Areas	.6
2.1.3 Stem Counts	.6
2.1.4 Vegetation Plot Photos	.9
2.2 Wetland Assessment	
2.2.1 Wetland Problem Area Plan View1	10
2.2.2 Wetland Criteria Attainment 1	
3.0 SIX-YEAR MONITORING ASSESSMENT 1	10
4.0. REFERENCES1	1

# Appendices

## APPENDIX A. VEGETATION PLOT PHOTOGRAPHS

1.	Vegetation	Monitoring	Photographs
1.	, egotation	monne	1 notographo

	-		-		
2	Vegetation	D 1.1	A	D1 1	i.
2.	vegeration	Proplem	Areas	Photograpi	<u>n</u>
<i>–</i> .	, egotation	110010111	1 m cub	1 notograpi	

APPENDIX B.	YEAR 6 (2006) GROUNDWATER GAUGE GRAPH
APPENDIX C.	YEAR 5 (2005) GROUNDWATER GAUGE GRAPH
APPENDIX D.	YEAR 4 (2004) GROUNDWATER GAUGE GRAPH
APPENDIX E.	YEAR 3 (2003) GROUNDWATER GAUGE GRAPH

# List of Figures

Figure 1.	Site Location	2
Figure 2.	Monitoring Plan	5
Figure 3.	Vegetation Problem Areas	7

# List of Tables

Table 1.	Project Mitigation Structures and Objectives	. 1
Table 2.	Project Activity and Reporting History	. 3
	Project Contact Table	
Table 4.	Project Background Table	.4
	Preliminary Soil Data	
Table 6.	Vegetation Problem Areas	.6
Table 7.	Vegetation Trends (Marsh Area)	. 8
Table 8.	Vegetation Trends (Shrub/Bay Forest Area)	. 8
Table 9.	Summary of Groundwater Gauge Results for Years 1 through 6	.9
Table 10	. Wetland Criteria Attainment	10

#### **1.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND**

#### 1.1 Location and Setting

The Wilson Bay (Surgeon City) Wetland Restoration Phase I Site (Site) is located within the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Hydrologic Unit 03030001 (North Carolina Division of Water Quality [NCDWQ] subbasin 03-05-02) of the White Oak River Basin. The Site includes approximately 3.5 acres, located at Sturgeon City in Jacksonville, North Carolina in Onslow County (Figure 1). The Site is located adjacent to abandoned drying beds of an inactive municipal wastewater treatment plant.

#### Directions to the Site:

From Raleigh:

- Travel east on Interstate 40 to Exit 373 (NC24/903 east)
- ➢ Follow NC 24 to Jacksonville
- > In Jacksonville, veer right onto Old Bridge Street to cross over the New River
- Turn right on Court Street
- > At the end of Court Street take a left into the inactive wastewater treatment plant
- > The Site is adjacent to Wilson Bay at the far end of the property

The Site is located in the Middle Atlantic Coastal Plain Physiographic Province, within the Carolina Flatwoods ecoregion.

#### **1.2 Mitigation Structure and Objectives**

Prior to implementation of wetland restoration activities, the Site was used as a municipal wasterwater treatment plant.

Restoration at the Site entailed 1) removal of trash laden fill material, 2) grading the Site to the desired elevations to restore wetland hydrology, and 3) planting the Site. The primary goals of this project were to reduce nutrient and stormwater inputs to adjacent estaurine waters, stabilize the shoreline through restoration of native vegetation, improve the aesthetics to that of a natural estuarine marsh, enhance wildlife habitat, and educate visitors about the importance of coastal wetlands. Project structures and objectives are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Project Mitigation Structures and Objectives         Wilson Bay (Sturgeon City) Wetland Restoration Phase I         (EEP Project Number .00090)						
Project Segment or Reach ID	Mitigation Type**	Approach	Linear Footage or Acreage	Stationing	Comment	
Bay Forest Wetland	Buffer		0.28 acre			
Cypress Gum Wetland Fringe	Buffer		0.07 acre			
Salt Shrub Fringe	Buffer		0.46 acre			
Brackish Marsh	Restoration		2.23 acres		Planted with Spartina cynosuroides in the lower elevations and Spartina patens in the higher elevations.	



#### **1.3 Project History and Background**

Completed project activities, reporting history, and completion dates are summarized in Table 2.

### Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History

#### Wilson Bay (Sturgeon City) Wetland Restoration Phase I (EEP Project Number .00090)

Data Actual Scheduled Collection Completion **Activity or Report** or Delivery Completion Completion **Restoration Plan** 2000 Jan. 14, 2001 ----Final Design - 90% Unknown Unknown ---Construction 2001 March 2001 ---2001 Temporary Sediment & Erosion Mix Applied to March 2001 ---Nonbrackish Marsh Project Areas Permanent Seed Mix Applied Not Applicable Not Applicable Not Applicable Brackish Marsh Planting 2001 April 2001 ---Containerized and B&B Plantings in Shrub/Forest 2001 June 2001 \_\_\_\_ Wetland/Buffer Areas As-built Report (Year 0 Monitoring – map only) 2001 Sept. 30, 2001 ---Year 1 Monitoring (2001) Fall 2001 Nov. 2001 ---Year 2 Monitoring (2002) Fall 2002 Not Completed ---Year 3 Monitoring (2003) Fall 2003 Oct. 2003 Year 4 Monitoring (2004) Fall 2004 Oct. 2004 ---Year 5 Monitoring (2005) Fall 2005 Sept. 2005 ---Year 6 Monitoring (2006) Fall 2006 Nov. 2006 Feb. 2007

Contact information regarding project designer, construction, planting contractor, and monitoring personnel are summarized in Table 3 and relevant project background information is summarized in Table 4.

Table 3. Project Contact Table Wilson Bay (Sturgeon City) Wet	tland Restoration Phase I			
(EEP Project Number .00090)				
Designer	BLUE: Land, Water, Infrastructure, PA			
	1271 Old Highway 1			
	Southern Pines, NC 28387			
	Thomas Blue (910) 692-6461			
Property Owner	City of Jacksonville			
	PO Box 128			
	Jacksonville, North Carolina 28541			
	Glenn Hargett (910) 938-5200			
Construction Contractor	Eastern Excavating			
	143 Penquin Lane			
	Jacksonville, North Carolina 28546			
	Terry Williams (910) 353-9100			

Table 3. Project Contact Table (continued)					
Planting Contractor	Southern Landscaping and Grounds Management				
	1379 Burgaw Highway				
	Jacksonville, North Carolina 28540				
	George Smith (910) 346-6092				
Seeding Contractor	Unknown				
Temporary Seed Mix Sources	Unknown				
Nursery Stock Suppliers (marsh plants)	Campbells Greenhouse				
	Raleigh, North Carolina				
	Street Address and Point of Contact: Unknown				
Monitoring Performers	Axiom Environmental, Inc.				
	2126 Rowland Pond Dr.				
	Willow Spring, NC 27592				
	Grant Lewis 919-215-1693				

Table 4. Project Background Table	
Wilson Bay (Sturgeon City) Wetland Restoration I (EEP Project Number .00090)	Phase I
Project County	Onslow County, North Carolina
Drainage Area	20 acres
Drainage impervious cover estimate (%)	< 10
Stream Order	First (tidal creek)
Physiographic Region	Coastal Plain
Ecoregion	Carolina Flatwoods
Rosgen Classification of As-built	Not Applicable
Cowardin Classification	Estaurine Intertidal Emergent Persistant Mixohaline (E213)
Dominant Soil Types	Wando fine sand
Reference Site ID	No Reference
USGS HUC for Project and Reference	Project - 03030001
NCDWQ Subbasin for Project and Reference	Project - 03-05-02
NCDWQ Classification for Project and Reference	Project – SC HQW NSW
Any portion of any project segment 303d listed?	No (Stream Index #19-14)
Any portion of any project segment upstream of a 303d listed segment?	No
Reasons for 303d listing or stressor	Not Applicable
% of project easement fenced	100 percent of landward side

## 1.4 Monitoring Plan View

Monitoring activities for the Site, including relevant structures and utilities, project features, specific project structures, and monitoring features are detailed in Figure 2.

Site features have been monitored with one 10-meter square shrub/bay forest vegetation plot, eight 1meter square marsh grass vegetation plots along two transects, one continuous recording groundwater gauge, and photographic documentation.



This closeout report summarizes data for year 1 (2001) through year 6 (2006) monitoring. No quantitative data was gathered for vegetation during year 6 (2006) monitoring; however, pictures and gauge data were collected and are included in this report.

# 2.0 PROJECT CONDITION AND MONITORING RESULTS

# 2.1 Vegetation Assessment

Vegetation monitoring plots were randomly established within the Site and measured during the five-year monitoring period. Measured parameters within all vegetation plots included vegetation height, counted stems, and percent coverage. One 10-meter by 10-meter shrub/bay forest vegetation plot located within the shrub/bay forest wetland area was used to measure survivability of tree species, while a smaller 5-meter square nested plot assessed shrub species, and a 1-meter square nested plot looked at herbaceous coverage. In addition, eight 1-meter by 1-meter marsh grass plots were sampled along two transects established within the brackish marsh area perpendicular to the shoreline.

## 2.1.1 Soil Data

General soil conditions found onsite, including level of erosion and percentage of organic matter, are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. Preliminary Soil Data         Wilson Bay (Sturgeon City) Wetland Restoration Phase I         (EEP Project Number .00090)							
Series Max Depth % Clay on K T OM %							
	(inches)	Surface	IX I		0.1170		
Wando	85	1	0.1	5	<1		

## 2.1.2 Vegetative Problem Areas

Vegetation problem areas within the Site are depicted on Figure 3 and are outlined in Table 6. Vegetation problem areas include an area between the drying beds and the boardwalk along the edge of the Site where vegetation had been removed prior to year 6 (2006) monitoring. However, this area is beginning to recover and is expected to recover naturally as long as vegetation removal activities are not resumed.

Table 6. Vegetation Problem Areas	
-----------------------------------	--

#### Wilson Bay (Sturgeon City) Wetland Restoration Phase I (EEP Project Number .00090)

Feature/Issue	Location	Probable Cause	Photo	
Vegetation	Between the drying beds and	Vegetation removal associated	Problem Area Photo 6	
removal	the boardwalk	with boardwalk construction	(Appendix A)	

# 2.1.3 Stem Counts

One 10-meter square shrub/bay forest vegetation plot and eight 1-meter square brackish marsh grass vegetation plots (along two linear transects) were previously established by North Carolina State University in 2003 as depicted in Figure 2. The plots were located randomly within the Site. The western linear marsh transect was shifted slightly for the year 5 (2005) surveys due to construction of the boardwalk. Vegetation trends during the monitoring years are summarized in Tables 7 and 8. No reference area was studied; therefore no comparisons could be made to reference conditions.



Table 7. Vegetat	ion Trends (I	Marsh Area)			
Wilson Bay (Stur (EEP Project Nu	0 0	Vetland Restoration Pha	se I		
Lower Marsh (Spa	ertina cynosuro	ides) Data Range			
<b>Monitoring Year</b>	Firm	Stem Count	Height (meters)	Percent Cover	
2001	S&EC		Not available		
2002		Not measured			
2003*	NCSU	55-87	2-2.5	35-60	
2004**	NCSU	52-66	1.75-2.5	45-60	
2005*	BLWI	24-41	1.0-3.4	60-80	
Upper Marsh (Spa	rtina patens) D	Data Range			
<b>Monitoring Year</b>	Firm	Stem Count	Height (meters)	Percent Cover	
2001	S&EC	Not available			
2002		Not measured			
2003	NCSU	Not applicable	0.75-1	100	
2004	NCSU	Not applicable	0.75-1	100	
2005	BLWI	Not applicable	1.1-1.4	60-65	

\* - Based on four plots.

**	-	Based	on	six	plots.	

Wilson Bay (EEP Proje	ν U	on City) Wetland Res er .00090)	toration Phase I				
Monitoring Year	Firm	Tree Stratum Density* (# in plot [# per acre])	Shrub Stratum Density** (# in plot [# per acre])	Total Tree + Shrub Stratum Density	Shrub Stratum % Coverage	Herbaceous Layer % Coverage	
2001	S&EC	Not available					
2002		Not measured					
2003*	NCSU	4 trees (162 trees per acre)	5 shrubs (820 shrubs per acre)	982 stems per acre	1	100	
2004**	2004** NCSU 6 trees (243 trees per acre)		6 shrubs (984 shrubs per acre)	1227 stems per acre	1.5	100	
		7 trees (283 trees per	3 shrubs (492 shrubs	775 stems per			
2005*	BLWI	acre)	per acre)	acre	8	100	

\* - Based on one 10-meter square bay forest plot (0.0247-acre plot).

\*\* - Based on one 5-meter square (0.0061-acre plot) nested shrub plot within the above 10-meter square bay forest tree plot.

According to previous monitoring reports, vegetative success criteria requires 25 percent coverage after the first year, 50 percent coverage after the second year, and 75 percent coverage after the third year.

The average percent coverage within the lower marsh (*Spartina cynosuroides*) was greater than 75 percent for year 5 (2005) monitoring and within the upper marsh (*Spartina patens*) was greater than 75 percent for years 3 and 4 (2003 and 2004) monitoring. The percent coverage dipped between 60 and 65 percent coverage in year 5 (2005) monitoring in the upper marsh (*Spartina patens*); however, vegetative growth has been excellent in the brackish marsh, with many native volunteer salt marsh species; in addition an organic mat typical of a coastal salt marsh is continuing to develop.

The average plot density monitored within the shrub/bay forest is greater than 260 stems per acre with greater than 75 percent coverage and is considered successful. The average plot density has been measured between 775 and 1227 tree and shrub stems per acre during the monitoring period. The dominant species identified within the shrub/bay forest plot were pond pine (*Pinus serotina*) and large gallberry (*Ilex coriacea*).

Undesirable or invasive species have not been observed within the Site during the entire monitoring period. In summary, the Site is stable, the desired plant communities are developing, the plants are healthy, and the marsh has an aesthetic appeal.

## 2.1.4 Vegetation Plot Photos

Photographs taken in the vegetation monitoring area are included in Appendix A; locations of each are depicted on Figure 2. The photographs show that the marsh grasses are growing well and the shrub/bay forest area continues to mature with a diversity of woody and herbaceous species.

#### 2.2 Wetland Assessment

One groundwater monitoring gauge has been maintained and monitored throughout the year 6 (2006) growing season. The gauge is located within the shrub/bay forest area and records daily readings of groundwater depth. Daily rainfall data recorded from a rain gauge maintained and monitored at the nearby New River Station in Jacksonville, North Carolina was used for seasonal comparison (SCONC 2007). The graph of groundwater hydrology and precipitation is included in Appendix B.

Success criteria for wetland groundwater hydrology require inundation or saturation within 12 inches of the ground surface for a consecutive period of 12.5 percent of the growing season. The growing season in Onslow County begins April 8 and ends November 5 (212 days). In order to attain hydrologic success in the shrub/bay forest area, saturation within 12 inches of the ground surface is required for at least 27 consecutive days (12.5 percent of the growing season).

The groundwater gauge was installed prior to year 3 (2003) monitoring; therefore, no groundwater data is available for years 1 and 2 (2001 and 2002) monitoring. The groundwater gauge graph for year 3 (2003) through year 6 (2006) is included in Appendices B through G. The following table summarizes success criteria achievement for the groundwater gauge over the six-year monitoring period.

Table 9. Summary of Groundwater Gauge Results for Years 1 through 6Wilson Bay (Sturgeon City) Wetland Restoration Phase I(EEP Project Number .00090)							
	Success Criteria Achieved/Max Consecutive Days During Growing Season (Percentage)						
Gauge	Year 1 (2001)	Year 2 (2002)	Year 3 (2003)	Year 4 (2004)	Year 5 (2005)	Year 6 (2006	
1	No Data*	No Data*	Yes/42 days (19.8 %)	Yes/47 days (22.2 %)	Yes/47 days (22.2 %)	Yes/37 days (17.5 %)	

\* - The groundwater gauge was not installed until year 3 (2003) monitoring; therefore, no hydrology data is available for years 1 or 2.

Groundwater hydrology within 12 inches of the soil surface occurred for greater than 12.5 percent of the growing season for the year 6 (2006) growing season with 37 days (17.5 percent) of consecutive saturation or inundation. The gauge has met success criteria each year since its installation.

### 2.2.1 Wetland Problem Area Plan View

No wetland problem areas have been identified during the year 6 (2006) monitoring year.

#### 2.2.2 Wetland Criteria Attainment

The groundwater gauge located within the bay forest restoration area met success criteria of inundation/saturation within 12 inches of the surface for greater than 12.5 percent of the growing season (Table 10). Hydrographs containing precipitation data for each gauge can be found in Appendix B. Photographs within the vegetation monitoring areas can be found in Appendix A. No quantitative data was gathered for vegetation during year 6 (2006) monitoring; vegetation trend data can be found above in Section 2.1.3 (Stem Counts).

Table 10. Wetland Criteria Attainment						
Wilson Bay (Sturgeon City) Wetland Restoration Phase I (EEP Project Number .00090)						
Gauge ID	Gauge IDHydrology Threshold Met?Hydrophytic Vegetation Criteria Met?Site Mean					
1	Yes	Yes	100 %			

# 3.0 SIX-YEAR MONITORING ASSESSMENT

In summary, based on available data over the six-year monitoring period, the restoration site achieved success criteria for vegetation and hydrology, and is expected to do so into the future.

No stem counts were performed in year 6 (2006); however, vegetative sampling performed in previous years supports the successful colonization and continued growth of planted species. Vegetative growth has been excellent in the brackish marsh, with many native volunteer salt marsh species; in addition an organic mat typical of a coastal salt marsh is continuing to develop. Undesirable or invasive species have not been observed within the Site during the entire monitoring period. In summary, the Site is stable, the desired plant communities are developing, the plants are healthy, and the marsh has an aesthetic appeal.

Vegetation problem areas include an area between the drying beds and the boardwalk along the edge of the Site where vegetation had been removed prior to year-6 (2006) monitoring. However, this area is beginning to recover and is expected to recover naturally as long as vegetation removal activities are not resumed.

No wetland problem areas have been identified during the year 6 (2006) monitoring year. Groundwater hydrology within 12 inches of the soil surface occurred for greater than 12.5 percent of the year 6 (2006) growing season. The gauge has met success criteria each year since its installation.

#### 4.0. REFERENCES

- State Climate Office of North Carolina (SCONC). 2007. North Carolina Climate Retrieval and Observations Network of the Southeast Database. (online). Available: http://www.ncclimate.ncsu.edu/cronos/ [January 24, 2007]. State Climate Office of North Carolina, Raleigh, North Carolina.
- United States. Department of Agriculture (USDA). 1992. Soil Survey of Onslow County, North Carolina. United States Department of Agriculture.

## APPENDIX A

# VEGETATION PHOTOGRAPHS

- 1. Vegetation Monitoring Photographs
- 2. Vegetation Problem Area Photograph

# Appendix A 1. Vegetation Monitoring Photographs Taken November 14, 2006





Picture 2: Looking at the edge of the marsh from dock







Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Monitoring Year 6 (2006) March 2007 Appendix A Appendix A 2. Vegetation Problem Area Photographs Taken November 14, 2006



Picture 6: This area had been mowed and shrubs were removed between the boardwalk and the drying basins.However, the area is started to recover and is expected to recover naturally. APPENDIX B YEAR 6 (2006) GROUNDWATER GAUGE GRAPH



Sturgeon City (Wilson Bay) Phase I Year 6 (2006 Gauge Data)

Wilson Bay (Sturgeon City) Phase I EEP Project Number .00090 Onslow County, North Carolina Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Monitoring Year 6 (2006) March 2007 Appendix B APPENDIX C YEAR 5 (2005) GROUNDWATER GAUGE GRAPH



(ui) diga

Wilson Bay (Sturgeon City) Phase I EEP Project Number .00090 Onslow County, North Carolina

Sturgeon City Phase I

Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Monitoring Year 6 (2006) March 2007 Appendix C APPENDIX D YEAR 4 (2004) GROUNDWATER GAUGE GRAPH



# APPENDIX E YEAR 3 (2003) GROUNDWATER GAUGE GRAPH

