

## E.4. Create, Restore, and Enhance Coastal Wetlands: Monitoring Guidance



*This guidance is intended to promote consistency in data collection among similar types of projects and allow for future analysis across TIGs and Restoration Types, (Section 10.6.2 of SOP; DWH NRDA Trustees, 2016). This guidance may also assist the TIGs by providing recommended methodologies for monitoring restoration projects, saving time and money spent developing suitable monitoring protocols for individual restoration projects. If adjustments from this monitoring guidance are needed for a particular project, these adjustments should be described in the project-specific MAM Plan and agreed to by the TIG (Section 10.6.3 of SOP; DWH NRDA Trustees, 2016). Project teams within each TIG will identify parameters applicable to the objectives for each individual restoration project when developing the project MAM Plan. In addition to the project monitoring guidance identified in this Manual, specific monitoring may be required to comply with permits granted by regulatory agencies. The TIGs are not restricted from adding additional parameters, and other project monitoring that may be needed for specific projects should be determined by the TIGs.*

*The Cross-TIG MAM work group developed this monitoring guidance by following the process described in the Monitoring and Adaptive Management Procedures and Guidelines Manual Version 1.0 (MAM Manual Version 1.0; DWH NRDA Trustees, 2017).*

This guidance is intended to assist the TIGs in developing MAM Plans for restoration projects, as appropriate. Specifically, it provides:

- Examples of Restoration Techniques
- Guidance on example restoration objectives, example drivers, and example uncertainties
- Guidance on core performance monitoring parameters for projects within the Restoration Approach
- Guidance on supplemental performance monitoring parameters for specific restoration objectives.

The monitoring parameters identified within a project MAM Plan should be consistent with the recommended monitoring defined within this guidance document, wherever appropriate. Depending on the nature of the restoration project, TIGs may also choose not to include some of the elements described in this guidance document (e.g., drivers, uncertainties). If adjustments from the monitoring guidance are needed, these adjustments should be described in the project-specific MAM Plan and agreed to by the TIG (Section 10.6.3 of SOP; DWH NRDA Trustees, 2016b). The guidance provided should not be considered exhaustive. Therefore, TIGs may develop project-level objectives, drivers, uncertainties, and monitoring parameters that have not been previously identified. The TIGs will develop MAM objectives and monitoring parameters that pertain to their restoration activities; and will determine the frequency and duration of monitoring, and the associated budget they deem appropriate. Finally, this section is subject to

change as new monitoring parameters, methods, and technologies are identified and/or developed.

The monitoring parameters recommended in this guidance document are further detailed in Attachment E Section E.3, which includes a complete list of core- and objective-specific monitoring parameters identified by the Cross-TIG MAM work group and guidance on measurement unit(s) and monitoring methods. Guidance on monitoring locations, frequencies, durations of sampling and potential analyses is also provided where appropriate.

#### **E.4.1. Restoration Techniques**

Restoration Techniques are specific restoration actions the Trustees identified for each of the Restoration Approaches. Restoration Techniques may be used individually or in combination. See Appendix 5.D of the PDARP/PEIS (DWH NRDA Trustees, 2016a). The following are example Restoration Techniques included in the PDARP/PEIS for this Restoration Approach. This list should not be considered exhaustive; additional Restoration Techniques may be developed and/or identified.

1. Create or enhance coastal wetlands through placement of dredged material
2. Backfill canals
3. Restore hydrologic connections to enhance coastal habitats
4. Construct breakwaters.

#### **E.4.2. Example Project-Level Restoration Objectives**

Project-level restoration objectives should be specific to the resource injuries and clearly specify the desired outcome(s) of the restoration project (15 CFR § 990.55(b)(2)). See Section 2.4.1 of the MAM Manual Version 1.0 for guidance on establishing restoration objectives. The following are example project-level restoration objectives that may apply to one or more of the above-mentioned Restoration Techniques. This list should not be considered exhaustive; additional objectives may be developed and/or identified.

- Create or restore intertidal wetland elevations
- Restore targeted coastal wetland hydrology
- Increase or maintain native coastal wetland vegetation
- Restore targeted salinity regime
- Reduce shoreline erosion rate
- Restore hydrologic connectivity
- Provide habitat for fish and invertebrates
- Provide habitat for resident and migratory birds
- Increase habitat connectivity
- Increase the abundance of targeted species
- Remove invasive species.

#### **E.4.3. Example Drivers**

Drivers are outside forces, natural or anthropogenic, that have the potential to influence the outcome(s) of a restoration project. Drivers tend to be large-scale, long-term forces that are not easily controlled at the scale of a single restoration project (Harwell et al., 2016). See Section 2.4.2 of the MAM Manual Version 1.0 for guidance on establishing the conceptual setting for a MAM Plan, including identifying drivers. The following are example drivers that may be applicable to this Restoration Approach. This list should not be considered exhaustive; additional drivers may be identified.

- Hydrologic regime
- Freshwater inflow
- Precipitation
- Sediment input/load
- Subsidence
- Nutrients
- Sea level rise
- Storms/wave energy
- Sediment accretion/erosion
- Grazing/herbivory
- Invasive species
- Hard-freeze events
- Physical impacts
- Boat wakes
- Adjacent development/land use
- Chemical impacts (e.g., oil spills).

#### **E.4.4. Example Uncertainties**

Uncertainties or information gaps have the potential to affect adaptive management decisions for individual or multiple restoration projects. These decisions may include how to improve the likelihood of achieving favorable project outcomes or selecting corrective actions in the event a project is not performing as intended. See Section 2.4.3 of the MAM Manual Version 1.0 for guidance on identifying potential sources of uncertainty for a MAM Plan. The following are example uncertainties that may be applicable to this Restoration Approach. This list should not be considered exhaustive; additional uncertainties may be identified.

- Local subsidence and accretion rates (e.g., organic, mineral)
- Optimal hydrologic conditions (e.g., depth, duration, frequency of flooding) for sustainability of the created/restored/enhanced marsh
- Long-term precipitation trends
- Frequency, duration, and severity of freeze events
- Sediment and nutrient inputs
- Vegetation stress due to herbivory, disease, competition by invasive species
- Appropriate habitat characteristics for targeted species, whether the habitat is a limiting factor for the species
- Use of the habitat by targeted species
- Predation on targeted species
- Land use changes
- Construction of new hydrologic barriers (e.g., roads, canals, berms)
- Wetland buffer conversion/management.

#### **E.4.5. Guidance on Developing Parameters for Project-Level Performance**

This section includes two types of monitoring parameters for consideration under the Create, Restore, and Enhance Coastal Wetlands Restoration Approach:

1. Core performance monitoring parameters applicable to projects within a Restoration Approach (core performance monitoring parameters are those used consistently across projects in order to facilitate the aggregation of project monitoring results and the evaluation of restoration progress for each Restoration Type; Appendix 5.E.4 of PDARP/PEIS; DWH NRDA Trustees, 2016a).

2. Objective-specific performance monitoring parameters that are only applicable to projects with a particular restoration objective.

Additional adaptive management and/or validation monitoring parameters for consideration have also been identified. These additional parameters may be helpful for resolving uncertainties, explaining outside drivers, optimizing project implementation, supporting decisions about corrective actions and other adaptive management of the project, and informing the planning of future DWH NRDA restoration projects. Tables E.4.1 and E.4.2 should not be considered exhaustive, and other parameters may be considered, as appropriate. See the complete list of core- and objective-specific monitoring parameters, Section E.3 above, for details on the core performance monitoring parameters including definitions, units, and other guidance.

**Table E.4.1. Core performance monitoring parameters and additional parameters for consideration under the Create, Restore, and Enhance Coastal Wetlands Restoration Approach**

Core performance monitoring parameters	Parameters for consideration (as appropriate)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area</li> <li>• Elevation</li> <li>• Vegetation survival<sup>a</sup></li> <li>• Vegetation percent cover and composition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Water level</li> <li>• Vegetation height (emergent)</li> <li>• Vegetation density (emergent)</li> <li>• Aboveground biomass</li> <li>• Belowground biomass</li> <li>• Salinity (surface water)</li> <li>• Salinity (porewater)</li> <li>• Subsidence</li> <li>• Accretion</li> <li>• Sediment texture</li> <li>• Soil bulk density</li> <li>• Soil moisture content</li> <li>• Soil organic matter</li> <li>• Consolidation of constructed features</li> </ul>

<sup>a</sup> If project is planted with vegetation.

**Table E.4.2. Performance monitoring parameters and additional parameters for consideration for projects with specific restoration objectives.** These would be collected in addition to the parameters listed in Table E.4.1.

Project-specific objective	Objective-specific performance monitoring parameters	Parameters for consideration (as appropriate)
Restore targeted salinity regime	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salinity (surface water)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Salinity (porewater)</li> </ul>
Reduce shoreline erosion rate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Shoreline position</li> <li>• Structural integrity and function of constructed features</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sediment consolidation</li> <li>• Elevation</li> <li>• Wave height</li> <li>• Wave energy</li> <li>• Wave attenuation</li> <li>• Fetch</li> <li>• Longshore drift and currents</li> </ul>

Project-specific objective	Objective-specific performance monitoring parameters	Parameters for consideration (as appropriate)
Restore hydrologic connectivity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Channel dimensions<sup>a, b</sup></li> <li>• Structural integrity and function of constructed features</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sediment deposition</li> <li>• Salinity (surface water)</li> <li>• Surface water nutrients</li> <li>• Dissolved oxygen</li> <li>• Soil nutrients</li> <li>• Soil moisture</li> <li>• Velocity (water) in channels, culverts<sup>a, b</sup></li> <li>• Discharge<sup>a, b</sup></li> </ul>
Provide habitat for fish and invertebrate species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Channel dimensions<sup>a</sup></li> <li>• Wetland edge</li> <li>• Nekton/epibenthos abundance, density, and composition</li> <li>• Nekton diversity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nekton length/width</li> <li>• Nekton biomass</li> <li>• Infauna/epifauna composition</li> <li>• Infauna/epifauna density</li> <li>• Infauna/epifauna biomass</li> <li>• Abundance/density of predators for targeted species</li> <li>• Salinity (surface water)</li> <li>• Temperature</li> <li>• Dissolved oxygen</li> <li>• Velocity (in channels, culverts)<sup>a, b</sup></li> <li>• Abundance of preferred food/prey species for targeted species</li> </ul>
Provide habitat for birds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Area (by targeted habitat types)</li> <li>• Bird abundance/density and species composition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bird habitat utilization (staging, loafing, feeding, etc.)</li> <li>• Bird nest density</li> <li>• Nest success</li> <li>• Nest predation rate</li> <li>• Abundance/density of predators for targeted species</li> <li>• Abundance/density of preferred food/prey species for targeted species</li> </ul>
Increase the abundance of targeted injured species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targeted injured species abundance/density</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reproductive capacity of targeted species</li> <li>• Abundance of preferred food/prey species for targeted species</li> <li>• Abundance/density of competing species, invasives, or predators for targeted species</li> </ul>

<sup>a</sup> If channels are included in the project design.

<sup>b</sup> If culverts are included in the project design.

## References

DWH NRDA Trustees. 2016a. *Deepwater Horizon* Oil Spill: Final Programmatic Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan (PDARP) and Final Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS). Available: <http://www.gulfspillrestoration.noaa.gov/restoration-planning/gulf-plan>.

DWH NRDA Trustees. 2016b. Trustee Council Standard Operating Procedures for Implementation of the Natural Resource Restoration for the *Deepwater Horizon* (DWH) Oil Spill. Originally approved May 4, 2016; revised November 15, 2016.

Harwell, M.A., J.H. Gentile, L.D. McKinney, J.W. Tunnell Jr., W.C. Dennison, and R.H. Kelsey. 2016. A New Framework for the Gulf of Mexico EcoHealth Metrics. Available: <http://www.harterresearchinstitute.org/sites/default/files/resources/Framework%20for%20the%20Gulf%20EcoHealth%20Metric.pdf>.