SOIL BIOGEOCHEMISTRY RESPONSE FOLLOWING THIN LAYER PLACEMENT IN A NEW JERSEY SALT MARSH

Prepared by Christine M. VanZomeren[1], Jacob F. Berkowitz[1], John R. White[2], Candice D. Piercy[1]

[1]Engineering Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS
[2]Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA



August 30, 2018

Distribution: Approved for public release.

US Army Corps of Engineers

The Nature Conservancy
Protecting nature. Preserving life.

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection

GreenVest
One Step Ahead.

pH Princeton Hydro

Wetlands Institute

ERDC
Engineer Research and Development Center

Salt marsh stress indicators…signs of waterlogging?

- Healthy, stable marsh contain mosaic of vegetated and stable open water areas
- Waterlogging negatively affects vegetation productivity
- Degraded salt marshes exhibiting excessive soil waterlogging, stunted unhealthy vegetation, and expansion of open water areas
- Observed in the Northeast

Project partners identified several degraded marsh areas near Avalon, NJ to be restored

Research Questions

- **Do initial soil properties differ between vegetated and open water areas?**

- **What is the soil response of vegetated and open water areas to thin layer applications of dredged material?**

Study Design

- Stratified random design
  - Vegetated vs.
  - Open water areas



Vegetated and Open Water Areas are Different

Bulk Density	>	Bulk Density
Total Carbon	>	Total Carbon
Microbial Biomass	=	Microbial Biomass
Potentially Mineralizable N	>	Potentially Mineralizable N
Dissolved Organic Carbon	>	Dissolved Organic Carbon
Extractable NH_4-N	<	Extractable NH_4-N

Marsh Restoration: Thin Layer Placement

- **Restoration strategy:**
  - Introduce sediment to account for low elevation
  - Support stable platform for vegetation growth
  - Keep up with future rates of sea level rise
- **Thin layer placement of dredged material**
  - Introduce sediment to raise marsh elevation and allow vegetation growth
- **Focused on response of soil properties to thin layer placement**



Research Questions

- Do initial soil properties differ between vegetated and open water areas?



- **What is the soil response of vegetated and open water areas to thin layer applications of dredged material?**

Project partners identified several degraded marsh areas near Avalon, NJ to be restored

- Placed within hydrologically isolated areas on the marsh
- Defined biologically-derived target elevation based on vegetation community surveys
- ~ 35 acres of marsh received DM between November 2015 and February 2016
- Thicknesses ranged from just a few cm up to ~0.5 m in pools

Site monitoring was conducted across project partners

- Thickness of placement – spatial variation
- Elevation over time – measuring settling, consolidation, and subsidence
- Soil properties – Physical, chemical, nutrients, and microbial biomass
- Vegetation – species, biomass, stem height, cover
- Epifaunal macroinvertebrates – species, abundance, etc.
- Nekton – species, abundance, etc.
- Avian surveys – species, abundance







Study Design

- Stratified random design: (vegetated vs. open water areas)
- Before-After/Control-Impact
  - Before placement
  - 6 months after placement
  - 18 months after placement



Six Months Following Placement

Increase in bulk density to support vegetation growth

Buried native marsh remained biologically active

Different response of buried vegetated and open water soil



Eighteen Months Following Placement: Preliminary Results

Microbial biomass decreased over time; temporary nutrient limitation?

Available nitrogen for vegetation growth; PMN is increasing

Buried vegetated and open water soil differences in short term; converging on similar patterns



Conclusions

- **Documented differences in vegetated and open water soil physicochemical and biogeochemical properties**
  - **Implication of marsh geomorphic components to restoration**
- **Difference in buried native marsh and dredged material**
  - **Buried material remained biologically active; decreased over time**
  - **Source of available nitrogen**
- **Dredged material nutrient limitation after 18 months?**
- **Highlights importance of identifying degrading marshes prior to large scale open water expansion**

Questions?

Jason Pietroski, Kevin Philley, and Darrell Evans assisted with field data collection and sample preparation

VanZomeren, C.M., J.F. Berkowitz, C. Piercy, J.R. White. *2018*. Short term effects of thin layer placement of dredged sediment to a degrading marsh. Ecol. Eng., 120:61-67.

Berkowitz, J.F. **C.M. VanZomeren**, C. Piercy, J.R. White. *2018*. Evaluation of coastal wetland soil properties in a degrading marsh. Estuarine, Coast, and Shelf Science Journal, 212: 311-317.

Berkowitz, J.F., **C.M. VanZomeren**, C. Piercy. 2017. Marsh restoration using thin layer sediment addition: Initial soil evaluation. Wetland, Science & Practice.

Contact:
Christine.M.VanZomeren@usace.army.mil