# WETLAND CLASSIFICATION & BASIN CHARACTER STUDY

**Preliminary Results** 

NTB LTPRG Meeting March 12, 2009





# WETLAND CLASSIFICATION & BASIN CHARACTER STUDY

#### INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE ®

#### Tasks

- Re-Evaluate Hydric/Non-Hydric
  Interface Location (119 sites)
- Soil Characterization at 46 District Sites
- Wetland Hydrologic Analysis
- Develop a Wetland Classification System











INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE ®

#### Background

- Soils consist of natural bodies that occur on a landform within a landscape and have properties that result from the integrated effects of climate and living organisms, acting on parent material, as conditioned by relief, over a period of time.
- Soil physical characteristics are specifically tied to the location where they form and conditions that they form under.







INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE®

#### Hydric Soils

#### - Definition

- Saturated, flooded, or ponded (5% -18.25 days/year)

#### – Types:

- S6. Stripped matrix,
- S7. Dark surface,
- A6. Organic bodies,
- A7. Mucky mineral,
- A8. Muck presence,
- S5. Sandy Redox











#### INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE®





#### A6. Organic bodies

















### HYDRIC/NON-HYDRIC REFERENCES







- 2003 Wade Hurt of UF
  - Conducted the hydric/non-hydric soil (H/NH) evaluation at 119 wetlands to determine if that interface was within the wetland boundary, near the wetland boundary (palmetto fringe), or outside the wetland boundary.
- In 2008 and 2009
  - Repeating 2003 Hurt work
    - Compare elevation and horizontal results
    - Results can provide insight into re-hydration or dehydration of previously impacted wetlands





INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE ©

#### Methods

- Evaluating 119 wetlands,
- 3 to 8 pits per wetland
- Characterize H/NH interface location to 12-16"
- H/NH marked in field with PVC pole
  - Location recorded with GPS
  - Elevation determined from District bench mark
- H/NH location measured from/to the wetland edge (saw palmetto fringe) and to previous evaluation
- Compare all results to control wetland





- Preliminary Results
  - Reference wetlands (Green Swamp)
    - H/NH at or above the palmetto fringe
  - Well field wetlands (no confining layer)
    - H/NH interface inside the wet prairie, marsh, or cypress communities versus in the saw palmetto community
    - Some no longer have hydric soil indicator within 6 or 12 inches
    - Many H/NH interfaces have moved toward the palmetto fringe compared to 5 years ago





#### INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE ®

#### Preliminary Results (red H/NH moved down the hill and blue H/NH moved up the hill)







- Overview
  - Soil assessments should provide additional insight into the historic and current hydroperiod of wetlands
  - Detailed soil characteristics within each vegetative community of 46 wetlands. Three pits per community:
    - One pit to a depth of 6 feet below grade or to a confining layer
    - Two pits to a depth 10" and 16" inches





INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE ®

#### Methods

- Soil transects paralleled WAP transects or were adjacent to the Wade Hurt evaluation transects
- Open face soil auger and a soil spade
- Evaluation points located with sub-meter GPS
- Generated cross-section graphs of soil transects





INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE ®

#### Preliminary Results (Upper Hillsborough FDA)



EDMUNDS

**ENGINEERS | ARCHITECTS | SCIENTISTS** 



INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE .

#### Preliminary Results (Reference Site (Green Swamp))

Cross Section of 304 C 07







#### **DETAILED SOIL EVALUATION Dehydrated Soils**

INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE 🕾

#### Preliminary Results (Starkey C (Dehydrated Soils))







INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE ®

#### Future Analysis

- Further characterize wetlands susceptible to drawdown
- Use results to develop wetland classification system that incorporates vulnerability
- Incorporate hydrologic data (historic normal pool and annual average water levels)
- Apply annual, seasonal, and long term average water levels can be applied to graphs
  - Compare soil characteristics to water levels
  - Compare water levels year by year





INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE ®

#### Background

- 2000-2004 USGS Study (Haag 2005)
  - Wetland bathymetry-10 District wetlands
    - Survey intensity (3 approaches)
    - Stage area/stage volume relationships
  - Installed water level recorders for 2 years
    - Generated flood frequency distributions
    - Compared natural & impaired marsh marsh
    - Flood frequency distributions- valuable data for District managers
  - Valuable monitoring tool for water resource managers





ENGINEERS | ARCHITECTS | SCIENTISTS



- What about LiDAR?
  - Widely available
    - District projects
    - FDEM project
    - Cities/Counties
  - Used extensively for SWFWMD WMP work
  - District monitors ALOT of wetlands...400
    - Extremely cost effective
    - Data currently available in many areas









- Project Purpose
  - Evaluate LiDAR's effectiveness in wetlands
  - Conduct pilot project:
    - Compare LiDAR vs. traditional surveying data (USGS)
    - Stage Area/Stage Volume relationships
    - Flood Area Frequencies









INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE ®

#### Sites

- 4 District wetlands from USGS study
  - 2 reference sites (302 and 304 in Green Swamp)
  - 2 impacted sites (439/S-063 and 443/S-068 in Starkey Well Field)

#### Data Sources

- USGS survey data
- LiDAR data (bare earth)
  - 2004 Pasco
  - 2006 North District (L470 and L471)







- Methods
  - USGS data prep
    - Obtained data in EXCEL
    - Converted from NGVD29 to NAVD88
      - -0.83 to 0.87 ft decrease
    - Generated TIN









INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE ®

#### Methods

- LiDAR data prep
  - Clipped to USGS wetland line (palmetto edge)
  - Reviewed outliers (> 0.5 ft) in field
    - Often logs and hummocks
    - Removal had minimal affect on RMSE
  - Generated TIN

#### Calculated RMSE b/w LiDAR and USGS

Extracted elevation from USGS TIN











eneral setup ——		Tolerances
N:	302_GS#5cypress-lidar	Standard elevation increment, ft: 0.1
ubbasins feature class	302_GS#5cypress_boundary	1st reduction factor, ft:
Subbasin selection		2nd reduction factor, ft:
C One	C Map selection C All	3rd reduction factor, ft: .01
		Maximum area tolerance, %:
Exclude channels?		Minimum area, ac:
Output table:	StageAreaVolumeLiDAR	Maximum depth, ft:
Vorking directory:	D:\Temp\	Save preferences
emporary directory:		Load saved preferences
og file name:	StageAreaVolume_log.txt	Calculate stage area and volume
Use max depth field?		Close
Infes of StageAreaVolumeLIDAR        SUBASHI      STACE      ABCADS        302      50.19997      66602.31        302      50.29996      6961.02        302      50.29996      6961.02        302      50.29996      779.42        302      50.29996      779.61        302      50.59997      779.62        302      60.59996      579.52        302      60.59996      579.52        302      60.59996      579.52        302      60.599966      579.52        302      60.99988      561.42        302      60.99988      561.42        302      60.99988      561.42        302      60.99988      561.42        302      60.99988      561.42        302      60.99988      561.42        302      60.99988      561.42        302      60.99988      561.42        302      60.99988      561.42        302      60.99988      561.42        302      60.99988      561.42	NERACALC      VOLDET      VOLCALC      Areafront        1      AREACALC      VOLDET      VOLCALC      Areafront      A        1060      67220 d01856      55902 4175      45902 61475      669057      45902 61475        1450      69641 416554      52777 413384      52792 413384      0 590925      669025        1450      69641 416554      52777 413384      52792 43271      0 2070761      0 860725        1947      73263 826165      59011 420276      67207 34271      0 880725      0 880725        1948      7501 91152 22450      672062 442569      0 81770      0 880755      0 82566        1948      0 5101 3207451      91152 22450      0 808755      0 82566      0 82566        1948      0 7208 020165      91152 22450      0 808755      0 82566      0 82566        1976      0 7301 255245      91152 22450      0 808755      0 82566      0 82566        1976      0 7301 255274      197147      125168 31746      0 800505      0 770155        1976      0 7204 72075      125168 31746      0 800505      1 80010	

Methods

SERVICE ®

- Stage Area/Stage Volume Analysis
  - Automated ArcMap tool
    - Average end/area method for calculating volume
    - Elevation extraction interval of 0.1 ft from TIN
    - Results written to a database



INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE ®

Methods

#### - Flood Frequency Analysis

- WMIS site
  - Sampling frequency varied (hourly, daily, bi-monthly)
- Generated Flood Frequency Distributions in EXCEL
  - POR
  - 2004 (Wet year)
  - 2007 (Dry year)









- Results
  - 523 pts/ac with LiDAR
  - 59 pts/ac with USGS
  - RMSE
  - Overall...very similar





RMSE = 0.43 ft RMSE W/Out Wetland Line = 0.47 ft



- Results
  - 648 pts/ac with LiDAR
  - 8 pts/ac with USGS
  - RMSE
    - Overall.....
      very similar





INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE ®

RMSE = 0.45 ft RMSE W/Out Wetland Line = 0.71 ft District RMSE= 0.68 ft



- 2374 pts/ac with LiDAR
- 18 pts/ac with USGS
- RMSE low
- Misclassification...
  bare earth may be top of veg
- No Class 11 points
- TIN could be adjusted



INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE ®



- 523 pts/ac with LiDAR
- 18 pts/ac with USGS
- RMSE...a little high
- Misclassification....
  bare earth may be top of veg
- No Class 11 points
- TIN could be adjusted



INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE ®



Jan

Feb

Mar

May

Apr

Jun

Jul

Aug

Sep

Oct

Nov

Dec

Jan

- Wetland 443 (S-068)
  - POR
  - Wet Year; 2004
  - Dry Year; 2007



INTEGRITY | KNOWLEDGE | SERVICE ®





- Wetland 302 GS#5
  - POR
  - Wet year; 2004
  - Dry year; 2007







#### 

- In Summary
  - Results are promising
  - Powerful wetland hydrology (health) monitoring tool
    - Cost effective...cheap
    - Can conduct assessment at various intervals
      - Annually
      - For POR
      - For only wet season/dry season
  - Future LiDAR flights could generate acceptable data for wetland sites where currently unacceptable
- Moving Forward
  - SOP for evaluating LiDAR suitability
    - Need to develop thresholds or screening process
    - TIN adjustment based on known elevations at wetland (benchi well, staff gauge, WAP transects)
  - Conduct analysis on 42 remaining wetlands







