



**US Army Corps  
of Engineers**®  
New England District  
696 Virginia Road  
Concord, MA 01742-2751

# PUBLIC NOTICE

**Comment Period Begins: February 21, 2017**  
**Comment Period Ends: March 23, 2017**  
**File Number: NAE-2004-0965**  
**In Reply Refer To: Crystal Gardner**  
**Phone: (978) 318-8332**  
**E-mail: crystal.i.gardner@usace.army.mil**

The District Engineer has received a permit application to conduct work in waters of the United States from The Plymouth County Mosquito Control District, 142 R Pembroke Street, Kingston, Massachusetts. This work is proposed in saltmarshes in various towns in South-eastern, Massachusetts.

The work involves the reauthorization and implementation of Open Marsh Water Management (OMWM) in order to abate mosquito populations, reduce the need for insecticides, enhance the tidal food web, and enhance and restore previously adversely impacted saltmarshes. The OMWM involves six types of alterations: pond, reservoir, radial, selective ditch, gutter ditch and sill ditch. Three-foot deep ponds will be utilized where depressions exist. Reservoirs will be three feet deep and will be utilized in areas where no existing depression exist. Radials will be used to connect three or more ponds and reservoirs and will be eighteen inches deep and will connect a pond or reservoir to another pond or reservoir. Selective ditches will be used to enhance tidal flow to an isolated breeding depression or tidally restricted salt marsh. They will be utilized to divert fresh water from an OMWM closed system. Gutter ditches will be utilized to maintain diversity by diverting surface freshwater or sheet runoff away from an OMWM closed system. Sill ditches will be used to enhance tidal flow to a closed system.

The OMWM is proposed at a maximum of 117 sites in 12 communities if necessary for mosquito control. The applicant will submit data pertaining to the proposed sites annually to the Corps of Engineers as part of the OMWM Committee review. The proposed work is described in the attached document entitled "PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT STANDARDS". The sites are shown on the attached eight quadrangle sheets for the Massachusetts towns of Cohasset, Scituate Marshfield, Duxbury, Kingston, Plymouth, Hingham, Hull, Marion, Mattapoisett, Plymouth, and Wareham.

This work was previously authorized by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in 1985, 1998 and 2004.

## **AUTHORITY**

Permits are required pursuant to:

- Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899
- Section 404 of the Clean Water Act
- Section 103 of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act.

The decision whether to issue a permit will be based on an evaluation of the probable impact of the proposed activity on the public interest. That decision will reflect the national concern for both protection and utilization of important resources. The benefit which may reasonably accrue from the proposal must be balanced against its reasonably foreseeable detriments. All factors which may be relevant to the proposal will be considered, including the cumulative effects thereof; among those are: conservation, economics, aesthetics, general

environmental concerns, wetlands, cultural value, fish and wildlife values, flood hazards, flood plain value, land use, navigation, shoreline erosion and accretion, recreation, water supply and conservation, water quality, energy needs, safety, food production and, in general, the needs and welfare of the people.

The Corps of Engineers is soliciting comments from the public; Federal, state, and local agencies and officials; Indian Tribes; and other interested parties in order to consider and evaluate the impacts of this proposed activity. Any comments received will be considered by the Corps of Engineers to determine whether to issue, modify, condition or deny a permit for this proposal. To make this decision, comments are used to assess impacts on endangered species, historic properties, water quality, general environmental effects, and the other public interest factors listed above. Comments are used in the preparation of an Environmental Assessment and/or an Environmental Impact Statement pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act. Comments are also used to determine the need for a public hearing and to determine the overall public interest of the proposed activity.

Where the activity involves the discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States or the transportation of dredged material for the purpose of disposing it in ocean waters, the evaluation of the impact of the activity in the public interest will also include application of the guidelines promulgated by the Administrator, U.S Environmental Protection Agency, under authority of Section 404(b) of the Clean Water Act, and/or Section 103 of the Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act of 1972, as amended.

### **ESSENTIAL FISH HABITAT**

The Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, as amended by the Sustainable Fisheries Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-267), requires all federal agencies to consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service on all actions, or proposed actions, permitted, funded, or undertaken by the agency, that may adversely affect Essential Fish Habitat (EFH).

This project will impact approximately 8,000 acres of Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) for egg, larval, and juvenile stages of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*), Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*), haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus*), pollock (*Pollachius virens*), whiting (*Merluccius bilinearis*), offshore hake (*Merluccius albidus*), red hake (*Urophycis chuss*), white hake (*Urophycis tenuis*), redfish (*Sebastes fasciatus*), witch flounder (*Glyptocephalus cynoglossus*), winter flounder (*Pleuronectes americanus*), yellowtail flounder (*Pleuronectes ferruginea*), windowpane flounder (*Scophthalmus aquosus*), American plaice (*Hippoglossoides platessoides*), ocean pout (*Macrozoarces americanus*), Atlantic halibut (*Hippoglossus hippoglossus*), Atlantic sea scallop (*Placopecten magellanicus*), Atlantic sea herring (*Clupea harengus*), monkfish (*Lophius americanus*), bluefish (*Pomatomus saltatrix*), long finned squid (*Loligo pealei*), short finned squid (*Illex illecebrosus*), Atlantic butterfish (*Peprilus triacanthus*), Atlantic mackerel (*Scomber scombrus*), summer flounder (*Paralichthys dentatus*), scup (*Stenotomus chrysops*), black sea bass (*Centropristus striata*), surf clam (*Spisula solidissima*), ocean quahog (*Artica islandica*), spiny dogfish (*Squalus acanthias*), tilefish (*Lopholatilus chamaeleonticeps*), king mackerel (*Scomberomorus cavalla*), Spanish mackerel (*Scomberomorus maculatus*), cobia (*Rachycentron canadum*). This habitat consists of tidally-influenced, upper estuarine silt/mud river bottom, intertidal silt/mud, and estuarine marsh habitat. Loss of this habitat may adversely affect (name species, provide a brief description of impact to habitat or species and any anticipated mitigation). However, the District Engineer has made a preliminary determination that the site-specific adverse effect will not be substantial. Further consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service regarding EFH conservation recommendations is being conducted and will be concluded prior to the final decision.

## NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT

Based on his initial review, the District Engineer has determined that little likelihood exists for the proposed work to impinge upon properties with cultural or Native American significance, or listed in, or eligible for listing in, the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, no further consideration of the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, is necessary. This determination is based upon one or more of the following:

- a. The permit area has been extensively modified by previous work.
- b. The permit area has been recently created.
- c. The proposed activity is of limited nature and scope.
- d. Review of the latest published version of the National Register shows that no presence of registered properties listed as being eligible for inclusion therein are in the permit area or general vicinity.
- e. Coordination with the State Historic Preservation Officer and/or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer(s)

## ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSULTATION

The New England District, Army Corps of Engineers has reviewed the list of species protected under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; as amended, which might occur at the project site. It is our preliminary determination that the proposed activity for which authorization is being sought is designed, situated or will be operated/used in such a manner that it is not likely to adversely affect any Federally listed endangered or threatened species or their designated critical habitat. By this Public Notice, we are requesting that the appropriate Federal Agency concur with our determination.

## COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT

The States of Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Rhode Island have approved **Coastal Zone Management Programs**. Where applicable, the applicant states that any proposed activity will comply with and will be conducted in a manner that is consistent with the approved Coastal Zone Management Program. By this Public Notice, we are requesting the State concurrence or objection to the applicant's consistency statement.

The following authorizations have been applied for, or have been, or will be obtained:

- (X) Permit, License or Assent from State.
- (X) Permit from Local Wetland Agency or Conservation Commission.
- (X) Water Quality Certification in accordance with Section 401 of the Clean Water Act.


In order to properly evaluate the proposal, we are seeking public comment. Anyone wishing to comment is encouraged to do so. Comments should be submitted in writing by the above date. If you have any questions, please contact Crystal Gardner at (978) 318-8332, (800) 343-4789 or (800) 362-4367, if calling from within Massachusetts.

Any person may request, in writing, within the comment period specified in this notice, that a public hearing be held to consider the application. Requests for a public hearing shall specifically state the reasons for holding a

public hearing. The Corps holds public hearings for the purpose of obtaining public comments when that is the best means for understanding a wide variety of concerns from a diverse segment of the public.

The initial determinations made herein will be reviewed in light of facts submitted in response to this notice. All comments will be considered a matter of public record. Copies of letters of objection will be forwarded to the applicant who will normally be requested to contact objectors directly in an effort to reach an understanding.

**THIS NOTICE IS NOT AN AUTHORIZATION TO DO ANY WORK.**



**Barbara H. Newman**  
**Chief, Permits and Enforcement Branch**  
**Regulatory Division**


If you would prefer not to continue receiving Public Notices by email, please contact Ms. Tina Chaisson at (978) 318-8058 or e-mail her at [bettina.m.chaisson@usace.army.mil](mailto:bettina.m.chaisson@usace.army.mil). You may also check here ( ) and return this portion of the Public Notice to: Bettina Chaisson, Regulatory Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 696 Virginia Road, Concord, MA 01742-2751.

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_  
ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_  
PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_


# Location of Salt Marsh in Cohasset and north Scituate Massachusetts


## Legend

- Roads
- - - Town Boundaries
- Salt Marsh



This map is for planning purposes only and not to be used for surveying purposes.  
All data is provided by MassGIS.  
Coordinate System: Mass State Plane 2001 NAD 83






# Location of Salt Marsh in Hingham and Hull Massachusetts


## Legend

- Roads
- - - Town Boundaries
- Salt Marsh



This map is for planning purposes only and not to be used for surveying purposes.  
All data is provided by MassGIS.  
Coordinate System: Mass State Plane 2001 NAD 83






**Location of Salt Marsh in Marion and Mattapoissett Massachusetts**

# Location of Salt Marsh in North Plymouth, Massachusetts

## Legend

-  Roads
-  Town Boundries
-  Salt Marsh




This map is for planning purposes only and not to be used for surveying purposes.  
 All data is provided by MassGIS.  
 Coordinate System: Mass State Plane 2001 NAD 83

# Location of Salt Marsh in Plymouth, Massachusetts

## Legend

- Roads
- - - Town Boundaries
- Salt Marsh



This map is for planning purposes only and not to be used for surveying purposes.  
All data is provided by MassGIS.  
Coordinate System: Mass State Plane 2001 NAD 83

# Location of Salt Marsh in south Scituate, North and South Rivers in of Marshfield Massachusetts

## Legend

-  Roads
-  Town Boundries
-  Salt Marsh


0 0.375 0.75 1.5 Miles




# MARSHFIELD

This map is for planning purposes only and not to be used for surveying purposes.  
All data is provided by MassGIS.

Coordinate System: Mass State Plane 2001 NAD 83





PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT  
STANDARDS**

DECEMBER 2014

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

**Preface**

---

---

The standards for Plymouth County Mosquito Control Project (PCMCP) are drawn from several documents. The primary document used are the standards that were written in conjunction with State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board (SRMCB), Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management and several other organizations. These standards were adopted by the SRMCB in 2010 as best operating procedures for Mosquito Control Projects in Massachusetts. However, these standards focus on data collection methods and failed to include a description of the kinds of marsh alterations that may occur. It also failed to include a description of the Open Marsh Water Management Committee which traditionally reviews individual projects. To rectify this short coming PCMCP has added the information in the appendices. The primary source for these appendices is Bristol County Mosquito Control Project's OMWM Standards.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

Compiled and edited by the Massachusetts Open Marsh Water Management Workgroup

Massachusetts Mosquito Control Districts

*Bristol County Mosquito Control Project*

*Cape Cod Mosquito Control Project*

*Plymouth County Mosquito Control Project*

*Norfolk County Mosquito Control Project*

*Northeast MA Mosquito Control and Wetlands Management District*

Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources

*State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board*

Massachusetts Fish and Wildlife Service

*Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program*

Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection

Massachusetts Audubon

---

The design of this Standard draws extensively from the original Essex County Mosquito Control Project's Standards for Open Marsh Water Management developed by Montgomery et al (1983), and the Northeast Massachusetts Mosquito Control and Wetlands Management District's OMWM Standards, Sullivan et al (2008). We wish to thank these authors for their permission to use materials from these manuals.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

**Table of Contents**

|   |         |
|---|---------|
| 1. Introduction   | Page 4  |
| 2. Site Selection   | Page 4  |
| 3. Site Criteria  | Page 4  |
| 4. Site Parameters  | Page 4  |
| 5. Site Set-up  | Page 5  |
| Locating Transects  | Page 5  |
| 6. Data Collection Effort   | Page 6  |
| Raw Data Records  | Page 6  |
| Timing for Pre Modification Surveys   | Page 6  |
| Timing for Post Modification Surveys  | Page 6  |
| Fish Sampling   | Page 6  |
| Mosquito Sampling   | Page 7  |
| Hydrology Sampling  | Page 9  |
| Soils Sampling  | Page 10 |
| Vegetation Sampling   | Page 10 |
| 7. Site Documentation   | Page 10 |
| Permanent Site Records  | Page 10 |
| Site Mapping  | Page 10 |
| Site Design   | Page 11 |
| Site Summaries  | Page 11 |
| Site Photography  | Page 11 |
| Site Notification   | Page 12 |
| <br>  |         |
| Acknowledgements  | Page 13 |
| <br>  |         |
| Appendices  |         |
| Appendix A: History of Salt Marsh Management for Mosquito Control<br>in Coastal Massachusetts | Page 14 |
| <br>  |         |
| Appendix B: Current Mosquito Species of Concern<br>in Coastal Massachusetts                   | Page 20 |
| <br>  |         |
| Appendix C: Common Salt and Brackish Marsh Plant Species<br>in Coastal Massachusetts          | Page 21 |
| <br>  |         |
| Appendix D: OMWM Data Binder  | Page 22 |
| <br>  |         |
| Appendix E: OMWM Site Summary Codes   | Page 27 |
| <br>  |         |
| Appendix F: Massachusetts Endangered Species Act (MESA)                                       | Page 28 |
| <br>  |         |
| Appendix G: OMWM Advisory Committee   |         |
| <br>  |         |
| Appendix H: Description of Site Alterations   |         |

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

Appendix I: OMWM Reference Library

Page 29

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the Open Marsh Water Management (OMWM) Standards is to function as the operational guidelines for mosquito control professionals for determining where and when it is appropriate to implement OMWM on salt marshes in Massachusetts. The Standards will assist mosquito control professionals in determining the effectiveness of the OMWM mosquito abatement modification. The Standards should help to define and standardize criteria, techniques, terminology, procedure and record keeping for Mosquito Control District (MCD) activities not regulated by the US Army Corps of Engineers.

## 2. SITE SELECTION

Sites will be identified from one or more of the following sources: MCD records, (adulticiding, larviciding, inspection or investigation) municipal, State or Federal official and/or affected private landowner.

## 3. SITE CRITERIA

Mosquito Control Districts consider a pre-monitored site appropriate for proposed OMWM modifications if the following apply:

Sampling of the site documents the development of 2 mosquito broods / season. A mosquito brood is defined as "*All the individuals that hatch at about one time, from eggs laid by one series of parents and which normally mature at about the same time.*" (from the Torre-Bueno Glossary of Entomology 1937, revised 1989).

Mosquito broods can be caused by tidal event, fresh water influence or precipitation typically of an inch or more but dependent on previous marsh saturation.

Species composition consists of nuisance mosquito population or a mosquito population of public health concern<sup>1</sup>.

The MCD may re-monitor a site at any time.

## 4. SITE PARAMETERS

Mosquito Control District personnel use their experience and field expertise (best professional judgment) to define a site's limit (bounds) at time of site set-up. To determine the limit of the site, the MCD will first define the approximate extent of anticipated OMWM modification

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendices: "Current Mosquito Species of Concern for Coastal Massachusetts". This list is not meant to preclude any mosquito species that fit either of the above categories but not currently listed.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT  
STANDARDS**  
December 2014

(direct impact). The area of likely indirect impact resulting from OMWM modifications is then estimated. Other considerations to weigh for determination of a site's limits include the following: potential mosquito habitat, existing topography, physical features (grid ditches, creeks etc.), property ownership, crossings, restrictions, major water features and adjacent OMWM site limits.

**5. SITE SET-UP**

**Locating Transects**


Once the limit of a site has been estimated, the MCD will establish appropriate monitoring locations to measure changes to the marsh that may occur as a result of OMWM modifications. Random sampling along transects will be performed to document hydrology and vegetation data. Mosquito sampling will occur at randomly selected and fully recoverable dip stations (RDS). See Section 8. below.

Transects will be oriented perpendicular to the topographic gradient (e.g. generally from creek/ditch edge to upland edge) according to a consistent compass bearing (Figure One). If there is no clear topographic gradient and/or there is no main creek, ditch or channel, then transects will be set by the MCD's best professional judgment by creating an arbitrary line parallel to the edge from which randomly generated transect lines will run through the area of proposed OMWM modifications.

Ordinarily three transects will be sufficient for each site. However, for narrower or linear sites, more than three and shorter transects may be used (see below). Transect locations along the baseline will be determined using a calculator (with a function for generating random numbers) or another random number generation method. The random number selected represents the distance in feet from the beginning of each section and marks the starting location for each transect. To improve distribution of transects, the randomly generated number can be used to represent the percentage of the site width and transects located accordingly. If the randomly generated location of a transect places it in a ditch or within three meters of another transect, another random number will be generated to determine that transect location.

**Figure 1: Transect Orientation**

Upland Edge



Upland Edge



PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

Main Channel/Creek Edge

Main Channel/Creek Edge

**6. DATA COLLECTION EFFORT**

While monitoring, technicians should to the extent practicable, record occurrences of interest such as wildlife (i.e., birds, mammals, plants, insects, etc.). All technicians are instructed in basic field identification and are equipped with field guides, binoculars and hand lenses to assist them with the task. MCDs will collect data from each site relevant to general observation, fish, mosquito, hydrology, soils and vegetation.

**Raw Data Records**

Raw data collection sheets, both pre and post modification, will incorporate general site information pertinent to the data collection visit. Each site is identified according to individual MCD format i.e., “# - municipality”. The site identification is recorded along with the date of data collection, the time and duration on site, the technician’s name (mosquito control professional tasked with collecting and recording data), the most recent high and low tide events (those of greatest potential influence to the site for that monitoring period), basic weather conditions (such as sunny, cloudy, wind speed and direction, precipitation totals etc.) and any human activity noted on or in the immediate vicinity of the site during the specified monitoring period. Air temperature is measured with a “red liquid” thermometer (or similar) for approximately 5 minutes.

**Timing for Pre Modification Surveys**

The MCDs conduct pre modification field surveys of all monitoring parameters to collect baseline data and assess a site for potential OMWM modification. Much of the information collected from the site is recorded on OMWM Pre Data Sheets and Summary Records (see appendices). A site should be visited monthly following a flooding event to capture data over a 5 month period (typically between May and September).

**Timing for Post Modification Surveys**

The MCDs conduct post modification field surveys of all monitoring parameters to measure efficacy of the modifications on mosquito populations and potential impacts to vegetation and hydrology. Much of the information collected from a site is recorded on OMWM Post Data Sheets and Summary Records. (See appendices). A site is monitored for all parameters at one year, two years and five years post site implementation. Post modification data collection is conducted monthly over a 5 month period (typically between May and September). Post modification mosquito population sampling should occur simultaneously with known larval presence on the marsh as evidenced by other field surveys, larviciding records etc. If the technician notes any conditions on site related to increased mosquito activity, poor vegetation recovery, erosion, sedimentation or break down of infrastructure it will be noted and remedied as soon as feasible and/or as necessary.

**Fish Sampling**

Technicians will record relative abundance of fish at each recoverable mosquito dip station, RDS. The technician notes and records the presence of live fish within a 3 meter radius of each recoverable dip station. Presence of fish is inferred when fish are seen in the water, vegetation or muck or if a fish-like disturbance/movement is noted in the water, vegetation or

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

muck. Data sheet entry for fish occurring at RDS is as follows: dry (no water) = -1, no fish = 0, 1-3 fish = 1, 4-10 fish = 2 and 10+ fish = 3.

### **Mosquito Sampling**

#### Immature Mosquito Sampling Stations

The marking of potential larval habitats is based upon the MCD professional's experience and field expertise or best professional judgment. The goal when marking potential larval sites on a marsh is to document mosquito production efficacy of OMWM modifications. Potential larval habitats should be re-identified post OMWM modification. Sampling points are generally considered to be the whole panne or the area of potential mosquito developmental habitat associated with a distinct marsh feature such as a panne. The exception to this rule occurs when dealing with very large or very small areas.

In cases where mosquito production is occurring in a small pocket (< 3ft<sup>2</sup> surface area) the area should be evaluated in relation to other adjacent small pockets. For example, if there are numerous small pockets within 500ft<sup>2</sup> of marsh area, one sampling point can be used to represent all the depressions.

In cases where mosquito production is occurring in large contiguous areas, the area can be marked approximately every 5,000 ft<sup>2</sup>. However, the MCD professional needs to consider that in some circumstances sheet water will dry back and concentrate into depressions. These depressions should be marked individually as potential mosquito habitat. The goal is to mark all areas that are likely to produce mosquito larvae, consistently.

It is suggested that in the spring prior to mosquito developmental habitat marking, the site should be inspected within a few days after an event that would create sheet water. This helps reveal areas that may hold sheet water and depressions that have the potential to produce mosquitoes. An examination of the plant communities and hydrological characteristics will help identify the depressions.

Once all potential larval habitats are identified, fifteen (15) stations will be randomly selected, flagged and labeled for full recoverability.<sup>2</sup> The location and corresponding flag number should be noted on the Site Map and entered with GPS description data (to within 5 meters of accuracy) on a recoverable dip station record. The observer may choose to randomly relocate any given station within the first month of monitoring if it becomes apparent that it will not support emergence of larvae through the adult phase. Miscellaneous mosquito sampling beyond this is frequently conducted for greater success of OMWM site implementation.

#### Immature Mosquito Sampling

A standard issue white "dipper" (350 ml) is used to dip for immature mosquitoes. The volume of any given dip will not exceed 350ml / dip but is often less. A dip is typically one smooth motion into the water / submerged vegetation and out keeping the dipper level upon exiting so that the sample does not spill. The technician deliberately targets areas of visible mosquito

---

<sup>2</sup> After two seasons, the number of dip stations required will be revisited based upon results of a power analysis to determine the optimum number of stations.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

activity at each RDS but within a three meter radius of the station flag. If there is no available water to sample at the RDS it is considered dry. The technician specifically notes dip samples that contain mosquito pupae. The technician may indicate developmental stages of the larvae (instar – 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>, or 4<sup>th</sup>) or indicate “pupae”. The technician may indicate condition of the sample i.e., live, moribund or dead as applicable.

#### Counting Methods

The technician counts live mosquito larvae and pupae and records the number per dip on the data sheet. Counts are most accurately achieved by “pouring off” larvae and / or pupae one at a time thereby avoiding the potential for counting a part of the sample more than once. Though dip numbers in excess of 200 larvae per dip or greater can be common on the salt marsh, it is difficult to precisely measure these numbers in the field. For this reason, numbers above 30 should be estimated based on technician best professional judgment and recorded within ranges of 31-100, 101-200, and 201 to 500. The midpoints of these ranges (65.5, 250.5, and 350.5 respectively) can then be used for data calculations.

#### Sampling Timing

Additionally, timing of the pre and post mosquito sampling effort can be determined by: marsh indicators (larval or flooding activity), local tide charts<sup>3</sup> (to predict flooding events) and / or precipitation of 1” or more. Experience demonstrates that it is best to wait 1-2 days after initial flooding of the marsh before collecting mosquito data. This provides more opportunity for complete tidal inundation of a site and greater saturation of the substrate thereby increasing the likelihood of mosquito egg hatching. This delay allows for advanced development of larvae and decreased chance that the technician will miscount due to poor visibility of 1<sup>st</sup> instar stages. Delayed sampling also allows for predation of larvae by larviferous fish; an important factor in the overall OMWM plan.

#### Adult Sampling

Adult mosquitoes may be sampled from a recoverable location such as a dip station using the standard “landing rate count”. The technician records the number of mosquitoes that are seen landing on their body within a specified time frame, i.e. 1 minute, 5 minutes, etc. Handheld aspirators are an effective means of collecting adults in the field. Identification can be performed in the field by trained technicians. An emergence trap developed to confirm emergence and identification of adult mosquitoes may also be utilized to verify larval field identification.

#### Species Identification

Samples for identification should be collected that represent each brood whenever possible. Field identification of larvae in later stages (3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> instar) is acceptable by trained technicians. Mosquito larvae and pupae can be brought to the MCD’s facility for rearing and / or detailed examination beneath a microscope. Vials are labeled with the name of the technician, date and location of collection, (site number and sample dip location). Once identified, the species is recorded on the appropriate data sheet / summary and discarded if not

---

<sup>3</sup> Though local tide charts can be used to set a general time table for post monitoring, salt marsh habitats can be flooded sufficiently to produce a brood of mosquitoes without indicated tidal activity and on very little rainfall.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

being pooled for virus or disease testing. When more than one species is identified the dominant species (species of greater abundance) is recorded as such and other species noted as well.

### **Hydrology Sampling**

#### **Flooding Events**

Tidal influence is measured with a rudimentary black stake tide gauge (1" x 1" x 48" - or other) and white chalk method.<sup>4</sup> The stake is placed at an RDS and a measurement of the elevation from the marsh surface to a mark on the stake is used as a predetermined standard. Each time the site is monitored the technician measures the elevation between the remaining chalk (line) and the reference mark and then re-chalks the stake to either water level or marsh surface as applicable for the next reading. "Marsh to mark" and "re-chalk" measurements are recorded. The difference between the previously re-chalked measurement and the current marsh to mark measurement is calculated to indicate previous flooding over the marsh surface.

#### **Pore Water**

Pore water wells will be located on the above described transect lines with one at the end of each transect (highest and lowest topographic points) and one located about halfway along each transect. Seventy (70) cm "pvc" pipe will be perforated along 60 cm of the length. The bottom of the pipe will be capped, and the pipe will be driven to a depth of 60 cm, with 10 cm extending above the marsh surface. The wells will be capped loosely to prevent rainwater from entering the well. The cap will have a small hole in the center for venting. Pore water measurements will be taken by recording the distance from the top of the well to the water surface within the well, minus the height of the well above the marsh surface. The height above the marsh surface should preferably be measured each time but at least once prior to monitoring season to adjust for movement of the well due to ice flow, freezing/thawing, etc. If the well is dry, that will be recorded on the data sheet. Pore water will be checked monthly throughout the monitoring period, within 5 days after a monthly spring tide. Sampling timing should occur 3 hours before or after a low tide. Pore water salinity is measured utilizing a standard refractometer that is calibrated with distilled water prior to each reading.

#### **Precipitation**

A wedge shaped rain gauge is typically fastened to a stake. Rainfall is measured in inches or millimeters but standardized throughout any given monitoring interval. Whenever possible the technician collects rainfall data shortly after a rain event. A rain gauge which is located on an adjacent site may be used as a measure provided it is relatively close in proximity – within 500 meters. Rainfall collection dates and amounts are noted on the data sheet, tallied between site visits and totaled on the summary sheets. Though not ideal, alternate methods may be used for documenting weekly precipitation amounts such as a trusted web site or other reliable resource.

#### **Salinity**

Surface water salinity will be measured at each mosquito sampling station utilizing a standard refractometer calibrated with distilled water prior to each reading. The technician carries an

---

<sup>4</sup> Though this method is not precise, more accurate and costly methods of measurement are unnecessary to the mosquito control professional for designing effective modifications for an OMWM site.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

eye-dropper for collecting a water sample from approximately 1” – 3” below the surface of the water. Three samples are taken and discarded to clear the eye-dropper and the 4th sample is measured. The technician cleans the instrument with distilled water and dries the instrument with a “Kim wipe” if available.

### **Soils Sampling**

Rudimentary soil core profiles by hand auger may be taken to determine the feasibility and or extent (mainly depth dimension) of a proposed alteration relative to subsurface soil condition. Locations where sampling may occur: reservoirs, ponds, and selective ditches.

### **Vegetation Sampling**

Technicians collect vegetation data using a point-intercept method along transects. Vegetation sampling is conducted once annually in late summer to early fall (July to October). The interval for point data collection along each transect will be every meter if the transect is 30 meters long or less, or every 2 meters if the transect is longer than 30 meters. At each interval, all species of plants intercepting the line are recorded. Observers only work transects from one side to avoid vegetation trampling.

### **Data Analysis**

Vegetation data are recorded on a Vegetation Record. Data will be analyzed to determine percent frequency (indicative of the overall vegetative cover) and absolute frequency (the number of one-meter intervals at which a plant species is present). To determine percent frequency for each transect, the absolute frequency is divided by the total number of intervals in each transect. These observations are designed to examine changes in vegetation after OMWM modification.

## **7. SITE DOCUMENTATION**

### **Permanent Site Records**

The Mosquito Control District will keep a permanent record of each OMWM site. Maps, field maps measurements, site imagery, preliminary and post monitoring data, sample locations (recoverable dip stations, groundwater sampling stations, vegetation transects, and recoverable photo stations) will be archived. Each implemented site (post) should also have notification records i.e., agency, advisory committee, and property owner. All relevant correspondence (conversation, meeting and written record) and any field notes or calculations pertinent to the site should be archived as well. All pre and/or post raw data (mosquito, hydrologic, soils, and vegetation) will be made available upon request.

### **Site Mapping**

Massachusetts GIS mapping data and occasionally aerial photography are used throughout project development. Available GPS information (within 5 meter accuracy) will be incorporated within layers as deemed pertinent to site design development. Layers that might be included are not limited to the following: ortho-photography, topography, property ownership, wetland types and boundaries, ACEC Designation, Outstanding Resource Waters,

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

and Natural Heritage Designations - Priority Habitats of Rare Species, Estimated Habitats of Rare Wildlife and Certified Vernal Pools<sup>5</sup>.

The site map identifies: site limits (perimeter), transect locations, groundwater well locations, and recoverable dip stations, and recoverable photo stations within 5 meter accuracy. These features are overlaid as layers or digitally drawn using GIS tools.

### **Site Design**

MCD professionals create a specific design for each site based on data collected, preexisting conditions, site influences and general observations. Available GIS data (orthophotography or similar) are used as a base map. Proposed modifications are numbered and labeled accordingly. A “Legend” is included that specifies a color code for digitally drawn modifications. The site design includes: estimated high tide line and proposed alterations i.e., staging area, access and egress routes, site preparation requirements, erosion and sediment control device locations, temporary designated stockpile areas, and on site spoil disposal areas if applicable.

### **Site Summaries**

At the end of each monitoring period, the site is evaluated utilizing Site Summary Codes (see appendices). Information recorded should include an approximate assessment of site characteristics relative to ownership, adjacent upland types and land use, ground conditions, general hydrology and invasive species composition.

The preliminary data is summarized for Advisory Committee review. Data summarized include but are not limited to dates of sampling, mosquitoes - corresponding mean immature mosquito range per # of dips taken / collection date, mosquito range per station and mosquito species identified, groundwater measurements, vegetation – percent frequency and absolute frequency and for fish - relative abundance range.

Proposed modification features are measured and approximate dimensions for each recorded on a Proposed Feature Dimensions Summary Record. An estimate for volume of spoil displaced (expressed in cubic yards) is calculated for each feature. The total volume (expressed in cubic yards) for all proposed on site features is also recorded.

The post data are summarized for Advisory Committee review. Data summarized include but are not limited to dates of observation, mosquitoes - corresponding mean immature mosquito range per # of dips taken / collection date, mosquito range per station and mosquito species identified, groundwater measurements, vegetation – percent frequency and absolute frequency and for fish - relative abundance range.

### **Site Photography**

A fully recoverable photo station (RPS) is marked by GPS coordinates (+ or – 5 meter accuracy) and a marker (i.e. wood stake) inserted in its place and replaced for the duration of

---

<sup>5</sup> Additional information on the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act, MESA and OMWM activities within designated habitat can be found in the Appendices.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

the monitoring period. This location is selected on its ability to provide optimal coverage of site characteristics. A digital panoramic record or aerial photograph consisting of 1 year preliminary and 1 and 2 year post alteration imagery of the site is recorded at time of peak vegetation – usually August.

**Site Notification**

A site map and proposed site design will be circulated to all members of the MCD OMWM Advisory Committee for review and comment prior to construction. Advisory Committee members should review, supply comments and make suggestions relative to their particular agency's expertise to the MCD within 30 days of receipt of the information. If the MCD receives no comment within 30 days it will be assumed that there is no comment and implementation of site design will proceed.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT

**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**

**STANDARDS**

December 2014

Acknowledgements in alphabetical order:

---

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Ellen Orell-Bidlack | Plymouth County Mosquito Control                             |
| Nate Boonisar       | Norfolk County Mosquito Control project                      |
| Robert Buchsbaum    | MA Audubon   |
| Mark Buffone        | MA DAR / State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board        |
| Jason Burtner       | MA Coastal Zone Management                                   |
| Bruce Carlisle      | MA Coastal Zone Management                                   |
| Anne Carroll        | MA DCR / State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board        |
| Tay Evans           | MA Fish and Game / Division of Marine Fisheries              |
| Kathryn Glenn       | MA Coastal Zone Management                                   |
| Gary Gonyea         | MA DEP / State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board        |
| David Janik         | MA Coastal Zone Management                                   |
| David Lawson        | Norfolk County Mosquito Control                              |
| Misty-Anne Marold   | Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program              |
| Priscilla Matton    | Bristol County Mosquito Control Project                      |
| Walter Montgomery   | Northeast MA Mosquito Control & Wetlands Management District |
| David Paulson       | Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program              |
| Richard Pollack     | Harvard School of Public Health                              |
| Mike Stroman        | Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection         |
| Emily DW Sullivan   | Northeast MA Mosquito Control & Wetlands Management District |

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

**APPENDIX A**  
**HISTORY OF SALT MARSH MANAGEMENT FOR MOSQUITO CONTROL**  
**IN COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS**

---

**Ditching**

There are some historic references to Native American tribes, who inhabited coastal areas of New England, conducting ditching on the salt marsh. However, extensive ditching of the marsh wasn't practiced until after the arrival of the first settlers. Ditching was largely conducted on salt marshes to improve conditions there for pasture and grazing of livestock but also to promote larger yields and allow easier access to harvest hay. Salt marsh vegetation provided for other uses such as thatch for roofing, salt grasses for insulation, but largely for livestock bedding and feed.

Ditching on a much larger scale was done to provide access by gondolas to outlying salt marshes for harvesting salt hay and to accommodate commerce between settlements. Natural creeks were widened, extended or rerouted to neighboring settlements. Ditching became a profession and apprentices were paid 16 cents per rod. In some cases, tolls were charged to navigate some creeks and channels.

**Grid Ditching**

The grid ditch system still evident on our salt marshes today, were dug by hand between 1928 and 1934. The primary purpose of this era of ditching was to put as many people to work as possible, as this was the time of the great depression. No entomological studies were conducted in conjunction with this ditching effort; mosquito control was a secondary consideration at best. However mosquito control was achieved by default as practically every square inch of marsh was drained by the extensive project. Some engineering studies were done to determine where and at what intervals ditches were dug. Ditches were dug in straight rows by hand with sod saws and two man shovels. In 1934, at the peak of this ditching effort, over 11,000 men were employed digging ditches and when completed nearly 3,000 linear miles of salt marsh ditch were dug in Massachusetts alone. Virtually all salt marsh in New England was ditched with the exception of one marsh in Rhode Island.

Later in the late 1940s and early 1950s soldiers returned home from World War II. Housing shortages were a big problem in the more populated areas particularly in and around Boston. A generation of young families, eager to get their lives back on track migrated to the north shore of Massachusetts to start new lives. This migration coincided with the degradation of the grid ditch system created in the 1930s. These ditches had not been maintained and now produced far more mosquitoes than they had initially eliminated. By many accounts it was so bad some considered the area to be almost uninhabitable. A few local programs were established to try to reopen the ditches but it was impossible to duplicate the labor force that had originally created the ditches.

In 1958, a grass roots effort, fueled by public demand for relief resulted in legislation establishing the Essex County Mosquito Control Project. For reasons unknown the project was

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

not formally funded until 1965. Equipment was purchased and a major effort was launched to reclaim salt marsh ditches.

**Salt Marsh Ditch Maintenance in Northeast Massachusetts**

In the late 1970s, Walter Montgomery was an equipment operator for what was then, the Essex County Mosquito Control Project, ECMCP. Montgomery's primary duty was to maintain the extensive salt marsh grid ditch system, excavated for the most part, between 1928 and 1934. Montgomery recalls using an implement known as a scavel plow; this was a large wedge shaped device mounted under a wing plow and could be attached to the front of a tractor or sometimes towed behind. A scavel plow wedge was basically constructed to the original ditch dimension. The wedge would be dropped into the ditch and the tractor either pushed or pulled it along. As the wedge peeled spoil out of the ditch the wing plow would roll the spoil into furrows approximately six feet wide on both sides of the ditch. These furrows of spoil were then either run over to flatten them or plowed off the marsh.

On a productive day Montgomery recalls completing two or more miles of ditch maintenance but even at that rate maintenance of hundreds of linear miles of ditch was an endless endeavor. It was Montgomery's experience that freshly maintained ditches were really only effective for about two years before requiring additional maintenance. Typically ditches would become blocked on the high marsh and previously drained salt pannes would often reestablish. Montgomery observed that the open water areas of these pannes or ponds didn't have mosquito larvae but the grassy sheltered areas around the edges or isolated depressions adjacent to the ponds, supported mosquito larvae. Montgomery's observations further supported his belief that continued maintenance of the grid ditch system was not productive and furthermore there had to be a better way to manage salt marsh mosquito populations.

In the early 1980s Montgomery was promoted to Field Foreman. This provided him with the opportunity to investigate possible alternatives to ditching. Montgomery became aware of work that was being done in the mid Atlantic states, Open Marsh Water Management, OMWM and wondered if it could be duplicated in the northeast. The Essex County Mosquito Control Project began experimenting with basic OMWM techniques but soon realized that more technical expertise was needed.

**Open Marsh Water Management**

The origins of Open Marsh Water Management, OMWM, can be traced back to New Jersey in the late 1960s and is directly attributed to mosquito control greats such as Dr. J.M. Jobbins, J.K. Shisler and Frederick Ferrigno. From its inception, OMWM was a collaborative of environmental advocates and mosquito control professionals. Delaware began evaluating OMWM in 1980 (William H. Meredith, Department of Fish and Wildlife, Division Of Natural Resources and Environmental Control / NMCA 1980) and soon the mosquito control technique was instituted as standard practice there. Maryland also began an OMWM Program under the direction of Dr. Cyrus Lesser.

**OMWM in Essex County, MA**

In March of 1982 the Town of Rowley received a Coastal Zone Management, CZM grant for \$19,800 to study mosquito control practices and the effect of ditching on migrating shore birds,

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

mosquitoes and invertebrates on Rowley salt marshes. Sixteen thousand five hundred dollars were contracted to the Manomet Bird Observatory. The remaining \$3,300.00 was used to pay for in kind service to various groups. The Essex County Mosquito Control Project approached the Rowley Conservation Commission and asked to be involved in the study, hoping to promote interest in OMWM and gain technical expertise, which was lacking. This was the beginning of a long and beneficial relationship between mosquito control and several environmental agencies and groups. The premise of this relationship was simple and unspoken; agreeing to disagree on subjects of controversy and focusing on OMWM which could be mutually beneficial to the environment and simultaneously provide for mosquito control. The results of the study were presented to both the Rowley Conservation Commission and CZM in a report entitled *The effect of ditching for mosquito control on salt marsh usage by birds in Rowley, Massachusetts* (published as Clarke, 1984).

In 1983 a \$10,000.00 grant was secured from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to continue the study. The Essex County Mosquito Control Project enlisted the help of many other mosquito control professionals from New Jersey, Delaware and Maryland as well as Dr. Thomas Hruby of the Resource for the North Shore and Office of the Massachusetts Audubon. Together two pilot projects were designed which used the New Jersey Standards for OMWM as guidance (Dr. Kenneth Bruder, 1980). An experimental permit was secured from the U.S Army Corp of Engineers. Findings of the study were published in the *Journal of Field Ornithology*, in the spring of 1984.

Fairly quickly Montgomery and others realized that they needed to develop an OMWM Standard which would reflect the regional characteristics of Essex County salt marshes; particularly differences in tidal range in comparison to that of New Jersey. The Standards would function as an operational manual and be designed to help mosquito control professionals and other interested agencies to understand the process of implementing OMWM. These Standards became the original *Essex County Mosquito Control Standards for Open Marsh Water Management* (Montgomery, 1982). It also became evident that the public would need to be educated as to the potential benefits of OMWM as compared to traditional maintenance of the grid ditch system. From the public's perspective, mosquito control professionals had been draining salt marshes for years and now here they were proposing to deliberately hold water on the marsh. A media blitz focusing on newspapers and regional magazines was initiated. Montgomery co-authored a brochure with Dr. Hruby entitled *The Mosquito, the Salt Marsh, and You; Controlling mosquitoes on Essex County salt marshes* (No date).

In 1984, ECMCP applied for and received its first Army Corp of Engineers Permit which included the original Essex County's *Standards for OMWM*. The permit provided ground rules for the development of the OMWM Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee's role was twofold: to act as a watch dog group to ensure that concerns of all the various agencies and environmental interests were considered as well as to provide technical assistance and expertise falling beyond the scope of mosquito control personnel.

**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT****STANDARDS**

December 2014

**Fresh Water Marsh vs. Salt Water Marsh**

Open Marsh Water Management in Essex County has been scrutinized from many angles over the course of the years. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service had its own internal debate which posed numerous questions culminating in concern regarding the effects of OMWM on the productivity and value of bordering fresh water marshes. Some experts preferred salt marshes and were not concerned by encroachment into the fresh water interface. Some put more value in maintaining the fresh water marshes. After much discussion a compromise was reached and incorporated into the Standards. Thus began the origins of an alteration technique known as the “perimeter” ditch (sometimes called a gutter ditch), which could be excavated on the estuarine interface between salt and fresh vegetation. A perimeter ditch allowed for fresh water sheet flow to its boundaries, simultaneously providing for its drainage away from the salt marsh surface, thereby stopping further encroachment of fresh water vegetation on the marsh; native salt marsh vegetation flourished. From the mosquito controller’s perspective these ditches provided much needed tidal circulation into the upper reaches of the salt marsh (typically more productive mosquito habitat) and encouraged movement of naturally occurring mosquito eating fish throughout a site.

As the debate over fresh marsh versus salt marsh evolved, concerns also rapidly grew regarding *Phragmites australis* and its invasion of the salt marsh. General consensus became that fresh water intrusion on salt marshes had a negative impact to the resource area. The perimeter ditch quickly became an effective means by which to redirect excess fresh water and thereby diminish *Phragmites* vigorous march across the marsh. This is perhaps the principle reason why OMWM was embraced so enthusiastically by a number of those in the environmental community. Open Marsh Water Management was seen as a means to restore salt marsh. *Sanctuary: Journal of the Massachusetts Audubon Society* (Buchsbaum, 1989). Massachusetts Audubon continued to conduct studies on these and other OMWM projects from 1985 through 1989 and results were presented at the New England Estuarine Research Society Conference in June of 1989.

**Chapter 410 of the Acts of 1996**

In October of 1996 Montgomery and the Essex County Mosquito Control Project received a Massachusetts Wetlands Restoration Award from The Executive Office of Environmental Affairs “in recognition of outstanding contributions to wetlands restoration in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts” and cited a total of 450 acres of restoration on 30 individual sites. It was not long after that Montgomery officially changed the name of the “Project” to reflect the agency’s more permanent stature in the field but also to suggest the solid commitment of the agency to manage wetlands with a long term perspective. Chapter 410 of the Acts of 1996 made it official: ECMCP became the Northeast Massachusetts Mosquito Control and Wetlands Management District, NEMMCWMD or the District.

**US Army Corps Individual Permit and the OMWM Standards**

The Army Corps permit was subsequently renewed for 3 years each in 1987, 1989, 1992 and 1995. In 1998, at the suggestion of the U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, NEMMCWMD renewed its OMWM permit for 10 years. The District revised and updated the OMWM Standards each time the permit required renewal in order to reflect the development of new strategies, technological advances in equipment, and lessons learned in the field.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

**OMWM in Coastal Massachusetts**

The Plymouth County Mosquito Control Project (PCMCP) held a permit in the 1980's and conducted about a half dozen or so OMWM projects, but the permit was not renewed. In 2001 PCMCP received a 5 year permit and then renewed for 10 years. They have completed 3 projects under the latest permit which expires in 2015.

The Norfolk County Mosquito Control Project (NCMCP) was mentored by the NEMMCWMD in OMWM and received a 5 year permit in 1999. This permit was renewed for 10 years in 2006 after some administrative delays, and will expire in 2016. NCMCP has completed 12 projects. NCMCP and PCMCP collaborated on a joint standards revision in 2005 that applied to their renewed permits.

Bristol County Mosquito Control Project (BCMCP) received a permit in 2002 which expired in 2006. A renewed permit was granted and it will expire in 2011. BCMCP has proposed OMWM projects, but for various extenuating circumstances has not completed any projects.

In 2008, the NEMMCWMD applied for its permit renewal and received a Federal Consistency Objection. The District filed a federal appeal which was later rescinded. A workgroup comprised of the Bristol, Cape Cod, Norfolk, Northeast MA and Plymouth County Mosquito Control Districts, the State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board, CZM, MA Fish and Wildlife, and MA Audubon was formed to revise the Standards.

References

Bruder, Kenneth W., 1980. The Establishment of Unified Open Marsh Water Management Standards in New Jersey. New Jersey Mosquito Control Association's Annual Meeting Proceedings

Brush T., Lent R.A., Hruby T., Harrington, B.A., Marshall, R.M., Montgomery W.G. Habitat Use by Salt Marsh Birds and Response to Open Marsh Water Management *Colonial Waterbirds*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (1986), pp. 189-195

Buchsbaum, R.N. Predation by mummichogs, *Fundulus heteroclitus*, on mosquito larvae in three different salt marsh plots in Ipswich, Massachusetts

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

Clarke, J., Harrington, B.A., Hruby, T., Wasserman, F.E. 1984. The Effect of Ditching for Mosquito Control on Salt Marsh Use by Birds in Rowley, Massachusetts. [Journal of Field Ornithology](#) 55-2

Cookingham, R.A. 1971. Coastal Wetlands of Massachusetts and New Jersey. New Jersey Mosquito Control Association Annual Meeting Proceedings

Hruby, T., and W.G. Montgomery. No date. The Mosquito, the Salt Marsh, and You; Controlling mosquitoes on Essex County salt marshes. Resources for Cape Ann. Massachusetts Audubon Society, Gloucester, Massachusetts

Ferrigno, F. 1968. Progress in Wildlife Management with Mosquito Control. Northeastern Mosquito Control Association Annual Meeting Proceedings

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

**APPENDIX B**  
**CURRENT MOSQUITO SPECIES OF CONCERN**  
**IN COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS**

---

The following mosquito species are of concern because of their potential or demonstrated ability to transmit viruses. The remaining species listed are those which have a significant annoyance potential. **Bolded** species are those with larval development habitat found directly in the salt marsh.

| <u>Scientific Name</u>                    | <u>Common Name</u>              |
|---|---------------------------------|
| <i>Aedes canadensis</i>                   | “woodland pool mosquito”        |
| <b><i>Aedes cantator</i></b> <sup>6</sup> | “brown salt marsh mosquito”     |
| <i>Aedes japonicus</i>                    | “Japanese rock pool mosquito”   |
| <b><i>Aedes sollicitans</i></b>           | “golden salt marsh mosquito”    |
| <b><i>Aedes taeniorhynchus</i></b>        | “Southern salt marsh mosquito”  |
| <i>Aedes triseriatus</i>                  | “eastern tree-hole mosquito”    |
| <i>Aedes vexans</i>                       | “re-flood mosquito”             |
| <i>Anopheles punctipennis</i>             | “mottle-winged mosquito”        |
| <i>Anopheles quadrimaculatus</i>          | “malaria-carrying mosquito”     |
| <i>Coquillettidia perturbans</i>          | “cattail marsh mosquito”        |
| <i>Culex pipiens</i>                      | “northern house mosquito”       |
| <i>Culex restuans</i>                     | “white-dotted mosquito”         |
| <b><i>Culex salinarius</i></b>            | “un-banded salt marsh mosquito” |
| <i>Culiseta melanura</i>                  | “cedar swamp mosquito”          |
| <i>Culiseta morsitans</i>                 |                                 |
| <i>Uranotaenia sapphirina</i>             | “sapphire-lined mosquito”       |

---

<sup>6</sup> Reference to *Ochlerotatus* has been reverted back to *Aedes* as defined in original or pre 2000 nomenclature. Many professionals of mosquito abatement have made this same decision as it has caused confusion nation-wide.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

**APPENDIX C**  
**COMMON SALT AND BRACKISH MARSH PLANT SPECIES**  
**IN COASTAL MASSACHUSETTS**

---

|                                    |                                     |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <i>Agalinis maritime</i>           | Salt marsh False Foxglove           |
| <i>Agropyren pungens</i>           | Quackgrass                          |
| <i>Aster tenuifolius</i>           | Aster                               |
| <i>Atriplex patula</i>             | Marsh Orach                         |
| <i>Carex paleacea</i>              | Salt Marsh Sedge                    |
| <i>Distichlis spicata</i>          | Spike Grass                         |
| <i>Glaux maritima</i>              | Sea Milkwort                        |
| <i>Iva frutescens/annua</i>        | Marsh Elder                         |
| <i>Juncus gerardii</i>             | Black Grass                         |
| <i>Juncus effusus</i>              | Soft Rush                           |
| <i>Juncus maritimus</i>            | Sea Rush                            |
| <b><i>Lepidium latifolium</i></b>  | <b>Perennial Pepperweed*</b>        |
| <i>Limonium nashii</i>             | Sea Lavender                        |
| <b><i>Lythrum salicaria</i></b>    | <b>Purple Loosestrife*</b>          |
| <i>Myrica gale</i>                 | Sweet Gale                          |
| <i>Panicum virgatum</i>            | Switchgrass                         |
| <b><i>Phragmites australis</i></b> | <b>Common Reed*</b>                 |
| <i>Plantago maritima</i>           | Seaside Plantain                    |
| <i>Pluchea purpurascens</i>        | Camphor Weed                        |
| <b><i>Polygonom cuspidatum</i></b> | <b>Japanese Knotweed</b>            |
| <i>Potentilla anserina</i>         | Silverweed                          |
| <i>Salicornia europaea</i>         | Common Glasswort                    |
| <i>Scirpus pungens</i>             | Common 3-Square – Sedge Family      |
| <i>Scirpus robustus</i>            | Salt Marsh Bulrush – Sedge Family   |
| <i>Scirpus validus</i>             | Soft Stemmed Bulrush – Sedge Family |
| <i>Spartina alterniflora</i>       | Smooth Cord Grass                   |
| <i>Spartina cynosuroides</i>       | Big Cordgrass                       |
| <i>Spartina patens</i>             | Salt Hay Grass                      |
| <i>Solidago sempirvirens</i>       | Seaside Goldenrod                   |
| <i>Suaeda linearis</i>             | Sea Blight                          |
| <i>Typha angustifolia</i>          | Narrow-leaved Cattail               |

\* **Bold text indicates invasive species. Follow protocols that prohibit spread.**

## OMWM Pre Modification Data Record

Site name or #: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Technician(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Weather: \_\_\_\_\_ Wind: \_\_\_\_\_ Air: \_\_\_\_\_ °F Begin: \_\_\_\_\_ End: \_\_\_\_\_ Rain / period\*: \_\_\_\_\_  
 High tide time: \_\_\_\_\_ Height: \_\_\_\_\_ Low tide time: \_\_\_\_\_ Height: \_\_\_\_\_ Last Spring Tide \_\_\_\_\_ Height: \_\_\_\_\_ Days since LST \_\_\_\_\_  
 Tide Gauge from: \_\_\_\_\_ Tide Gauge up to: \_\_\_\_\_ Tide Gauge Rechalked: \_\_\_\_\_ Rise: \_\_\_\_\_ LRC Interval: \_\_\_\_\_

### Mosquito\*\*

| RDS            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | Total # of Dips | Total #          |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|-----------------|------------------|
| Dips           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |                 |                  |
| Mean / Station |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |                 |                  |
| Dom sp.        |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |                 | Mean of all Dips |
| Other sp.      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |                 |                  |
| LRC            |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |                 |                  |

### Fish\*\*

| RDS         | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | Mean Value / Site |
|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------------------|
| Value Code* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |                   |

### Comments

Humans on site: \_\_\_\_\_ Vicinity: \_\_\_\_\_ Coastal Birds on Site: \_\_\_\_\_ Vicinity: \_\_\_\_\_ Types: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \* Rain Dates and Amounts: \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*Mosquito Counts: Dry = 0 / 0-30 = 0-30 / 31-100 = 65.5 / 101-200 = 250.5 / 201-500 = 350.5

\*\*\* Fish Counts: Dry = (-1) / None = (0) / 1-3 = (1) / 4-10 = (2) / 11+ = 3

# OMWM Pre Modification Data Summary Record

Site #: \_\_\_\_\_ Municipality: \_\_\_\_\_ Ownership: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Upland Type: \_\_\_\_\_ Upland Land Use: \_\_\_\_\_ Fresh Marsh: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Marsh Type: \_\_\_\_\_ Ground Conditions: \_\_\_\_\_ Hydrology: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Dominant Vegetation: \_\_\_\_\_ Invasive Vegetation: \_\_\_\_\_

| Date  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Mosquitoes  | # of Dips / Site          |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Total of all Dips         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Mean                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Mosquito / Site           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Dominant Mosquito Species |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Other Mosquito Species    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Landing Rate Count        |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fish  | # of Wet Stations         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Mean Value / Site         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Total Value / Site        |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General   | Humans                    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Coastal Birds             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Other                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Comments:                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fish *Dry = -1 / None = 0 / 1-3 = 1 / 4-10 = 2 / 11+ = 3                General ** N = None / O = Occasional (1-3) / C = Common (4-10) / A = Abundant (11+) |                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## OMWM Post Modification Data Record

Site name or #: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Technician(s): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Weather: \_\_\_\_\_ Wind: \_\_\_\_\_ Air: \_\_\_\_\_ °F Begin: \_\_\_\_\_ End: \_\_\_\_\_ Rain / period\*: \_\_\_\_\_  
 High tide time: \_\_\_\_\_ Height: \_\_\_\_\_ Low tide time: \_\_\_\_\_ Height: \_\_\_\_\_ Last Spring Tide \_\_\_\_\_ Height: \_\_\_\_\_ Days since LST \_\_\_\_\_  
 Tide Gauge from: \_\_\_\_\_ Tide Gauge up to: \_\_\_\_\_ Tide Gauge Rechalked: \_\_\_\_\_ Rise: \_\_\_\_\_ LRC Interval: \_\_\_\_\_

### Mosquito\*\*

| RDS               | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | Total #<br>of Dips | Total #          |
|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|--------------------|------------------|
| Dips              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |                    |                  |
| Mean /<br>Station |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |                    |                  |
| Dom sp.           |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |                    | Mean of all Dips |
| Other sp.         |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |                    |                  |
| LRC               |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |                    |                  |

### Fish\*\*

| RDS            | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | Mean Value / Site |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------------------|
| Value<br>Code* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |    |                   |

### Comments

Humans on site: \_\_\_\_\_ Vicinity: \_\_\_\_\_ Coastal Birds on Site: \_\_\_\_\_ Vicinity: \_\_\_\_\_ Types: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \* Rain Dates and Amounts: \_\_\_\_\_

\*\*Mosquito Counts: Dry = 0 / 0-30 = 0-30 / 31-100 = 65.5 / 101-200 = 250.5 / 201-500 = 350.5

\*\*\*Fish Counts: Dry = (-1) / None = (0) / 1-3 = (1) / 4-10 = (2) / 11+ = 3

# OMWM Post Modification Data Summary Record

Site #: \_\_\_\_\_ Municipality: \_\_\_\_\_ Ownership: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Upland Type: \_\_\_\_\_ Upland Land Use: \_\_\_\_\_ Fresh Marsh: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Marsh Type: \_\_\_\_\_ Ground Conditions: \_\_\_\_\_ Hydrology: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Dominant Vegetation: \_\_\_\_\_ Invasive Vegetation: \_\_\_\_\_

| Date  |                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <b>M</b><br><b>o</b><br><b>s</b><br><b>q</b><br><b>u</b><br><b>i</b><br><b>t</b><br><b>o</b><br><b>e</b><br><b>s</b>  | # of Dips / Site          |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Total of all Dips         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Mean                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Mosquito / Site           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Dominant Mosquito Species |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Other Mosquito Species    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Landing Rate Count        |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>F</b><br><b>i</b><br><b>s</b><br><b>h</b><br><b>*</b>  | # of Wet Stations         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Mean Value / Site         |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Total Value / Site        |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>G</b><br><b>e</b><br><b>n</b><br><b>e</b><br><b>r</b><br><b>a</b><br><b>l</b>  | Humans                    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Coastal Birds             |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Other                     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Comments:                 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fish *Dry = -1 / None = 0 / 1-3 = 1 / 4-10 = 2 / 11+ = 3 <span style="float: right;">General ** N = None / O = Occasional (1-3) / C = Common (4-10) / A = Abundant (11+)</span> |                           |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

**APPENDIX E**  
**OMWM SITE SUMMARY CODES**

| Category         | Type                                       | Code |
|------------------|--|------|
| Ownership        | Private, unspecified                       | 1    |
|                  | Private, agricultural                      | 2    |
|                  | Private, conservation                      | 3    |
|                  | Public, unspecified                        | 4    |
|                  | Public, agricultural                       | 5    |
|                  | Public, conservation                       | 6    |
|                  | Public, wildlife refuge                    | 7    |
| Upland type      | Hilly (Solid rock)                         | 1    |
|                  | Hilly (Soil or glacial deposits)           | 2    |
|                  | River or coastal valley                    | 3    |
|                  | Man-made (Causeway, railroad, buildings..) | 4    |
| Upland Land Use  | Business/Industrial                        | 1    |
|                  | Residential, developed                     | 2    |
|                  | Residential, undeveloped                   | 3    |
|                  | Agricultural                               | 4    |
|                  | Transportation                             | 5    |
|                  | Conservation                               | 6    |
| Fresh Marsh      | None                                       | 1    |
|                  | Less than ½ upland edge                    | 2    |
|                  | More than ½ upland edge                    | 3    |
| Marsh Type       | High                                       | 1    |
|                  | Low  | 2    |
| Ground Condition | Firm                                       | 1    |
|                  | Soft                                       | 2    |
|                  | Very Soft                                  | 3    |
| Hydrology        | Unditched, "natural"                       | 1    |
|                  | Ditched, poorly drained                    | 2    |
|                  | Ditched, well drained                      | 3    |
|                  | Restricted, culvert/roadway etc.           | R    |
| Invasives        | Phragmites australis                       | 1    |
|                  | Lepidium latifolium                        | 2    |
|                  | Lythrum salicaria                          | 3    |
|                  | Other (List species)                       | -    |

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

**APPENDIX F**

**OMWM AND THE MASSACHUSETTS ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT (MESA)**

---

The Massachusetts Endangered Species Act (M.G.L. c.131A) and its implementing regulations (MESA, 321 CMR 10.00) establish procedures for the listing and protection of state-listed plants and animals. The MESA regulations include project review filing requirements for projects or activities that are located within a Priority Habitat of State-listed Rare Species (“Priority Habitat”). The MESA is administered by the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP) of the MA Division of Fisheries & Wildlife, and prohibits the “take” of state-listed species. The “take” of state-listed species is defined as “in reference to animals, means to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, hound, kill, trap, capture, collect, process, disrupt the nesting, breeding, feeding or migratory activity or attempt to engage in any such conduct, or to assist such conduct, and in reference to plants, means to collect, pick, kill, transplant, cut or process or attempt to engage or to assist in any such conduct. Disruption of nesting, breeding, feeding or migratory activity may result from, but is not limited to, the modification, degradation or destruction of Habitat” (321 CMR 10.02).

Mosquito Control Districts should consult the most recent edition of the *MA Rare & Endangered Species Habitat Atlas* <http://www.mass.gov/dfwele/dfw/nhosp/nhosp.htm> to determine if a proposed project will occur within *Priority Habitat* and the relevant NHESP guidance information to determine if direct filing pursuant to the MESA is required.

If a filing with the NHESP is required, filing should consider access, egress, spoil/soil deposition or spreads or other activities related to the project occurring within *Priority Habitat*. In general, the Site Plan should include sufficient detail and mapping to clarify the location of all work areas and the form of work (e.g., mechanical work or hand work).

Within 30 days of receiving a filing, the NHESP will provide a response letter indicating whether or not the submission is complete. If the submission is complete, the NHESP will provide a letter determining if the project will result in a “take” within 60 days of the date of posting of the first letter (321 CMR 10.18). In this letter, the NHESP will determine whether or not a project, as currently proposed, will (a) avoid a “take” as proposed, or with conditions and may proceed without further review, or (b) will result in a “take” of State-listed Rare Species and cannot proceed as proposed (321 CMR 10.23).

If an OMWM project is determined to result in a “take” then it may be possible to redesign the project to avoid a “take”. If such revisions are not possible, then OMWM projects resulting in a “take” may only be permitted if they qualify for a MESA Conservation & Management Permit (321 CMR 10.23).

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

**APPENDIX G**  
**OMWM Advisory Committee:**

---

This committee is comprised of federal, state and local authorities. Other environmental organizations may be invited to participate at the discretion of US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and the Project. Selected member agencies and organizations supply the Project with the appropriate participant's contact information and are responsible for keeping the Project apprised of any changes for these "points of contact". The points of contact attend the advisory meetings and are responsible for identifying and contacting individuals within their respective agencies with the appropriate expertise to respond to any special issues of concern. Member participation on the Project's OMWM advisory committee is initially solicited from the following agencies / groups but may be supplemented upon additional request or recommendation:

Federal - Mandatory Participation

US Army Corps of Engineers, USACE  
US Environmental Protection Agency, EPA  
US Fish and Wildlife Service, USFWS

Federal – Potential Participation

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)

State - (MA) Potential Participation

Department of Conservation and Recreation, DCR  
Department of Environmental Protection, DEP  
Division of Fish and Wildlife, MDFW<sup>7</sup>  
Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act Office, MEPA  
Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management, MCZM  
State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board, SRMCB

Local – Potential Participation

Conservation Commission<sup>8</sup>

Other

Ducks Unlimited, DU  
Massachusetts Audubon, MA  
The Trustees of Reservations, TTOR

Advisory Committee Meeting:

---

<sup>7</sup> Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program

<sup>8</sup> Municipality of proposed project locus

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

Meetings will be schedule in accordance with new proposed OMWM sites and the review of completed projects. Committee members are expected to participate in meetings to discuss and review data relative to OMWM projects. However the Project's workload is unpredictable and may occasionally require an additional meeting(s) to discuss work activities not previously known at the time of the initial meeting. Thirty (30) calendar days prior to a meeting, a notice specifying the date, time and location of the meeting is sent to all points of contact for the OMWM advisory committee. This notice (either digital/e-mail or written) is sent in advance and should include a proposed project locus map(s) and information depicting anticipated alterations for each project site. Additional materials such as data sheets or summaries will be supplied at the advisory meeting upon request.

The purpose of the advisory meeting is to review proposed alterations to site-specific OMWM projects. The role of the advisory committee is to ask questions and express concerns within the respective areas of agency expertise; advisory committee members should state the resource or species which might be impacted by the project and describe impacts that either individually or cumulatively are considered more than minimal to the specified resource. Advisory committee members and/or the Project may request a site visit(s) within 10 days (of the annual meeting) to explore the site for clarification of any proposed OMWM alterations. Comments should be received within 30 calendar days (from the meeting date) relative to sites proposed at advisory committee meetings. All comments should be sent to USACE as well as the Project. If no comments are received within 30 days of the meeting in which the project was presented, the project is considered acceptable and authorized under the conditions of the USACE permit. In the case of unresolved conflict USACE will arbitrate and make the final determination.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

**APPENDIX H**  
**Description of Site Alterations**

---

I. ALTERATIONS:

There are eight types of alterations- Site preparation, ponds, reservoirs, circuit radials, radials, selective ditches, gutter ditches and sill ditches.

All alterations will be implemented with suitable low ground pressure (LGP) equipment. Standard equipment may be used if operated on mats or other suitable device designed to improve weight displacement. In any case, equipment operating directly on the marsh surface will not exceed an operating weight of three and one half pounds per square inch (3.5 P.S.I.). Alterations will make use of existing topography, such as; ponds, depressions, and excavations, such as; perimeter ditches and grid ditches, whenever possible. Spoil will be used to fill adjacent breeding depressions, plug unnecessary ditches or broadcast evenly over the marsh surface as thinly as possible. When alterations are in close proximity to the upland edge spoil will be moved to the upland and deposited off the marsh. When completed, alteration will be left open to tidal fluctuation for a period of one month or the next flooding tide to flush the alterations of silt and sediment and promote higher levels of oxygen for predatory fish when system is closed.

1. SITE PREPARATION: It may be necessary to prep a site prior to implementing alterations.
  - A. Access and Egress- Bordering vegetation may be cut at a minimum necessary to provide safe operation of equipment to and from the site. Using only existing materials earthen ramps may be constructed only as necessary to provide safe operation of equipment to and from site. Upon completion of work on site ramps will be re-graded to approximate original condition.
  - B. Vegetation Management- Invasive stands of *Phragmites spp.* may be mowed or plowed for improved visibility, line site for laser level operation or safe operation of equipment. Also mowing may result in short term stress to *Phragmites spp.*, which is considered to be detrimental to a healthy salt marsh, in lieu of long-term gradual reduction that may occur as a result of completed OMWM alterations.
  - C. Fill Removal- Fill material and debris may be excavated and removed from the site. The existing salt marsh grade adjacent to the fill area will be approximately replicated to promote restoration of a healthy marsh.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

- D. Vegetation Removal- In the course of implementing OMWM designed alterations and at the discretion of the property owners, vegetation plugs may be removed from designed areas where ponds, pans or radials are to be excavated as directed by or under the supervision of Project personnel and used for salt marsh restoration projects within a one hundred mile radius of the removal site. State, municipal and non-profit groups will have priority over private (for profit) companies. Private (for profit) companies may charge contracted parties reasonable labor cost for removal, transport and planting but may not charge for the plugs that are removed from OMWM sites.

2. PONDS:

- A. Ponds will have a three (3) feet deep area below marsh surface to provide adequate habitat for predatory fish during drought and graduate up to marsh grade promoting wading shore birds and waterfowl use.
- B. Ponds will be utilized on sites having depressions and will take the shape of existing vegetation outline and profile.
- C. Overflow ponds will be used to divert excess tidal water away from a plug during out going tides.

3. RESERVOIR:

- A. Reservoirs will be three (3) feet deep to eliminate mosquito breeding and provide adequate habitat for predatory fish during drought.
- B. A reservoir can be utilized in areas when there are no existing depressions on or in close proximity to the breeding marsh. Preferably adjacent to the upland edge and can be placed in a radial to enhance fish movement and survival.

4. CIRCUIT RADIAL:

- A. Circuit radials will be eighteen (18) inches deep, and can vary in width and be meandering or straight.
- B. Circuit radials will be utilized to connect three (3) or more ponds or reservoir around the extremity of a large breeding area.
- C. Additional radials can be connected to a circuit radial to provide access to the interior of the circuit for predatory fish.

5. RADIAL:

- A. Radial ditches will be eighteen (18) inches deep, and can vary in width. They should preferably be meandering but can be straight if there are constraints that limit a meandering ditch.
- B. Radials can be utilized to promote access and egress of predatory fish by connecting a pond or reservoir to another pond or reservoir. Connect a

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

pond or reservoir to a breeding depression or connect a breeding depression to a circuit radial.

6. SELECTIVE DITCH:

- A. Selective ditches may vary in depth and width depending on the particular circumstances associated with a specific site. Most often and whenever possible existing ditches or creeks will be used and the depth and width will conform to approximate original dimensions not to exceed four (4) feet deep and six (6) feet wide.
- B. Selective ditches may be utilized to enhance tidal flow to an isolated breeding depression usually in close proximity to a tidal channel or where a selective ditch would require less of an alteration than a radial connecting to a closed system.
- C. Selective ditches may be utilized in areas where retention of surface water is impractical or undesirable, such as areas where a discharge or culvert from a roadside or other upland drainage system empties onto the marsh. Retention of surface water in such an area would reduce the efficiency of the upland drainage system.
- D. Selective ditches may be utilized to divert fresh water from an OMWM closed system in order to reduce encroachment of upland fresh water vegetation, in particular *Phragmites spp.*, which could cause habitat change and introduce upland species of mosquitoes to a closed system.
- E. Selective ditches may be utilized to enhance or restore tidal ebb and flow to a tidal restricted salt marsh.

7. GUTTER DITCH:









- A. Gutter ditches will be utilized to maintain diversity by diverting surface fresh water or sheet runoff away from an OMWM close system. This will retard the advancement of fresh water vegetation on to the salt marsh while preserving the integrity of the bordering fresh water wetlands. It may vary in width and depth sufficient only to divert surface runoff (not ground water) depending on the particular circumstances associated with a specific site.

8. SILL DITCH:

- A. Sill ditches will be utilized to enhance tidal flow to a closed system in an area of low tide range.
- B. Depth of the sill will be calculated by the height of the “mean high tide” in relationship to the marsh level of the target area. Sill ditches can vary in width and can be meandering or straight.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
 December 2014

**OMWM: EXAMPLE ALTERATION DIMENSIONS AND PROFILE**



\* When measuring pond, an average diameter can be used for the length (L) depending on the pond configuration.

..... Indicates alternative design

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

**APPENDIX I**  
**OMWM REFERENCE LIBRARY**

---

Andreadis, T.G., M.C. Thomas, and J. J. Shepard 2005. Identification Guide to the Mosquitoes of Connecticut. Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station.

Basler, D. Common estuarine fish: an identification guide. Fisheries Ecology Laboratory, Department of Forestry and Wildlife, University of Massachusetts. 51 pp.

Bourn, W.S. and C. Cottam 1950. Some biological effects of ditching tidewater marshes. Research Report 19. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Dept. of Interior, Washington, DC.

Borror, D.J. and R.E. White. 1970. A Field Guide to the Insects of America North of Mexico. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, MA

Boyes, D. 1998. Phased Implementation of OMWM (Open Marsh Water Management) Principles in the Marsh Restoration Project at the Galilee Bird Sanctuary, Narragansett, RI. Northeastern Mosquito Control Association Meeting – December.

Bradbury, H.M. 1938. Mosquito control operations on tide marshes in Massachusetts and their effect on shore birds and waterfowl. J. Wildl. Manage. 2: 49-52.

Bristol County Mosquito Control Project. 2006. Standards for Open Marsh Water Management (OMWM).

Bruder, Kenneth W., 1980. The Establishment of Unified Open Marsh Water Management Standards in New Jersey. New Jersey Mosquito Control Association's Annual Meeting Proceedings

Brush T., Lent R.A., Hrubby T., Harrington, B.A., Marshall, R.M., Montgomery W.G. Habitat Use by Salt Marsh Birds and Response to Open Marsh Water Management *Colonial Waterbirds*, Vol. 9, No. 2 (1986), pp. 189-195

Buchsbaum, R. 1994. Coastal marsh management. Pages 331-361 in D.M. Kent, Editor. Applied wetland science and technology. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Fla.

Buchsbaum, R.N. Predation by mummichogs, *Fundulus heteroclitus*, on mosquito larvae in three different salt marsh plots in Ipswich, Massachusetts

Bull, J. and J. Farrand, Jr. 1977. The Audubon Society Field Guide to North American Birds: eastern region. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.

Burger J., Shisler, J. and Lesser, F. 1978. The effects of ditching salt marshes on nesting birds, pp. 27-37. In: Proc. Colonial Waterbird Group. Northern Illinois Univ., Dekalb.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

- Carlisle, B.K., A.M. Donovan, A.L. Hicks, V.S. Kooken, J.P. Smith, and A.R. Wilbur. 2002. *A Volunteer's Handbook for Monitoring New England Salt Marshes*. Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management, Boston, MA
- Carpenter, S. J. and W.J. LaCasse. 1974. *Mosquitoes of North America (North of Mexico)*. University of California Press, Berkely, Los Angeles, London.
- Clarke, J., B.A. Harrington, T. Hruby and F.E. Wasserman, 1984. The effect of ditching for mosquito control on salt marsh use by birds in Rowley, Massachusetts, *J. Field Ornithol.* 55: 160-180
- Cookingham, R.A. 1971. Coastal Wetlands of Massachusetts and New Jersey. New Jersey Mosquito Control Association Annual Meeting Proceedings
- Darsie, R. F., Jr., and R. A. Ward. 1981. Identification and geographic distribution of mosquitoes of North America, north of Mexico.
- Duncan, W. and M. B. Duncan. 1987. *The Smithsonian Guide to Seaside Plants of the Gulf and Atlantic Coasts*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C., and London.
- Essex County Mosquito Control Project. 1993. Standards for Open Marsh Water Management.
- Ferrigno, F. 1968. Progress in Wildlife Management with Mosquito Control. Northeastern Mosquito Control Association Annual Meeting Proceedings
- Ferrigno, F. and D.M. Jobbins. 1968. Open marsh water management. *Proc. NJ Mosquito Exterm. Assoc.* 55: 104-115
- Ferrigno, F., P.Slavin, and D. M. Jobbins. 1975. Salt marsh water management for mosquito control. Proceedings of the 62nd Annual Meeting of the New Jersey Mosquito Control Association: 32-38.
- Hruby and Lent (1989), and Hruby (1990). Long Island Region Tidal Wetlands Management Manual Cowan et al. (1988).
- Hruby, T., and W.G. Montgomery. No date. *The Mosquito, the Salt Marsh, and You; Controlling mosquitoes on Essex County salt marshes*. Resources for Cape Ann. Massachusetts Audubon Society, Gloucester, Massachusetts
- Hruby, T., W.G. Montgomery, R.A. Lent, and N. Dobson. 1985. Open marsh water management in Massachusetts: Adapting the technique to local conditions and its impact upon mosquito larvae during the first season. *J. Am. Mosq. Assoc.* 1:85-88

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

James-Pirri, M. J., R. M. Erwin, and D. J. Prosser. 2008. US Fish and Wildlife Service (Region 5) Salt Marsh Study, 2001-2006: an assessment of hydrologic alterations on salt marsh ecosystems along the Atlantic coast. USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center and University Rhode Island, Final Report to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, April 2008.

Jewett, A.E. 1949. The tidal marshes of Rowley and vicinity with an account of the old-time methods of "marshing." The Essex Institute Historical Collections LXXXV. 23 pp.

Lent, R. A., T. Hruby, D. F. Cowan, and T. S. Litwin. 1990. Open marsh water management on Great South Bay Islip, New York. Final Report. The Seatuck Foundation, Islip, NY.

Madsen, John. 1999. "Point Intercept and Line Intercept Methods for Aquatic Plant Management," Aquatic Plant Control Technical Note MI-02.

Mahaffy, L.A. 1987. Effects of open marsh water management on submerged aquatic vegetation utilized by waterfowl in Delaware. Proceedings of a Symposium on Waterfowl and Wetlands Management. William R. Whitman and William H. Meredith, editors; pp. 323-332.

Meredith, W.H. and D.E. Savelkis. 1987. Effects of Open Marsh Water Management (OMWM) on bird populations of a Delaware tidal marsh, and OMWM's use in waterbird habitat restoration and enhancement, pp. 229-318. In: W.R. Whitman and W.H. Meredith (eds.), Waterfowl and Wetlands Symposium: proceedings of a symposium on waterfowl and wetlands management in the coastal zone of the Atlantic flyway. Delaware Coastal Management Program, Delaware Dept. of Natural resources and Environmental Control, Dover, DE.

Meredith, W. H., D. E. Saveikis, and C. J. Stachecki. 1985. Guidelines for "open marsh water management" in Delaware salt marshes - objectives, system designs, and installation procedures. Wetlands 5: 119-133.

Milne, L. and M. Milne. 1980. The Audubon Society Field Guide to North American Insects and Spiders. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., New York.

Norfolk and Plymouth County Mosquito Control Project. 2005. Norfolk and Plymouth County Mosquito Control Project Standards for Open Marsh Water Management (OMWM).

Rochlin, I., T. Iwanejko, M. E. Dempsey, and D. V. Ninivaggi. 2009. Geostatistical evaluation of integrated marsh management impact on mosquito vectors using before-after-control-impact (BACI) design. Int. J. Health Geogr. 8:35.

Rozsa, R. 1995. Human impacts on tidal wetlands: history and regulations, pp. 42-50. In G. D. Dreyer and W. A. Niering [eds.], Tidal marshes of Long Island Sound: ecology, history, and restoration. Bulletin 34, The Connecticut Arboretum Press, New London, CT.

Ruber, E., A. Gilbert, PA Montagna, G. Gillis, and E. Cummings. 1994. Effects of impounding coastal salt marsh for mosquito control on microcrustacean populations. Ecology and Morphology of Copepods. Hydrobiologia. Vol. 292-293.

PLYMOUTH COUNTY MOSQUITO CONTROL PROJECT  
**OPEN MARSH WATER MANAGEMENT**  
**STANDARDS**  
December 2014

Ruber E. and R.E. Murray. 1978. Some ideas about coastal management from production and export studies on a Massachusetts salt marsh. Proceedings of the New Jersey Mosquito Control Association. 65: 51-58.

Saveikis, D. E., W. H. Meredith, and R. V. Cole. 1983. Control of mosquito larvae on Delaware salt marsh during the first season following experimental OMWM treatment. Proc. N.J. Mosq. Control Assoc. 70: 34-36.

Shisler, J.K., and F.H. Lesser, and T. Candeletti. 1979. An approach to the evaluation of temporary versus permanent measures in salt marsh mosquito control operations. Mosq. News. 39: 776-780.

Stojanovich, C.J. 1961. Illustrated Key to Common Mosquitoes of Northeastern North America. C.J. Stojanovich, Atlanta Georgia.

Tiner, R. W., Jr. 1987. A field Guide to Coastal Wetland plants of the Northeastern United States. The University of Massachusetts Press, Amherst, MA.

US Army Corps of Engineers. 1995. Galilee salt marsh restoration, Narragansett, Rhode Island. Feasibility (Section 1135) Report and Environmental Assessment. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, New England Division, Waltham, MA.

USDA Soil Conservation Service. 1994. Evaluation of restorable salt marshes in New Hampshire. 32 pp.

Warren, R.S., P.E. Fell, R. Rozsa, A.H. Brawley, A.C. Orsted, E.T. Olson, V. Swamy, and W.A. Niering, 2002. Salt Marsh Restoration in Connecticut: 20 Years of Science and Management, Connecticut College.

Whitman, W.R. 1995. Modifications of open marsh water management for wildlife habitat enhancement in Delaware. In: W.R. Whitman, et al., ed. Waterfowl habitat restoration, enhancement and management in the Atlantic Flyway. Third ed. Environmental Manage. Comm., Atlantic Flyway Council Technical Section and Delaware Div. Fish and Wildlife pp. E42-E65.

Widieskog, L. 1994. Duck habitat and Open Marsh Water Management. Proc. NJ Mosq. Control Assoc. 81: 48-51.

Wolfe, R. J. 1992. A decade of open water marsh management in Delaware: reducing *Aedes* in the 80's. Proc. N.J. Mosq. Control Assoc. 79: 51-56.

Wolfe, R. J. 1996. Effects of open marsh water management on selected tidal marsh resources: a review. J. Am. Mosq. Control Assoc. 12: 701-712.