



W&M ScholarWorks

Reports

2017

Summary Tables: King George County, Virginia Shoreline Inventory Report

Marcia Berman
Virginia Institute of Marine Science

Karinna Nunez Virginia Institute of Marine Science

Sharon A. Killeen Virginia Institute of Marine Science

Tamia Rudnicky
Virginia Institute of Marine Science

Julie G. Bradshaw
Virginia Institute of Marine Science

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.wm.edu/reports

Part of the Environmental Monitoring Commons, Natural Resources Management and Policy Commons, and the Sustainability Commons

Recommended Citation

Berman, M.R., Nunez, K., Killeen, S., Rudnicky, T., Bradshaw, J., Angstadt, K., Duhring, K., Brown, K.F., Hendricks, J., Weiss, D. and Hershner, C.H. 2017. King George, Virginia -Shoreline Inventory Report: Methods and Guidelines, SRAMSOE no.461. Comprehensive Coastal Inventory Program, Virginia Institute of Marine Science, College of William and Mary, Gloucester Point, Virginia, 23062.

This Report is brought to you for free and open access by W&M ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Reports by an authorized administrator of W&M ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@wm.edu.

uthors arcia Berman, Karini aren Duhring, Kallie E	na Nunez, Sharon A. Killeen, Tamia Rudnicky, Julie G. Bradshaw, Kory Angstadt, Brown, Jessica Hendricks, David Weiss, and Carl H. Herschner

Table 4. King George County, Virginia Shoreline Attributes - Riparian Land Use (miles) - River System Summary 2017

	TOTAL*			RE	BARE			COMMERCIAL		FOREST GRASS		INDUSTRIAL		MILITARY			PAVED			RESIDENTIAL			SCRUB-SHRUB		RUB	TIMBERED		D				
RIVER SYSTEM	MILES SURVEYED	no tree buffer	tree fringe	total	no tree buffer		total	no tree buffer		total	total	no tree buffer	tree fringe	total	no tree buffer	tree fringe	total	no tree buffer	tree fringe	total	no tree buffer	tree fringe	total	no tree buffer		total	no tree buffer	tree fringe	total	no tree buffer		total
Chotank Creek	8	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	<1	<1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	2	2	1	0	1	0	0	0
Gambo Creek	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	<1	1	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	<1	0	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Potomac River	47	1	2	3	0	0	0	1	<1	1	15	3	2	4	0	0	0	2	<1	3	<1	0	<1	11	8	19	1	1	2	0	<1	<1
Rappahannock River	67	5	23	29	<1	0	<1	0	0	0	20	<1	1	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	<1	0	<1	2	7	9	5	2	7	0	0	0
Rosier Creek	4	0	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Machodoc Creek	56	3	12	15	0	1	1	<1	2	2	15	<1	2	2	0	0	0	<1	0	<1	1	1	1	7	12	19	<1	<1	1	0	0	0
Total	193	9	39	48	<1	1	1	1	3	4	56	4	6	10	0	1	1	5	6	11	1	1	2	20	30	51	7	3	10	0	<1	<1

^{*}Total = upland shoreline only (upland/marsh and upland/water). Does not include marsh/water shoreline.

Note: Numbers have been rounded. Summing numbers across rows or down columns may not necessarily equal the exact total whole number shown.

Table 5. King George County, Virginia Shoreline Attributes - Riparian Bank Condition - River System Summary 2017

RIVER SYSTEM	TOTAL* MILES		BANK COVER (miles)		BANK HEIGHT (miles)						
	SURVEYED	bare	partial	total	0-5 feet	5-30 feet	>30 feet				
Chotank Creek	8	<1	0	7	8	0	0				
Gambo Creek	12	0	0	12	12	0	0				
Potomac River	47	1	2	45	41	6	0				
Rappahannock River	67	<1	<1	66	64	2	0				
Rosier Creek	4	<1	<1	4	4	<1	0				
Upper Machodoc Creek	56	0	0	56	56	<1	0				
Total	193	1	3	189	185	9	0				

^{*}Total = upland shoreline only (upland/marsh and upland/water). Does not include marsh/water shoreline. Note: Numbers have been rounded. Summing numbers across rows or down columns may not necessarily equal the exact total whole number shown.

^{**}tree fringe: When the dominant riparian land use is not forested but a line of trees is maintained along the bank edge, the land use is noted to include a tree fringe. This tree fringe value includes tree fringe and tree fringe > 100 feet wide.

Table 6. King George County, Virginia Shoreline Attributes - Natural Buffers, *Phragmites australis* and Marsh Survey Dates - River System Summary 2017

												MARSH											PHRAGMITES ³	
RIVER SYSTEM	_	# Wetland Polygons		ns Marsh Type (acres)											Con	nmunity T	ype ¹ (acres	s)					(percent of field	MARSH SURVEY DATES
	(miles)	total	field checked	marsh	marsh island	no marsh forested	no marsh sand	no marsh scrub-shrub	total marsh	1	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII ²	IX	Х	XI	ХII	DNS**	checked marshes)	
Chotank Creek	<1	25	3	207	0	20	0	0	207	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	204	100	June 20, 2017
Gambo Creek	<1	48	0	124	0	0	0	0	124	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	DNS	DNS
Potomac River	10	59	28	299	0	0	0	0	299	<1	0	0	1	0	<1	0	3	0	0	8	<1	287	14	June 20, 2017
Rappahannock River	0	173	0	475	0	86	0	4	475	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	475	DNS	DNS
Rosier Creek	<1	33	24	63	0	0	0	0	63	<1	0	0	0	<1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	58	33	June 20, 2017
Upper Machodoc Creek	1	269	201	342	0	<1	0	0	342	34	0	0	14	106	3	0	3	0	0	1	52	128	15	June 19, 20, & Aug 24, 2017
Total	12	607	256	1511	0	107	0	4	1511	35	0	0	14	106	3	0	11	0	0	9	56	1276		

^{**}DNS = Did Not Survey

¹Community Type: I = Saltmarsh Cordgrass / low marsh

rrsh Cordgrass / low marsh VII = Arrow Arum – Pickerel Weed

II = Saltmeadow / high marsh

VIII = Reed Grass (*Phragmites australis*)

III = Black Needlerush

IX = Yellow Pond Lily

IV = Saltbush V = Big Cordgrass X = Saltwort XI = Freshwater mix

VI = Cattail

XII = Brackish mix

Table 7. King George County, Virginia Shoreline Attributes - Shoreline Features - River System Summary 2017

RIVER SYSTEM	TOTAL*					Number	r			Miles											
	MILES SURVEYED		dilapidated		nps		marinas				dilapidated		marsh toe								
	CONVETED	docks	docks	boathouses	private	public	<50 slips	>50 slips	wharfs	jetties	bulkhead	bulkhead	debris	revetment	riprap	unconventional	breakwater	groinfields			
Chotank Creek	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0			
Gambo Creek	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	<1	0	<1	0	0	<1			
Potomac River	47	85	2	18	33	0	2	0	0	12	3	<1	1	<1	6	<1	1	4			
Rappahannock River	67	28	0	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0			
Rosier Creek	4	9	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	<1	0	0	0			
Upper Machodoc Creek	56	78	0	25	19	1	1	2	0	5	1	<1	0	<1	<1	<1	0	0			
Total	193	203	3	48	58	3	4	2	0	17	4	<1	1	<1	7	<1	1	4			

^{*}Total = upland shoreline only (upland/marsh and upland/water). Does not include marsh/water shoreline.

Note: Numbers have been rounded. Summing numbers across rows or down columns may not necessarily equal the exact total whole number shown.

²Type VIII - Field checked marshes where *Phragmites australis* was estimated to cover >50% marsh area.

³Phragmites - percent of field checked marshes where *Phragmites australis* is present in any amount.