Beaver Creek Stream Restoration 2008 Final Monitoring Report

Construction Completed January 2003 - 5 Years Elapsed (MY5) Third Year of Measurement - Measurement Suspended in MY3 and MY4 Due to Repair

Ecosystem Enhancement Program Project Number 00028



Submitted to:

NCDENR-Ecosystem Enhancement Program 1652 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1652

Project Designed by:

Earth Tech of North Carolina 701 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 475 Raleigh, NC 27606

Submitted: February 12, 2009



Beaver Creek Stream Restoration 2008 Final Monitoring Report Monitoring Year Five

Ecosystem Enhancement Program Project Number 00028





Prepared by:

URS Corporation – North Carolina 1600 Perimeter Park Drive, Suite 400 Morrisville, NC 27560

Project Manager:

Kathleen McKeithan kathleen_mckeithan@urscorp.com 919-461-1597

February 12, 2009

Table of Contents

1.0	Executive Summary/Project Abstract	1								
2.0	Project Background	3								
2.1	Project Objectives	3								
2.2	Project Structure, Mitigation Type, and Approach									
2.3	Location and Setting									
2.4	Project History and Background									
2.5	Monitoring Plan View	8								
3.0	Project Condition and Monitoring Results	.14								
3.1	Vegetation Assessment	.14								
3.	1.1 Vegetation Problem Areas	.14								
3.	1.2 Vegetation Current Condition Plan View	.14								
3.2	Stream Assessment	.14								
3.	2.1 Procedural Items	.14								
	3.2.1.1 Morphometric Criteria	.14								
	3.2.1.2 Hydrologic Criteria	.14								
3.	2.2 Stream Problem Areas	16								
3.	2.3 Fixed Photo Station Photos	16								
3.	2.4 Stability Assessment	16								
3.	2.5 Quantitative Measures Tables (Morphology and Hydrology)	16								
4.0	Methodology Section	.22								
4.1	Stream Methodology	.22								
4.2	Vegetation Methodology	.22								
5.0	References	24								

List of Tables

Table I: Project Mitigation Structure and Objectives Table	6
Table II: Project Activity and Reporting History	6
Table III: Project Contact Table	7
Table IV: Project Background Table	8
Table V: Verification of Bankfull Events	15
Table VI: BEHI and Sediment Export Estimates	16
Table VII: Categorical Stream Feature Visual Stability Assessment (% Functioning)	16
Table VIII: Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary	17
Table IX: Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary	19
Table A1: Vegetation Metadata	Appendix A
Table A2: Vegetation Vigor by Species	Appendix A
Table A3: Vegetation Damage by Species	Appendix A
Table A4: Vegetation Damage by Plot	Appendix A
Table A5: Stem Count by Plot and Species	Appendix A
Table A6: Vegetation Problem Areas	Appendix A
Table B1: Stream Problem Areas	Appendix B
Table B2: Visual Morphological Stability Assessment	Appendix B

List of Figures

Figure 1: Project Vicinity	4
Figure 2: Monitoring Plan View	9
Figure 3: USGS Stream Gage Discharge Data	
Vegetation Current Condition Plan View	Appendix A
Stream Current Condition Plan View	Appendix B

List of Appendices

Vegetation Raw Data Appendix A: Appendix A-I: Vegetation Survey Data Tables Appendix A-II: Vegetation Problem Area Photos Appendix A-III: Vegetation Current Condition Plan View Appendix A-IV: Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos Appendix B: Geomorphic Raw Data Appendix B-I: Stream Current Condition Plan View Appendix B-II: Stream Problem Areas Data Table Appendix B-III: Representative Stream Problem Area Photos Appendix B-IV: Stream Photo Station Photos Appendix B-V: Visual Morphological Stability Assessment Table Appendix B-VI: Cross Section Photos and Plots Appendix B-VII: Longitudinal Plot Appendix B-VIII: Pebble Count Frequency Distribution Plots

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY/PROJECT ABSTRACT

The Beaver Creek site consists of 4,670 linear feet of stream restoration. A tributary to the Fisher River, Beaver Creek is located on agricultural land approximately 3.6 miles southeast of the Town of Dobson in Surry County, North Carolina. The watershed area for the site is 5.9 square miles, and the property is fully contained within the property of five landowners.

The Surry County Soil and Water Conservation District (SCSWCD) staff identified Beaver Creek as a potential restoration site after landowners complained of active erosion and flooding adjacent to the stream. Beaver Creek had areas of significant, active bank erosion throughout the proposed project limits. There is evidence of historic straightening as well as thinning and removal of riparian vegetation, both of which resulted in stream degradation. The degradation included a deeply incised channel that accelerated the erosion process and forced the channel to contain larger than bankfull storm events. One of the three tributaries, within the project limits, had also been straightened.

The restoration site is located entirely within undeveloped land. There are no utilities within the project limits. The Priority I restoration involved converting the 4,670 linear feet of impaired channel into a sinuous channel that meanders for a total 4,266 linear feet. Rock and log cross vanes and rootwads were incorporated for aquatic habitat enhancement and bed and bank stability. A 50-foot riparian buffer on either side of the stream was planted with native vegetation.

Per the 2003 As-Built Report, prepared by Earth Tech (Earth Tech 2003), the objectives of the Beaver Creek Stream Restoration Project included the following: Restore 4,670 linear feet of Beaver Creek (as measured along the thalweg); Provide a stable stream channel that neither aggrades nor degrades while maintaining its dimension, pattern, and profile with the capacity to transport its watershed's water and sediment load; Improve water quality and reduce further property loss by stabilizing eroding stream banks; Reconnect the stream to its floodplain or establish a new floodplain at a lower elevation; Improve aquatic habitat with the use of natural material stabilization structures such as root wads, rock vanes, woody debris and establish a riparian buffer; and Provide aesthetic value, wildlife habitat, and bank stability through the creation or enhancement of a riparian zone.

The Beaver Creek site was constructed in the summer of 2002. Repair work was conducted at the site in the spring of 2004. The site was then monitored in 2004, Monitoring Year (MY) 1 by NC State University (NCSU 2005) and in 2005 (MY2) by EcoLogic Associates (Ecologic 2006). A second round of repair work was scheduled for 2005. The site was not monitored in 2006 (MY3) or 2007 (MY4), pending additional repairs and maintenance. Repairs were completed at the site in the summer of 2008. Additional planting and transplants took place in December, 2008.

The 2008 monitoring event signifies MY5, as well as the baseline data for the site post-repairs. In general, it appears as if the recent repairs have helped stabilize the site. Rock and log vane repairs have improved the stability of the system and are successfully directing flow away from problem erosion areas. Woody survival at the site is poor in some areas, but much of this is due to disturbance from the recent construction activities. Several haul roads and staging and

stockpiling areas were placed along the channel, thus destroying any planted woody vegetation. The site was re-planted in December/January of 2008 and 2009. Transplants from areas with strong vegetation survival were also used to supplement areas with poor survival.

2.0 **PROJECT BACKGROUND**

2.1 **PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

The project objectives stated in the 2003 As-Built Report, prepared by Earth Tech are to:

- 1. Restore 4,670 linear feet of Beaver Creek (as measured along the thalweg).
- 2. Provide a stable stream channel that neither aggrades nor degrades while maintaining its dimension, pattern, and profile with the capacity to transport its watershed's water and sediment load.
- 3. Improve water quality and reduce further property loss by stabilizing eroding stream banks.
- 4. Reconnect the stream to its floodplain or establish a new floodplain at a lower elevation.
- 5. Improve aquatic habitat with the use of natural material stabilization structures such as root wads, rock vanes, woody debris, and establish a riparian buffer.
- 6. Provide aesthetic value, wildlife habitat, and bank stability through the creation or enhancement of a riparian zone.

2.2 PROJECT STRUCTURE, MITIGATION TYPE, AND APPROACH

The Beaver Creek site was suggested by the SCSWD after landowners complained of active erosion and flooding adjacent to the channel. The stream had been subject to historic straightening and removal of riparian vegetation. The channel was incised and was accelerating erosion by forcing the channel to contain larger than bankful storm events.

The Priority I restoration involved converting the impaired channel into a sinuous channel that meanders for a total of 4,266 feet as measured along the thalweg. Rock and log cross vanes and rootwads were incorporated for aquatic habitat enhancement and bed and bank stability. A 50-foot riparian buffer on either side of the stream was planted with native vegetation.

2.3 LOCATION AND SETTING

The Beaver Creek site is located on agricultural land approximately 3.6 miles southeast of the Town of Dobson in Surry County, North Carolina (Figure 1). The watershed area for the site is 5.9 square miles, and the property is fully contained within the property of five landowners.

To travel to the site from I-40, take exit 206 to US-421 north. Follow US-421 to exit 257, US-601. Follow US-601 north to Dobson, NC. At the second Dobson exit (NC-1100), turn right at the top of the ramp onto Turkey Ford Road (SR 1100). Follow Turkey Ford Road for 3.7 miles and turn right onto Copeland School Road (SR 2220). Follow for two miles and turn right onto Simpson Mill Road (SR 2210). Follow Simpson Mill Road for 0.7 miles and turn right onto Hamlin Ford Road (SR 2222). The entrance to the site is a driveway to the right after the mobile home park.



2.4 **PROJECT HISTORY AND BACKGROUND**

SCSWCD staff identified Beaver Creek as a potential restoration site after landowners complained of active erosion and flooding adjacent to the stream. The stream was actively eroding along a tight meander located on the property owned by Mr. Mike Jones. The extensive erosion created a meander with a sharp radius where, during storm events, water was overtopping the bank and flooding the adjacent landowner, Mr. Wayne Draughn.

Besides the above stated problem area, Beaver Creek had other areas of significant active bank erosion throughout the proposed project limits. There is evidence of historic straightening that resulted in stream degradation. Thinning and removal of riparian vegetation also contributed to the stream degradation. The degradation included a deeply incised channel that accelerated the erosion process and forced the channel to contain larger than bankfull storm events. One of the three tributaries, within the project limits, had also been straightened.

The Priority I restoration involved converting the 4,670 linear foot impaired channel into a sinuous channel that meanders for a total 4,266 linear feet. Rock and log cross vanes and rootwads were incorporated for aquatic habitat enhancement and bed and bank stability. A 50-foot riparian buffer on either side of the stream was planted with native vegetation.

The Beaver Creek Stream Restoration project was designed by Earth Tech and construction was completed in the summer of 2002. The Mitigation and As-Built Plan were completed in February 2003. The estimated restoration length is 4,266 linear feet.

Repair work was conducted at the site in the spring of 2004. The site was then monitored in 2004 (MY1) by NC State University and in 2005 (MY2) by EcoLogic Associates. Both monitoring reports state that the project was not performing as designed. The 2005 (MY2) report states that "Serious damage and deterioration of the restoration started in 2003 and continues to the present day." A second round of repair work was scheduled for 2005. The site was not monitored in 2006 (MY3) or 2007 (MY4), pending additional repairs and maintenance. Repairs were completed at the site in the summer of 2008. Additional planting and transplants will take place in December, 2008.

The 2008 monitoring event signifies MY5, as well as the baseline data for the site post-repairs. In general, the site has been improved drastically by the recent repairs. The 2008 (MY5) monitoring event roughly follows the cross sections and vegetation plots established by EcoLogic in 2005. EcoLogic followed protocol similar to that presently required by North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program (NCEEP). EcoLogic used the As-Built cross section locations, but had to establish all of the vegetation plots. No vegetation monitoring plots had been established at the time of the As-Built survey.

		I doie I.	I I Oject Mil	igation of	i ucture and objec										
	Beaver Creek EEP Project Number 00028														
Project Segment or Reach	Existing Feet	Mitigation Type	Approach	Linear Footage	Stationing	Comment									
Beaver Creek	4,670	R	PI	4,266	10+00 to 52+13										
R = Restoration PI = Priority I EI = Enhancement PII = Priority II EII = Enhancement II PIII = Priority III S = Stabilization SS = Stream Bark Stabilization															

Table I: Project Mitigation Structure and Objectives Table

Beaver Creek FEP Project Number 00028											
	EEP Project Number	00028									
Activity or Report	Scheduled Completion	Data Collection Complete	Actual Completion or Delivery								
Restoration Plan	2001	Unknown	2001								
Mitigation Plan	2001	Unknown	2001								
Construction	Fall 2002	Unknown	Fall 2002								
Temporary S&E mix applied to project area	Fall 2002	Unknown	Fall 2002								
As-Built Report	Fall 2002	Unknown	February 2003								
Permanent seed mix applied to reach	Fall 2002	Unknown	Fall 2002								
Structural maintenance (bank and structure)	Spring 2004	Unknown	Spring 2004								
Supplemental planting of bare root and containers	Spring 2004	Unknown	Spring 2004								
Year 1 Monitoring	Fall 2003	Unknown	September 2004								
Year 2 Monitoring	August 2005	Unknown	September 2005								
Year 3 Monitoring*	August 2006	N/A	N/A								
Year 4 Monitoring*	August 2007	N/A	N/A								
Structural maintenance (bank and structure)	Summer 2008	Unknown	Summer 2008								
Year 5 Monitoring	August 2008	September 2008	October 2008								
Supplemental planting of bare root and containers	December 2008	Unknown									

Table II: Project Activity and Reporting History

Beaver Creek EEP Project Number 00028									
Activity or Report	Actual Completion or Delivery								
Designer	Earth Tech of North Carolina								
	701 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 475								
	Raleigh, NC 27607								
Primary project design POC	Bill Jenkins 919-854-6200								
Construction Contractor	West Contracting								
	PO Box 310								
	Marble, NC 28905								
Construction contractor POC	Maurice West Jr. 828-837-2280								
Planting Contractor	Carolina Environmental								
	PO Box 1905								
	Mount Airy, NC 27030								
Planting contractor POC	Joanne Cheatham 336-320-3849								
Seeding Contractor	Carolina Environmental								
	PO Box 1905								
	Mount Airy, NC 27030								
Seeding contractor POC	Joanne Cheatham 336-320-3849								
2004 Monitoring Performers	Biological & Agricultural Engineering								
	North Carolina State University								
	Campus Box 7625								
	Raleigh, NC 27695								
Monitoring POC	Dan Clinton 919-515-6771								
2005 Monitoring Performers	EcoLogic Associates, P.C.								
	4321-A South Elm-Eugene Street								
	Greensboro, NC 27406								
Monitoring POC	Kyle Hoover, Moni Bates 336-355-1108								
2006 Monitoring Performers	No monitoring conducted								
2007 Monitoring Performers	No monitoring conducted								
2008 Monitoring Performers	URS Corporation – North Carolina								
	1600 Perimeter Park Drive, Suite 400								
	Morrisville, NC 27560								
	919-461-1597								
Monitoring POC	Kathleen McKeithan								

Table III: Project Contact Table

Beaver Creek EEP Project Number 00028									
Project County	Surry County								
Drainage Area	5.9 square miles								
Drainage impervious cover estimate (%)	Estimated at < 5%								
Stream Order	3rd order								
Physiographic Region	Piedmont/Foothills								
Ecoregion	Northern Inner Piedmont (45e)								
Rosgen Classification of As-Built	E								
Dominant soil types	N/A								
Reference site ID	N/A								
USGS HUC for Project and Reference	03040101								
NCDWQ Sub-basin for Project and Reference	12-63-12								
NCDWQ classification for Project and Reference	С								
Any portion of any project segment 303d listed?	No								
Any portion of any project segment upstream of a 303d listed segment?	No								
Reasons for 303d listing or stressor	N/A								
% of project easement fenced	0% - No cattle								

Table IV: Project Background Table

2.5 MONITORING PLAN VIEW

See Figure 2 for Monitoring Plan View.













3.0 **PROJECT CONDITION AND MONITORING RESULTS**

3.1 VEGETATION ASSESSMENT

Vegetation monitoring plot stem counts and photos are located in Appendices A-I and A-IV.

3.1.1 VEGETATION PROBLEM AREAS

Vegetative problem areas include poor woody survival, bare floodplains, and the presence of kudzu (*Puereria montana*). These areas are concentrated mainly in those portions of the project disturbed during recent construction activities. These areas were re-planted in the winter of 2008-2009. The kudzu is concentrated in the upstream reach of the site. Vegetative Problem Area Photos are located in Appendix A-II.

3.1.2 VEGETATION CURRENT CONDITION PLAN VIEW

See Appendix A-III for the Vegetation Current Condition Plan View.

3.2 STREAM ASSESSMENT

3.2.1 PROCEDURAL ITEMS

3.2.1.1 Morphometric Criteria

Dimension and profile were sampled per the 2003 Stream Mitigation Guidelines (USACE 2003) as follows:

Dimension: Seven permanent cross sections were surveyed. Due to recent disturbance caused by repair activities, several cross section bank pins were re-established. URS re-established cross section bank pins as close as possible to the locations surveyed by EcoLogic in 2005. Both pins were found at cross section one. The right bank was re-established at cross sections two, three, six, and seven. No pins were found for cross sections four or five; URS re-established both banks at cross sections four and five. The survey includes points measured at all breaks in slope including top of bank, bankfull, and thalweg.

Profile: A total of 3,672 linear feet of longitudinal profile was surveyed. Survey points include the top of bank, the beginning of each stream feature such as riffle or pool, and the maximum pool depth.

3.2.1.2 Hydrologic Criteria

No crest gages are installed at this site to document bankfull events. Therefore, potential occurrence was extrapolated based on US Geological Survey (USGS) stream gage discharge data for the Fisher River near Copeland, NC (02113000). The gage is located within one mile of the site in the same watershed and has a drainage area of 128 square miles. An estimate of the number of bankfull events between August 2007 and August 2008 was made by comparing the stream discharges from the USGS data in cubic feet per second (cfs) against the bankfull discharge estimated from the drainage area on the Rural Piedmont NC Regional Curve. According to the regional curve, a bankfull event occurs on a stream with a 128 square mile drainage area when the discharge nears 2,900 cfs. Based on this primary surrogate USGS data, an estimated two bankfull events occurred between August 2007 and August 2008 (USGS 2008).

Beaver Creek EEP Project Number 00028												
Date of Data Collection	Date of Occurrence	Method										
September 19, 2008	October 2007	Proximal USGS Gage Resource										
September 19, 2008	April 2008	Proximal USGS Gage Resource										

Figure 3: USGS Stream Gage Discharge Data



		Table	V I .	DLL	n an	u BU	iiiici	пі Цл	port	Loui	naus				
	Beaver Creek EEP Project Number 00028														
Time Point	Segment/ Reach Linear Footage Extreme Very High				High Moderate					Low		Very Low		Sediment Export	
			ft	%	ft	%	ft	%	ft	%	ft	%	ft	%	Ton/y
MY5	Beaver	3,672									3,672	100			56

Table VI: BEHI and Sediment Export Estimates

3.2.2 STREAM PROBLEM AREAS

There were a total of four stream problem areas. The recent repairs focused on many of the problem areas identified in the 2005 Monitoring Report prepared by EcoLogic. The new and replaced structures have also allowed eroding banks to re-stabilize and re-vegetate. Bare bank areas remain, but are improving. Three vane structures were found to have failed due to shifting boulders, channel downcutting, and scouring behind vane arms.

3.2.3 FIXED PHOTO STATION PHOTOS

Stream Photo Station Photos are located in Appendix B-IV.

3.2.4 STABILITY ASSESSMENT

Table VII: Categorical Stream Feature Visual Stability Assessment (% Functioning)

Beaver Creek													
EEP Project Number 00028													
Feature	Initial	MY-01	MY-02	MY-03*	MY-04*	MY-05							
A. Riffle	100		88			99							
B. Pool	100		87			100							
C. Thalweg	100		100			100							
D. Meanders	100		100			94							
E. Bed General	100		100			99							
F. Bank Condition	100		100			99							
G. Vanes / J Hooks	100		100			96							
H. Wads and Boulders	100		38			100							

*Data were not collected in 2006 and 2007 (MY3 and MY4). The project was put on hold due to pending repair activities.

3.2.5 QUANTITATIVE MEASURES TABLES (MORPHOLOGY AND HYDROLOGY)

							EED	Beaver	Creek									
Parameter*	Re	gional C	urve	Р	re-Existi	ing	Project Reference			00028 Proj	ect Refe	rence		Design			As-built	t
		Interva	1	Condition			Stream (Big Branch)			Stream	n (Basin	Creek)			-			
Dimension	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
BF Width (ft)	15	50	28	27	37.5	30.6	20.0	21.5	20.8	29.5	36.9	33.2			28	21.9	33.6	
Floodprone Width (ft)						230			130			329			230			313
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)	40	150	75	53.3	89.7	70.6	40.9	42.8	41.9	64.9	71.9	68.4			70.0	55.1	104.6	
BF Mean Depth (ft)	1.7	4.0	2.8	1.8	2.8	2.3			2.0	1.9	2.2	2.1			2.5	2.6	3.1	
BF Max Depth (ft)				2.5	3.3	3.1	2.5	2.7	2.6	3.0	3.2	3.1			4.2	4.3	5.2	
Width/Depth Ratio				9.5	16.0	13.6	9.8	10.8	10.3	13.4	19.4	16.4			11.2	9.8	10.8	
Entrenchment Ratio						7.5			65			8.9			7.5	9.4	12	
Bank Height Ratio				1.6	2.4	2.0			1.0			1.0			1.0			
Wetted Perimeter (ft)																		
Hydraulic radius (ft)																		
Pattern																		
Channel Beltwidth (ft)				34	256	107	31	44	37	59	75	64.7	43	208	99	43	208	87
Radius of Curvature (ft)				16.0	285	99	42	63	55	40.1	69.3	51.2	45	76	65.5	45	76	65
Meander Wavelength (ft)				116	802	338	185	260	222			350	192	485	305	192	485	275
Meander Width Ratio				1.1	8.4	3.5	1.5	2.1	1.8	1.7	2.3	1.9	1.5	7.4	3.5			

 Table VIII: Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary

* USGS gage data are unavailable for this project and are not included in the table.

				Т	able VI	II: Base	eline Mo	orpholo	gy and l	Hydrau	lic Sum	mary (c	ont.)						
								Beaver	Creek										
	1			1			EEP I	Project N	lumber (00028			1						
Parameter*	Re	gional C	urve	Pre-Existing			Proj	Project Reference			Project Reference			Design			As-built		
	2.61	Interva			Conditio	n	Stream (Big Branch)			Stream (Basin Creek)			2.61			2.01			
Dimension	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	
Profile																			
Riffle Length							23.4	78.0	58.5										
(ft)																			
Riffle Slope							0.015	0.019	0.017	0.018	0.02	0.021	0.004	0.032	0.010				
(ft/ft)																			
Pool Length (ft)							23.6	32.0	26.9										
Pool Spacing (ft)				80	440	215	98	180	139	271	334	305	94	321	159				
Substrate																			
d50 (mm)						4.7						58							
d84 (mm)						90						180							
Additional Reach																			
Parameters																			
Valley Length (ft)																		3314	
Channel Length (ft)																		4220	
Sinuosity						1.35			1.1						1.22			1.3	
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)						0.005			0.009			0.014			0.005			0.5%	
BF Slope (ft/ft)						0.006			0.009						0.006				
Rosgen Classification						C4, G4, F4			E4			C4			E4			E5	

* USGS gage data are unavailable for this project and are not included in the table.

	Table IX: Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary																			
							E	E EP Pro	Beave Dject I	r Creek Number	00028									
Parameter	Cross S Riffle	Section 1				Cross S Pool	s Section 2			Cross Section 3 Pool				Cross Section 4 Riffle						
Dimension	IXM	MY2	MY3*	MY4*	MY5	MY1	MY2	MY3*	MY4*	MYS	MY1	MY2	MY3*	MY4*	MY5	MYI	MY2	MY3*	MY4*	MYS
BF Width (ft)	29.1	19.3			22.5	29.1	25.6			35.3	24.6	21.2			34.1	32.9	19.1			20.2
Floodprone Width (ft)	315	33.9			>50		62.1			>70		39.2			>70	315	31.2			>60
BF Cross Sectional Area	86.8	32.14			18.4	110.6	71 7			110.0	78.2	18.8			83.7	108	38.0			78.6
BF Mean Depth	2.7	1.67			2.2	3.8	2.79			3.1	3.2	23			2.5	33	2.04			3.9
BF Max Depth	4.5	2.19			3.0	5.8	4.8			5.0	5.2	3.3			4.3	6.7	2.84			4.9
Width/Depth Ratio	11.8	11.6			10.4		9.2			11.3		9.23			13.9	10	9.33			5.2
Entrenchment Ratio	10.8	1.7			>2.2		2.4			>2.0		1.85			>2.1	9.6	1.64			>3.0
Bank Height Ratio					1.0					1.0					1.0					1.0
Wetted Perimeter (ft)		20.62			23.9		28.9			37.6		23.2			36.0		20.84			25.0
Hydraulic radius (ft)		1.56			2.0		2.5			2.9		2.11			2.3		1.87			3.1
Substrate																				
d50 (mm)	1.13	3.2			40	0.36	0.69			6.4	0.44	1.56			1.5	0.55	1.96			.062
d84 (mm)	45.32	32			120	27.88	1			39	21.7	16			6	22.02	52.6			9.1

Beaver Creek FFP Project Number 00028															
Parameter	Cross S Pool	Section 5				Cross S Riffle	Section 6	ci 0002			Cross S Pool	Section 7			
Dimension	IYN	MY2	MY3*	MY4*	MYS	IYM	MY2	MY3*	MY4*	MY5	IYN	MY2	MY3*	MY4*	MY5
BF Width (ft)	48	34			38.1	34.6	33.2			31.6	38.2	20.77			21.8
Floodprone Width (ft)		50.7			>60	315	43.1			>60		45.3			>60
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)	125.8	88.8			101.6	93.6	78.2			90.2	95.2	47			71.1
BF Mean Depth	2.6	2.6			2.7	2.7	2.35			2.9	2.5	2.28			3.3
BF Max Depth	5.7	4.5			5.0	4.8	4.32			4.5	5.8	3.88			4.7
Width/Depth Ratio		13.13			14.3	12.8	14.11			11.1		9.12			6.7
Entrenchment Ratio		1.49			>1.6	9.1	1.3			>1.9		2.18			>2.8
Bank Height Ratio					1.0					1.0					1.0
Wetted Perimeter (ft)		35.7			39.9		36			34.4		22.64			24.9
Hydraulic radius (ft)		2.5			2.5		2.17			2.6		2.09			2.8
Substrate															
d50 (mm)	5.25	1.38			.062	0.36	11.03			1.1	0.36	0.61			.91
d84 (mm)	38.5	16			1.5	27.88	32			5.2	27.88	1.39			5.1

Table IX:	Morphology	and Hydraulic	Monitoring	Summary (cont.)

				•		Beave	er Creek		0		/				
	-			1	EE	P Project	Number	00028		1					
Parameter		MY1			MY2			MY3*			MY4*			MY5	
Pattern	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	39	192	80	40	240	90							20	200	80
Radius of Curvature (ft)	42	170	90	50	100	70							42	100	60
Meander Wavelength (ft)	182	481	267	225	435	262							230	570	380
Meander Width Ratio				11.6	22.5	13.5							9.8	29.7	17.8
Profile															
Riffle Length (ft)				5.2	53.3	21.1							25	50.8	35.7
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)				0.0053	0.069	0.029							0.0083	0.026	0.016
Pool Length (ft)				33.9	195	89							57.8	187.8	95.1
Pool Spacing (ft)				17.5	219	84							16.3	384.8	127.7
Additional Reach Parameters															
Valley Length (ft)		3314			3314									3314	
Channel Length (ft)		4198			4360									4210	
Sinuosity		1.3			1.3									1.3	
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)		0.55			0.005									0.005	
BF Slope (ft/ft)		0.54			0.005									0.005	
Rosgen Classification		E5			B5									B5	

Table IX: M	lorphology a	and Hydrauli	c Monitoring	Summarv	(cont.)
-------------	--------------	--------------	--------------	---------	---------

4.0 METHODOLOGY SECTION

All monitoring methodologies follow the most current templates and guidelines provided by EEP (EEP 2006). Photographs were taken at high resolution using a Sealife EcoShot 6.0 megapixel digital camera. GPS locations were collected in 2005 (MY2) on both banks of each cross section and on all four corners of each vegetation plot. GPS locations were taken in 2008 (MY5) of the southwest corner of each vegetation plot inventoried during 2008 monitoring. GPS location information was collected using a Trimble Geo XT handheld mapping grade GPS unit. Stream and vegetation problem areas were noted in the field on 2008 As-Built Plan Sheets provided by Baker Engineering (Baker 2008). Permanent photo station photographs were taken from locations marked in the Year One Monitoring Report, prepared by EcoLogic Associates. URS included four additional photo station locations (11 photos) during the 2008 monitoring event.

4.1 STREAM METHODOLOGY

The methods used to generate the data in this report are standard fluvial geomorphology techniques as described in *Applied River Morphology* (Rosgen 1996) and related publications from US Forest Service and the interagency Stream Mitigation Guidelines (USACE 2003). URS' field morphology survey was conducted using a Nikon Total Station and the data were analyzed and displayed using the Reference Reach Spreadsheet, Version 4.1T (Mecklenburg 2006). Modified Wolman pebble counts were conducted within the feature of each cross section. Photographs were taken from both banks at each cross section. A photo was taken from the left bank towards the right bank and from the right bank towards the left bank.

4.2 **VEGETATION METHODOLOGY**

Vegetation plots were not established for the As-Built survey by Earth Tech due to storm damage that occurred prior to vegetation monitoring. Four circular vegetation monitoring plots were established by NC State University during 2004 (MY1). Fourteen new vegetation plots were established during 2005 (MY2) by EcoLogic. EcoLogic established 14 10-meter by 10-meter vegetation plots, per EEP's current protocol at that time.

According to the 2006, Version 4.0 CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation (Lee *et al* 2006), the Beaver Creek Stream Restoration Project requires the monitoring of six vegetation plots. The new CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation was used to inventory a total of seven vegetation plots. Five of EcoLogic's plots were inventoried (VP11, VP10, VP12, VP4, and VP15) during 2008. Two new plots (VP16 and VP17) were to be established by URS in 2008 after re-planting occurred in areas newly planted following the 2008 repairs. However, this will be accomplished during 2009 monitoring once contract issues have been resolved.

URS' vegetation monitoring methods followed the 2006, Version 4.0 CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation (http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/methods.htm). Vegetation plot photographs were collected at the southwest corner of each vegetation plot. Vegetation monitoring plots were re-marked in the field by replacing all old flagging with new flagging. Each vegetation plot was marked by Ecologic in 2005 with a four-foot PVC pipe at the upstream, outside corner. The remaining three corners were marked with steel conduit. URS moved the PVC to the southwest corner (origin of the plot) and placed orange flagging at the southwest corner of each vegetation plot. Blue flagging was placed at the remaining three corners. Planted stems were flagged in white. Volunteer/natural regeneration stems were inventoried but not flagged. Monitoring taxonomy follows 'Flora of the Carolinas, Virginia, Georgia, and Surrounding Areas' (Weakley 2007). Stem height was measured with a folding one-meter rule. Diameter at breast height and decimeter height were measured with calipers. The X,Y coordinates relative to the southwest

corner (origin) of each stem in the plot were recorded, as was the bearing of the x axis from the southwest corner. The results of the stem counts are located in Appendix A-I. Photographs of the monitoring plots are located in Appendix A-IV.

5.0 **REFERENCES**

Baker Engineering. 2008. Beaver Creek Stream Repair / Sediment and Erosion Control. May 7, 2008.

Earth Tech. 2003. Stream Mitigation As-Built Report. Beaver Creek, Surry County, North Carolina. Earth Tech of North Carolina, Inc. Prepared for NC Wetlands Restoration Program, NCDENR, NCDWQ. February 2003.

EcoLogic. 2006. Beaver Creek 2005 Monitoring Report, Monitoring Year Two. EcoLogic Associates, P.C. Prepared for NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program. March 2006.

EEP. 2006. Content, Format, and Data Requirements for EEP Monitoring Reports. Version1.2 (11/16/06). NCDENR, NCEEP. 17pp.

Lee, Michael T., Peek, Robert K., Roberts, Steven D., Wentworth, Thomas R. 2006. CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation. Version 4.0. (http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/methods.htm)

Mecklenburg, Dan. 2006. The Reference Reach Spreadsheet for Channel Survey Data Management. Version 4.1T. Ohio Department of Natural Resources.

NCSU. 2005. Beaver Creek Stream Restoration Annual Monitoring Report. Monitoring Year 2004, Measurement Year 1. NC State University Biological and Agricultural Engineering, Prepared for NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program. June 2005.

Rosgen, D.L. 1996. Applied River Morphology. Wildland Hydrology, Pagosa Springs, CO.

USACE, Wilmington District, US Environmental Protection Agency, NC Wildlife Resources Commission, and NC Division of Water Quality. 2003. Stream Mitigation Guidelines. April 2003. 26 pp.

USGS. 2008. Fisher River near Copeland, NC streamflow gage. USGS Real-Time Water Data. Gage 02113000. http://waterdata.usgs.gov.

Weakley, A.S. 2007. Flora of the Carolinas, Virginia, Georgia, and surrounding Areas. Working Draft as of 11 January 2007. UNC Herbarium. North Carolina Botanical Garden. UNC at Chapel Hill.

Appendices

Appendix A: Vegetation Raw Data

Appendix A-I: Vegetation Survey Data Tables

Report Prepared By	Susan Shelingoski
Date Prepared	9/22/2008 12:47
database name	cvs-eep-entrytool-v2.2.5.mdb
database location	C:\Documents and Settings\susan_shelingoski\Desktop
computer name	RDUXPL160
DESCRIPTION OF WORKSHEETS	IN THIS DOCUMENT
Metadata	Description of database file, the report worksheets, and a summary of project(s) and project data.
Proj, planted	Each project is listed with its PLANTED stems per acre, for each year. This excludes live stakes.
Proj, total stems	Each project is listed with its TOTAL stems per acre, for each year. This includes live stakes, all planted stems, and all natural/volunteer stems.
Plots	List of plots surveyed with location and summary data (live stems, dead stems, missing, etc.).
Vigor	Frequency distribution of vigor classes for stems for all plots.
Vigor by Spp	Frequency distribution of vigor classes listed by species.
Damage	List of most frequent damage classes with number of occurrences and percent of total stems impacted by each.
Damage by Spp	Damage values tallied by type for each species.
Damage by Plot	Damage values tallied by type for each plot.
Planted Stems by Plot and Spp	A matrix of the count of PLANTED living stems of each species for each plot; dead and missing stems are excluded.
PROJECT SUMMARY	
Project Code	28
project Name	Beaver Creek
Description	Stream Restoration
River Basin	Yadkin-Pee Dee
length(ft)	4,199
stream-to-edge width (ft)	20
area (sq m)	9.6 acres
Required Plots (calculated)	6
Sampled Plots	5

Table A1: Vegetation Metadata

	Species	4	3	2	1	0	Missing	Unknown
	Alnus serrulata	6						
	Betula nigra	13		1				
	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	6	2					
	Juglans nigra	1						
	Nyssa sylvatica	1						
	Quercus falcata	2						
	Quercus michauxii	9	1					
	Quercus phellos	3						
	Quercus velutina	1	1					
	Rhus glabra	6	1					
	Salix nigra	10						
	Carpinus caroliniana	2						
	Cercis canadensis	4						
	Prunus serotina	2						
TOT:	14	66	5	1				

 Table A2:
 Vegetation Vigor by Species

 Table A3: Vegetation Damage by Species

	Species	All Damage Categories	(no damage)	Insects
	Alnus serrulata	6	6	
	Betula nigra	14	14	
	Carpinus caroliniana	2	2	
	Cercis canadensis	4	4	
	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	8	8	
	Juglans nigra	1	1	
	Nyssa sylvatica	1	1	
	Prunus serotina	2	2	
	Quercus falcata	2	2	
	Quercus michauxii	10	10	
	Quercus phellos	3	3	
	Quercus velutina	2	2	
	Rhus glabra	7	6	1
	Salix nigra	10	10	
TOT:	14	72	71	1

	plot	All Damage Categories	(no damage)	Insects
	00028-01-0004-year:5	13	13	
	00028-01-0010-year:5	26	26	
	00028-01-0011-year:5	25	24	1
	00028-01-0012-year:5	8	8	
TOT:	4	72	71	1

Table A4: Vegetation Damage by Plot

Table A5: Stem Count by Plot and Species

	Species	Total Planted Stems	# plots	avg# stems	plot 00028-01-0004-year:5	plot 00028-01-0010-year:5	plot 00028-01-0011-year:5	plot 00028-01-0012-year:5
	Alnus serrulata	6	1	6			6	
	Betula nigra	14	3	4.67		12	1	1
	Carpinus caroliniana	2	1	2	2			
	Cercis canadensis	4	3	1.33	1	2	1	
	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	8	4	2	1	2	4	1
	Juglans nigra	1	1	1		1		
	Nyssa sylvatica	1	1	1			1	
	Prunus serotina	2	1	2		2		
	Quercus falcata	2	1	2			2	
	Quercus michauxii	10	3	3.33	1		5	4
	Quercus phellos	3	3	1		1	1	1
	Quercus velutina	2	2	1	1			1
	Rhus glabra	7	2	3.5		6	1	
	Salix nigra	10	2	5	7		3	
TOT:	14	72	14		13	26	25	8

 Table A6:
 Vegetation Problem Areas

Beaver Creek										
EEP Project Number 00028										
Feature #	Feature/Issue	Station # / Range	Probable Cause	Photo #						
VPA1	Exotic population	3+00	Kudzu	VPA1						
VPA2	Exotic population	5+00	Kudzu	VPA2						
VPA3	No woody survival	8+00 to 13+00	Maintenance and repairs	VPA3						
VPA4	No woody survival	15+00 to 19+00	Maintenance and repairs	VPA4						
VPA5	No woody survival	25+00 to 26+00	Maintenance and repairs	VPA5						
VPA6	Bare floodplain	25+00 to 25+50	Maintenance and repairs	VPA6						
VPA7	Bare banks	37+00 to 37+25	Bank erosion	VPA7						

VPA8 No	o woody survival	39+50 to 40+00	Maintenance and repairs	VPA8

Appendix A-II: Vegetation Problem Area Photos


VPA1 facing left bank



VPA3 facing right bank



VPA5 facing upstream



VPA2 facing right bank



VPA4 facing upstream



VPA6 facing upstream



VPA7 facing upstream



VPA8 facing downstream

Appendix A-III: Vegetation Current Condition Plan View

	Beaver Creek		
Feature #	Feature/Issue	Station # / Range	Suspected Cause
VPA1	Invasive/exotic plant	3+00	Kudzu
VPA2	Invasive/exotic plant	5+00	Kudzu
VPA3	No woody survival	8+00 to 13+00	Maintenance and repairs
VPA4	No woody survival	15+00 to 19+00	Maintenance and repairs
VPA5	No woody survival	25+00 to 26+00	Maintenance and repairs
VPA6	Bare floodplain	25+00 to 25+50	Maintenance and repairs
VPA7	Bare banks	33+00 to 33+25	Bank erosion
VPA8	No woody survival	40+00 to 40+50	Maintenance and repairs







35+00

Cross Section 6

P27-30

JPAS

Cross Section 7

′P15

P31-32

40+00



Prepared By:

URS Corporation - North Carolina 1600 Perimeter Park Drive Suite 400 Morrisville, NC 27560 Phone: 919-461-1100 Fax: 919-461-1415



Prepared For: NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program



Project:

Beaver Creek Stream Restoration Surry County, NC

Monitoring Year:

5 (2008)

Project Number:

28

Date:

February 2009

Legend

Problem Area Concern Problem Area Concern * Stations - Cross Section ----- As-Built Streambank - As-Built Centerline Vegetation Plot Meeting Success Criteria Vegetation Plot Not Meeting Success Criteria Photo Point

Vegetation Current Condition Plan View

Appendix A-IV: Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos



VP4



VP10



VP11



VP15



VP12

Appendix B: Geomorphic Raw Data

Appendix B-I: Stream Current Condition Plan View

Beaver Creek EEP Project Number 00028						
		Range				
PA1	Structure failure	9+40	Improper design and/or construction			
PA2	Structure failure	33+00	Improper design and/or construction			
PA3	Structure failure	38+00	Scour behind vane arm			
PA4	Bare bank	39+80 to 40+00	Bank erosion			









Cross Section 2

Prepared By:

URS Corporation - North Carolina 1600 Perimeter Park Drive Suite 400 Morrisville, NC 27560 Phone: 919-461-1100 Fax: 919-461-1415



Prepared For: NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program



Project:

Beaver Creek Stream Restoration Surry County, NC

Monitoring Year:

5 (2008)

Project Number:

28

Date:

February 2009

Legend

- Problem Area Concern Problem Area Concern
- * Stations
- **Cross Section**
- As-Built Streambank
- As-Built Centerline
- Vegetation Plot
- Photo Point

Stream **Current Condition** Plan View

Appendix B-II: Stream Problem Areas Data Table

Beaver Creek						
EEP Project Number 00028						
Feature #	Feature/Issue	Station # / Range	Probable Cause	Photo #		
PA1	Structure failure	9+40	Improper design and/or construction	PA1		
PA2	Structure failure	33+00	Improper design and/or construction	PA2		
PA3	Structure failure	38+00	Scour behind vane arm	PA3		
PA4	Bare bank	39+80 to 40+00	Bank erosion	PA4		

Appendix B-III: Representative Stream Problem Area Photos



PA1 facing upstream



PA3 facing left bank



PA2 facing right bank



PA4 facing right bank

Appendix B-IV: Stream Photo Station Photos



P1 facing upstream



P3 facing upstream



P5 facing downstream



P2 facing downstream



P4 facing left bank



P6 facing right bank floodplain



P7 facing upstream



P9 facing downstream



P11 facing upstream



P8 facing left bank



P10 facing right bank floodplain



P12 facing left bank



P13 facing downstream



P15 facing upstream



P17 facing downstream



P14 facing right bank floodplain



P16 facing left bank



P18 facing right bank floodplain



P19 facing upstream



P21 facing downstream



P23 facing upstream



P20 facing left bank



P22 facing right bank floodplain



P24 facing left bank



P25 facing downstream



P27 facing upstream



P29 facing downstream



P26 facing right bank floodplain



P28 facing left bank



P30 facing right bank floodplain



P31 facing upstream



P33 facing upstream



P35 facing downstream



P32 facing downstream at Fisher River



P34 facing left bank



P36 facing upstream



P37 facing left bank



P39 facing upstream



P41 facing downstream



P38 facing downstream



P40 facing left bank



P42 facing upstream



P43 facing downstream

Appendix B-V: Visual Morphological Stability Assessment Table

Table B2: Visual Morphological Stability Assessment Beaver Creek EEP Project Number 00028						
A. Riffles	Present?	20	20	N/A	100	
	Armor stable (no displacement)?	19	20	N/A	95	
	Facet grade appears stable?	20	20	N/A	100	
	Minimal evidence of embedding/fining?	20	20	N/A	100	
	Length appropriate?	20	20	N/A	100	
						99
B. Pools	Present (not subject to severe aggrad. or migration)?	40	40	N/A	100	
	Sufficiently deep (max pool D:mean Bkf >1.6)	40	40	N/A	100	
	Length appropriate?	40	40	N/A	100	
						100
C. Thalweg	Upstream of meander bend (run/inflection) centering?	22	22	N/A	100	
	Downstream of meander (glide/inflection) centering?	22	22	N/A	100	
						100
D. Meanders	Outer bend in state of limited/controlled erosion?	10	11	N/A	91	
	Of those eroding, # w/concomitant point bar formation?	0	0	N/A	n/a	
	Apparent Rc within spec?	11	11	N/A	100	
	Sufficient floodplain access and relief?	10	11	N/A	91	
				N/A		94
E. Bed General	General channel bed aggradation areas (bar formation)	3672	3672	0	100	
	Channel bed degradation-areas of increasing downcutting/headcutting?	3572	3672	5/100	97	
						99
F. Bank	Actively eroding, wasting, or slumping bank	3652	3672	2/20	99	
						99
G. Vanes	Free of back or arm scour?	33	36	N/A	92	
	Height appropriate?	36	36	N/A	100	
	Angle and geometry appear appropriate?	36	36	N/A	100	
	Free of piping or other structural failures?	33	36	N/A	92	
						96
H. Wads/ Boulders	Free of scour?	29	29	N/A	100	
	Footing stable?	29	29	N/A	100	
						100

Appendix B-VI: Cross Section Photos and Plots



Facing Left Bank

Facing Right Bank



Facing Left Bank

Facing Right Bank



Beaver Creek Cross Section 3 - Pool 9/17/08



Facing Left Bank



- bkf

Facing Right Bank









Appendix B-VII: Longitudinal Plot

Beaver Creek Longitudinal Profile, 09/17/08 and 09/18/08

-water srf \triangle x-section \diamond riffle crest \circ pool \blacksquare run \triangle glide \times LTOB + RTOB \triangle Grade Control --- bed







Appendix B-VIII: Pebble Count Frequency Distribution Plots












