Year 1 Monitoring Report

Freedom Park Stream Restoration



February 2006

S&EC Project No. 9443.D1 EEP Project No. 00032

Prepared for



NCEEP, 1652 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-1652

Table of Contents

I.	E	Executive Summary / Project Abstract			
II.	Pı	roject l	Background	2	
	A.	Loc	cation and Setting	2	
	B.	Str	acture and Objectives	2	
	C.	Pro	ject History and Background	3	
	D.	Mo	nitoring Plan View	4	
III.		Projec	et Condition and Monitoring Results	5	
	A.	Ve	getation Assessment	5	
		1.	Soil Data	5	
		2.	Problem Areas Plan View (vegetation)	6	
		3.	Vegetative Problem Areas Plan View	6	
		4.	Stem Counts	6	
		5.	Vegetation Photo Plots	8	
	B.	Str	eam Assessment	8	
		1.	Problem Areas Plan View (stream)	8	
		2.	Problem Areas table Summary	8	
		3.	Numbered Issues Photo Section	8	
		4.	Fixed Photo Station Photos	8	
		5.	Stability Assessment	8	
IV.		Metho	odology Section	3	

I. Executive Summary / Project Abstract

The subject of this stream restoration monitoring report, Little Sugar Creek, is located within the confines of Freedom Park, in the City of Charlotte. Little Sugar Creek was chosen for restoration due to severe impairment as a result of historic channelization and dredging. The project, located in Mecklenburg County, was designed by HDR Engineering, Inc. using natural channel design methods and was restored in 2003. This report serves as the Year 1 Annual Monitoring report.

Monitoring of the vegetated buffer was performed during the growing season of 2005, by Soil & Environmental Consultants, PA. Stem counts were preformed within the established vegetation monitoring plots, resulting in a live stem density of approximately 670 stems per acre.

The physical stream channel was surveyed, and a visual stability assessment was performed for the Freedom Park Stream Restoration project. While there are several problem areas along the restored channel, the overall channel is stable and successful. Year 2 of 5 monitoring will commence in 2006.

II. **Project Background**

The background information for this report is referenced from previous monitoring reports submitted by the Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department at North Carolina State University.

A. Location and Setting

The Little Sugar Creek stream restoration site is located in the Catawba River Basin (HU No. 03050103) in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina. The stream reach is bounded by East Boulevard and Princeton Avenue, and lies entirely within Freedom Park and the City of Charlotte. Freedom Park is part of the Mecklenburg County Park and Recreation Department public park system. (See Figure 1)

B. Structure and Objectives

Little Sugar Creek was dredged in 1917 to a minimum width of approximately 20 feet and a depth of 8 feet. Overall, the current alignment has existed since the early part of the 1900s. In the mid-1960s and early 1970s, the City initiated an erosion control system along the banks of Little Sugar Creek, as it flows through Freedom Park, using a combination of grouted riprap and concrete bank covering. In July 2002, the County removed the grouted riprap and concrete banking and temporarily stabilized the banks with erosion control matting. Additionally, the large flood control weir structure located approximately 450 feet upstream of Princeton Avenue was removed.

The restoration plan proposed to increase aquatic habitat diversity, improve on-site water quality, stabilize the stream banks, provide flood storage, and aesthetically enhance the stream setting.

Values for the restoration reach are shown in Tables I and II below:

Little Sugar Creek Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project # 00032)		
Segment/Reach ID	Linear Feet or Acreage	
Restoration Reach – Little Sugar Creek	4.450 linear feet	

Table I: Project Structure Table					
ittle Sugar Creek Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project # 00032)					

Little Sugar Creek Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project # 00032)						
Segment/Reach ID	Objectives	Linear Feet or Acreage	Comment			
Restoration Reach – Little Sugar Creek	Restoration	4,450 lf				

C. Project History and Background

Construction of the Little Sugar Creek Stream Restoration project was commenced in mid-2003 with construction ending in September 2003. The As-built survey was completed in June 2004. 2005 served as Year 1 of monitoring. Additional details regarding the timeline of the project are included as Table III.

	Calendar Year of Completion or Planned	Actual Completion Date	
Activity or Report	Compiction		
Restoration plan			
Mitigation plan			
Construction	2003	Sept-03	
Temporary S&E mix applied to entire project area	2003	Sept-03	
As-built report	2004	June-04	
Planting	2004	Spring 04	
Initial-Year 1 monitoring	2005	Nov-05	
Year 1 vegetation monitoring	2005	Oct-05	
Year 2 monitoring	2006		
Year 3 monitoring	2007		
Year 4 monitoring	2008		
Year 5 monitoring	2009		

Table III: Project Activity and Repo	orting History
Little Sugar Creek Stream Restoration Site	(EEP Project # 00032)

The project was designed by HDR Engineering, Inc of the Carolinas. Construction was performed by SEI Environmental. Monitoring activities for Year 1 were performed by S&EC. Additional information regarding contractors is shown in Table IV.

Little Sugar Creek Stream Restoration Site (EEF 110ject # 00052)					
Designer	HDR Engineering, Inc. of the Carolinas 128 South Tryon St., Suite 1400, Charlotte, NC 28202				
Construction Contractor	SEI Environmental 5100 North I-85, Suite 7., Charlotte, NC 28206				
Monitoring Performers	Soil & Environmental Consultants, PA 11010 Raven Ridge Road, Raleigh, NC 27614				
Stream Monitoring POC Vegetation Monitoring POC	Rebecca Wargo, S&EC Jessica Regan, S&EC				

 Table IV: Project Contact Table

 Little Sugar Creek Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project # 00032)

The project is located within Mecklenburg County, portions of which are located within the Charlotte Belt of the Piedmont of North Carolina. The site is located within a highly urbanized area. Additional information regarding this stream is included in Table V.

Project County	Mecklenburg
Drainage Area	13.6 square miles
Drainage impervious cover estimate (%)	75%
Stream Order	
Physiographic Region	Piedmont
Ecoregion	Charlotte Belt
Rosgen Classification of As-Built	
Dominant Soil Types	Cecil, Monacan
Reference Site ID	N/A
USGS HUC for Project and Reference	03050103
NCDWQ Sub-basin for Project and Reference	03-08-34
NCDWQ classification for Project	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	No
% of project easement fenced	0%

 Table V: Project Background Table

 Little Sugar Creek Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project # 00032)

D. Monitoring Plan View

A series of monitoring devices have been installed on site. A total of nine (9) individual cross-sections were located. Cross-sections were plotted from left to right facing downstream. Each cross-section is also a designated photographic point that will be photographed annually. There are twelve (12) permanent photo points located at various points along the length of the channel. Four (4) vegetation-monitoring plots were randomly located within the riparian buffer of the Freedom Park project. The locations of all monitoring devices are shown on Sheets 1 through 3 (Monitoring Plan View).

III. Project Condition and Monitoring Results

A. Vegetation Assessment

Planted zones related to the stream restoration consisted of the riparian buffer zone and the stream banks. The riparian buffer zone initiates at the top of the bank and continues out perpendicular from the stream. The planted stream bank initiates at the normal base flow elevation and extends to the top of bank or interface with the flood plain.

Four vegetation plots were re-established on-site by S&EC. These plots are shown on the Monitoring Plan View (Sheets 1 through 3). As the original vegetation monitoring plots were unable to be located, variations in stem density were found.

1. Soil Data

The project site is located in the Charlotte Belt region of the North Carolina Piedmont physiographic province. Soils present in the riparian areas adjacent to Little Sugar Creek are characteristic of those found in alluvial landforms in the Charlotte Belt. However, extensive grading and dredging has likely modified much of the naturally occurring soils on site.

Monacan soils (*Fluvaquentic Eutrudept*) are the prevalent map unit along the channel. Formed in recent alluvial sediments, they are deep, moderately well and somewhat poorly drained with moderate permeability.

Other soils in the project's vicinity include Cecil sandy clay loam (*Typic Kanhapludults*), which is often mapped on broad ridges and side slopes. In the upland areas surrounding the project, Pacelot (*Typic Kanhapludults*) and Cecil (*Typic Kanhapludults*) are the predominate soil series. Pacelot soils consist of very deep, well-drained, moderately permeable soils that formed in material weathered mostly from acid crystalline rocks of the Piedmont uplands.

Series	Max Depth (in.)	% Clay on Surface	K	Т	OM %
Cecil (CeB2, CeD2)	62	20-35	0.28	5	0.5-1.0
Monocan loam (MO)	80	7-27	0.28	5	2.0-3.0
Monacan and Arents (MS)	80	7-27	0.28	5	2.0-3.0
Pacelot (PaE)	60	8-20	0.20	3	0.5-2.0

 Table VI: Preliminary Soil Data

 Little Sugar Creek Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project # 00032)

2. Problem Areas Plan View (vegetation)

Upon inspection on September 12, 2005, it was noted that several areas along the banks of Little Sugar Creek and its floodplain have suffered localized loss of vegetation. It is suspected that overbank flows occurred before the newly planted vegetation had sufficient time to establish a root system capable of withstanding flood flow. Other areas may have compacted soils causing poor vegetative success. There are several areas with exposed soil as indicated on the problem area plan view as "Bare Bank."

Feature Issues	Station numbers	Suspected Cause	Photo number
	21+00 to 21+75	Overbank flow / Compacted soils	Vegetation
Bare Bank	25+60 to 27+35	Overbank flow / Compacted soils	Problem Area 1

 Table VII: Vegetative Problem Areas

 Little Sugar Creek Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project # 00032)

3. Vegetative Problem Areas Plan View

Vegetative problem areas are shown on Sheets 4 through 6 (Problem Area Plan View)

4. Stem Counts

On October 10, 2005, S&EC conducted vegetation counts within each established plot as described above. The results of this survey are shown below in Table VIII.

	Plots				Vear 1
Species	1	1 2 3 4			Totals
TREE					
Swamp Chestnut Oak					
(Quercus michauxii)				1	1
Willow Oak					
(Quercus phellos)	1			1	2
Hackberry					
(Celtis sp)			1		1
Green Ash					
(Fraxinus pennsylvanica)	9			3	12
Cherrybark Oak					
(Quercus falcata)	2			1	3
Northern Red Oak					
(Quercus rubra)			1		1
River Birch					
(Betula nigra)		3	9	6	18
Sweet Gum					
(Liquidambar styraciflua)					0
American Sycamore					
(Platanus occidentalis)			1	1	2
Tulip Poplar					
(Liriodendron tulipifera)	1				1
SHRUB					
Black Willow					
(Salix nigra)		7	2	1	10
Elderberrry			_		
(Sambucus canadensis)			7		7
Silky Dogwood		7	1		0
(Cornus amomum)		/	1		ð
Year 1 Totals	13	17	22	14	66
	15	1/	22	17	00
Live Stem Density	526	688	890	567	
Average Live Stem Density		60	68		

Table VIII: Stem Counts for Each Species Arranged by PlotFreedom Park Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project #00032)

The 2005 vegetation monitoring of the site revealed an average tree density of 668 stems per acre.

5. Vegetation Photo Plots

Photos taken during the August 4, 2005 Vegetation Sampling event are included in Appendix A.

B. Stream Assessment

1. Problem Areas Plan View (stream)

An assessment of the stability of the channel was preformed on September 12, 2005, by S&EC. Several areas of concern were observed and documented including localized bank scour, overbank scour, and several areas of bare banks. These problem areas are shown on Sheets 4 through 6 (Problem Area Plan View).

2. Problem areas table summary

Feature Issues	Station numbers	Suspected Cause	Photo number	
	10+47 to 11+17	Excessive bank shear stress	Stream Problem Areas	
Bank Scour	13+39 to 13+94	Resultant from floodplain drainage		
	20+66 to 21+82	Excessive bank shear stress	1-3	

Table IX: Stream Problem AreasLittle Sugar Creek Stream Restoration Site

3. Numbered issues photo section

Representative photos of each category of stream problem area were taken and are shown in Appendix B.

4. Fixed photo station photos

Photos from established photo stations were collected on September 12, 2005 during the stream survey. These photos are included in Appendix B along with the photos taken during the As-built post-construction survey.

5. Stability assessment

A visual qualitative assessment was performed to inspect channel facets, meanders, bed, banks, and installed structures. This visual assessment was confirmed and enhanced with a quantitative assessment of the physical stream survey. The goal of this assessment is to provide a percentage of the features listed in Table X that are in a state of stability. Table X was compiled from the data in Table B1 in Appendix B of this report.

Feature	Initial 2004	MY-1 2005	MY-2 2006	MY-3 2007
	2004	2005	2000	2007
A. Riffles	*	100%		
B. Pools	*	95%		
C. Thalweg	*	100%		
D. Meanders	*	85%		
E. Bed General	*	94%		
F. Channel General	*	NA		
G. Banks	*	92%		
H. Vanes/ J Hooks, etc.	*	100%		
I. Wads and Boulders	*	100%		

Table X: Categorical Stream Feature Visual Stability Assessment Freedom Park Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project # 00032)

* Items denoted with an asterisk have not been provided due to: lack of data provided for previous monitoring years, incorrect data provided for previous monitoring years, or these are items outside the scope of this year's monitoring effort.

6. Quantitative Morphology

The following tables (Table XI and Table XII) summarize the quantitative data collected from the cross-sectional and longitudinal stream survey. This data was analyzed and summarized, and then compared with baseline data types available for this project. It should be noted that bankfull indicators on-site (other than the constructed bench) were difficult to recognize in this channel since it is newly constructed and repairs have recently taken place. For this reason, the SRI Peidmont curve was used to determine an average bankfull cross-sectional area, and bankfull was placed at the elevation that would yield this area (for 2005 cross-sections). This elevation is lower than the bench that has been constructed in portions of the reach, however the bankfull area used for pools does correspond to field indicators. When the elevations chosen for bankfull (2005 – based on the regional curve) were plotted on the longitudinal profile, the points formed a reasonably uniform slope that was consistent with the water surface slope. While it is difficult to exactly identify the location of bankfull on this project, the baseline that has been chosen for 2005 is consistent with the regional curve and will provide accurate illustrations of departure if bankfull is located in the same manner for future years of monitoring. The Quantitative Morphology Tables illustrate the degree of departure, if any, of the current channel from the baseline data. Tables XI and XII were compiled from the cross-section and profile raw data and plots located in Appendix B of this report.

Based on a review of available site data and observations made during 2005 site visits, no crest gauge has been installed on the site. A review of available on-line USGS gauge sites was performed to determine if a suitable surrogate gauge was present in the area. No nearby gauge was identified. The closest USGS gauge to

the site was on Little Sugar Creek (Gauge Identification Number 02146409) which is approximately 0.5 miles from the project site. At the time this report was prepared, discharge data for 2005 was not available, therefore we were unable to determine the number of bankfull events experienced at the site.

Parameter	Pre-I	Existing Con	dition	Projec	t Reference	Stream		Design			As-built			
								<u> </u>						
Dimension	Min *	Max *	Avg.	Min *	Max *	Avg.	Min *	Max *	Avg.	Min 20	Max 107	Avg.		
Eloodprope	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	39 *	107	00 *		
Width (ft)														
BF Cross	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	169	414	263		
Sectional Area														
(ft ²)														
BF Mean Depth (ft)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	3.4	5.5	4		
BF Max Depth (ft)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	5	9.4	6.92		
Width/Depth Ratio	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	9.1	27.4	17.06		
Entrenchment Ratio	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		
Wetted	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		
Perimeter(ft)														
Hydraulic radius (ft)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		
Pattern														
Channel	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	105	236	153		
Beltwidth (ft)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	70	222	147.5		
Curvature (ft)	~	т Т	~	~	~	~	~	τ. Γ	~	12	232	147.5		
Meander	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	403	840	531		
Wavelength (ft)														
Meander Width ratio	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	1.9	4.2	2.7		
Profile														
Riffle length (ft)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	15	207	66		
Riffle slope (ft/ft)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.0027	0.0175	0.0115		
Pool length (ft)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	76	252	132		
Pool spacing (ft)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	171	587	294		
Substrate														
d50 (mm)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.18	1.13	*		
d84 (mm)	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	0.2	4.7	*		
Additional														
Reach														
Parameters														
Valley Length (ft)		*			*			*			*			
Channel Length (ft)		*		*				*			*			
Sinuosity		*		*				*			*			
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)		*		*				*			0.0025			
BF slope (ft/ft)		*		*				*			*			
Rosgen		*		*				*		*				
*Habitat Index		*			*			*		<u> </u>	*			
*Macrobenthos		*			*			*			*			

 Table XI. Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary

 FREEDOM PARK STREAM RESTORATION SITE (EEP Project # 00032)

* Items denoted with an asterisk have not been provided due to: lack of data provided for previous monitoring years, incorrect data provided for previous monitoring years, or these are items outside the scope of this year's monitoring effort.

Table XII. Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary FREEDOM PARK STREAM RESTORATION SITE (EEP Project # 00032)

					u .												r																			
Parameter		Cross S	Section 1			Cross S	lection 2			Cross S	lection 3			Cross S	Section 4			Cross S	Section 5			Cross S	Section 6			Cross S	Section 7			Cross S	Section 8			Cross S	ection 9	
		Ri	ffle			Pe	ool			Ri	ffle			Р	ool			Ri	ffle			Р	ool			Ri	ffle			Ri	ffle			P	ool	
														-								-												-		
Dimension	2004	2005	2006	2007	2004	2005	2006	2007	2004	2005	2006	2007	2004	2005	2006	2007	2004	2005	2006	2007	2004	2005	2006	2007	2004	2005	2006	2007	2004	2005	2006	2007	2004	2005	2006	2007
Dimension	2004	2005 MV1	2000 MV2	MV2	2004	2005 MV1	2000 MV2	MV2	2004	2005 MV1	2000 MV2	2007 MV2	2004	2005 MV1	2000 MV2	2007 MV2	2004	2005 MV1	2000 MV2	MV2	2004	2005 MV1	2000 MV2	MV2	2004	2005 MV1	2000 MV2	2007 MV2	2004	2005 MV1	2000 MV2	MV2	2004	2005 MV1	MV2	 MV2
DE WELL (A)	46	47.59	IVI I Z	WI15	72	MITI 46	INI I Z	WI15	52	29.52	NI I Z	WI15	94	54.44	WI 1 2	MI13	20	28.01	IVI I Z	IVI I 3	107	42.50	IVI I Z	IVI I S	74	50.06	IVI I Z	WI15	69	51.20	IVI I Z	IVI I 5	52	24.92	IVI I Z	WIT5
BF width (It)	40	47.38			/3	40			33	38.32			64	34.44			39	58.01			107	45.39			/4	39.06			08	31.39			33	54.82		
Floodprone Width (ft)	*	/1.34			*	95			*	49.95			*	93.74			*	67.43			*	121.45			*	74.29				65.87				88.7		
BF Cross	197	205.73			275	159.19			219	121.31			283	160.25			169	132.18			414	162.74			250	121.93			372	127.07			189	156.78		
Sectional Area																																				
(ft ²)																																				
BF Mean Depth	4.3	4.32			3.8	3.46			4.2	3.15			3.4	2.94			4.3	3.48			3.9	3.73			3.4	2.06			5.5	2.47			3.6	4.5		
(ft)																																				
BF Max Depth (ft)	5.5	5.64			7.1	5.5			6.7	4.16			6.8	5.81			5.9	5.02			9.4	6.29			5	3.55			7.2	3.3			8.7	7.44		
Wild Dead Deda	10.0	11			10.5	12.20			12.6	10.00			25.1	10.40			0.1	10.02			27.4	11.69			21.0	29.61			10.2	20.79			14.0	7 72		
width/Depth Ratio	10.9	11			19.5	13.29			12.6	12.25			25.1	18.49			9.1	10.93			27.4	11.68			21.9	28.61			12.5	20.78			14.8	1.15		
Entrenchment	*	1.5			*	2.07			*	1.3			*	1.72			*	1.77			*	2.79			*	1.26			*	1.28			*	2.55		
Ratio																																				
Wetted	*	50.49			*	48.41			*	40.41			*	58.1			*	40.84			*	46.03			*	60.06			*	52.39			*	41.5		
Perimeter(ft)																																				
Hydraulic radius	*	4.07			*	3.29		1	*	3			*	2.76			*	3.24			*	3.54			*	2.03			*	2.43			*	3.78		
(ft)																																				
Substrate																																				
d50 (mm)	1.13	*			0.31	*			0.19	*			0.24	*			0.52	*			0.06	*			0.53	*			0.18	*			0.85	*		
d84 (mm)	2.8	*			2.3	*			4.7	*			1.4	*			2	*			0.2	*			1.5	*			1.3	*			1.5	*		

Parameter	А	s-built (200)4)	1	MY-1 (2005	5)	1	MY-2 (2006	5)	N	MY-3 (2007	7)
Pattern	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	105	236	153	102.54	304.24	183.88						
Radius of Curvature (ft)	72	232	148	125.91	194.73	158.56						
Meander Wavelength (ft)	403	840	531	522.87	836.79	634.34						
Meander Width ratio	1.9	4.2	2.7	2.239	6.644	4.016						
Profile												
Riffle length (ft)	15	207	66	*	*	*						
Riffle slope (ft/ft)	0.0027	0.0175	0.0115	0.00206	0.00258	0.00234						
Pool length (ft)	76	252	132	82.51	412.54	167.56						
Pool spacing (ft)	171	587	294	132.93	650.9	372.12						
Additional Reach												
Parameters												
Valley Length (ft)		*			39.26							
Channel Length (ft)		*			4437							
Sinuosity		*			1.13							
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)		*			0.00234							
BF slope (ft/ft)		*			0.00234							
Rosgen Classification		*		В5								
Habitat Index*		*			*							
Macrobenthos*		*			*							

* Items denoted with an asterisk have not been provided due to: lack of data provided for previous monitoring years, incorrect data provided for previous monitoring years, or these are items outside the scope of this year's monitoring effort.

IV. Methodology Section

No unavoidable deviations from initially prescribed methodologies were implemented as a part of monitoring Year 1 activities.

















le: Sec\Jobs7-9k\9443.D1\PAPV\PAPV 2005 11-14.d





TION PROBLEM AREAS-SEVERE Il site data provided by NCEEP. al restoration design prepared by echnologies, Inc. valuation prepared by Soil and valuation prepared by Soil and nmental Consultants, PA on 9/17/05. ations are approximate.	PAPV LEGEND PROBLEM AREAS-STRESSED PROBLEM AREAS-FAILING	
Ecosystem S&	Soil & Environmental Consultants, PA 11010 Raven Ridge Road • Raleigh, North Carolina 27614 • Phone: (919) 846-5900 • Fax: (919) 846-940	Project: Project No.: 9443.D1 STREAM RESTORATION Proj. Mgr.: Drawn: Drawn: </th

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A -

Vegetation Survey Data Tables

		Pl	ots		Vear 1
Species	1	2	3	4	Totals
TREE					
Swamp Chestnut Oak					
(Quercus michauxii)				1	1
Willow Oak					
(Quercus phellos)	1			1	2
Celtis sp					
-			1		1
Green Ash					
(Fraxinus pennsylvanica)	9			3	12
Cherrybark Oak					
(Quercus falcata)	2			1	3
Northern Red Oak					
(Quercus rubra)			1		1
River Birch					
(Betula nigra)		3	9	6	18
Sweet Gum					
(Liquidambar styraciflua)					0
American Sycamore					
(Platanus occidentalis)			1	1	2
Tulip Poplar					
(Liriodendron tulipifera)	1				1
SHRUB					
Black Willow					
(Salix nigra)		7	2	1	10
Elderberrry			_		_
(Sambucus canadensis)			1		1
Silky Dogwood		7	1		9
(Cornus amomum)		/	1		0
Year 1 Totals	13	17	22	14	66
Live Stem Density	526	688	890	567	
Average Live Stem Density		6	58		

 Table VIII: Stem Counts for Each Species Arranged by Plot

 Freedom Park Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project #00032)

EEP Stem Count Data Sheet

EEP Project #:	00032	Date:	10/10/2005
Project Name:	Freedom Park	Staff Name:	D. Gainey
Monitoring Contractor:	S&EC	Staff Name:	J. Regan
County:	Mecklenburg		
8 Digit Catalog Unit	03050103		
Stream/Wetland Name:	Little Sugar Creek		
	Tree/Shrub		

Plot Location

Plot ID	Species	2004	Stem #
1	Cherrybark Oak		2
1	Ash sp.		9
1	Willow oak		1
1	Tulip poplar		1
1			
1			
1			

Plot Location

I IOL LOCA			
Plot ID	Species	2004	Stem #
2	River birch		3
2	Silky dogwood		7
2	Black willow		7
2			
2			
2			
2			

Plot Location

Plot ID	Species	2004	Stem #
3	River birch		9
3	Sycamore		1
3	N.Red oak		1
3	Celtis sp.		1
3	Black Willow		2
3	Silky dogwood		1
3	Elderberry		7

Plot Location

Plot ID	Species	2004	Stem #
4	Cherrybark oak		1
4	Ash sp.		3
4	Sycamore		1
4	River birch		6
4	Swamp chestnut oak		1
4	Willow oak		1
4	Black willow		1

Herbaceous

Plot Loca	Plot Location									
Plot ID	Species	2004	Percent Cover							
1	Erigeron sp.		5%							
1	Trifolium sp.		30%							
1	Juncus sp.		1%							
1	Astragalus gilviflorus		2%							
1										
1										
1										

Plot Location

Plot ID	Species	2004	Percent Cover
2	Panicum clandestinum		15%
2	Astragalus gilviflorus		3%
2	Microstegium vimineum		2%
2	Polygonum sp.		5%
2			
2			
2			

Plot Location

Plot ID	Species	2004	Percent Cover
3	Ipomea sp.		1%
3	Erigeron sp.		5%
3	Pamicum clandestinum		3%
3	Trifolium sp.		2%
3	Sorghum halapense		30%
3			
3			

Plot Location

Plot ID	Species	2004	Percent Cover
4	Erigeron sp.		25%
4			
4			
4			
4			
4			
4			

APPENDIX A -

Vegetation Problem Area Photos



Photo 1—Typical Bare Bank

APPENDIX A -

Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos



Vegetation Plot #1—Year 1 (2005)



Vegetation Plot #2—Year 1 (2005)



Vegetation Plot #3—Year 1 (2005)



Vegetation Plot #4—Year 1 (2005)

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B -

Representative Stream Problem Area Photos



Photo 1— Typical Bank Scour



Photo 2—Typical Bank Scour

Freedom Park Stream Mitigation Site Year 1 Monitoring December 2005



Photo 3—Typical Bank Scour
APPENDIX B -

Stream Photo Point Photos



Figure 1— Photo Point 1 (2004)



Figure 2—Photo Point 1 (2005)



Figure 3—Photo Point 2 (2004)



Figure 4—Photo Point 2 (2005)



Figure 5—Photo Point 3 (2004)



Figure 6—Photo Point 3 (2005)



Figure 7—Photo Point 4 (2004)



Figure 8—Photo Point 4 (2005)



Figure 9—Photo Point 5 (2004)



Figure 10—Photo Point 5 (2005)



Figure 11—Photo Point 6 (2004)



Figure 12—Photo Point 6 (2005)



Figure 13—Photo Point 7 (2004)



Figure 14—Photo Point 7 (2005)



Figure 15—Photo Point 8 (2004)



Figure 16—Photo Point 8 (2005)



Figure 19—Photo Point 9 (2004)



Figure 20—Photo Point 9 (2005)



Figure 21—Photo Point 10 (2004)



Figure 22—Photo Point 10 (2005)



Figure 23—Photo Point 11 (2004)



Figure 24—Photo Point 11 (2005)



Figure 25—Photo Point 12 (2004)



Figure 26—Photo Point 12 (2005)



Figure 27— Photo Point 13 (2004)



Figure 28—Photo Point 13 (2005)



Figure 29— Photo Point 14 (2004)



Figure 30—Photo Point 14 (2005)



Figure 31—Photo Point 15 (2004)



Figure 32—Photo Point 15 (2005)



Figure 33—Photo Point 16 (2004)



Figure 34—Photo Point 16 (2005)



Figure 35—Photo Point 17 (2004)



Figure 36—Photo Point 17 (2005)



Figure 37— Photo Point 18 (2004)



Figure 38—Photo Point 18 (2005)



Figure 39—Photo Point 19 (2004)



Figure 40—Photo Point 19 (2005)



Figure 41—Photo Point 20 (2004)



Figure 42—Photo Point 20 (2005)



Figure 43—Photo Point 21 (2004)



Figure 44—Photo Point 21 (2005)



Figure 45— Photo Point 22 (2004)



Figure 46—Photo Point 22 (2005)



Figure 47—Photo Point 23 (2004)



Figure 48—Photo Point 23 (2005)

APPENDIX B -

Cross-section Data

Freedom Park Stream Restoration Cross-Section #1 - Riffle



River Reach Cross Survey	Name: Name: Section Date:	Freedom 2005 Name: 1/4/2006	Park XS1
Cross TAPE	Section FS	Data ELEV	Entry NOTE
0	0	100.11	
3.82	0	98.3221	
8.76	0	95.084	
14.04	0	92.6302	
16.54	0	91.04	
21.83	0	89 819	
25.04	0	89.6696	
28.37	0	89.6829	
31.06	0	89.5521	
34.87	0	89.6447	
38.92	0	89.8755	
43.52	0	89.9414	
49.5Z	0	90.3304	
56 54	0	95 4216	
62.69	0	97.3906	
68.15	0	99.7905	
70.7	0	100.5538	
71.34	0	100.531	
Cross	Sectional	Geometrv	
			Right
Floodprone	Elevation	(ft)	100.83
Bankfull	Elevation	(ft)	95.19
Floodprone	Width	(ft) (ft)	/1.34 47.59
Entrenchm	VVICIN Patio	(11)	47.58
Mean	Depth	(ft)	4.32
Maximum	Depth	(ft)	5.64
Width/Dept	Ratio	. /	11
Bankfull	Area	(sqFT	205.73
Wetted	Perimeter	(ft)	50.49
Hydraulic	Radius	(ft)	4.07
Begin End	BKF	Station	8.6
⊏na	DVL	Station	11.00

Freedom Park Stream Restoration Cross-Section #2 - Pool



River Reach Cross	Name: Name: Section		Freedom 2005 Name:	Park XS2
Survey	Date:		1/4/2006	
Cross TAPE	Section FS		Data ELEV	Entry NOTE
0		0	101.1761	
4.62		0	99.8754	
10.27		0	97.9406	
17.98		0	95.7454	
24.39		0	94.4273	
27.43		0	93.1555	
30.16		0	91.6473	
32.74		0	89.963	
35.34		0	88.3693	
38.04		0	87.0881	
40.38		0	86.7947	
43.08		0	86.5533	
47.16		0	80.0337	
50.69		0	87.1935	
04.0Z		0	07.0071	
07.00 62.09		0	00.24/9	
02.00 64 31		0	88 55/2	
67 /2		0	90.5542	
71 73		0	91 5292	
76 45		0	92 1939	
85,69		0	92.607	
91,17		Õ	93.0365	
97.72		Õ	93.6267	
102.61		0	94.5029	
107.07		0	97.8578	
109.82		0	98.9833	
111.28		0	99.1873	

Cross Sectional Geometry

	Channel	Left	Right
Floodprone	Elevation	(ft)	97.55
Bankfull	Elevation	(ft)	92.05
Floodprone	Width	(ft)	95
Bankfull	Width	(ft)	46
Entrenchm	Ratio		2.07
Mean	Depth	(ft)	3.46
Maximum	Depth	(ft)	5.5
Width/Dept	Ratio		13.29
Bankfull	Area	(sq	159.19
Wetted	Perimeter	(ft)	48.41
Hydraulic	Radius	(ft)	3.29
Begin	BKF	Station	29.43
End	BKF	Station	75.43

Freedom Park Stream Restoration Cross-Section #3 - Riffle



- - 2004 ---- 2005

River Reach Cross Survey	Name: Name: Section Date:		Freedom 2005 Name: 1/4/2006	Park XS3
Cross	Section		Data	Entry
TAPE	FS		ELEV	NOTE
0		0	99.287	
0.2		0	99.112	
2.26		0	98.585	
5.42		0	90.700	
0.09		0	90.047	
11 28		0	91 827	
14.32		0	89.372	
19.02		0	87.896	
23.44		0	88.166	
25.37		0	87.882	
29.95		0	87.488	
35.11		0	87.417	
40.41		0	87.537	
41.93		0	87.91	
43.92		0	88.67	
47.02		0	90.254	
51.56		0	92.208	
54.96		0	94.645	
57.82		0	96.241	
60.29		0	97.355	
61.18		0	97.403	
61.34		U	97.525	

Cross	Sectional	Geometry	
Floodpron	€ Elevation	(ft)	95.74
Bankfull	Elevation	(ft)	91.58
Floodpron	€Width	(ft)	49.95
Bankfull	Width	(ft)	38.52
Entrenchm	n Ratio		1.3
Mean	Depth	(ft)	3.15

Entrenchm Ratio					
Mean	Depth	(ft)	3.15		
Maximum	Depth	(ft)	4.16		
Width/Dep	Ratio		12.23		
Bankfull	Area	(sq	121.31		
Wetted	Perimeter	(ft)	40.41		
Hydraulic	Radius	(ft)	3		
Begin	BKF	Station	11.59		
End	BKF	Station	50.1		

Freedom Park Stream Restoration Cross-Section #4 - Pool



River Reach Cross Survey	Name: Name: Section Date:	Freedom 2005 Name: 1/4/2006	Park XS4
Cross	Section	Data	Entry
TAPE	FS	ELEV	NOTE
0 3.82 8.34 12.51 18.95 22.43 28.17 33.48 51.92 58.56 62.48 75.84 86.6 94.61 105.62 108.03	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	100.2848 98.2452 95.9388 93.9237 92.3713 92.2529 85.6434 84.9241 86.9756 87.5009 90.7048 90.4473 91.7426 93.9081 98.4986 98.542	
Cross	Sectional	Geometry	
Floodprone Bankfull Floodprone Bankfull Entrenchm Mean Maximum Width/Dept Bankfull Wetted Hydraulic Bacin	Channel Elevation Elevation Width Width Ratio Depth Depth Ratio Area Perimeter Radius	Left (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft) (sq (ft) (ft) (ft) Station	Right 96.54 90.73 93.74 54.44 1.72 2.94 5.81 18.49 160.25 58.1 2.76 23.75
End	BKF	Station	78.19

Freedom Park Stream Restoration Cross-Section # 5 - Riffle



River Reach Cross Survey	Name: Name: Section Date:		Freedom 2005 Name: 1/4/2006	Park XS5
Cross	Section		Data	Entry
TAPE	FS		ELEV	NOTE
0 0.15 3.56 9.77 14.81 15.61 19.97 24 28.36 34.89 40.2 45.14 49.25 54.13 55.38 57.8			101.006 100.852 100.013 96.389 93.101 91.358 89.307 87.587 86.163 85.708 85.564 84.927 85.808 86.613 89.346 90.533 00.002	
63.52 66.31 69.19 74.96 81.8 85.66		0 0 0 0 0 0	90.092 91.21 92.11 93.377 95.852 96.735	
85.85		0	96.937	

Cross	Sectional	Geometry		
Floodprop	Elevation	(ft)	0/ 07	

Flooaprone	Elevation	(π)	94.97
Bankfull	Elevation	(ft)	89.95
Floodprone	Width	(ft)	67.43
Bankfull	Width	(ft)	38.01
Entrenchm	Ratio		1.77
Mean	Depth	(ft)	3.48
Maximum	Depth	(ft)	5.02
Width/Dep	Ratio		10.93
Bankfull	Area	(sq	132.18
Wetted	Perimeter	(ft)	40.84
Hydraulic	Radius	(ft)	3.24
Begin	BKF	Station	18.6
End	BKF	Station	56.61

Freedom Park Stream Restoration Cross-Section # 6 - Pool



- → - 2004 **--=** 2005
River Reach Cross Survey	Name: Name: Section Date:	Freedom 2005 Name: 1/4/2006	Park XS6
Cross	Section	Data	Entry
TAPE	FS	ELEV	NOTE
0 4.5 7.47 10.71 14.72 20.94 22.76 27.43 31.33 33.14 36.39 41.11 46.57 53.78 55.81 60.48 63.63 74.05 86.34 95.73 102.73 102.73 115.9 123.76 135.85 147.19		100.09 97.0817 95.6114 93.4777 90.3835 87.8886 86.4054 84.4718 83.8422 82.589 82.1527 82.9248 83.5602 84.9905 86.3278 87.5513 88.5963 89.0983 89.7842 90.1675 90.5183 91.1914 92.7167 96.4563 98.4688	
Cross	Sectional	Geometry	
Floodprone Bankfull Floodprone Bankfull Entrenchm Mean Maximum Width/Dept Bankfull Wetted Hydraulic Begin End	Elevation Elevation Width Ratio Depth Depth Ratio Area Perimeter Radius BKF BKF	(ft) (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft)	94.73 88.44 121.45 43.59 2.79 3.73 6.29 11.68 162.74 46.03 3.54 19.57 63.16

Freedom Park Stream Restoration Cross-Section # 7 - Riffle



River Reach	Name: Name:	Freedom 2005	Park	
Cross	Section	Name:	XS7	
Survey	Date:	1/4/2006		
Cross	Section	Data	Entry	
TAPE	FS	ELEV	NOTE	
0 12	0	95.9015		
3.22	0	95.0200		
9.41	0	92.6282		
13.15	0	90.6457		
19.7	0	88.9294		
24.96	0	87.5067		
26.25	0	86.9189		
33.11	0	87.2805		
36.73	0	86.6513		
45.78	0	86.2384 95 7525		
56.26	0	85 0526		
59.46	0	84,7669		
64.16	0	85.3874		
68.89	0	85.5847		
74.34	0	86.18		
79.36	0	87.0286		
81.59	0	88.7699		
89.94	0	96.0913		
91.99	0	96.6603		
Cross	Sectional	Geometry		
Floodprone	Elevation	(ft)	91.87	
Bankfull	Elevation	(ft)	88.32	
Floodprone	Width	(ft)	74.29	
Bankfull	VVICIN	(ft)	59.06	
Entrenchm	Rall0 Denth	(f +)	1.20	
Maximum	Depth	(ft)	2.00	
Width/Dept	Ratio	\	28.61	
Bankfull	Area	(sq	121.93	
Wetted	Perimeter	(ft)	60.06	
Hydraulic	Radius	(ft)	2.03	
Begin	BKF	Station	21.95	
End	BKF	Station	81.01	

Freedom Park Stream Restoration Cross-Section # 8 - Riffle



River Reach Cross Survey	Name: Name: Section Date:	Freedom 2005 Name: 1/4/2006	Park XS8
Cross	Section	Data	Entry
TAPE	FS	ELEV	NOTE
0 0.12 2.72 11.13 18.61 22.81 24.88 29.14 37.77 45.16 55.86 59.69 65.69 73.09 79.52 82.46 84.56 84.73	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	95.813 95.638 94.727 89.961 87.056 85.343 84.337 84.052 84.16 83.852 84.155 85.183 85.735 88.312 92.818 94.647 95.399 95.555	
Cross	Sectional	Geometry	
Floodprone Bankfull Floodprone Bankfull Entrenchm Mean Maximum Width/Dept Bankfull Wetted Hydraulic Begin End	Elevation Elevation Width Ratio Depth Depth Ratio Area Perimeter Radius BKF BKF	(ft) (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft) (sq (ft) (ft) Station Station	90.45 87.15 65.87 51.39 1.28 2.47 3.3 20.78 127.07 52.39 2.43 18.37 69.75

Freedom Park Stream Restoration Cross-Section #9 - Pool



River Reach	Name: Name:		Freedom 2005	Park
Cross Survey	Section Date:		Name: 1/4/2006	XS9
Cross	Section		Data	Entry
TAPE	FS		ELEV	NOTE
0		0	92.1075	
0.19		0	92.038	
1.59		0	91.7063	
3.23		0	90.7235	
8.79		0	88.003	
16.78		0	85.7376	
23.74		0	83.4801	
25.79		0	76.1985	
34.15		0	76.7206	
35.81		0	70 4000	
38.95		0	78.1208	
42.92		0	79.2030	
40.0Z		0	00.1020	
52.70 55.15		0	01.1040	
61 56		0	85 0851	
73 65		0	85.0651	
82.2		0	86 9662	
88.94		0	90.0529	
94.72		0	92.5422	
96.27		0	92,5009	
96.47		0	92.6757	
Cross	Sectiona	1	Geometry	

Floodprone	Elevation	(ft)	91.08
Bankfull	Elevation	(ft)	83.64
Floodprone	Width	(ft)	88.7
Bankfull	Width	(ft)	34.82
Entrenchm	Ratio		2.55
Mean	Depth	(ft)	4.5
Maximum	Depth	(ft)	7.44
Width/Dep	t Ratio		7.73
Bankfull	Area	(sq	156.78
Wetted	Perimeter	(ft)	41.5
Hydraulic	Radius	(ft)	3.78
Begin	BKF	Station	23.25
End	BKF	Station	58.07



Photo 1— Cross-section 1 (2005)



Photo 2—Cross-section 2 (2005)



Photo 3—Cross-section 3 (2005)



Photo 4—Cross-section 4 (2005)



Photo 5—Cross-section 5 (2005)



Photo 6—Cross-section 6 (2005)



Photo 7—Cross-section 7 (2005)



Photo 8—Cross-section 8 (2005)



Photo 9—Cross-section 9 (2005)

APPENDIX B -

Longitudinal Profile

Little Sugar Creek Stream Restoration (Freedom Park) Longitudinal Profile STA 0+00 to 15+00







- + - 2004 **- + -** 2005

Little Sugar Creek Stream Restoration (Freedom Park) Longitudinal Profile STA 30+00 to 45+00



River Reach	Name: Name:	Freedom 2005	Park								
Stream	Туре В	Valley 5c	Type VIII	D50(mm) 1.13	Val 0.0026	Slope 586.6	BKF 13	Q(cf: 3.6	s)	DA(sq	mi)
Dimension	Summary										
Variable	Min	Avg	Max								
Floodprone	e Width	(ft)		49.95	65.75	74.29					
Riffle	Area	(Sq	ft)	121.31	145.29	205.73					
Max	Riffle	Depth	(ft)	3.55	4.59	5.64					
Mean	Riffle	Depth	(ft)	2.06	3.25	4.32					
Riffle	Width	(ft)		38.01	45.79	59.06					
Pool	Area	(Sq	ft)	156.78	159.74	162.74					
Max	Pool	Depth	(ft)	5.5	6.26	7.44					
Mean	Pool	Depth	(ft)	2.94	3.66	4.5					
Pool	Width	(ft)		34.82	44.71	54.44					
Pattern	Summary										
Variable			Min	Avg	Max						
Sinuosity				 1.13							
Meander	Waveleng	tl (ft)	522.87	634.34	836.79						
Radius	Curvature	(ft)	125.91	158.56	194.73						
Belt	Width	(ft)	102.54	183.88	304.24						
Profile	Summary										
Variable	Min	Avg	Max								
S	riffle	(ft/ft)	0.00206	0.00234	0.00258						
S	pool	(ft/ft)	C	0.00027	0.00082						
S	run	(ft/ft)	C	0.02825	0.08331						
S	glide	(ft/ft)	0.00152	0.02197	0.04094						
POOL TO	POOL	(ft)	132.93	372.12	650.9						
Р	length	(ft)	82.51	167.56	412.54						
Dmax	riffle	(ft)	2.29	3.67	5.1						
Dmax	pool	(ft)	3.4	5.78	7.35						
Dmax	run	(ft)	2.69	9 4.22	5.41						
Dmax	glide	(ft)	4.27	7 5.12	5.89						
Bankfull	Slope	(ft/ft)	0.00234	ŀ							
Hydraulic	Summary										
Variable	Min	Avg	Max								
Discharge	(cfs)	586.6									
Velocity	(fps)	2.85									
Hyd	Radius	(ft)	2.03	3.09	4.07						
Bkf	Shear	(lb/	0.3	0.45	0.59						

River Reach	Name: Name:	Freedom 2005	Park					
	Stream B	Type 5c	Valley TYF VIII	2D50(mm) 1.13	ValLEY SL 0.0026	Q(cfs) 586.6	DA(sq 13.6	mi)
Dimension Variable	Summary Min	Avg	Max					
Wfpa Pool AREA Max POOl Mean POO Pool WIDT Pattern	/ Depth Depth Depth / Summary	Wbkf Abkf / DBKF / DBKF Wbkf	1.09 1.07908 1.69231 0.90462 0.76043	1.4359 1.09946 1.92615 1.12615 0.97641	1.62241 1.1201 2.28923 1.38462 1.18891			
Variable	Min	Avg	Max					
Sinuosity Lm Rc Wblt	1.13 / /	W W Wbkf	bkf bkf (MWR)	11.41887 2.74973 2.23935	13.85324 3.46276 4.01572	18.27451 4.25268 6.64425		
Profile Variable	Summary Min	Avg	Max					
S S S POOL TO P Dmax Dmax Dmax Dmax Bankfull Hydraulic	riffle pool run glide P length riffle pool run glide Slope Summary	/ / / / / / / / / / (ft/ft)	S S S W W D D D D D 0.00234	bkf bkf bkf bkf bkf bkf bkf bkf bkf	(ft/ft) (ft/ft) (ft/ft) (ft/ft) (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft) (ft)	0.88034 0 0 0.64957 2.90304 1.80192 0.70462 1.04615 0.82769 1.31385	1 0.11538 12.07265 9.38889 8.12667 3.65931 1.12923 1.77846 1.29846 1.57538	1.10256 0.35043 35.60256 17.49573 14.21489 9.00939 1.56923 2.26154 1.66462 1.81231
Variable	Min	Avg	Max					
Q V HR Bkf	bkf bkf / Shear	586.6 (fps) D (lb/	2.85 bkf sq	(ft) ft)	0.62462 0.3	0.95077 0.45	1.25231 0.59	