YEAR 1 (2014) ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT

PEPPERWOOD FARM RIPARIAN BUFFER MITIGATION SITE

Wake County, North Carolina EEP Project ID: 95713 Contract No. 004946, DWR Project No. 2013-1262

Data Collected August-October 2014



Prepared for:



NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources Ecosystem Enhancement Program 1652 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1652

December 2014

Table of Contents

1.0 Executive Summary

2.0 Methodology

3.0 References

Appendices

<u>Appendix A</u>: Vicinity Map and Background Tables Figure 1. Vicinity Map Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Credits Table Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History Table Table 3. Project Contact Table Table 4. Project Baseline Information and Attributes Table

<u>Appendix B</u>: Visual Assessment Data Figure 2. Current Conditions Plan View Vegetation Plot Photos Fixed Photo Points

<u>Appendix C</u>: Vegetation Plot Data Table 5. Vegetation Plot Success by Project Asset Type

 Table 6. Total and Planted Stems by Plot and Species

1.0 Executive Summary

This Year 1 (2014) Annual Monitoring Report describes the Pepperwood Farm Riparian Buffer Mitigation Site (Site) and is designed specifically to assist in fulfilling the North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program riparian buffer mitigation goals within the Neuse 03020201 Watershed. Completed project activities, reporting history, completion dates, project contacts, and project attributes are summarized in Tables 1-4 (Appendix A). This report (compiled based on the NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program (NCEEP) *Procedural Guidance and Content Requirements for EEP Monitoring Reports* Version 1.5 dated 6/8/12) summarizes data for Year 1 (2014) monitoring.

The Site is located approximately 1 mile northeast of Willow Springs and 4 miles northeast of Fuquay-Varina, in Wake County, North Carolina, (Figure 1, Appendix A). The project is situated within the Middle Creek watershed (United States Geological Society (USGS) 14-digit Hydrologic Cataloging Unit (HUC) 03020201120010 of the Neuse River Basin and North Carolina Division of Water Resource (NC DWR) Sub-basin 03-04-03). This sub-basin was identified by the 2010 Neuse River Basin Restoration Priorities (NC DENR) as a Targeted Local Watershed (TLW).

The Site encompasses 12.66 acres and is protected in perpetuity by three conservation easements recorded at the Wake County Register of Deeds on 11/25/2013. The Site protects five unnamed tributaries with direct hydrologic connection to Terrible Creek, DWR Stream Index Number 27-43-15-8-(2) and a Best Usage Classification of C, NSW (NC DWR 2009). Prior to restoration activities, riparian areas were cleared of native forest vegetation, heavily degraded by livestock grazing and hoof shear, maintained for hay production, and subject to raw manure fertilization. Streams were straightened, routinely cleared and subject to storm water runoff from boarding facilities.

The primary goal of this riparian buffer restoration project is to provide **10.70 Neuse River Riparian Buffer Units** (RBMU). The success of this goal is based on the following.

- 1. Removing nonpoint sources of pollution associated with agricultural activities including a) removal of horses from riparian areas; b) eliminating the application of fertilizer, pesticides, and other agricultural materials into and adjacent to streams; and c) establishing a vegetative buffer adjacent to streams to treat surface runoff, which may contain pollutants such as sediment and/or agricultural pollutants from the adjacent landscape.
- 2. Reducing sedimentation onsite and downstream by a) reducing bank erosion associated with vegetation maintenance and b) planting a diverse hardwood vegetative buffer adjacent to Site tributaries.
- 3. Stabilizing stream banks where necessary by sloping channel banks, and installing erosion control matting and livestakes.
- 4. Improving aquatic habitat by enhancing stream bed shading and natural detritus input.
- 5. Providing a terrestrial wildlife corridor and refuge in an area continually being developed for commercial and residential use.
- 6. Restoring and reestablishing natural community structure, habitat diversity, and functional continuity.
- 7. Protecting the Site's full potential of stream and riparian buffer functions and values in perpetuity.

Accomplishing this criterion is a multi-year process. Restoration activities outlined in the Pepperwood Farm Mitigation Plan were implemented during February and March of 2014. Activities included the installation of a shallow marsh treatment area, stabilization of stream banks, planting of riparian areas with bare root hardwood seedlings, removal of livestock from riparian areas and protecting the Site in

perpetuity with a conservation easement. Additionally, the Site has been surveyed and marked per NC EEP guidelines by a licensed NC surveyor.

Vegetation Success Criteria

Success of vegetation criteria at the Site indicates successful restoration of riparian area adjacent to subject streams as well as improvement of overall water quality resulting from the treatment of runoff from agriculture fields. Success criteria are dependent upon the density and growth of planted tree species.

An average density of 320 stems per acre of planted species must be surviving after five monitoring years in accordance with NC Division of Water Resources Administrative Code 15A NCAC 02B.0242 (*Neuse River Basin: Nutrient Sensitive Waters Management Strategy*).

2.0 Methodology

Monitoring of vegetation restoration efforts will follow Level 2 *CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.2* (Lee et al. 2008) and will be conducted between June 1 and October 30. Site monitoring will be conducted at thirteen (13) vegetation monitoring plots representing 3.6% of the 10.7 acres of restored buffer. Monitoring reports will be reported to the NC EEP annually for a minimum of 5 years or until success criteria are fulfilled. Monitoring parameters will include species composition and density. Visual observations to ascertain the degree of shrub and herbaceous species, including overtopping of seedlings during year 1 will be documented with photos and included in the annual monitoring report (Appendix C).

Year 1 (2014) monitoring data was collected August 22, 2014 by Axiom Environmental, and established an average density of 511 planted stems per acre on Site with all 13 CVS monitoring plots exceeding success criteria (Appendix C). The dominant tree species identified from year 1 (2014) data collection at the Site was *Betula nigra, Celtis laevigata, Fraxinus pennsylvanica, Liriodendron tulipifera, Quercus michauxii,* and *Quercus pagoda.* In summary, the Site is in compliance with success criteria for vegetation in Monitoring Year 1 (2014).

3.0 References

- Griffith, G.E., J.M. Omernik, J.A. Comstock, M.P. Schafale, W.H. McNab, D.R. Lenat, T.F. MacPherson, J.B. Glover, and V.B. Shelbourne. 2002. Ecoregions of North Carolina and South Carolina. U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia.
- Lee, M.T., R.K. Peet, S.D. Roberts, and T.R. Wentworth. 2008. CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation. Version 4.2. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Ecosystem Enhancement Program. Raleigh, North Carolina.
- North Carolina Division of Water Resources (NCDWR). 2004. Final North Carolina Water Quality Assessment and Impaired Waters List (2004 303(d) Report) (online). Available: <u>http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wq/ps/mtu/assessment</u> [March 2014]. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Raleigh, North Carolina.
- North Carolina Division of Water Resources (NCDWR). 2010. Final North Carolina Water Quality Assessment and Impaired Waters List (2010 Integrated 305(b) and 303(d) Report) (online). Available: http://h2o.enr.state.nc.us/tmdl/documents/draft_2010_Cat_5.pdf [February 1, 2011]. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Raleigh, North Carolina.
- North Carolina Division of Water Resources (NCDWR). 2010. River Restoration Priorities Executive Summary (online). Available: <u>http://portal.ncdenr.org/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=665be84c-cf93-477b-918c-1993778ef11f&groupId=60329</u> [March 2014]. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Raleigh, North Carolina.
- Schafale, M.P. and A.S. Weakley. 1990. Classification of the Natural Communities of North Carolina: Third Approximation. North Carolina Natural Heritage Program, Division of Parks and Recreation, N.C. Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources. Raleigh, North Carolina.

Appendix A: Vicinity Map and Background Tables

Figure 1. Vicinity Map

Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Credits Table

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History Table

Table 3. Project Contact Table

 Table 4. Project Baseline Information and Attributes Table



			Mitigation C	redits								
		Ν	euse Riparian	Buffer								
Existing Acreage	Restoration/ Mit. Ratio	Restoration Acreage	RestorationMitigationCommentAcreage/ AcreComment									
.30	n/a	n/a	n/a	Existing forested area – excluded from credit determination								
10.70	Restoration (1:1)	10.70	43,560 sq. ft. / acre	Cessation of current land use practices, removing invasive species, and planting with native forest vegetation.								
		C	omponent Sur	nmation								
Resto	ration Level		Neuse Riparian Buffer Credits (sq. ft.)									
Re	estoration		10.70 acres = 466,092 sq. ft.									
	Totals			10.70 acres = 466,092 sq. ft.								

Table 1: Project Components and Mitigation CreditsPepperwood Farm Riparian Buffer Mitigation Site, Wake County NC EEP Project ID 95713

Table 2: Project Activity and Reporting History

Pepperwood Farm Riparian Buffer Mitigation Site, Wake County NC EEP Project ID 95713

Activity or Report	Data Collection Complete	Completion or Delivery
CE Document	NA	August 13 th , 2013
Conservation Easement	NA	November 25 th , 2013
Mitigation Plan	NA	January 30 th , 2014
Earthwork	NA	March 5 th , 2014
Bare Root Planting	NA	March 13 th , 2014
Baseline Monitoring Document	March 2014	May 5 th , 2014
Year 1 (2014) Annual Monitoring Report	October 2014	October 20 th , 2014

	Firm	POC & Address
Full Delivery Provider	Restoration Systems, LLC	1101 Haynes Street, Suite 211 Raleigh, North Carolina 27604 George Howard and John Preyer 919-755-9490
Designer:	Restoration Systems, LLC	Raymond Holz: 919-755-9490 1101 Haynes Street, Suite 211 Raleigh, North Carolina 27604
Earthwork Contractor:	Land Mechanics, Inc.	Lloyd Glover; 919.422.3392 780 Landmark Road Willow Spring, NC 27592-7756
Planting Contractor:	Carolina Silvics	Mary-Margaret McKinney 252.333.9852 908 Indian Trail Road Edenton, NC 27932
Seeding Contractor:	Land Mechanics, Inc.	Lloyd Glover; 919.422.3392 780 Landmark Road Willow Spring, NC 27592-7756
Nursery Stock Suppliers:	ArborGen	1.888.888.7158
Baseline Data Collection	Axiom Environmental, Inc.	Grant Lewis; 919.215.1693 218 Snow Ave. Raleigh, NC 27603
Vegetation Monitoring:	Axiom Environmental, Inc.	Grant Lewis; 919.215.1693 218 Snow Ave. Raleigh, NC 27603

Table 3: Project Contact TablePepperwood Farm Riparian Buffer Mitigation Site, Wake County NC EEP Project ID 95713

	Projec	ct Information	2	5								
Project Name		Pepperwood Farm										
County		Wake										
Project Area (acres)		12.66										
Project Coordinates (latitude and	l longitude)	35.6172	49°N, -78.715	332°W (NA	D83/WGS84)							
	Project Watershe	ed Summary Inf	d Summary Information									
Physiographic Province			Northern C	Outer Piedmo	ont							
River Basin			Ν	leuse								
USGS Hydrologic Unit 8-digit	3020201	USGS Hy	drologic Unit	14-digit	3020201120010							
DWR Sub-basin			3/4	4/2003								
Project Drainage Area, Total Out	tfall (acres)	285.45										
Project Drainage Area Percentag Area	e of Impervious	> 5%										
	Regulator	ry Consideratio	ns									
Regulation		Applicable?	Resolved ?	Supportin	ng Documentation							
Waters of the United States – See	ction 404	No										
Waters of the United States – See	ction 401	No										
Endangered Species Act		No										
Historic Preservation Act		No										
Coastal Zone Management Act [CZM Management Act (CAMA)]	IA/Coastal Area	No										
FEMA Floodplain Compliance		No										
Essential Fisheries Habitat		No										

Table 4: Project Baseline Information & Attributes TablePepperwood Farm Riparian Buffer Mitigation Site, Wake County NC EEP Project ID 95713

Appendix B: Visual Assessment Data

Figure 2. Current Conditions Plan View Vegetation Plot Photos Fixed Photo Points



Pepperwood Farm Vegetation Monitoring Photographs Taken August 22, 2014



Pepperwood Farm Vegetation Monitoring Photographs Taken August 22, 2014 (continued)













Pepperwood Farm Fixed Photo Points Taken October 17, 2014



Appendix C: Vegetation Plot Data

Table 5. Vegetation Plot Success by Project Asset TypeTable 6. Total and Planted Stems by Plot and Species

Plot #	Riparian Buffer Stems ¹	Stream/ Wetland Stems ²	Live Stakes	Invasives	Volunteers ³	Total⁴	Unknown Growth Form
1	16	n/a	0	0	0	16	0
2	13	n/a	0	0	0	13	0
3	15	n/a	0	0	1	16	0
4	8	n/a	0	0	0	8	0
5	10	n/a	0	0	0	10	0
6	13	n/a	0	0	4	17	0
7	9	n/a	0	0	3	13	1
8	10	n/a	0	0	0	10	0
9	10	n/a	0	0	0	10	0
10	18	n/a	0	0	5	23	0
11	17	n/a	0	0	0	17	0
12	12	n/a	0	0	2	14	0
13	12	n/a	0	0	115	127	0

Table 5. Vegetation Plot Success by Plot Type

Stem Class

characteristics

Native planted hardwood trees. Does NOT include shrubs. No pines. No vines. Native planted woody stems. Includes shrubs, does NOT include live stakes. No vines Native woody stems. Not planted. No vines. Planted + volunteer native woody stems. Includes live stakes. Excl. exotics. Excl. vines.

¹Buffer Stems ²Stream/ Wetland Stems ³Volunteers ⁴Total

			Current Plot Data (MY1 2014)																				
			123-01-000		001	12	23-01-0	0002	12	123-01-0003			23-01-0	004	123-01-0005			123-01-0006			123-01-0007		
Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all [•]	т
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																					1
Baccharis halimifolia	eastern baccharis	Shrub									1	L										i T	
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree	1	. 1	1	1		1	1									1	1	. 1	-		
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Tree				1		1	1 1	. 1	1	L			3	3	3	8 1	1	. 1	-		
Carya	hickory	Tree																					
Carya cordiformis	bitternut hickory	Tree							1	. 1	1	L 2	2	2 2									
Carya ovata	shagbark hickory	Tree																				i T	
Celtis	hackberry	Tree																				1	
Celtis laevigata	sugarberry	Tree	4	. 4	4 4																1	1	1
Diospyros virginiana	common persimmon	Tree																				i T	
DONTKNOW: unsure reco	rd*																				1	1	1
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	3		3 3	1	1	1	1 4	4	2	1 1	1	. 1	2	2	. 2	2 2	2	2 2	9		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree																		1			2
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree	2	2	2 2	1		1	1 6	6 6	6	5 3	3	3 3	1	1	1	-					
Morella cerifera	wax myrtle	shrub																				i T	
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree																					
Prunus serotina	black cherry	Tree																				i T	
Quercus	oak	Tree							1	. 1	1	L 2	2	2 2								1	
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree	2	2	2 2	4	ļ ,	4	4 2	2 2	2	2						1	1	. 1	-		
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree	1	. 1	L 1										1	1	1	. 3	3	3 3	3	3	3
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree																					
Ulmus alata	winged elm	Tree																		3	6		
Ulmus americana	American elm	Tree	3		3 3	5	5	5	5						3	3	3	5 5	5	5 5	5 5	5	5
		Stem count	: 16	16	5 16	13	3 1	3 1	3 15	15	16	5 8	8	8 8	10	10	10	13	13	8 17	10	10	13
		size (ares)		1			1			1			1			1			1			1	
		size (ACRES)		0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02		0.02			0.02			0.02		
		Species count	. 7	7	7 7	6	6	6	6 6	6	7	7 4	4	4	5	5	5	6	6	6 8	8 4	4	6
Stems per ACR			647.5	647.5	647.5	526.1	526.	1 526.	1 607	607	647.5	323.7	323.7	323.7	404.7	404.7	404.7	526.1	526.1	688	404.7	404.7	526
Exceeds requirements, bu	it by less than 10%	P-all = Planting	includi	ng lives	stakes			•	-		-											·	

Table 6. Total and Planted Stems by Plot and Species

Fails to meet requirements, by less than 10% T = All planted and natural recruits including livestakes

Fails to meet requirements by more than 10% T includes natural recruits

* As-built counts were completed 1 week after Site planting; therefore, this is a known planted stem. It was not easily identified at asbuilt or Year 1 monitoring and will be identified in Year 2 (2015).

Table 6. Total and Planted Stems by Plot and Species (continued)

			Current Plot D											Data (MY1 2014)									Annual Means					
			12	23-01-00	008 123-01-0009			12	3-01-00	010	12	23-01-0	011	12	3-01-0	012	12	23-01-0	013	N	IY1 (201	L4)	MY0 (2014)					
Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	PnoLS	noLS P-all T Pno		PnoLS	noLS P-all T		PnoLS	PnoLS P-all T		PnoLS	PnoLS P-all T		PnoLS	PnoLS P-all T		PnoLS P-all T		Т	PnoLS P-all		Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т		
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																					1					
Baccharis halimifolia	eastern baccharis	Shrub									2	2											3					
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree																1	. 1	. 1	4	4	4	42	42	. 42		
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Tree				2	2	2 2	1	1	. 1	L 4	Ļ Z	Ļ Z	1						13	13	13	8	8	, 8		
Carya	hickory	Tree																						5	5	, 5		
Carya cordiformis	bitternut hickory	Tree							2	2	. 2	2									5	5	5	6	6	6		
Carya ovata	shagbark hickory	Tree																						3	3	, 3		
Celtis	hackberry	Tree																						1	1	. 1		
Celtis laevigata	sugarberry	Tree				1	1	. 1				1			1 5	5	5	2	. 2	2	2 14	14	14	25	25	25		
Diospyros virginiana	common persimmon	Tree									1	L								2	2		3					
DONTKNOW: unsure recor	d*																				1	1	1	3	3	, 3		
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree							2	2	2	2			3	3	3	1	. 1	. 1	19	19	19	23	23	, 23		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree									1	L					2			110)		116					
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree							2	2	2	2 1	. 1		1					1	16	16	17	17	17	17		
Morella cerifera	wax myrtle	shrub																		1	L		1					
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree																						3	3	, 3		
Prunus serotina	black cherry	Tree									1	L								1	L		2					
Quercus	oak	Tree	1	. 1	1	1	1	. 1	3	3		3 1			1						9	9	9	24	24	. 24		
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree							1	1	. 1	L 1	. 1		1 3	3	3	1	. 1	. 1	15	15	15	9	9	9		
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree	6	6 6	6	1	1	. 1				2	2 2	2 2	2			4	. 4	. 4	1 21	21	21	16	16	16		
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree	2	2	2																2	2	2	4	4	. 4		
Ulmus alata	winged elm	Tree																					3	1	1	. 1		
Ulmus americana	American elm	Tree	1	. 1	1	5	5	5 5	7	7	7	7 7	/	/	7 1	1	1	. 3	3		8 45	45	45	17	17	17		
		Stem count	10	10	10	10	10	0 10	18	18	23	3 17	17	/ 17	7 12	12	14	12	. 12	. 127	7 164	164	294	207	207	207		
		size (ares)		1			1			1			1			1			1			13			13			
		size (ACRES)		0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.32			0.32			
		Species count	4	4	4	5	5	5 5	7	7	11	L 7	7	7	7 4	4	5	6	6	5 11	12	12	19	17	17	17		
		Stems per ACRE	404.7	404.7	404.7	404.7	404.7	404.7	728.4	728.4	930.8	688	688	688	8 485.6	485.6	566.6	485.6	485.6	5140	510.5	510.5	915.2	644.4	644.4	644.4		
Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10% P-all = Plantin				ng lives	takes																							

Fails to meet requirements, by less than 10% T = All planted and natural recruits including livestakes

T includes natural recruits Fails to meet requirements by more than 10%

* As-built counts were completed 1 week after Site planting; therefore, this is a known planted stem. It was not easily identified at asbuilt or Year 1 monitoring and will be identified in Year 2 (2015).