# Bugaboo Creek Stream Restoration 2009 Final Monitoring Report Monitoring Year Five

**Ecosystem Enhancement Program Project Number 00056** 



Submitted to:

Project Designed by:

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

EarthTech of North Carolina, Inc. 701 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 475 Raleigh, NC 27607

Submitted: April 23, 2010



# Bugaboo Creek Stream Restoration 2009 Final Monitoring Report Monitoring Year Five

**Ecosystem Enhancement Program Project Number 00056** 





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

April 23, 2010

## **Table of Contents**

1.0	Executive Summary/Project Abstract	.1
2.0	Methodology Section	.2
2.1	Stream Methodology	.2
2.2	Vegetation Methodology	.2
3.0	References	.4

## List of Tables

Table 1:	Project Restoration Components	18
Table 2:	Project Activity and Reporting History	18
Table 3:	Project Contacts Table	19
Table 4:	Project Attribute Table	20
Table 5:	Vegetation Metadata Table	27
Table 6:	Stem Count Total and Planted by Plot and Species	28
Table 7:	Visual Morphological Stability Assessment	36
Table 8:	Verification of Bankfull Events	38
Table 9:	Cross Section Pin Change Summary	40

# **List of Figures**

Figure 1: Vicinity Map	7
Figure 2: Monitoring Plan View	8
Figure 3: Stream Current Condition Plan View	9
Figure 4: Vegetative Current Condition Plan View	13
Figure 5: Percent Change in Cross Section Riffle	40
Figure 6: Pebble Count Summaries	52

# List of Appendices

Appendix A:	General Figures and Plan Views	6
Appendix B:	General Project Tables	17
Appendix C:	Vegetation Assessment Data	21
Appendix C-	I: Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos	22
Appendix C-	II: Vegetation Data Table	26
Appendix D:	Stream Assessment Data	30
Appendix D-	I: Stream Photo Station Photos	31
Appendix D-	II: Stream Data Tables	35
Appendix D-	III: Cross Section Photos and Plots	39
Appendix D-	IV: Longitudinal Profile Plot	47
Appendix D-	V: Pebble Count Frequency Distribution Plots	51

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY/PROJECT ABSTRACT

The primary goal of the Bugaboo Creek Stream Restoration was to construct a stable meander geometry, modify the channel cross sections, and establish a floodplain at the existing stream elevation, thus restoring a stable dimension, pattern, and profile (EarthTech 2005). Specific project objectives included the following:

Restore 4,276 linear feet of Little Bugaboo Creek (Bugaboo Creek) and 1,954 linear feet of an Unnamed Tributary to Bugaboo Creek;

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 a riparian buffer; and

Provide aesthetic value, wildlife habitat, and a bank stability through the creation or enhancement of a riparian zone.

Vegetation survival at the site is variable. Vegetation survival along the Unnamed Tributary is excellent; whereas, survival along Bugaboo Creek is very poor in certain areas. According to the 2005 (As-Built/MY1) Monitoring Report (EarthTech 2005), five of the vegetation plots were significantly disturbed due to repair activities along Bugaboo Creek. The plots disturbed by channel repairs were replanted, but plantings appear to be concentrated close to the channel, leaving much of the upper floodplain/upland void of woody vegetation. The 2005 (MY1) Monitoring Report (EcoLogic 2006) found insufficient stems to fulfill US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) requirements. USACE requires 260 stems per acre, or at least seven stems per plot at MY5. The 2006 (MY2) Monitoring Report (URS 2007), the 2007 (MY3) Monitoring Report (URS 2008), and the 2008 (MY4) Monitoring Report (URS 2009) also found that some vegetation plots had insufficient stems to fulfill USACE requirements. During 2009 (MY5), four (plots 8, 15, 16, and 19) of the 14 vegetation plots did not meet the minimum stem criteria for USACE success criteria. Herbaceous grasses and herbs dominated much of the buffer area along Bugaboo Creek during the 2009 (MY5) monitoring event. Common species include wiregrass (Aristida spp.), dogfennel (Eupatorium capillifolium), goldenrod (Solidago spp.), and bluestem (Andropogon spp.). In addition, fescue (*Festuca* sp.) is widespread along the fencelines to the adjoining pastures. Taxonomy follows 'Flora of the Carolinas, Virginia, Georgia, and surrounding areas' (Weakley 2007).

The Bugaboo Creek restoration site is in overall fair condition. The site continues to have areas of severe bank erosion, bare banks, accelerated channel widening, and associated aggradation. However, the system appears as if it has stabilized over the last two years. Previous erosional areas are becoming vegetated and areas of aggradation are forming point bars and narrowing the channel. The majority of the rock structures are functioning properly and providing crucial grade control for the system. Overall, the bed features are in good condition with many riffles and pools. URS conducted 2006 (MY2), 2007 (MY3), 2008 (MY4), and 2009 (MY5) monitoring for the site. Beaver activity was observed along either the Unnamed Tributary, Bugaboo Creek, or both reaches during the last four monitoring years. The beavers have caused damage to the site by destroying the streamside planted vegetation and changing the nature of the channel and the channel materials. During 2008 (MY4) monitoring, only one small beaver dam was observed. The dam was on the mainstem and appeared to be inactive. No new stem chew was observed along either channel. It appears as if the beavers have abandoned the site since 2007 (MY3) monitoring. During 2009 (MY5) monitoring several areas containing fresh stem chews were observed as well as two new dams along Bugaboo Creek.

No known 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 Roaring River near Roaring River, NC (USGS 2009) and on-site evidence such as sediment on the banks and floodplains and the height of recent wrack lines. The gage is located less than five miles from the project site and has a drainage area of 128 square miles. An estimate of the number of bankfull events in 2009 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 Regional Curve (Harman et al. 1999). According to the regional curve, a bankfull event occurs on a stream with a 128 square mile drainage area when the discharge is about 2,500 cfs. This discharge was not exceeded between November 1, 2008 and September 30, 2009. Bugaboo Creek is in close proximity to Roaring River. Therefore, based on discharge data, it is likely that the project site did not experience any bankfull events in 2009. However, evidence observed on-site suggests the system has experienced at least one bankfull event in the past nine months (since the time of the last site visit). There is a significant peak in the stream gage discharge data for Roaring River in January 2009. Sediment and wrack lines were observed well above bankfull levels on Bugaboo Creek.

Summary information/data related to the occurrence of items such as beaver or encroachment and statistics related to the performance of various project and monitoring elements can be found in the tables and figures in report appendices. Narrative background and supporting information formerly found in these reports can be found in the Mitigation and Restoration Plan documents available on the Ecosystem Enhancement Program's (EEP) website. All raw data supporting the tables and figures in the appendices is available from EEP upon request.

## 2.0 METHODOLOGY SECTION

All monitoring methodologies follow the 2006 templates and guidelines provided by EEP (EEP 2006). Photographs were taken at high resolution using a Sealife EcoShot 6.0 megapixel digital camera. GPS location information was collected in 2006 (MY2) using a Trimble Geo XT handheld mapping grade GPS unit. GPS locations were collected on both banks of each cross section and on all four corners of each vegetation plot. Stream and vegetation problem areas were noted in the field on As-Built Plan Sheets. Permanent photo station photographs were taken from locations marked in the 2005 (MY1) Monitoring Report, prepared by EcoLogic Associates.

## 2.1 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). Pebble counts were conducted by sampling a total of 100 pebbles from the feature of the cross section (the entire riffle or pool). According to the most recent guidance issued in Rosgen courses, the pebble count was concentrated within the wetted perimeter of the channel and did not include the banks. Photographs were taken 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.

## 2.2 VEGETATION METHODOLOGY

According to 2005 As-Built/Monitoring Year One Report (EarthTech 2005), 16 permanent vegetation plots were established at the site, using metal conduit to mark their locations in the field. During the initial site assessment in 2006, none of the As-Built vegetation plots were located. However, URS did observe 21 permanent vegetation plots that were established by EcoLogic Associates, using white PVC

piping at the upstream outside corner of each plot to mark their locations in the field. At the time of the 2006 (MY1) Report, EcoLogic did not have historic project documentation. EcoLogic established 21 new vegetation plots and six new cross sections in 2005 (MY1). The locations of the vegetation plots and cross sections are different than those presented in the 2005 As-Built/Year One Monitoring Report. Since EarthTech's vegetation plots and cross sections were not located during URS' 2006 initial site visit, the plots and cross sections established by EcoLogic in 2006 (MY1) were used. Vegetation monitoring methods followed the 2008 CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation (Lee, et al. 2008). Per the protocol (http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/methods.htm), 14 vegetation plots are required for the site. URS inventoried EcoLogic plots 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, and 21. Vegetation plot photographs and GPS locations were collected at the southwest corner of each vegetation plot in 2006 (MY2). 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 placed orange flagging at the southwest corner of each vegetation plot and blue flagging at the remaining corners. The orientation of the plot was marked on the CVS-EEP data sheet if the PVC was not in the southwest corner (the origin of the plot). 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 in 2006.

### **3.0 REFERENCES**

EarthTech. 2005. As-Built/Monitoring Year One Report. Little Bugaboo Creek, Wilkes County, North Carolina. Prepared for NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program. June 2005.

EcoLogic Associates, P.C. 2006. Bugaboo Stream Restoration 2005 Draft Monitoring Report. Year One Monitoring. Prepared for NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program. June 2006.

EEP. 2006. Content, Format, and Data Requirements for EEP Monitoring Reports. Version 1.2 (11/16/06). NCDENR, NCEEP. 17pp.

Harman, W.H., Jennings, G.D., Patterson, J.M., Clinton, D.R., Slate, L.O., Jessup, A.G., Everhart, J.R., and R.E Smith. 1999. Bankfull Hydraulic Geometry Relationships for North Carolina Streams. AWRA Wildland Hydrology Symposium Proceedings. Edited By: D.S. Olsen and J.P. Potyondy. AWRA Summer Symposium. Bozeman, MT.

Lee, Michael T., Peek, Robert K., Roberts, Steven D., Wentworth, Thomas R. 2008. CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation. Version 4.2 (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.

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

URS. 2007. Little Bugaboo Creek Stream Restoration 2006 Monitoring Report. Monitoring Year Two. Prepared for NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program. January 2007.

URS. 2008. Little Bugaboo Creek Stream Restoration 2007 Monitoring Report. Monitoring Year Three. Prepared for NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program. February 2008.

URS. 2009. Little Bugaboo Creek Stream Restoration 2008 Monitoring Report. Monitoring Year Four. Prepared for NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program. February 2009.

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. 2009. Roaring River near Roaring River, NC streamflow gage. USGS Real-Time Water Data. Gage 02112120. 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.

**Project Condition and Monitoring Data Appendices** 

Appendix A: General Figures and Plan Views



Veg Plots			Photo Points		
ID	Northing	Easting	ID	Northing	Easting
9	915332	1414444	655	917481.3	1416889
8	915589.8	1414222	657	917200.1	1416993
10	915207.1	1414512	670	916874.1	1416935
11	915122.6	1414617	673	916737.4	1416889
12	915063	1414755	676	916563.6	1416971
13	915037.7	1414879	679	916406.3	1416998
14	915070.8	1414991	681	916355.9	1416999
15	915031.9	1415095	687	916153	1417029
17	915339.3	1415648	693	915956.5	1417054
16	915271.5	1415568	745	915923.2	1416982
18	915487.6	1415860	741	915860	1417048
21	915760.4	1416504	703	915544.2	1414237
19	915884.5	1416806	706	915232.6	1414449
21	915822.1	1416922	718	915308.9	1415522
7	916335	1417003	723	915407.5	1415713
6	916548.7	1416925	728	915606.3	1416020
5	916744.3	1416905	661	917038.5	1416952
4	916948.1	1416931	667	916938.3	1416877
2	917144.6	1416954			
3	917273.8	1416986			
1	917346.9	1416918			

VP8 -



VP2I 🐢







m Areas		Prepared By: URS Corporation - North Carolina 1600 Perimeter Park Drive Suite 400 Morrisville, NC 27560 Phone: 919-461-1100
56		Fax: 919-461-1415
Station # / Range		URS
40+80 to 41+50		
41+30		Prepared For:
41+60		NC Ecosystem
42+76		Enhancement Program
38+00		
15+05 to 15+15           13+00 to 13+30           14+85 to 14+95           17+20		Ecosystem Enhancement
		Project:
		Bugaboo Creek Stream Restoration Wilkes County, NC
		Monitoring Year:
		5 (2009)
		Project Number:
		00056
		Date:
		April 2010
	N	Legend Vegetation Plot Meeting Success Criteria Vegetation Plot Not Meeting Success Criteria Problem Area Concern Stations Cross Sections As-built Centerline As-built Streambank Structures
W	Б S	Stream Current Condition

Sheet 3 of 4

Plan View

100

200

Feet

Bugaboo Creek Stream Problem Areas				
	EEP Project Number 00	)056		
	Unnamed Tributary	7		
Feature #	Feature Issue	Station # / Range		
UTPA2	Bank erosion	1+60 to 2+00		
UTPA4	Bank erosion	5+35		
UTPA12	Bank erosion	8+00		
UTPA16	Bank erosion	11+60 to 11+75		
UTPA17	Bank erosion	12+40 to 12+50		
UTPA22	Structure degradation	6+80		
UTPA25	Bank erosion	8+50 to 9+00		
UTPA26	Root Wad Failure	12+90		





100



200

Feet

#### 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:

Bugaboo Creek Stream Restoration Wilkes County, NC

### Monitoring Year:

5 (2009)

### **Project Number:**

00056

Date:

April 2010

#### Legend

 Vegetation Plot Meeting Success Criteria
 Vegetation Plot Not Meeting Success Criteria
 Problem Area Concern
 Problem Area Concern
 Stations
 Cross Sections
 As-built Centerline
 As-built Streambank

Structures

Stream Current Condition Plan View

Sheet 4 of 4





#### 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:

Bugaboo Creek Stream Restoration Wilkes County, NC

Monitoring Year:

5 (2009)

Project Number:

00056

Date:

April 2010

#### Legend



- ----- As-built Streambank
- Structures

Matchline

Vegetation Current Condition Plan View

Sheet 1 of 4









Sheet 3 of 4



Feet

<b>Bugaboo Creek Vegetative Problem Areas</b>					
EEP Project Number 00056					
	Bugaboo Creek				
Feature #	Feature Issue	Station # / Range			
UTVPA1	Bare bank	0+15			
UTVPA2	Bare bank	1+90 to 3+10			
UTVPA3	Bare bank	7+20 to 7+40			
UTVPA9	Invasive/exotic plant	8+90 to 9+40			



0 50



Sheet 4 of 4



200

Feet

**Appendix B:** General Project Tables

Tuble 11 Troject Restoration Components						
Bugaboo Creek EEP Project Number 00056						
Project Segment or Reach	Existing Feet*	Mitigation Type	Approach	Linear Footage <sup>**</sup>	Stationing***	Comment
Unnamed Tributary	1,892	R	PII	1,954	0+00 to 19+54	
Bugaboo Creek	4,478	R	PII	4,276	0+00 to 42+76	

### Table 1: Project Restoration Components

\* Existing Feet were measured from existing topography on design plans provided by EEP.

\*\*Linear Footage is derived from As-Built/Monitoring Year One Report centerline provided by EarthTech in 2005.

\*\*\* Stationing follows the 2005 (MY1) Monitoring Report (EcoLogic 2006).

R = Restoration EI = Enhancement EII = Enhancement II

S = Stabilization

PI = Priority I PII = Priority II PIII = Priority III SS = Stream Bank Stabilization

#### **Table 2: Project Activity and Reporting History**

Bugaboo Creek EEP Project Number 00056				
Activity or Report	Scheduled Completion	Data Collection Complete	Actual Completion or Delivery	
Restoration Plan	April 2002	Unknown	April 2002	
Construction	2003	Unknown	2003/2004	
Permanent seed mix applied	2004	Unknown	2004	
Live stakes and woody plants	2004	Unknown	2004	
Final Walk Through	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	
As-Built Report/Mitigation Plan	2004	Unknown	June 2005	
Year 1 Monitoring	October 2005	February 2006	June 2006	
Year 2 Monitoring	October 2006	November 2006	January 2007	
Year 3 Monitoring	October 2007	November 2007	January 2008	
Year 4 Monitoring	December 2008	December 2008	December 2008	
Repair and Replanting	March 2009	March 2009	March 2009	
Year 5 Monitoring	December 2009	December 2009	December 2009	

Table 3: Project Contacts Table				
Bugaboo Creek				
EEP Project Number 00056				
Designer	EarthTech of NC, Inc.			
	701 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 475			
	Raleigh, NC 27607			
Primary project design POC	Bill Jenkins PE, RLA 919-854-6228			
Construction Contractor	Dixie Grading and Equipment Company			
	5228 W US HWY 421			
	Wilkesboro, NC 28697			
Construction contractor POC	Randall Miles 336-973-7281			
Planting Contractor	Carolina Environmental			
	PO Box 1905			
	Mt. Airy, NC 27030			
Planting contractor POC	Joanne Chetham 336-320-3849			
Seeding Contractor	Carolina Environmental			
	PO Box 1905			
	Mt. Airy, NC 27030			
Seeding contractor POC	Joanne Chetham 336-320-3849			
Seed Mix Sources				
	Unknown			
Nursery Stock Suppliers				
	Unknown			
Monitoring Performers – 2004	Earth Tech of North Carolina			
-	701 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 475			
	Raleigh NC 27607			
Monitoring POC	Ron Johnson 919-854-6210			
Monitoring Performers – 2005 (MY1)	EcoLogic Associates, P.C.			
	4321-A S. Elm-Eugene St.			
	Greensboro, NC 27406			
Monitoring POC	Kyle Hoover 336-335-1108			
Monitoring Performers – 2006 (MY2)	URS Corporation – North Carolina			
	1600 Perimeter Park Drive, Suite 400			
	Morrisville, NC 27560			
Monitoring POC	Kathleen McKeithan 919-461-1100			
Monitoring Performers – 2007 (MY3)	URS Corporation – North Carolina			
	1600 Perimeter Park Drive, Suite 400			
	Morrisville, NC 27560			
Monitoring POC	Kathleen McKeithan 919-461-1100			
Monitoring Performers – 2008 (MY4)	URS Corporation – North Carolina			
-	1600 Perimeter Park Drive, Suite 400			
	Morrisville, NC 27560			
Monitoring POC	Kathleen McKeithan 919-461-1100			
Repair and Replanting Contractor -	NC Wildlife Resources Commission			
Unknown	PO Box 387			
	Elkin, NC 28621			
	Mark Fowlkes 336-527-1547			

Monitoring Performers – 2009 (MY5)	URS Corporation – North Carolina
	1600 Perimeter Park Drive, Suite 400
	Morrisville, NC 27560
Monitoring POC	Kathleen McKeithan 919-461-1100

Bugaboo Creek EEP Project Number 00056	
Project County	Wilkes County
Drainage Area Bugaboo	3.45 square miles
Unnamed Tributary	1.4 square miles
Drainage impervious cover estimate (%)	2
Stream Order Bugaboo	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Unnamed Tributary	3 <sup>rd</sup>
Physiographic Region	Piedmont/Foothills
Ecoregion	Northern Inner Piedmont (45e)
Rosgen Classification of As-Built	С
Dominant soil types	Chewacla and Rion
Reference site ID	Basin Creek
USGS HUC for Project and Reference	03040101
NCDWQ Sub-basin for Project and Reference	05050001
NCDWQ classification for Project and Reference	03-07-01 – Project
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	NA
% of project easement fenced	100%

Appendix C: Vegetation Assessment Data

Appendix C-I: Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos



VP1



VP2



VP4



VP7



VP6







VP11



VP13



VP12



VP14











VP19



VP21

Appendix C-II: Vegetation Data Table

	8
Report Prepared By	Susan Shelingoski
Date Prepared	12/15/2009 9:59
Database Name	Snow_Bugaboo_BigWarrior2009.mdb
	C:\Documents and Settings\susan_shelingoski\MyDocuments\PROJECT
Database Location	FILES\Monitoring
Computer Name	RDUXPL160
File Size	57880576
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.
ALL Stems by Plot and spp	A matrix of the count of total living stems of each species (planted and natural volunteers combined) for each plot; dead and missing stems are excluded.
PROJECT SUMMARY	
Project Code	56
Project Name	Bugaboo Creek
Description	Stream Restoration
River Basin	Yadkin-Pee Dee River Basin
Length(ft)	6,920
Stream-to-Edge Width (ft)	15
Area (sq m)	4.8 acres
Required Plots (calculated)	14
Sampled Plots	14

Table 5:	Vegetation	Metadata	Table
----------	------------	----------	-------

							Та	able 6	: Sten	n Coun	t Tota	l and I	Planted by	Plot	and S	pecies												
			Current Plot Data (MY5 2009)																									
				056-01-0001	1	056-	-01-0002			056-01-0004	L .		056-01-0006			056-01-0007	7		056-01-00	8		056-01-001	1		056-01-001	2	056-01	-0013
Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	P-LS	P-all	т	P-LS P-	-all	г	P-LS	P-all	т	P-LS	P-all T		P-LS	P-all	т	P-LS	P-all	т	P-LS	P-all	т	P-LS	P-all	т	P-LS P-al	i T
Acer negundo	boxelder	Tree																										
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																										
Alnus serrulata	hazel alder	Shrub Tree		4	4		2	2								3	3					1	1					1 1
Aronia arbutifolia	Red Chokeberry	Shrub																										
Betula lenta	sweet birch	Tree		1	1																							
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree																										1 1
Callicarpa americana	American beautyberry	Shrub		2	2																							
Cornus racemosa	gray dogwood	Shrub					13	13																	1	1		1 1
Crataegus	hawthorn	Shrub Tree																										
Fagus grandifolia	American beech	Tree																										
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree					6	6		4	4		1	1		2	2		1	1		1	1		1	1		3 3
Ilex opaca	American holly	Shrub Tree																										
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree					5	5														2	2		1	1		
Juniperus virginiana	eastern redcedar	Tree																										
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree											1	1														
Nyssa sylvatica	blackgum	Tree					3	3					2	2														
Oxydendrum arboreum	sourwood	Shrub Tree																										
Pinus virginiana	Virginia pine	Tree																										
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree		15	15		8	8		1	1		5	5		8	8		3	3		4	4		1	1		
Prunus	plum	Shrub Tree																							3	3		
Quercus alba	white oak	Tree		7	7		1	1														2	2					1 1
Rhus copallinum	flameleaf sumac	Shrub Tree																										
Rhus glabra	smooth sumac	Shrub Tree								2	2											1	1					
Salix nigra	black willow	Tree														3	3											
Sambucus canadensis	Common Elderberry	Shrub Tree					2	2		1	1											7	7		1	1		
		Stem count	0	29	29	0	40	40	0	8	8	0	9	9	0	16	16	0	4	4	0	18	18	0	8	8	0	7 7
		size (ares)		1			1			1			1			1			1			1			1		1	
		size (ACRES)		0.02		ļ	0.02			0.02	1		0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02	1	0.0	)2
		Species count	0	5	5	0	8	8	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	4	4	0	2	2	0	7	7	0	6	6	0	5 5
		Stems per ACRE	0	1173.59	1173.59	0 1	618.74	1618.74	0	323.749	323.749	0	364.217 364	.217	0	647.497	647.497	0	161.874	161.874	0	728.434	728.434	0	323.749	323.749	0 28	3.28 283.28

	Current Plot Data (MY5 2009)																		Annual Means										
				056-01-001	4	_	056-01-001	5		056-01-001	5		056-01-001	9		056-01-002	1		MY5 (200	9) I		MY4 (200	8)		MY3 (200	7)	_	MY2 (2006	<u>6)</u>
Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	P-LS	P-all	т	P-LS	P-all	т	P-LS	P-all	т	P-LS	P-all	т	P-LS	P-all	т												
Acer negundo	boxelder	Tree									6					13	13		13	19		12	12		12	27		12	18
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																								7			2
Alnus serrulata	hazel alder	Shrub Tree		1	1														12	12		11	11		13	17		13	17
Aronia arbutifolia	Red Chokeberry	Shrub																							2	2	<b>_</b> '	2	2
Betula lenta	sweet birch	Tree																	1	1							<u> </u>		
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree														1	1		2	2		2	2		2	2	'	3	4
Callicarpa americana	American beautyberry	Shrub																	2	2		3	3		4	4	<u> </u>	5	5
Cornus racemosa	gray dogwood	Shrub																	15	15		18	18		18	19		18	19
Crataegus	hawthorn	Shrub Tree					1	1											1	1							<u> </u>		
Fagus grandifolia	American beech	Tree																					1						
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree		2	2											3	3		24	24		25	26		28	30		27	27
Ilex opaca	American holly	Shrub Tree																								6		1	1
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																	8	8		7	7		6	6	<u> </u>	5	5
Juniperus virginiana	eastern redcedar	Tree																					2				<u> </u>		
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree														1	1		2	2		2	2		2	24		2	2
Nyssa sylvatica	blackgum	Tree											2	2		1	1		8	8		9	9		8	12		12	13
Oxydendrum arboreum	sourwood	Shrub Tree																								6			
Pinus virginiana	Virginia pine	Tree																								3			1
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree		4	4		2	2		2	4		1	1		5	5		59	61		55	65		57	99		55	110
Prunus	plum	Shrub Tree		1	1		1	1								1	1		6	6		8	8		8	8	<u> </u>	9	9
Quercus alba	white oak	Tree																	11	11		12	14		10	14		10	11
Rhus copallinum	flameleaf sumac	Shrub Tree		1	1		1	1											2	2		2	2		2	22		2	10
Rhus glabra	smooth sumac	Shrub Tree																	3	3		3	8		4	4	<u> </u>	5	5
Salix nigra	black willow	Tree																	3	3		3	3		3	3		3	3
Sambucus canadensis	Common Elderberry	Shrub Tree														1	1		12	12		14	14		13	13		14	14
		Stem count	0	9	9	0	5	5	0	2	10	0	3	3	0	26	26	0	184	192	0	186	207	0	192	328	0	198	278
		size (ares)		1	•		1			1			1	•		1			14			14			14			. 14	-
		size (ACRES)		0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.35			0.35		1	0.35			0.35	
		Species count	0	5	5	0	4	4	0	1	2	0	2	2	0	8	8	0	18	18	0	16	18	0	17	21	0	18	20
		Stems par ACDE	0	364 217	364 217	0	202 343	202 343	0	80 9371	404 686	0	121 406	121 406	0	1052.18	1052.18	0	531 873	554 997	0	537 654	598 357	0	554 997	948 121	0	572 341	803 50
		Stems per ACKE	0	504.217	504.217	0	202.343	202.343	0	00.7571	404.000	0	121.400	121.400	U	1032.10	1032.10	U	551.075	554.77/	0	557.054	570.557	U	554.77/	740.121	U U	512.341	003.39

Appendix D: Stream Assessment Data

Appendix D-I: Stream Photo Station Photos



P655 facing downstream



P661 facing downstream



P673 facing downstream



P657 facing upstream



P667 facing upstream



P676 facing downstream



P679 facing downstream



P687 facing downstream



P741 facing downstream



P681 facing upstream



P693 facing downstream



P745 facing upstream



P703 facing downstream



P718 facing downstream



P728 facing downstream



P706 facing upstream



P723 facing upstream

Appendix D-II: Stream Data Tables

	Table 7: Visual Morphological Stability Assessment								
	Bug EEP	aboo Creek (4,577 ft) Project Number 00056							
Feature Category	Metric (per As-Built and Reference Baselines)	(# Stable) Number Performing as Intended	Total Number per As-Built	Total Number/Feet in Unstable State	% Perform in Stable Condition	Feature Perform. Mean or Total			
A. Riffles	Present?	21	27	N/A	78				
	Armor stable (no displacement)?	21	27	N/A	78				
	Facet grade appears stable?	21	27	N/A	78				
	Minimal evidence of embedding/fining?	21	27	6	78				
	Length appropriate?	21	27	6	78				
						78			
B. Pools	Present (not subject to severe aggrad. or migration)?	43	48	N/A	88				
	Sufficiently deep (max pool D:mean Bkf >1.6)	45	49	N/A	92				
	Length appropriate?	43	49	N/A	88				
						89			
C. Thalweg	Upstream of meander bend (run/inflection) centering?	25	26	N/A	96				
	Downstream of meander (glide/inflection) centering?	26	26	N/A	100				
						98			
D. Meanders	Outer bend in state of limited/controlled erosion?	21	26	5/170	81				
	Of those eroding, # w/concomitant point bar formation?	3 of 5	26	2/70	97				
	Apparent Rc within spec?		26	N/A					
	Sufficient floodplain access and relief?	21	26	5/170	81				
						86			
E. Bed General	General channel bed aggradation areas (bar formation)	N/A	N/A	2/595	86				
	Channel bed degradation-areas of increasing downcutting/headcutting?	N/A	N/A	0/0	100				
						93			
F. Bank	Actively eroding, wasting, or slumping bank	N/A	N/A	7/230	97				
						97			
G. Vanes	Free of back or arm scour?	17	19	3	89				
	Height appropriate?	19	19	N/A	100				
	Angle and geometry appear appropriate?	19	19	N/A	100				
	Free of piping or other structural failures?	17	19	2	89				
						95			
H. Wads/ Boulders	Free of scour?	20	26	N/A	77				
	Footing stable?	22	26	N/A	85				
						81			

	Unnamed Tributary (2,089 ft)								
	EEP Project Numbe	r 00056							
Feature Category	Metric (per As-Built and Reference Baselines)	(# Stable) Number Performing as Intended	Total Number per As-Built	Total Number/Feet in Unstable State	% Perform in Stable Condition	Feature Perform. Mean or Total			
A. Riffles	Present?	18	12	N/A	100				
	Armor stable (no displacement)?	18	12	N/A	100				
	Facet grade appears stable?	18	12	N/A	100				
	Minimal evidence of embedding/fining?	18	12	N/A	100				
	Length appropriate?	18	12	N/A	100				
						100			
B. Pools	Present (not subject to severe aggrad. or migration)?	36	30	N/A	100				
	Sufficiently deep (max pool D:mean Bkf >1.6)	36	30	N/A	100				
	Length appropriate?	36	30	N/A	100				
						100			
C. Thalweg	Upstream of meander bend (run/inflection) centering?	9	9	N/A	100				
	Downstream of meander (glide/inflection) centering?	9	9	N/A	100				
						100			
D. Meanders	Outer bend in state of limited/controlled erosion?	8	18	10/165	44				
	Of those eroding, # w/concomitant point bar formation?	5 of 10	16	N/A	50				
	Apparent Rc within spec?								
	Sufficient floodplain access and relief?	8	16	N/A	50				
						48			
E. Bed General	General channel bed aggradation areas (bar formation)	N/A	N/A	0	100				
	Channel bed degradation-areas of increasing downcutting/headcutting?	N/A	N/A	0	100				
						100			
F. Bank	Actively eroding, wasting, or slumping bank	N/A	N/A	1/175	49				
						49			
G. Vanes	Free of back or arm scour?	15	16	1	94				
	Height appropriate?	16	16	0	100				
	Angle and geometry appear appropriate?	16	16	0	100				
	Free of piping or other structural failures?	16	16	0	100				
						99			
H. Wads/ Boulders	Free of scour?	18	18	N/A	100				
	Footing stable?	18	18	N/A	100				
						100			

Bugaboo Creek EEP Project Number 00056										
Date of Data Collection	Date of Occurrence	Method								
12/2/07	January 2007	USGS Stream Gage Discharge								
12/17/08	August 2008	USGS Stream Gage Discharge								
12/17/08	November 2008	USGS Stream Gage Discharge								
12/10/09	Unknown (Most likely January 2009)	Visual inspection of wrack lines on mainstem (Date estimated from USGS Stream Gage Discharge peak in discharge of 1,800 cfs)								

### Table 8: Verification of Bankfull Events



12/2009 Wrack lines at and above bankfull



12/2009 Wrack lines at and above bankfull

Appendix D-III: Cross Section Photos and Plots

Table 9 summaries the changes in pins each year.

Bugaboo Creek EEP Project Number 00056										
Reach ID	Cross Section	Description of Change								
Bugaboo Creek	XS3	November 2006: Reestablished								
Bugaboo Creek	XS4	November 2006: Reestablished December 2008: Left pin reestablished								
Bugaboo Creek	XS5	November 2006: Reestablished								
Bugaboo Creek	XS6	November 2006: Reestablished								

Table 0. Cross Section Din Change Summer

Figure 5 summaries the percent changes in each riffle cross section monitored. The peaks and valleys beginning to reduce in size by monitoring year (remaining closer to zero) reveals a stabilizing trend as shown in two of the riffle cross sections on-site.



### Figure 5: Percent Change in Cross Section Riffle





Facing Left Bank



Facing Right Bank





Facing Left Bank



Facing Right Bank





Facing Left Bank



Facing Right Bank





Facing Left Bank



Facing Right Bank





Facing Left Bank



Facing Right Bank





Facing Left Bank



Facing Right Bank

Appendix D-IV: Longitudinal Profile Plot



4/10





Appendix D-V: Pebble Count Frequency Distribution Plots



#### Figure 6: Pebble Count Summaries

In a riffle cross section, a stable system is indicated by a d50 maintaining or increasingly. Maintaining a d50 indicates the riffles are not filling with sediment and pools are not moving into the reach. In a pool cross section, the bed material in a stable system typically remains small. Bugaboo's pebble counts show changes throughout the monitoring years due to the presence and absence of beaver dams. The dams cause water to slow upstream of them, thus fine sediments cover the bed material. As the dams are eradicated, the stream has the ability to transport the sediment load again and the natural bed materials begin to show back up in the pebble counts.









00056 - Bugaboo Creek - MY5 Final Report

URS



