ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT FOR 2009 CLAYHILL FARMS



CLAYHILL FARMS MITIGATION SITE JONES COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA TIP No. R-2105 WM (EEP Project Number .00018) 2009 Annual Monitoring Report (Year 4 of 5)

> Submitted to: North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources Ecosystem Enhancement Program Raleigh, North Carolina

Design Firm: Office of Natural Environment & Roadside Environmental Unit North Carolina Department of Transportation Raleigh, North Carolina

November 2009

ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT FOR 2009 CLAYHILL FARMS



CLAYHILL FARMS MITIGATION SITE JONES COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA TIP No. R-2105 WM (EEP Project Number .00018) 2009 Annual Monitoring Report (Year 4 of 5)





Submitted to: North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources Ecosystem Enhancement Program Raleigh, North Carolina

> Prepared by: Axiom Environmental, Inc. 20 Enterprise Street, Suit7 Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Design Firm: Office of Natural Environment & Roadside Environmental Unit North Carolina Department of Transportation Raleigh, North Carolina

November 2009

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Clayhill Farms Stream and Wetland Restoration Site (Site) is located in southern Jones County, approximately 1 mile north of the Town of Kuhns and 0.75 mile north of the Carteret County/Jones County line. The Site is located east of Highway 58 and is bordered by the Croatan National Forest to the north, east, and west and by various forested and residential parcels to the south. Site streams, Billy's Branch and other unnamed tributaries to Hunters Creek, bisect the Site. The project is located within the White Oak River Basin in United States Geological Survey (USGS) 14-digit Hydrologic Unit 03020106010060 (North Carolina Division of Water Quality [NCDWQ] subbasin 03-05-01). This document serves as the 2009 Year Four Annual Monitoring Report.

Twenty groundwater gauges were maintained and monitored for the year 4 (2009) growing season. Groundwater hydrology within 12 inches of the soil surface is occurring for greater than 12.5 percent of the growing season for year 4 (2009) at Gauges GW1-GW9, GW14-GW15, and GW18. The remainder of the gauges were saturated or inundated for less than 12.5 percent of the growing season (Gauges GW10-GW13, GW16-GW17, and GW19-GW20). Gauges currently below 12.5 percent of the growing season are located within the lower half of the Site near the restored stream channel. Gauges will continue to be monitored closely; a jurisdictional wetland delineation may be necessary at the end of the five-year monitoring period to accurately quantify successful wetlands within this portion of the Site.

Ten 10-meter square vegetation plots were monitored for the year 4 (2009) season. Based on stem counts, the average plot density monitored at this Site is greater than 290 stems per acre and is considered successful. The average plot density has been measured at 680 planted stems per acre for 2009 (year 4) monitoring. Dominant species identified at the Site were overcup oak (*Quercus lyrata*), tupelo species (*Nyssa biflora* and *Nyssa* sp.), and green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*). Nine out of the ten individual vegetation plots were above success criteria with 364 to 1619 planted stems per acre. Planted stems were not documented during planting making it difficult to determine planted trees from naturally recruited trees. Therefore, the number of "planted" species may be influenced by naturally recruited stems. In addition, the range of variation for survival between individual plots may be influenced by varied planting densities throughout the Site. Vegetation plot 9 was low with 40 planted stems per acre; however, when including additional pine (*Pinus* sp.) natural recruits, the stem count increases to 2388 stems per acre.

One vegetation problem area noted during year 4 (2009) monitoring consisted of a large area of poor planted stem survival adjacent to the restored stream (near Reach 1). Poor survival most likely has resulted from soil infertility. Similarly, herbaceous vegetation on the lower half of the Site adjacent to the restored stream is not establishing well.

Based on visual observation during the year 4 (2009) monitoring, channel geometry compares favorably with the emulated, stable E/C stream type as set forth in the detailed mitigation plan. The current monitoring observations demonstrate that dimension, pattern, and profile were stable over the course of the year 4 (2009) monitoring period.

Two stream problem areas were noted during year 4 (2009) monitoring. Both problem areas are stressed cross-vanes with failing right bank arms resulting from a lack of footers. Additional inspections and monitoring of bed and banks up and downstream of compromised structures is recommended prior to initiation of proactive maintenance measures.

In summary, the Site achieved success criteria for vegetation and stream attributes in the Fourth Monitoring Year (2009). The upper half of the Site achieved hydrology success criteria for the Fourth Monitoring Year (2009).

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND	. 1
1.1 Project Description	. 1
1.2 Purpose	. 1
1.3 Project History	. 1
1.4 Mitigation Structure and Objectives	
2.0 HYDROLOGY	. 5
2.1 Success Criteria	. 5
2.2 Hydrologic Description	
2.3 Results of Hydrologic Monitoring	. 6
2.3.1 Site Data	. 8
2.3.2 Climatic Data	.9
2.4 Hydrologic Conclusions	.9
3.0 VEGETATION	.9
3.1 Success Criteria	.9
3.2 Description of Planted Areas	
3.3 Results of Vegetation Monitoring	10
3.4 Vegetation Conclusions	
4.0 STREAM ASSESSMENT	
4.1 Success Criteria	
4.2 Stream Assessment Results	
4.3.1 Visual Stream Observations	11
4.3.2 Bankfull Events	13
4.3 Stream Assessment Conclusions	13
5.0 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS	
6.0. REFERENCES	15

List of Figures

Figure 1. Site Location	2
Figure 2. DRAINMOD Post Construction Conditions	
Figure 3A. Monitoring Plan	6
Figure 3B. Monitoring Plan	
Figure 4. Climatic Data vs. 30-year Historic Data	

List of Tables

Table 2. Summary of Groundwater Gauge Results for Years 1 through 5	5	Table 1.
	8	Table 2.
Table 3. Stem Counts for Planted Species Arranged by Plot		
Table 4. Verification of Bankfull Events 13		

Appendices

APPENDIX A. YEAR 4 (2009) GROUNDWATER GAUGE GRAPHS APPENDIX B. VEGETATION MONITORING PHOTOGRAPHS APPENDIX C. STREAM MONITORING DATA AND PHOTOGRAPHS

1.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

1.1 Project Description

The Clayhill Farms Stream and Wetland Restoration Site (Site) is located in southern Jones County, approximately 1 mile north of the Town of Kuhns and 0.75 mile north of the Carteret County/Jones County line. The Site is located east of Highway 58 and is bordered by the Croatan National Forest to the north, east, and west and by various forested and residential parcels to the south. Site streams, Billy's Branch and other unnamed tributaries to Hunters Creek, bisect the Site (Figure 1). The project is located within the White Oak River Basin in United States Geological Survey (USGS) 14-digit Hydrologic Unit 03020106010060 (North Carolina Division of Water Quality [NCDWQ] subbasin 03-05-01).

Directions to the Site:

From Raleigh, North Carolina

- ➤ Travel east on US Highway 70 to Kinston
- ▶ Turn right and go south on NC 58 to US 17
- > Turn right on US 17/NC 58 and continue south approximately 6 miles to Maysville
- From Maysville, continue south on NC 58 approximately 8 miles to left on SR 1100 (Hunters Creek Road)
- Then make an immediate left onto a gravel road with a gate. The gate has a combination lock to access the Site

1.2 Purpose

In order to demonstrate successful mitigation, hydrologic, vegetative, and stream monitoring must be conducted for five years or until success criteria are achieved. Success criteria are based on federal guidelines for wetland mitigation. These guidelines stipulate criteria for hydrologic conditions, vegetation survival, and stream morphology. The following report details the results of monitoring for the 2009 (year 4) growing season at the Clayhill Farms Stream and Wetland Restoration Site.

1.3 Project History

, <u>,</u>	
September 2005	Mitigation Plan
2006	Final Design (90%)
2006	Site Construction
2006	Planting
November 2006	Vegetation Monitoring (Year 1)
March-November 2006	Hydrologic Monitoring (Year 1)
January-March 2007	Stream Monitoring (Year 1)
July 2007	Vegetation Monitoring (Year 2)
March – November 2007	Hydrologic Monitoring (Year 2)
July 2007	Stream Monitoring (Year 2)
August 2008	Vegetation Monitoring (Year 3)
March – November 2008	Hydrologic Monitoring (Year 3)
October 2008	Stream Monitoring (Year 3)
August 2009	Vegetation Monitoring (Year 4)
March – November 2009	Hydrologic Monitoring (Year 4)
July 2009	Stream Monitoring (Year 4)



1.4 Mitigation Structure and Objectives

In the early 1970s the Site was logged and portions of the Site were converted to agricultural land. At that time, perimeter and interior drainage ditches were excavated and Site streams were channelized in support of land uses.

The primary mitigation activities at the Site included restoration of previously ditched and filled wetlands, vegetative enhancement of previously cleared wetlands within agricultural fields, preservation of the forested wetlands, restoration of channelized stream channel, and preservation of secondary tributaries within forested wetlands.

Restoration activities at the Site entailed 1) plugging and filling of feeder ditches, 2) removal of crowning within fields, 3) clearing and grading to prepare for creation of the new stream alignment, 4) construction of a stable channel, 5) filling of the abandoned stream channel with onsite materials excavated from the floodplain and other upland areas, 6) installation of a grade control structure at the downstream end of the restoration reach, 7) removal of the bridge crossing of Billy's Branch within the southeast portion of the Site, and 8) ripping/scarifing soils to prepare for planting.

The primary goals of the project include 1) maximizing the area returned to historic wetland function; 2) establishing stable dimension, pattern, and profile along Billy's Branch; 3) expanding, enhancing, and preserving 355.6 acres adjacent to the Croatan National Forest; 4) protecting the Site with a conservation easement in perpetuity; 5) providing valuable habitat to a diverse assemblage of terrestrial and aquatic flora and fauna; 6) serving as a wildlife corridor; and 7) providing numerous wetland values including water storage, pollutant removal, aquatic/wildlife habitat, recreation, and education. Project structures and objectives are summarized in Table 1 and are depicted on Figure 2.



Table 1. Project Mitigation Structures and Objectives

Clayhill Farms (EEI	P Proje	ect Numb	er .00018)		
Project Segment or Reach ID	Mitigation Type*	Approach**	Linear Footage or Acreage	Stationing	Comment
Billy's Branch	R	Р2	7931	0+00 to 79+31	Includes 7931 linear feet of excavation of new channel within a floodplain bench
Secondary Tributaries	R	P1&P2	1667.8		Includes 1667.8 linear feet of eight secondary tributaries
Secondary Tributary	Р				Preserving forested secondary tributaries
Downstream end of Billy's Branch	Р		2009.9		Preserving forested downstream reach of Billy's Branch
Riverine Wetland Restoration	R		21.6		Filling ditches, removing field crowns, and planting agricultural fields.
Riverine Wetland Enhancement	Е		1.8		Planting within agricultural fields.
Riverine Wetland Preservation	Р		3.9		Preserving forested riverine wetlands.
Nonriverine Wetland Restoration	R		79.9		Filling ditches, removing field crowns, and planting agricultural fields.
Nonriverine Wetland Enhancement	Е		52.0		Planting within agricultural fields.
Nonriverine Wetland Preservation	Р		110.5		Preserving forested nonriverine wetlands within the interstream flat.

* R = Restoration E = Enhancement

P = Preservation

** P1 = Priority I P2 = Priority II

P3 = Priority III

2.0 HYDROLOGY

2.1 Success Criteria

Success criteria for wetland hydrology at Clayhill Farms require inundation or saturation within 12 inches of the ground surface for a consecutive period of 12.5 percent of the growing season, or if the hydroperiod is within 20 percent of an approved reference wetland hydroperiod within drought years. The growing season for Jones County begins March 15 and ends November 11 (242 days). In order to attain hydrologic success, saturation within 12 inches of the ground surface is required for at least 30 consecutive days (12.5 percent of the growing season).

2.2 Hydrologic Description

Twenty groundwater monitoring gauges have been maintained and monitored throughout the year 4 (2009) growing season (Figures 3A-3B). Daily rainfall data recorded from a rain gauge maintained and monitored on the Site was used for seasonal comparison. Graphs of groundwater hydrology and precipitation are included in Appendix A.





2.3 Results of Hydrologic Monitoring

2.3.1 Site Data

Twenty gauges were maintained and monitored for the year 4 (2009) growing season. Groundwater hydrology within 12 inches of the soil surface is occurring for greater than 12.5 percent of the growing season for year 4 (2009) at Gauges GW1-GW9, GW14-GW15, and GW18. The remainder of the gauges were saturated or inundated for less than 12.5 percent of the growing season (Gauges GW10-GW13, GW16-GW17, and GW19-GW20). Gauges currently below 12.5 percent of the success criteria are located within the lower half of the Site near the restored stream channel.

The following table summarizes success criteria achievement for Site gauges.

Table 2. Summary of Groundwater Gauge Results for Years 1 through 5 Clayhill Farms (EEP Project Number .00018)								
Clayhill Fari Gauge	、 。	,	Iax Consecutive Day (Percentage)	s During Growing Se:	ason			
0	Year 1 (2006)	Year 2 (2007)	Year 3 (2008)	Year 4 (2009)	Year 5 (2010)			
GW1	Yes/34 days (14.0 percent)	Yes/79 days (32.6 percent)	Yes/94 days (38.8 percent)	Yes/118 days (48.8 percent)				
GW2	Yes/68 days (28.1 percent)	Yes/50 days (20.7 percent)	Yes/91 days (37.6 percent)	Yes/80 days (33.1 percent)				
GW3	Yes/81 days (33.5 percent)	Yes/78 days (32.3 percent)	Yes/93 days (38.4 percent)	Yes/118 days (48.8 percent)				
GW4	Yes/81 days (33.5 percent)	Yes/77 days (31.8 percent)	Yes/91 days (37.6 percent)	Yes/80 days (33.1 percent)				
GW5	Yes/66 days (27.3 percent)	Yes/50 days (20.7 percent)	Yes/91 days (37.6 percent)	Yes/79 days (32.6 percent)				
GW6	Yes/37 days (15.3 percent)	No/23 days (9.5 percent)	Yes/88 days (36.4 percent)	Yes/48 days (19.8 percent)				
GW7	Yes/69 days (28.5 percent)	Yes/50 days (20.7 percent)	Yes/90 days (37.2 percent)	Yes/80 days (33.1 percent)				
GW8	Yes/68 days (28.1 percent)	Yes/50 days (20.7 percent)	Yes/89 days (36.8 percent)	Yes/67 days (27.7 percent)				
GW9	Yes/38 days (15.7 percent)	No/24 days (9.9 percent)	Yes/89 days (36.8 percent)	Yes/60 days (24.8 percent)				
GW10	No/7 days (2.9 percent)	No/5 days (2.1 percent)	No/14 days (5.8 percent)	No/12 days (5.0 percent)				
GW11	No/2 days (0.8 percent)	No/1 day (0.4 percent)	No/4 days (1.7 percent)	No/3 days (1.2 percent)				
GW12	No/5 days (2.1 percent)	No/5 days (2.1 percent)	No/8 days (3.3 percent)	No/8 days (3.3 percent)				
GW13	No/6 days (2.5 percent)	No/1 day (0.4 percent)	No/9 day (3.7 percent)	No/7 days (2.9 percent)				

(continued)					
Gauge	Success Ci	riteria Achieved/M	ax Consecutive Day (Percentage)	s During Growing Sea	ison
	Year 1 (2006)	Year 2 (2007)	Year 3 (2008)	Year 4 (2009)	Year 5 (2010)
GW14	No/18 days (7.4 percent)	No/14 days (5.8 percent)	Yes/54 days (22.3 percent)	Yes/44 days (18.2 percent)	
GW15	No/24 days (9.9 percent)	No/14 days (5.8 percent)	Yes/74 days (30.6 percent)	Yes/44 days (18.2 percent)	
GW16	No/0 days (0 percent)	No/2 days (0.8 percent)	No/9 day (3.7 percent)	No/9 day (3.7 percent)	
GW17	No/7 days (2.9 percent)	No/3 days (1.2 percent)	No/13 days (5.4 percent)	No/11 days (4.5 percent)	
GW18	No/5 days (2.1 percent)	No/2 days (0.8 percent)	No/15 days (6.2 percent)	Yes/66 days (27.3 percent)	
GW19	No/6 days (2.5 percent)	No/4 days (1.7 percent)	No/7 days (2.9 percent)	No/8 days (3.3 percent)	
GW20	No/11 days (4.5 percent)	No/17 days (7.0 percent)	No/10 days (4.1 percent)	No/11 days (4.5 percent)	

 Table 2. Summary of Groundwater Gauge Results for Years 1 through 5

2.3.2 Climatic Data

Climatic data for the year 4 (2009) growing season is compared to previous monitoring years growing season data and precipitation probabilities from 30-year historical data at the New Bern Craven County Airport station (Figure 4) (NOAA 2004). The Site experienced slightly above average rainfall for the year 4 (2009) growing season totaling 38.1 inches for the months of March to October compared to the mean 30-year historic total for rainfall of approximately 34.6 inches.

2.4 Hydrologic Conclusions

Twenty gauges were maintained and monitored for the year 4 (2009) growing season; gauge results are depicted on Figures 3A-3B and graphs for each gauge can be found in Appendix A. Twelve of the twenty monitored gauges met success criteria of inundation/saturation within 12 inches of the surface for at least 12.5 percent of the growing season with a presence of hydrophytic vegetation. Gauges will continue to be monitored closely; a jurisdictional wetland delineation may be necessary at the end of the five-year monitoring period to accurately quantify successful wetlands within the Site.

3.0 VEGETATION

3.1 Success Criteria

Wetland vegetation success criteria at Clayhill Farms require an average across the Site of 320 stems per acre of approved target species surviving for the first three years of monitoring, 290 stems per acre in year four, and 260 stems per acre in year five.



3.2 Description of Planted Areas

According to the 2006 *Revised Wetland and Stream Mitigation Plan for the Clayhill Farms Property*, planted species were to include the following communities as described in Schafale and Weakley (1990):

- 1. Coastal Plain Small Stream Swamp
- 2. Nonriverine Wet Hardwoods Forest
- 3. Mesic Pine Flatwoods
- 4. Mixed-Mesic Hardwood Forest (Coastal Plain subtype)
- 5. Coastal Plain Bottomland Hardwood Forest (Blackwater subtype)

3.3 Results of Vegetation Monitoring

Ten 10-meter square vegetation plots were established as depicted in Figures 3A-3B in November 2006. Plots were surveyed in August 2009 for the year 4 (2009) monitoring season using the *CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.0* (Lee et al. 2006) (http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/methods.htm); results are included in Table 3 and pictures are included in Appendix B. The taxonomic standard for vegetation used for this document was *Flora of the Carolinas, Virginia, Georgia, and Surrounding Areas* (Weakley 2007). No reference area was studied; therefore, no comparisons could be made to reference conditions. Three plots (Plots 5, 6, and 7) were established in the Headwater Swamp, three plots (Plots 4, 3, and 8) in the Nonriverine Wet Hardwood Forest, two plots (Plots 1 and 2) in the Mesic Pine Flatwoods, and two plots (Plots 9 and 10) in the Mixed-Mesic Hardwood Forest restoration areas.

Based on stem counts, the average plot density monitored at the Site is greater than 290 stems per acre and is considered successful. The average plot density has been measured at 680 planted stems per acre

for 2009 (year 4) monitoring. Dominant species identified at the Site were overcup oak (*Quercus lyrata*), tupelo species (*Nyssa biflora* and *Nyssa* sp.), and green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*). Nine out of the ten individual vegetation plots were above success criteria with 364 to 1619 planted stems per acre. Planted stems were not documented during planting making it difficult to determine planted trees from naturally recruited trees. Therefore, the number of "planted" species was based on the experience and judgment of the monitoring team, and counts for planted species may be influenced by naturally recruited stems. In addition, the range of variation for survival between individual plots may be influenced by varied planting densities throughout the Site. Vegetation plot 9 was low with 40 planted stems per acre; however, when including additional pine (*Pinus* sp.) natural recruits, the stem count increases to 2388 stems per acre.

3.4 Vegetation Conclusions

Based on the number of stems counted, the average plot density monitored at this Site is greater than 290 stems per acre and is considered successful for 2009 (year 4) monitoring. The average plot density has been measured at 680 planted stems per acre. Planted seedlings exhibited various degrees of vigor at the Site. Overall, vigor was noted as good.

One vegetation problem area was documented within the Site and is depicted on Figure 3B. The area consists of poor planted stem survival adjacent to the restored stream (near Reach 1); photographs of this area are included in Appendix B. Poor survival most likely has resulted from soil infertility. In addition, herbaceous vegetation on the lower half of the Site adjacent to the restored stream is not establishing well.

4.0 STREAM ASSESSMENT

4.1 Success Criteria

Success criteria dictate that based on visual observations there should be little or no change in the as-built cross-sections. If a change takes place it should be determined if the change is to a more unstable condition (downcutting, erosion) or to a more stable condition (settling, increase in riparian vegetation, deposition along the banks, decrease in the width-depth ratio, decrease in cross-sectional area). The as-built longitudinal profile should show that bed features are neither aggrading nor degrading based on visual observation; however, short-term aggradation/degradation may occur depending on the peak annual discharge. Bed features should be consistent with those observed in typical E- and C-type channels. The as-built pattern should not change and the riffle-pool sequence should remain constant. A significant coarsening of bed materials is not expected due to the sand/silt/clay substrate; therefore, bed materials will not be analyzed for stream success.

4.2 Stream Assessment Results

4.3.1 Visual Stream Observations

Based on visual observation during the year 4 (2009) monitoring, channel geometry compares favorably with the emulated, stable E/C stream type as set forth in the detailed mitigation plan. The current monitoring observations demonstrate that dimension, pattern, and profile were stable over the course of the year 4 (2009) monitoring period.

	Table 3. Stem Counts for Planted Species Arranged by Plot	for Plan	ted Spe	cies Ar	ranged	l by Plc	it									
Year 4 (2009) Individual Piots Year 4 (2009) Individual Piots (0.0247 acree each) (0.014 (0.0247 acree each) (0.0247 acree each) (0.0247 acree each) (0.0247 acree each) (0.014 (0.014 (0.0247 acree each) (0.014 (0.0247 acree each) (0.014 (0.014 (0.014 (0.014 (0.014 Year 2 20 20	Clayhill Farms (EEP P	roject N	umber	.00018	<u> </u>											
(0.0247 acre each) (0.0247 acre each) (0.038) (008) (2009) (2007) <th <="" colspa="10" th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>/ear 4 (2</th><th>nI (600;</th><th>ndividus</th><th>ul Plots</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>Year 4</th><th>Year 3</th><th>Year 2</th><th>Year 1</th></th>	<th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>/ear 4 (2</th> <th>nI (600;</th> <th>ndividus</th> <th>ul Plots</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Year 4</th> <th>Year 3</th> <th>Year 2</th> <th>Year 1</th>					/ear 4 (2	nI (600;	ndividus	ul Plots				Year 4	Year 3	Year 2	Year 1
	Species				(0)	0247 ac	re each	((2009)	(2008)	(2007)	(2006)	
insylvanica : <t< th=""><th>1</th><th>1</th><th>2</th><th>3</th><th>4</th><th>S</th><th>9</th><th>7</th><th>8</th><th>6</th><th>10</th><th>Totals</th><th>Totals</th><th>Totals</th><th>Totals</th></t<>	1	1	2	3	4	S	9	7	8	6	10	Totals	Totals	Totals	Totals	
msylvanica - - 1 6 8 5 2 - 2 24 22 20 4 τ - - - - - - - 1 1 4 2 τ - - - - - - 1 1 1 4 4 τ - - 1 - - 1 1 1 4 4 ris 10 3 - - - - - - 36 36 32 ris 10 3 - - - - - - 36 36 32 tas - 6 9 - - - - - 37 36 37 37 tas - - 1 1 1 1 4 6 6 6 6	Betula nigra	•	ı	1	7	ı		1	3	ı	1	9	6	9	ю	
i i <td>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</td> <td>•</td> <td>ı</td> <td>1</td> <td>9</td> <td>8</td> <td>5</td> <td>7</td> <td>ı</td> <td>ı</td> <td>2</td> <td>24</td> <td>22</td> <td>20</td> <td>7</td>	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	•	ı	1	9	8	5	7	ı	ı	2	24	22	20	7	
n - - - - - - - - 15 15 15 9 ris - - 16 17 - - 1 13 <t< td=""><td>Fraxinus sp.</td><td>•</td><td>ı</td><td>ı</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>ı</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td></td><td>1</td><td>4</td><td>1</td></t<>	Fraxinus sp.	•	ı	ı	1	1	1	1	ı	1	1		1	4	1	
is	Nyssa biflora		ı	9	6	1	1	,	ı		1	15	15	6	6	
ris 10 3 - - - - - - 13 13 13 13 ris - 6 - - - - - 13 13 13 13 ria - 6 - - - - - 3 9 9 9 9 9 9 ria - - - - - - - 3 9 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 14 14 16 16 16 10 10 10<	Nyssa sp.	•	ı	16	17	ı	1	4	ı	1	1	37	36	32	16	
interface :	Pinus palustris	10	Э	ı	1	1	1	,	ı		1	13	13	13	13	
ita - - 9 3 12 4 - 8 - 7 43 42 39 ra - - - - - - - - 39 42 39 ra - - - - - - - - 42 39 value - - - - - - - 49 66 load - - - - - - 3 66 66 66 load - - - - - - - 1 1 1 load - - - - - - 1 1 1 load - - - - - - 1 1 1 load - - - - - - 1 1 1 stichum - - - - - - 12 10 10 stichum - - - - - - - 12 10 10 Per Plot<	Pinus sp.	•	9	1	ı		1		ı		Э	6	6	6	6	
rat - - - - - - - - - - - - 4 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Quercus lyrata		ı	6	Э	12	4	,	8	,	7	43	42	39	41	
oda - - - 3 - - 3 6 7 7 7	Quercus nigra	,	ı	ı	ı	ı	ı	,	ı	ı	1	1	4	9	5	
Illos - - - - - - 1 <td>Quercus pagoda</td> <td>,</td> <td>ı</td> <td>ı</td> <td>3</td> <td>ı</td> <td>ı</td> <td>,</td> <td>ı</td> <td>ı</td> <td>3</td> <td>9</td> <td>9</td> <td>9</td> <td>5</td>	Quercus pagoda	,	ı	ı	3	ı	ı	,	ı	ı	3	9	9	9	5	
- -	Quercus phellos	,	ı	ı	•	,	ı	,	,	1	,	1	1	1	1	
num - - - - - 7 5 - - 12 10 10 10 · Plot 10 9 33 40 20 16 12 11 1 16 166 155 · Plot 10 9 33 40 20 16 12 11 1 16 166 155 · Plot 364 1335 1619 809 647 486 445 40 647 680 672 628	Quercus sp.	,	ı	ı	•	,	ı	,	,	,		0	1	I	-	
· Plot 10 9 33 40 20 16 12 11 1 16 166 155 405 364 1335 1619 809 647 486 445 40 647 680 672 628	Taxodium distichum	•	ı	ı	ı		7	5	ı	ı	1	12	10	10	9	
405 364 1335 1619 809 647 486 445 40 647 680 672 628	Total Stems Per Plot	10	6	33	40	20	16	12	11	1	16	168	166	155	116	
	Stems Per Acre	405			1619	809	647	486	445	40	647	680	672	628	470	

Axiom Environmental, Inc.

4.3.2 Bankfull Events

Documented bankfull events are included in Table 4.

Table 4. Verificat	ion of Bankfull Ever	nts	
Clayhill Farms (E	EP Project Number	.00018)	
Date of Data Collection	Date of Occurrence	Method	Photo (if available)
September 1, 2006	September 1, 2006	Total of 4.74 inches of rain documented by the onsite rain gauge over a two-day period from August 31 (4.06 inches) to September 1, 2006 (0.68 inches).	
August 13, 2008	August 13, 2008	Total of 4.0 inches of rain documented by the onsite rain gauge over a seven-day period from August 7-13, 2008.	
August 14, 2009	August 14, 2009	Total of 6.6 inches of rain documented at a nearby rain station over a four-day period from August 11-14, 2009.	
November 12, 2009	November 12, 2009	Visual observations of bankfull as the result of Tropical Storm Ida	1-3



4.3 Stream Assessment Conclusions

Based on stream observations, the channel geometry compares favorably with the emulated, stable E/C type stream reaches as set forth in the detailed mitigation plan. The current monitoring observations demonstrate that dimension, pattern, and profile were stable over the course of the year 4 (2009) monitoring period.

Stream problem areas within the Site are depicted on Figures 3A through 3B. Two problem areas were noted for the year 4 (2009) monitoring period. Both problem areas are stressed cross-vanes with failing right bank arms resulting from a lack of footers; photographs of each are included in Appendix C. Additional inspections and monitoring of bed and banks up and downstream of compromised structures is recommended prior to initiation of proactive maintenance measures.

5.0 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Twenty gauges were maintained and monitored for the year 4 (2009) growing season. Twelve of the twenty monitored gauges met success criteria of inundation/saturation within 12 inches of the surface for at least 12.5 percent of the growing season with a presence of hydrophytic vegetation. Gauges will continue to be monitored closely; a jurisdictional wetland delineation may be necessary at the end of the five-year monitoring period to accurately quantify successful wetlands within the Site.

Based on the number of stems counted, the average plot density monitored at the Site is greater than 290 stems per acre and is considered successful for 2009 (year 4) monitoring. The average plot density has been measured at 680 planted stems per acre.

One vegetation problem area documented within the Site consists of a large area of poor planted stem survival adjacent to the restored stream (near Reach 1). Poor survival most likely has resulted from soil infertility. Similarly, herbaceous vegetation on the lower half of the Site adjacent to the restored stream is not establishing well.

Based on stream observations, channel geometry compares favorably with the emulated, stable E/C type stream reaches as set forth in the detailed mitigation plan. The current monitoring observations demonstrate that dimension, pattern, and profile were stable over the course of the year 4 (2009) monitoring period.

Stream problem areas within the Site included two stressed cross-vanes with failing right bank arms resulting from a lack of footers. Additional inspections and monitoring of bed and banks up and downstream of compromised structures is recommended prior to initiation of proactive maintenance measures.

In summary, the Site achieved success criteria for vegetation and stream attributes in the Fourth Monitoring Year (2009). The upper half of the Site achieved hydrology success criteria for the Fourth Monitoring Year (2009).

6.0. REFERENCES

- Lee, Michael T., R.K. Peet, S.D. Roberts, and T.R. Wentworth. 2006. CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.0. (online). Available: http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/methods.htm.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 2004. Climatography of the United States No. 20; Monthly Station Climate Summaries, 1971-2000. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service, National Climatic Data Center, Asheville, North Carolina.
- North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). 2006. Revised Wetland and Stream Mitigation Plan for the Clayhill Farms Property, Jones County, North Carolina, TIP No. R-2105 WM. Office of Natural Environment & Roadside Environmental Unit.
- 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, North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources. Raleigh, North Carolina.
- Weakley, Alan S. 2007. Flora of the Carolinas, Virginia, Georgia, and Surrounding Areas (online). Available: http://www.herbarium.unc.edu/WeakleysFlora.pdf [February 1, 2008]. University of North Carolina Herbarium, North Carolina Botanical Garden, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

APPENDIX A

YEAR 4 (2009) GROUNDWATER/SURFACEWATER GAUGE GRAPHS



GW1 Clayhill Farm Year 4 (2009 Gauge Data)



GW2 Clayhill Farm Year 4 (2009 Gauge Data)



GW3 Clayhill Farm Year 4 (2009 Gauge Data)









GW6 Clayhill Farm Year 4 (2009 Gauge Data)













GW9 Clayhill Farm Year 4 (2009 Gauge Data)

Precipitation (inches)















GW13 Clayhill Farm Year 4 (2009 Gauge Data)




GW15 Clayhill Farm Year 4 (2009 Gauge Data)



Date





Precipitation (inches)









Precipitation (inches)

GW19 Clayhill Farm Year 4 (2009 Gauge Data)



Precipitation (inches)



GW20 Clayhill Farm Year 4 (2009 Gauge Data)

Date

APPENDIX B VEGETATION MONITORING PHOTOGRAPHS

Clayhill Farms Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photographs Year 4 (2009) Annual Monitoring Pictures Taken August 2009









Clayhill Farms (final) EEP Project Number .00018 Jones County, North Carolina Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Clayhill Farms Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photographs Year 4 (2009) Annual Monitoring Pictures Taken August 2009 (continued)











Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Clayhill Farms Vegetation Problem Area Photographs Year 4 (2009) Annual Monitoring Pictures Taken July 2009









Axiom Environmental, Inc.

APPENDIX C STREAM MONITORING PHOTOGRAPHS

Clayhill Farms Stream Monitoring Fixed-Photo and Problem Area Photographs Year 4 (2009) Annual Monitoring Pictures Taken July 2009











Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Clayhill Farms Stream Monitoring Fixed-Photo and Problem Area Photographs Year 4 (2009) Annual Monitoring Pictures Taken July 2009 (continued)









Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Clayhill Farms Stream Monitoring Fixed-Photo and Problem Area Photographs Year 4 (2009) Annual Monitoring Pictures Taken July 2009

(continued)



Stream Photo 12 and Stream Problem Area (moderately stressed cross-vane)









Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Clayhill Farms Stream Monitoring Fixed-Photo and Problem Area Photographs Year 4 (2009) Annual Monitoring Pictures Taken July 2009 (continued)







Axiom Environmental, Inc.