Gray Farm Stream Restoration Monitoring Report – Year One

Contract # D05016-2

Iredell County, North Carolina



March 2007

Cataloging Unit – Catawba Basin 03050101

Prepared For:



1652 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1652

Table of Contents

I. Ex	ecut	tive Summary / Project Abstract1
II. P	roje	ct Background2
1.	P	roject Goals and Objectives2
2.	P	roject Structure, Restoration Type, and Approach4
3.	L	ocation and Setting5
4.	P	roject History and Background5
5.	N	Ionitoring Plan View7
III. F	Proj	ect Condition and Monitoring Results8
A.	V	egetation Assessment
	1.	Problem Areas Plan View (Vegetation) 10
	2.	Vegetative Problem Areas Plan View10
B. St	real	n Assessment10
	1.	Problem Areas Plan View (Stream) 11
	2.	Problem Areas Table Summary 11
	3.	Numbered Issues Photo Section11
1	4.	Fixed Photo Station Photos 11
	5.	Stability Assessment 11
	6.	Quantitative Measures Summary Tables12
IV.	N	Iethodology Section

Tables

Exhibit Table I.	Project Structure Table
Exhibit Table II.	Project Activity and Reporting History
Exhibit Table III.	Project Contact Table
Exhibit Table IV.	Project Background Table
Exhibit Table V.	Verification of Bankfull Events
Exhibit Table VII.	Catergorical Stream Feature Visual Stability Assessment
Exhibit Table VIII.	Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary
Exhibit Table IX.	Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Sumamry

Figure 1

Appendix A Vegetation Raw Data

- 1. Vegetation Survey Data Tables
- 2. Vegetation Problem Area Photos
- 3. Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos

Appendix B Geomorphologic Raw Data

- 1. Stream Problem Area Table
- 2. Representative Stream Problem Area Photos
- 3. Stream Photo-Station Photos
- 4. Exhibit Table B.1. Qualitative Visual Stability Assessment
- 5. Annual Overlays of Cross Section Plots
- 6. Annual Overlays of Longitudinal Plots
- 7. Annual Overlays of pebble count frequency distribution plots

Appendix C Integrated Problem Area Plan View

I. Executive Summary / Project Abstract

The Gray Farm Stream Restoration project consists of two separate reaches (Reach 1 and Reach 2) along unnamed tributaries of Buffalo Shoals Creek, a tributary of the Catawba River (Hydrologic Cataloging Unit #03050101). The site is located approximately 10 miles due west of the City of Statesville in western Iredell County, NC. This report summarizes the monitoring efforts for Year 1 (2006) of the Gray Farm Stream Restoration Project.

Restoration construction of the Reach 2 began in early March 2006 and was completed in mid-April 2006. Restoration construction of the Reach 1 began in mid-April 2006 and was completed in early July 2006. Demobilization and minor Contractor punch list items were completed shortly thereafter. Installation of monitoring devices and As-built surveys for both reaches were performed as construction progressed.

Monitoring of the vegetated buffer was performed during the growing season of 2006, by Soil & Environmental Consultants, PA. Stem counts were performed within the established vegetation monitoring plots, resulting in an average live stem density of approximately 647 stems per acre.

Physical monitoring of the restored channel consisted of the collection of cross-section and representative longitudinal profile data and a visual assessment of the stream. Collected data was then compared with as-built data.

Based on Year 1 Monitoring results, the site has met all success criteria.

Year 2 Monitoring will commence in January of 2007.

II. Project Background

The Gray Farm Stream Restoration project is located in the Catawba Basin, Hydrologic Cataloging Unit 03050101. The site consists of two separate reaches (Reach 1 and Reach 2) along unnamed tributaries of Buffalo Shoals Creek, a tributary of the Catawba River Hydrologic Cataloging Unit #03050101). The site is located approximately 10 miles due west of the City of Statesville in western Iredell County, NC.

The restoration project objective was to restore the impaired streams to appropriately sized stream channels that are stable and self-maintaining, and will not aggrade or degrade over time. Restoration was accomplished with Rosgen-based natural channel design procedures and techniques. Reach 1 restoration was a combination of a Priority I (reconnection of the channel with its historic floodplain) restoration and a Priority II (construction of a new floodplain at a lower elevation) restoration. Reach 2 was a Priority I restoration. Restoring an appropriate sinuosity lengthened both channels, thereby lowering their bankfull slope.

The buffer of both reaches of the restored stream channel were planted with native tree and shrub species and seeded with a native grass seed mix. During construction, additional opportunities existed to create vernal pools, oxbows, or pocket wetlands within the riparian zone along the restored reaches.

Restoration construction of the Reach 2 began in early March 2006 and was completed in mid-April 2006. Restoration construction of the Reach 1 began in mid-April 2006 and was completed in early July 2006. Demobilization and minor Contractor punch list items were completed shortly thereafter. Installation of monitoring devices and As-built surveys for both reaches were performed as construction progressed.

1. Project Goals and Objectives

The goals of the Gray Farm Stream Restoration project are:

- 1) Improve local water quality within the restored channel reaches as well as the downstream watercourses through;
 - a. The reduction of current channel and off site sediment loads by restoring appropriately sized channels with stable beds and banks.
 - b. The reduction of nutrient loads (both soil enhancement practices and cattle) from adjacent agricultural fields with a restored riparian buffer.
 - c. The reduction of water temperatures provided by shading of the channel from canopy species along with the resultant increase in oxygen content.

- 2) Improve local aquatic and terrestrial habitat and diversity within the restored channels and their vicinity through;
 - a. The formation of varying bed form within the channels to provide for fish, amphibian, and benthic species.
 - b. The restoration of a suitable riparian buffer corridor which will provide both vertical and horizontal structure and connectivity with adjacent upland areas.
 - c. The restoration of understory and canopy species which will provide forage, cover, and nesting for a variety of mammals, reptiles, and avian species.
- 3) Improve local watershed conditions through the restoration of two low order streams (one first order, one second order) and the placement of permanent conservation easements.

Through the restoration process the following objectives were accomplished:

- 1) Restore approximately 7,610 linear feet of appropriately sized stream channel that is stable and self-maintaining, and will not aggrade or degrade over time. Restoration was accomplished with Rosgen-based natural channel design procedures and techniques.
- 2) Develop restored channels with the appropriate morphological characteristics (cross-sectional dimension, pattern, and longitudinal profile) utilizing collected reference reach data as a guide. Allow for no net loss of overall channel length in the process.
- 3) Create and/or improve bed form diversity (riffles, runs, pools, and glides) and improve aquatic and benthic macroinvertebrate habitat.
- 4) Construct a floodplain (or local bankfull bench) that is accessible at the proposed bankfull channel elevation.
- 5) Ensure channel and stream bank stabilization by integrating in-stream structures and native bank vegetation.
- 6) Establish a native forested and herbaceous riverine buffer plant community within a minimum width of 50 feet from the edge of the restored channel. This new community will be established in conjunction with the eradication of any existing exotic and/or undesirable plant species.
- 7) Improve water quality within the subject channels and the downstream receiving waters.

8) Supplement the education and conservation efforts for natural resources in Iredell County as indicated in program goals for the local Soil & Water Conservation District and the NC Cooperative Extension Service.

2. Project Structure, Restoration Type, and Approach

The restoration project objective was to restore the impaired streams to appropriately sized stream channels that are stable and self-maintaining, and will not aggrade or degrade over time. Restoration was accomplished with Rosgen-based natural channel design procedures and techniques. Restoring an appropriate sinuosity lengthened both channels, thereby lowering their bankfull slope. A total of 8,004 linear feet of stream channel were restored on site (8,004 SMU's).

Reach 1

Reach 1 restoration was a combination of a Priority I (reconnection of the channel with its historic floodplain) restoration and a Priority II (construction of a new floodplain at a lower elevation) restoration. Approximately 800 linear feet of this length was inundated by an existing farm pond that was removed.

One additional piped farm road crossing existed approximately 700 feet downstream of the dam. This piped crossing was removed and replaced with an in-stream crossing. Immediately downstream of the dam for a distance of approximately 1,000 feet, severe bank erosion, channel incision, and an overwidening of the stream channel was evidenced. This degradation appeared in large part due to previous uncontrolled releases from the existing dam spillway.

The lower two thirds of the reach were characterized by overly steep and undercut banks. Significant localized erosion was evidenced along this lower portion. Trees of large diameter lined the banks, many of which were undercut, suspended or had collapsed into the stream. The channel had down cut and over widened in many locations along the reach allowing no access to its floodplain. The last 200 feet (approximately) of the pre-existing channel was not down cut due to a change in surrounding topography.

The upper portion of Reach 1 has demonstrated pool development since the asbuilt survey. Significant sediment entered the pools at the upper end of Reach 1 shortly after construction. This sediment came from upstream sources including areas of cattle pasture and areas previously inundated due to the old pond. This sediment has been flushed from the system during the first year causing these pools to deepen to their previously excavated depth.

Reach 1 consists of 5,813 (5,813 SMU's) linear feet of restored Type C4 channel.

Reach 2

Reach 2 was a Priority I restoration. A small impoundment formerly existed near the lower end of the reach; however, it was drained and removed a number of

years prior. A piped farm road crossing existed at roughly the same location (the old dam embankment). This was the only existing crossing along the reach.

Throughout Reach 2, severe bank erosion, channel incision, and an over-widening of the stream channel were evidenced. This impairment appeared in large part due to previous uncontrolled grazing operations. The reach was characterized by overly steep, sloughing, and undercut banks. Significant localized erosion was evidenced along the entire reach. Trees of large diameter lined the banks, many of which were undercut, suspended or collapsed into the stream. The channel had down cut and over widened in many places along the reach allowing no access to its floodplain.

Reach 2 consists of 2,191 linear feet (2,191 SMU's) of restored Type B4 channel.

3. Location and Setting

The Gray Farm Stream Restoration project is located in the Catawba Basin, Hydrologic Cataloging Unit 03050101. The site consists of two separate reaches (Reach 1 and Reach 2) along unnamed tributaries of Buffalo Shoals Creek, a tributary of the Catawba River. The site is located approximately 10 miles due west of the City of Statesville in western Iredell County, NC.

Reach 1 is located immediately north of Bolick Road (SR 1532) and consisted of approximately 4,340 linear feet of impaired stream channel. Reach 2 is located immediately west of the intersection of New Sterling Road (SR 1525) and Gray House Road and consisted of approximately 1,600 linear feet of impaired stream channel. The watershed areas for Reaches 1 and 2 are estimated at approximately 0.91 square miles (582 acres) and 0.085 square miles (54 acres) respectively. See attached Figure 1.

4. Project History and Background

		Gra					n Components Project # 92219	
Project Segment or Reach ID	Existing Feet/Acres	Type	Approach	Footage or Acreage	Mitigation Ratio	Mitigation Units	Stationing	; Comment
Reach I	3,000	R	ΡI	4,119	1:1	4,119	0+00 to 41+	19
Reach I	1,340	R	PII	1.694	1:1	1.694	41+19 to 58+	-13
Reach II	1,600	R	ΡI	2,191	1:1	2,191	0+00 to 20+9	91
Mitigation Un	it Summ	ations						
Stream (lf)	ream (lf) Riparian Nonriparian Wetland (Ac) Wetland (Ac)		Total Wetland (Ac)		Buffer (Ac)	Comment		
8,004							18.38	
Gray Farm Stream I	Restoration	Site					Soil & Environment	al Consultants, PA

The following tables summarize the project history and background:

Year 1 Monitoring March 2007

S&EC Job # 9385.D7

Exhibit Table II. Project Activity : Gray Farm Stream Restoration Site/I		
Activity or Report	Data Collection Complete	Actual Completion or Delivery
Restoration Plan	Aug-05	Nov-05
Construction	Reach 1	Jul-06
	Reach 2	Apr-06
Temporary S&E mix applied to entire project area	Apr-06	Apr-06
Permanent seed mix applied to reach/segments 1 & 2	Apr-06	Apr-06
Plantings for reach/segments 1 & 2	Apr-06	Apr-06
Mitigation Plan / As-built (Year 0 Monitoring - baseline)	May-06	Jun-06
Year 1 Monitoring	Dec-06	Dec-06
Supplemental Planting	Dec-06	
Year 2 Monitoring		Dec-07
Year 3 Monitoring		Dec-08
Year 4 Monitoring		Dec-09
Year 5 Monitoring		Dec-10

Exhibit Table III. Project Contacts Table Gray Farm Stream Restoration Site/EEP Project # 92219					
Designer	Soil & Environmental Consultants, PA				
Primary Project Design POC	11010 Raven Ridge Rd				
	Raleigh, NC 27614				
	Rebecca S. Wargo (919) 846-5900				
Construction Contractor	North State Environmental				
Construction Contractor POC	2889 Lowery St.				
	Winston-Salem, NC 27101				
	Darrell Westmoreland (336) 725-2010				
Planting Contractor	North State Environmental				
Planting Contractor POC	2889 Lowery St.				
	Winston-Salem, NC 27101				
	Darrell Westmoreland (336) 725-2010				
Seeding Contractor	North State Environmental				
Seeding Contractor POC	2889 Lowery St.				
	Winston-Salem, NC 27101				
	Darrell Westmoreland (336) 725-2010				
Monitoring Performers	Soil & Environmental Consultants, PA				
	11010 Raven Ridge Rd.				
	Raleigh, NC 2761				
Stream Monitoring POC	Jessica Regan (919) 846-5900				
Vegetation Monitoring POC	Jessica Regan (919) 846-5900				
Wetland Monitoring POC	Jessica Regan (919) 846-5900				

Exhibit Table IV. Projec Gray Farm Stream Restoration S	
Project County	Iredell
Drainage area	Reach 1 - 0.91 square miles (582 acres)
	Reach 2 - 0.085 square miles (54 acres)
Drainage impervious cover estimate (%)	< 20%
Stream Order	Reach 1 - 2nd order
	Reach 2 - 1st order
Physiographic Region	Piedmont
Ecoregion	Northern Inner Piedmont
Rosgen Classification of As-built	Reach 1 - C4
	Reach 2 - B4
Cowardin Classification	N/A
Dominant soil types	Reach 1 - Cw, CxB
	Reach 2 - CsE2
Reference site ID	Reach 1 - Tributary of Turkey Creek
	Reach 2 - Basin Creek
USGS HUC for Project and Reference	3050101
NCDWQ Sub-basin for Project and Reference	Reach 1 - 03-08-32 / 03-04-02
	Reach 2 - 03-08-32 / 03-07-01
NCDWQ classification for Project and Reference	Reach 1 - WS-IV; CA / C;NSW
	Reach 2 - WS-IV; CA / C; Tr; ORW
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 N/A
% of project easement fenced	Reach 1 – No Fence, Reach 2 - 100%
70 of project easement rended	Reach $1 - 100$ Fence, Reach $2 - 100\%$

5. Monitoring Plan View

Six (6) tree and shrub buffer vegetation plots (four (4) on Reach 1 and two (2) on Reach 2) and four (4) bank vegetation plots (two (2) on Reach 1 and two (2) on Reach 2) were established. All monitoring will occur within these observation plots throughout the monitoring period for as long as they continue to be representative of the community.

For all buffer monitoring plots, Level 1 of the Carolina Vegetation Survey-Ecosystem Enhancement Program (CVS-EEP) Protocol for Recording Vegetation will be utilized for vegetation sampling in Year 1. Subsequent monitoring years will utilize Level 2 of the CVS-EEP protocol in order to record and report woody plant volunteers within vegetation monitoring plots along with planted stems. A corner of each vegetation monitoring plot will be used as a permanent photo point for vegetation monitoring photos. Locations of these photo points are shown on the attached Monitoring Plan View.

A total of seven (7) nested riffle and pool segments were established along Reach 1, and two (2) nested riffle and pool segments were established along Reach 2. Each cross-section is also a designated photo point that will be photographed annually.

The locations of all monitoring devices are shown on Sheets 2 through 6 (Reach 1 - Monitoring Plan View) and Sheets 11 through 14 (Reach 2 - Monitoring Plan View).

III. Project Condition and Monitoring Results

A. Vegetation Assessment

The success of the adjacent riparian buffer will be based on the combined survival of tree and shrub species for the five-year monitoring period.

Survival of woody (tree and shrub) species planted within the restored buffers will be at least 320 stems/acre through year three, 288 stems/acre through year four, 260 stems/acre through year five. The stem count will be based on an average of the stem counts of the evaluated tree and shrub buffer vegetation plots. The success of the bank vegetation plots along the restored channels will be based on the survival of live-stake (or other) bank plantings for the five-year monitoring period. Survival of bank plantings will be based on a linear average of approximately 50 percent of the planted species within the restoration reaches.

Biological monitoring will be used as a general indicator of restoration success, however, no specific biological criteria applies to the success of the restoration reaches.

The approximately 18.4 acre restoration area was planted with various native hardwood tree and shrub species, native to the area. Reaches 1 and 2 were planted in April 2006. Supplemental planting was performed in December of 2006.

The following tree species were planted in the Riparian Buffer Area:

- Alnus serrulata (Tag Alder)
- Betula nigra (River Birch)
- Carpinus caroliniana (Ironwood)
- Fraxinus pennsylvanica (Green Ash)
- *Ilex opaca* (American Holly)
- Lindera benzoin (Spicebush)
- *Liriodendron tulipifera* (Tulip Poplar)
- Platanus occidentalis (Sycamore)
- *Quercus michauxii* (Swamp Chestnut Oak)
- *Quercus nigra* (Water Oak)
- Quercus phellos (Willow Oak)
- *Viburnum nudum* (Possumhaw)

Stream banks were planted with live stakes in two offset rows. The following shrub species were planted as live stakes:

Cornus amomum (Silky Dogwood)

.

- *Salix sericea* (Silky Willow)
- Sambucus canadensis (Elderberry)

As previously described, a total of six (6) buffer vegetation monitoring plots were established on site in 2006. The success criteria for the site require a minimum of 320 live stems per acre for the first three (3) years of monitoring. Year 1 vegetation monitoring shows 647 live stems per acre. Future buffer vegetation monitoring data will be compared with Year 1 data to determine survival rates and stem densities for woody vegetation planted within the riparian buffer. Vegetation monitoring data for buffer plots was collected using the CVS-EEP monitoring protocol and is presented in Appendix A.

Four (4) bank vegetation plots were also established (two on each reach) to monitor survival of live-stake plantings along stream banks. Future bank vegetation monitoring data will be compared with Year 1 data to determine survival rates for live-stakes planted along stream banks. Live-stake counts by species and by plot are presented in the following tables:

Common Name	Species	REA	REACH 1		% of Total
		BANK 1	BANK 2		
Silky Dogwood	Cornus amomum	12	17	29	39%
Silky Willow	Salix sericea	30	16	46	61%
	TOTAL	42	33	75	

Common Name	Species	REA	CH 2	H 2 Species Total	
		BANK 1	BANK 2		
Silky Willow	Salix sericea	7	4	11	23%
Silky Dogwood	Cornus amomum	9	25	34	72%
Elderberry	Sambucus canadensis		2	2	4%
	TOTAL	16	31	47	

Herbaceous vegetation varies widely throughout the restoration site. The upper half of the buffer of Reach 1 is dominated by dense stands of switchgrass while the lower half is dominated by a low growing cover crop species. The upper half of the buffer of Reach 2 is dominated by low growing cover crop grasses with some native grasses and rushes present. The lower end of Reach 2 has a few very dense stands of aster (*Aster* sp.) that are up to 6 feet tall and have crowded out most other species in the area. These areas will be monitored closely in the future to ensure establishment of woody vegetation.

The stream banks on both reaches have a variety of herbaceous species including various sedges, rushes and some duck potato (*Sagittaria latifolia*). Soft rush (*Juncus effusus*), cattails (*Typha latifolia*) and a variety of sedges (*Carex* sp.) are among the species that are present in the wetland areas.

1. Problem Areas Plan View (Vegetation)

During a field inspection on November 27, 2006, a total of five localized areas of bare floodplain were observed. On Reach 1, three insignificant areas were observed, which appear to be due to surface flows creating small rills in the ground surface. These areas are shown on sheets 6 through 9.

On Reach 2, two insignificant areas of bare floodplain were observed. These appear to be due to localized poor soils which have inhibited plant growth on the floodplain and are shown on Sheets 14 through 16. Photos are included in Appendix A.

While we will continue to monitor these areas, based on vegetative success criteria the site currently exhibits strong vegetative success.

2. Vegetative Problem Areas Plan View

Vegetative problem areas are shown on Sheets 6 through 9 for Reach 1 and Sheets 14 through 16 for Reach 2 (Problem Area Plan View).

B. Stream Assessment

A review of available on-line USGS gauge sites was performed to determine if a suitable surrogate gauges was present in the area. No nearby gauge was identified. The closest USGS gauge to the site was on the Lower Little River (near Healing Springs, NC, Gauge Identification Number 02142000) which is approximately 15 miles from the project site. Based on this large distance, significant disparity in watershed sizes, and topographic variation, it is unlikely that a conclusive determination regarding the number of bankfull events experienced on the restoration site could be made.

Based on site observations, to include wrack lines, staining of vegetation, displaced/flattened vegetation, and observable sediment deposition, it is apparent that multiple overbank events have occurred.

Exhibit Table V. Verification of Bankfull Events Gray Farm Stream Restoration Site/EEP Project # 92219										
Date of Data Collection	Date of Occurrence	Method	Photo # (if available)							
4/24/2006	Unknown		N/A							
6/22/2006	Unknown	Oraite charmations (to include survey) lines attaining of acceptation	N/A							
10/19/2006	Unknown	Onsite observations (to include wrack lines, staining of vegetation, displaced/flattened vegetation, and observable sediment deposition)	N/A							
11/27/2006	Unknown	displaced/matched vegetation, and observable sedment deposition)	N/A							
12/18/2006	Unknown		N/A							

1. Problem Areas Plan View (Stream)

An assessment of channel stability was also preformed on November 27, 2006, by S&EC. Areas of concern that were observed and documented included some minor localized bank scour and a single stressed structure. These problem areas are shown on Sheets 6 through 9 for Reach 1 and Sheets 14 through 16 for Reach 2 (Problem Area Plan View).

And, while we will continue to monitor these areas, based on physical success criteria the site clearly exhibits stable conditions and meets the requirements for physical success.

2. Problem Areas Table Summary

Stream problem areas observed are shown in Table 6 in Appendix B.

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 (at each cross-section) were collected during the stream survey (November 2006). These photos are included in Appendix B.

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 VII that are in a state of stability. Table VII was compiled from the data in Table B1 in Appendix B of this report.

Table VIIa: Categorical Stream Feature Visual Stability AssessmentGray Farm Stream and Wetland Restoration Site/EEP Project # 92219Reach 1									
Feature	MY-1 2006	MY-2 2007	MY-3 2008	MY-4 2009	MY-5 2010				
A. Riffles	100%								
B. Pools	100%								
C. Thalweg	99%								
D. Meanders	100%								
E. Bed General	96%								
F. Bank Condition	100%								
G. Vanes/ J Hooks, etc.	99%								
H. Wads and Boulders	N/A								

Table VIIb: Categorical Stream Feature Visual Stability AssessmentGray Farm Stream and Wetland Restoration Site/EEP Project # 92219Reach 2									
Feature	MY-1 2006	MY-2 2007	MY-3 2008	MY-4 2009	MY-5 2010				
A. Riffles	100%								
B. Pools	100%								
C. Thalweg	100%								
D. Meanders	99%								
E. Bed General	100%								
F. Bank Condition	100%								
G. Vanes/ J Hooks, etc.	99%								
H. Wads and Boulders	N/A								

6. Quantitative Measures Summary Tables

The following tables (Table VIII and Table IX) summarize the quantitative data collected from the cross-sectional and representative longitudinal stream survey. This data was analyzed and summarized, and then compared with baseline data types available for this project.

The Quantitative Morphology Tables illustrate the degree of departure, if any, of the current channel from the baseline data. Tables VIII and IX were compiled from the cross-section and profile raw data and plots located in Appendix B of this report.

				VIII. Bas ARM STRF	CAM REST	ORATION	•		•			
Parameter	Pre-F	Existing Con	dition	Project	Reference	EACH 1 Stream		Design			As-built	
		8		,								
Dimension	Min	Max	Avg.	Min	Max	Avg.	Min	Max	Avg.	Min	Max	Avg.
BF Width (ft)	15.77	15.77	15.77	32.08	32.08	32.08	15.2	15.2	15.2	13.62	19.48	16.02
Floodprone Width (ft)	19.41	52.54	20.39		100		47	90.34	47	37.49	89.67	61.53
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)	17.87	17.87	17.87	79.79	79.79	79.79	17.84	17.84	17.84	11.01	17.92	13.79
BF Mean Depth (ft)	1.13	1.13	1.13	2.49	2.49	2.49	1.17	1.17	1.17	0.7	0.94	0.86
BF Max Depth (ft)	1.49	1.49	1.49	3.61	3.61	3.61	1.71	1.71	1.71	1.36	2.04	1.61
Width/Depth Ratio	13.96	13.96	13.96	12.43	12.43	12.43	12.67	12.67	12.67	18.63	20.07	19.46
Entrenchment Ratio	1.29	1.29	1.29	3.47	3.47	3.47	3.09	3.09	3.09	2.75	4.6	3.84
Wetted Perimeter(ft)	16.52	16.52	16.52	34.8	34.8	34.8	16.01	16.01	16.01	13.26	16.41	15.67
Hydraulic radius (ft)		1.08			2.29			1.11		0.69	0.92	0.83
Pattern												
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	67.62	137.29	98.27	70.8	91.93	84.35	26.1	61.8	40.75	59.32	93.89	72.85
Radius of Curvature (ft)	64.8	121.04	81.58	13.36	36.57	26.56	19.97	37.85	28.23	16.64	40.88	25.73
Meander Wavelength (ft)	716.91	716.91	716.91	148.13	291.09	221.56	77.08	117.13	95.07	77.08	117.13	94.8
Meander Width ratio	4.29	8.71	6.23	2.21	2.87	2.63	1.72	4.07	2.68	3.7	5.86	4.55
Profile												
Riffle length (ft)	N/A	N/A	N/A	32.94	48.35	40.29	19.31	54.86	30.86	25.87	54.2	37.85
Riffle slope (ft/ft)	0.00632	0.00657	0.00647	0.00809	0.01395	0.01074		0.0057		0.00092	0.0187	0.0062
Pool length (ft)	93.8	159.47	119.6	8.96	41.09	26.43	22.9	33.17	29.66	7.41	244.47	23.01
Pool Slope (ft/ft)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0009	0.0029	0.0013	0.0007	0.0064	0.0016
Pool spacing (ft)	347.07	525.3	444	44.08	130.73	67.98	51.66	82.92	67.79	12.35	142	70.94
Substrate												
d50 (mm)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
d84 (mm)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Additional Reach Parameters												
Valley Length (ft)	4258.3			648.35		4258.3		4258.3				
Channel Length (ft)					758.58			5622			5813.3	
Sinuosity	1.16			1.17			1.29			1.36		
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	0.00647			0.01074		0.0057			0.00544			
BF slope (ft/ft)		0.00647			0.01074		0.0057			0.00544		
Rosgen Classificatior		F4			C4			C4			C4	
*Habitat Index		N/A			N/A			N/A			N/A	
*Macrobenthos		N/A			N/A			N/A			N/A	

				VIII. Bas ARM STRE	AM REST								
Parameter	Pre-E	existing Con	dition	Project	Reference			Design			As-built		
Dimension	Min	Max	Avg.	Min	Max	Avg.	Min	Max	Avg.	Min	Max	Avg.	
BF Width (ft)	5.34	5.34	5.34	4.86	4.86	4.86	6.9	6.9	6.9	7.38	8.21	7.8	
Floodprone Width (ft)	7.04	7.04	7.04	8.73	8.73	8.73	12.4	12.4	12.4	13.96	39.05	26.53	
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)	3.88	3.88	3.88	1.94	1.94	1.94	3.96	3.96	3.96	4.14	6.77	5.46	
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.73	0.73	0.73	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.57	0.57	0.57	0.56	0.82	0.69	
BF Max Depth (ft)	1.13	1.13	1.13	0.61	0.61	0.61	0.87	0.87	0.87	0.86	1.3	1.08	
Width/Depth Ratio	7.32	7.32	7.32	12.15	12.15	12.15	12.11	12.11	12.11	1.01	13.18	11.3	
Entrenchment Ratio	1.32	1.32	1.32	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9	4.7	3.4	
Wetted Perimeter(ft)	6.03	6.03	6.03	5.28	5.28	5.28	7.36	7.36	7.36	7.68	8.77	8.23	
Hydraulic radius (ft)		0.64			0.37		0.94737	0.94737	0.94737	0.78261	1.11594	0.95652	
Pattern													
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	43.58	68.11	54.22	6.97	22.7	13.32	9.49	16.5	12.65	11.83	22.05	16.96	
Radius of Curvature (ft)	32.54	52.64	41.25	4.1	8.88	5.93	6.71	9.9	8.05	4.63	9.1	6.43	
Meander Wavelength (ft)	209.46	394.66	334.46	22.47	68.78	46.57	31.6	37.12	34.08	27.51	34.72	31.75	
Meander Width ratio	8.16	12.75	10.15	1.43	4.67	2.74	1.38	2.39	1.83	1.52	2.83	2.17	
Profile													
Riffle length (ft)	N/A	N/A	N/A	5.52	7.6	6.39	4.93	7.24	5.88	3.36	11.6	5.6	
Riffle slope (ft/ft)	0.0179	0.03688	0.02444	0.03022	0.05058	0.04025		0.0258		0.0053	0.0555	0.0279	
Pool length (ft)	26.27	54.41	40.34	7.56	10.65	8.78	6.25	10.46	8.45	5.2	10.08	7.59	
Pool Slope (ft/ft)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0017	0.0087	0.003	0.001	0.0092	0.0022	
Pool spacing (ft)	125.7	474.65	265.15	20.17	70.04	46.72	15.73	23.84	19.22	9.43	28.94	19.51	
Substrate													
d50 (mm)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
d84 (mm)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Additional Reach Parameters													
Valley Length (ft)		1872			216.55			1872			1872		
Channel Length (ft)		1965.6		266.36				2114			2191		
Sinuosity		1.05		1.23				1.16			1.2		
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)		0.0286		0.039			0.0258				0.025		
BF slope (ft/ft)		0.0286			0.039		0.0258			0.025			
Rosgen Classification		G4			B4		B4			B4			
*Habitat Index		N/A			N/A		N/A			N/A			
*Macrobenthos		N/A			N/A			N/A		N/A			

									aulic Monit SITE (EEP							
Parameter								REA	ACH 1							
		RIFF	FLE 1			POO	DL 1			RIF	FLE 2			PO	OL 2	
Dimension	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3
	2006	2006	2007	2008	2006	2006	2007	2008	2006	2006	2007	2008	2006	2006	2007	2008
BF Width (ft)	15.34	11.25			22.32	20.84			13.62	11.33			20.84	20.41		
Floodprone Width (ft)	54.53	50			61.28	62.34			59.9	60.26			57.43	58.07		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)	11.97	5.96			39.71	41.33			11.01	9.18			29.04	26.98		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.78	0.53			1.78	1.98			0.81	0.68			1.39	1.32		
BF Max Depth (ft)	1.39	0.87			3.29	3.47			1.53	1.25			2.89	2.74		
Width/Depth Ratio	19.67	21.23			12.54	10.53			16.81	19.94			14.99	15.46		
Entrenchment Ratio	3.56	4.44			2.75	2.99			4.4	4.45			2.76	2.85		
Wetted Perimeter(ft	15.67	11.41			23.83	22.42			13.97	13.82			21.83	21.52		
Hydraulic radius (ft)	0.76	0.52			1.67	1.84			0.79	0.66			1.33	1.25		
Substrate									1 1							
d50 (mm)	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A		
d84 (mm)	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A		
Parameter					REACH 1 POOL 3 RIFFLE 4 POOI							DOL 4				
		RIFF	FLE 3			POO	DL 3	KEP	АСН І	RIFI	FLE 4			PO	OL 4	
														-	-	
Dimension	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3
	2006	MY1 2006		MY3 2008	2006	MY1 2006			AS BUILT 2006	MY1 2006		MY3 2008	2006	MY1 2006	-	MY3 2008
Dimension BF Width (ft) Floodprone Width (ft		MY1	MY2			MY1	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2			MY1	MY2	-
BF Width (ft) Floodprone Width (ft BF Cross Sectional	2006 12.94	MY1 2006 12.1	MY2		2006 20.75	MY1 2006 21.49	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT 2006 15.7	MY1 2006 19	MY2		2006 20.28	MY1 2006 21.29	MY2	-
BF Width (ft) Floodprone Width (ft	2006 12.94 89.67	MY1 2006 12.1 89.64	MY2		2006 20.75 61.38	MY1 2006 21.49 61.32	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT 2006 15.7 66.39	MY1 2006 19 66.2	MY2		2006 20.28 65.77	MY1 2006 21.29 65.75	MY2	-
BF Width (ft) Floodprone Width (ft BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²) BF Mean Depth (ft)	2006 12.94 89.67 9.49 0.73	MY1 2006 12.1 89.64 9.25 0.76	MY2		2006 20.75 61.38 34.09 1.64	MY1 2006 21.49 61.32 33.59 1.56	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT 2006 15.7 66.39 11.02 0.7	MY1 2006 19 66.2 13.49 0.71	MY2		2006 20.28 65.77 32.64 1.61	MY1 2006 21.29 65.75 38.77 1.82	MY2	-
BF Width (ft) Floodprone Width (ft BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²) BF Mean Depth (ft) BF Max Depth (ft)	2006 12.94 89.67 9.49 0.73 1.41	MY1 2006 12.1 89.64 9.25 0.76 1.36	MY2		2006 20.75 61.38 34.09 1.64 3.03	MY1 2006 21.49 61.32 33.59 1.56 2.83	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT 2006 15.7 66.39 11.02 0.7 1.36	MY1 2006 19 66.2 13.49 0.71 1.41	MY2		2006 20.28 65.77 32.64 1.61 2.79	MY1 2006 21.29 65.75 38.77 1.82 3.2	MY2	-
BF Width (ft) Floodprone Width (ft BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²) BF Mean Depth (ft)	2006 12.94 89.67 9.49 0.73	MY1 2006 12.1 89.64 9.25 0.76	MY2		2006 20.75 61.38 34.09 1.64	MY1 2006 21.49 61.32 33.59 1.56	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT 2006 15.7 66.39 11.02 0.7	MY1 2006 19 66.2 13.49 0.71	MY2		2006 20.28 65.77 32.64 1.61	MY1 2006 21.29 65.75 38.77 1.82	MY2	-
BF Width (ft) Floodprone Width (ft BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²) BF Mean Depth (ft) BF Max Depth (ft) Width/Depth Ratic	2006 12.94 89.67 9.49 0.73 1.41 17.73	MY1 2006 12.1 89.64 9.25 0.76 1.36 15.92	MY2		2006 20.75 61.38 34.09 1.64 3.03 12.65	MY1 2006 21.49 61.32 33.59 1.56 2.83 13.78	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT 2006 15.7 66.39 11.02 0.7 1.36 22.43	MY1 2006 19 66.2 13.49 0.71 1.41 26.76	MY2		2006 20.28 65.77 32.64 1.61 2.79 12.6	MY1 2006 21.29 65.75 38.77 1.82 3.2 11.79	MY2	-
BF Width (ft) Floodprone Width (ft BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²) BF Mean Depth (ft) BF Max Depth (ft) Width/Depth Ratic Entrenchment Ratic	2006 12.94 89.67 9.49 0.73 1.41 17.73 6.93	MY1 2006 12.1 89.64 9.25 0.76 1.36 15.92 7.41	MY2		2006 20.75 61.38 34.09 1.64 3.03 12.65 2.96	MY1 2006 21.49 61.32 33.59 1.56 2.83 13.78 2.85	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT 2006 15.7 66.39 11.02 0.7 1.36 22.43 4.23	MY1 2006 19 66.2 13.49 0.71 1.41 26.76 3.48	MY2		2006 20.28 65.77 32.64 1.61 2.79 12.6 3.24	MY1 2006 21.29 65.75 38.77 1.82 3.2 11.79 3.09	MY2	-
BF Width (ft) Floodprone Width (ft BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²) BF Mean Depth (ft) BF Max Depth (ft) Width/Depth Ratic Entrenchment Ratic Wetted Perimeter(ft	2006 12.94 89.67 9.49 0.73 1.41 17.73 6.93 13.26 0.72	MY1 2006 12.1 89.64 9.25 0.76 1.36 15.92 7.41 12.46 0.74	MY2		2006 20.75 61.38 34.09 1.64 3.03 12.65 2.96 21.78 1.57	MY1 2006 21.49 61.32 33.59 1.56 2.83 13.78 2.85 22.45 1.5	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT 2006 15.7 66.39 11.02 0.7 1.36 22.43 4.23 16.01 0.69	MY1 2006 19 66.2 13.49 0.71 1.41 26.76 3.48 19.29 0.7	MY2		2006 20.28 65.77 32.64 1.61 2.79 12.6 3.24 21.59 1.51	MY1 2006 21.29 65.75 38.77 1.82 3.2 11.79 3.09 22.97 1.69	MY2	-
BF Width (ft) Floodprone Width (ft BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²) BF Mean Depth (ft) BF Max Depth (ft) Width/Depth Ratic Entrenchment Ratic Wetted Perimeter(ft Hydraulic radius (ft)	2006 12.94 89.67 9.49 0.73 1.41 17.73 6.93 13.26	MY1 2006 12.1 89.64 9.25 0.76 1.36 15.92 7.41 12.46	MY2		2006 20.75 61.38 34.09 1.64 3.03 12.65 2.96 21.78	MY1 2006 21.49 61.32 33.59 1.56 2.83 13.78 2.85 22.45	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT 2006 15.7 66.39 11.02 0.7 1.36 22.43 4.23 16.01	MY1 2006 19 66.2 13.49 0.71 1.41 26.76 3.48 19.29	MY2		2006 20.28 65.77 32.64 1.61 2.79 12.6 3.24 21.59	MY1 2006 21.29 65.75 38.77 1.82 3.2 11.79 3.09 22.97	MY2	-

Parameter		REACH 1														
		RIFF	FLE 5			PO	OL 5			RIF	FLE 6			POO	DL 6	
Dimension	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3
	2006	2006	2007	2008	2006	2006	2007	2008	2006	2006	2007	2008	2006	2006	2007	2008
BF Width (ft)	15.63	14.32			26.27	23.03			17.01	14.54			18.59	21.11		
Floodprone Width (ft	72.27	64.56			68.23	68.53			50.57	60			60.15	62.76		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)	14.76	14.03			37.47	33.39			16	14.61			26.72	27.06		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.94	0.98			1.43	1.45			0.94	1.01			1.44	1.28		
BF Max Depth (ft)	1.67	2.27			2.75	3.08			1.56	1.49			2.83	3.14		
Width/Depth Ratio	16.63	14.61			18.37	15.88			18.1	14.4			12.91	16.49		
Entrenchment Ratio	4.62	4.51			2.6	2.98			2.97	4.13			3.24	2.97		
Wetted Perimeter(ft	16.14	15.28			27.26	24.24			17.42	15			20.27	22.27		
Hydraulic radius (ft)	0.91	0.92			1.37	1.38			0.92	0.97			1.32	1.21		
Substrate																
d50 (mm)	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A		
d84 (mm)	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A		

Parameter	REACH 1												
		RIF	FLE 7			POO	DL 7						
Dimension	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3					
	2006	2006	2007	2008	2006	2006	2007	2008					
BF Width (ft)	19.48	16.96			22.66	22.31							
Floodprone Width (ft)	50	50			51.23	55							
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)		15.49			42.08	38.22							
BF Mean Depth (ft)		0.91			1.86	1.71							
BF Max Depth (ft)	2.04	1.61			3.47	3.06							
Width/Depth Ratio	21.17	18.64			12.18	13.03							
Entrenchment Ratio	2.57	2.95			2.26	2.46							
Wetted Perimeter(ft	20.08	17.38			23.91	24.11							
Hydraulic radius (ft)	0.89	0.89			1.76	1.59							
Substrate													
d50 (mm)	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A							
d84 (mm)	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A							

Parameter	As-built (2006)			Ν	MY-1 (2006	j)	1	MY-2 (2007	7)	Ν	MY-3 (2008)			
D 11				10						10				

Pattern	Min	Max	Avg	Min	Max	Avg	Min	Max	Avg	Min	Max	Avg
Channel Beltwidth (ft	59.32	93.89	72.85	58.48	96.38	71.67						
Radius of Curvature (ft)	16.64	40.88	25.73	16.84	39.51	24.43						
Meander Wavelength (ft)	77.08	117.13	94.8	76.54	118.26	91.85						
Meander Width ratio	3.7	5.86	4.55	3.56	5.72	4.65						
Profile												
Riffle length (ft)	25.87	54.2	37.85	19.31	54.86	30.86						
Riffle slope (ft/ft)	0.00092	0.0187	0.0062	0.00125	0.01763	0.00883						
Pool length (ft)	7.41	244.47	23.01	14.19	31.92	24.11						
Pool Slope (ft/ft)	0.0007	0.0064	0.0016	0.0007	0.0029	0.0012						
Pool spacing (ft)	12.35	142	70.94	52.58	159	88.05						
Additional Reach Parameters												
Valley Length (ft		4258.3			4258.3							
Channel Length (ft		5813.3			5813.3							
Sinuosity		1.36			1.36							
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)		0.00544			0.00544							
BF slope (ft/ft)		0.00544			0.00544							
Rosgen Classification		C4			C4							
Habitat Index*		N/A			N/A					İ		
Macrobenthos*		N/A			N/A							

Parameter								REA	ACH 2								
		RIFF	FLE 1		POOL 1				RIFFLE 2					POOL 2			
									I								
Dimension	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3	AS BUILT	MY1	MY2	MY3	
	2006	2006	2007	2008	2006	2006	2007	2008	2006	2006	2007	2008	2006	2006	2007	2008	
BF Width (ft)	7.38	7.61			18.44	17.46			8.21	7.6			9.59	10.03			
Floodprone Width (ft	23.08	26.25			46.7	46.7			39.05	26.17			54.65	51.62			
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)		4.65			19.78	18.94			6.77	4.86			17.34	16.04			
BF Mean Depth (ft)		0.61			1.07	10.9			0.82	0.64			1.81	1.6			
BF Max Depth (ft)	0.86	0.98			2.6	2.64			1.3	1.19			3.2	2.88			
Width/Depth Ratio	13.18	12.48			17.23	16.02			10.01	11.88			5.3	6.27			
Entrenchment Ratio	3.13	1.84			2.53	2.67			4.76	3.44			5.7	5.15			
Wetted Perimeter(ft)	7.68	7.92			20.58	19.14			8.77	8.01			12.14	11.79			
Hydraulic radius (ft)	0.54	0.59			0.96	0.99			0.77	0.61			1.43	1.37			
Substrate																	
d50 (mm)	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A			
d84 (mm)	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A		I	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A			

Parameter	A	s-built (200)6)	1	MY-1 (2006	5)		MY-2 (2007	7)	1	MY-3 (2008)
Pattern	Min	Max	Avg	Min	Max	Avg	Min	Max	Avg	Min	Max	Avg
Channel Beltwidth (ft	11.83	22.05	16.96	11.56	23.13	17.05						
Radius of Curvature (ft)	4.63	9.1	6.43	4.776	9.84	6.32						
Meander Wavelength (ft)	27.51	34.72	31.75	28.61	35.43	32.47						
Meander Width ratio	1.52	2.83	2.17	1.43	2.94	2.33						
Profile												
Riffle length (ft)	3.36	11.6	5.6	4.93	7.24	5.88						
Riffle slope (ft/ft)	0.0053	0.0555	0.0279	0.0045	0.0393	0.1073						
Pool length (ft)	5.2	10.08	7.59	5.17	8.67	14.37						
Pool Slope (ft/ft)	0.001	0.0092	0.0022	0.00087	0.00754	0.00253						
Pool spacing (ft)	9.43	28.94	19.51	14.65	21.98	35.31						
Additional Reach Parameters												
Valley Length (ft)		1872.37			1872.37							
Channel Length (ft)		2190.67			2190.67							
Sinuosity		1.2			1.2							
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)		0.025			0.025							
BF slope (ft/ft)		0.025			0.025							
Rosgen Classification		B4			B4							
Habitat Index*		N/A			N/A							
Macrobenthos*		N/A			N/A							

Gray Farm Stream Restoration Site Year 1 Monitoring March 2007

IV. Methodology Section

No deviations from initially prescribed methodologies were implemented as a part of monitoring Year 1 (2006) activities.



APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A -

Vegetation Survey Data Tables

Table 1. - Vegetation Metadata

Report Prepared By	David Ingersoll
Date Prepared	12/20/2006 9:37

 database name
 CVS_EEP_DataEntry_v202.mdb

 database location
 \\Sec5\secdavidi\EEP Guidelines\CVS-EEP-Veg Monitoring Protocols\CVS_EEP_DataEntry_v202

DESCRIPTION OF WORKSHEETS IN THIS DOCUMENT------

Metadata	This worksheet, which is a summary of the project and the project data.
Plots	List of plots surveyed.
Vigor	Frequency distribution of vigor classes.
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.
Stem Count by Plot and Spp	Count of living stems of each species for each plot; dead and missing stems are excluded.

PROJECT SUMMARY-----

Project Code	project Name	Description	length (ft)
GFR1	Gray Farm Reach 1	Gray Farm stream restoration - Reach 1	
GFR2	Gray Farm Reach 2	Gray Farm stream restoration - Reach 2	
stream-to-edge width (ft)	area (sq m)	Required Plots (calculated)	Sampled Plots
			4
			2

Table 2	- Vegetation	Vigor	bv	Species
1 uoie 2.	, egotation	1 1 5 01	0,	Species

	Species	4	3	2	1	0	Missing
	Alnus serrulata		6				
	Betula nigra	1	4				
	Cornus amomum			3			
	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	1	5	1			
	Quercus michauxii		1				
	Quercus nigra		6	1			
	Quercus phellos		1	8			
	Viburnum nudum		1				
	Viburnum			1			
	llex opaca	3	2	1			
	Carpinus caroliniana			1			
	Quercus	1	6	6			
	Lindera benzoin		2	2			
	Liriodendron tulipifera	1	4				
	Platanus occidentalis	1	16	10			
TOT:	15	8	54	34			

Table 3. – Vegetation Damage by Species

	Species	All Damage Categories	(no damage)	Insects	Unknown	Vine Strangulation	(other damage)
	Alnus serrulata	6	6				
	Betula nigra	5	5				
	Carpinus caroliniana	1	1				
	Cornus amomum	3	3				
	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	7	6			1	
	llex opaca	6	6				
	Lindera benzoin	4	4				
	Liriodendron tulipifera	5	5				
	Platanus occidentalis	27	20	6			1
	Quercus	13	13				
	Quercus michauxii	1	1				
	Quercus nigra	7	6	1			
	Quercus phellos	9	7		2		
	Viburnum	1	1				
	Viburnum nudum	1	1				
TOT:	15	96	85	7	2	1	1

	plot	All Damage Categories	(no damage)	Insects	Unknown	Vine Strangulation	(other damage)
	GFR1-01-buffer1	17	14		2	1	
	GFR1-01-buffer2	15	14				1
	GFR1-01-buffer3	15	15				
	GFR1-01-buffer4	11	7	4			
	GFR2-01-Buffer1	23	21	2			
	GFR2-01-Buffer2	15	14	1			
TOT:	6	96	85	7	2	1	1

Table 4. – Vegetation Damage by Plot

Table 5. – Stem Count by Plot and Species

	Species	Total Stems	# plots	avg# stems	plot GFR1- 01- buffer1	plot GFR1- 01- buffer2	plot GFR1- 01- buffer3	plot GFR1- 01- buffer4	plot GFR2- 01- Buffer1	plot GFR2- 01- Buffer2
	Alnus serrulata	6	3	2	3	2				1
	Betula nigra	5	3	1.67			2	2	1	
	Carpinus caroliniana	1	1	1					1	
	Cornus amomum	3	2	1.5			1	2		
	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	7	4	1.75	2	3	1		1	
	llex opaca	6	4	1.5	1	1	2		2	
	Lindera benzoin	4	2	2		1			3	
	Liriodendron tulipifera	5	1	5						5
	Platanus occidentalis	27	6	4.5	3	3	9	7	4	1
	Quercus	13	3	4.33	2				4	7
	Quercus michauxii	1	1	1		1				
	Quercus nigra	7	3	2.33	3	3				1
	Quercus phellos	9	2	4.5	2				7	
	Viburnum	1	1	1		1				
	Viburnum nudum	1	1	1	1					
TOT:	15	96	15		17	15	15	11	23	15

	Exhibit Table 6. Vegetat	ive Problem Areas					
	Reach	1					
Feature/Issue	Station # / Range Probable Cause						
Bare Flood Plain	5+10 - 5+50	Surface flow					
	6+60 - 7+00	Surface flow	1				
	51+50 - 52+75	Surface flow					
	Reach	2					
Feature/Issue	Station # / Range	Probable Cause	Photo #				
Bare Flood Plain	2+40 - 2+65	Poor soil quality	2				
	2+75 - 3+15	Poor soil quality	2				

APPENDIX A -

Vegetation Problem Area Photos



Typical Bare Bench/Floodplain—Reach 1—Year 1 (2006)



Typical Bare Floodplain—Reach 2—Year 1 (2006)

APPENDIX A -

Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos



Vegetation Monitoring Plot—Reach 1—Buffer 1—Year 1 (2006)



Vegetation Monitoring Plot—Reach 1—Buffer 2—Year 1 (2006)



Vegetation Monitoring Plot—Reach 1—Buffer 3—Year 1 (2006)



Vegetation Monitoring Plot—Reach 1—Buffer 4—Year 1 (2006)



Vegetation Monitoring Plot-Reach 1-Bank 1-Year 1 (2006)



Vegetation Monitoring Plot-Reach 1-Bank 2-Year 1 (2006)



Vegetation Monitoring Plot—Reach 2—Buffer 1—Year 1 (2006)



Vegetation Monitoring Plot-Reach 2-Buffer 2-Year 1 (2006)



Vegetation Monitoring Plot—Reach 2—Bank 1—Year 1 (2006)



Vegetation Monitoring Plot-Reach 2-Bank 2-Year 1 (2006)

APPENDIX B
Stream Problem Area Table

Exhibit Table B1a - Stream Problem Areas Gray Farm Stream and Wetland Restoration Site/EEP Project #XXXXX Reach 1				
Feature Issue	Station numbers	Suspected Cause	Photo number	
Bank Scour	5+30	Surface flow		
	6+85	Surface flow		
	41+30	Downcutting Left Bank	1	
	41+30	Downcutting Right Bank		
	48+75	Structure geometry incorrect		

Exhibit Table B1b - Stream Problem Areas Gray Farm Stream and Wetland Restoration Site/EEP Project #XXXXX Reach 2					
Feature Issue	Station numbers	Suspected Cause	Photo number		
Bank Scour	17+60	Stressed structure – rock shift	2		
Structures	17+60	Stressed structure - rock shift	Z		

Representative Stream Problem Area Photos



Typical Bank Scour—Reach —Year 1 (2006)



Typical Stressed Structure/Bank Scour—Reach 2—Year 1 (2006)

Stream Photo Point Photos



Cross-Section 1—Reach 1—Riffle 1—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 1—Reach 1—Riffle 1—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 1—Reach 1—Pool 1—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 1—Reach 1—Pool 1—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 2—Reach 1—Riffle 2—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 2—Reach 1—Riffle 2—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 2—Reach 1—Pool 2—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 2-Reach 1 - Pool 2-Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 3—Reach 1—Riffle 3—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 3—Reach 1—Riffle 3—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 3—Reach 1—Pool 3—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 3—Reach 1 - Pool 3—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 4—Reach 1—Riffle 4—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 4—Reach 1—Riffle 4—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 4—Reach 1—Pool 4—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 4—Reach 1—Pool 4—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 5—Reach 1—Riffle 5—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 5—Reach 1—Riffle 5—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 5—Reach 1—Pool 5—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 5—Reach 1—Pool 5—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 6—Reach 1—Riffle 6—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 6—Reach 1—Riffle 6—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 6—Reach 1—Pool 6—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 6—Reach 1—Pool 6—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 7—Reach 1—Riffle 7—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 7—Reach 1—Riffle 7—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 7—Reach 1—Pool 7—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 7—Reach 1—Pool 7—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 1—Reach 2—Riffle 1—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 1—Reach 2—Riffle 1—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 1—Reach 2—Pool 1—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 1—Reach 2—Pool 1—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 2—Reach 2—Riffle 2—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 2—Reach 2—Riffle 2—Year 1 (2006)



Cross-Section 2—Reach 2—Pool 2—As-Built (2006)



Cross-Section 2—Reach 2—Pool 2—Year 1 (2006)

Exhibit Table B.1. Qualitative Visual Stability Assessment

Table B2. Qualitative Visual Stability AssessmentDate: NOVEMBER 27, 2006GRAY FARM STREAM RESTORATION - REACH 1

Project # 9385.D7

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	% perfor. in stable condition	Feature Perform. Mean or Total
A. Riffles	1. Present?	34	34	NA	100%	
	2. Armor stable (e.g. no displacement)?	34	34	NA	100%	
	3. Facet grade appears stable?	33	34	NA	97%	
	4. Stable interval grade?	34	34	NA	100%	
	5. Feature spacing appropriate?	34	34	NA	100%	
	6. Minimal evidence of embedding/fining?	34	34	NA	100%	
	7. Depth appears appropriate for current discharge?	34	34	NA	100%	
	8. Length appropriate?	34	34	NA	100%	100%
B. Pools	1. Present? (e.g. not subject to severe aggradation?)	49	49	NA	100%	
5.1 0010	2. Sufficiently deep (Max Pool D:Mean Bkf>1.6)	49	49	NA		
5. Pools 5. Thalweg 9. Meanders	3. Thalweg located outer bend?	49	49	NA		
	4. Spacing appropriate?	49	49	NA		
	5. Non-aggrading (not filling)?	49	49	NA		
	6. Length appropriate?	49	49	NA	100%	100%
	1. Upstream of meander bend (run/inflection) centering?	34	34	NA	100%	
C. Malwey	2. Downstream of meander (glide/inflection) centering?	33	34	NA		99%
			-	1		0070
D. Meanders	1. Outer bend in state of limited/controlled erosion?	49	49	NA		
	2. Of those eroding, # w/ concomitant point bar formation?	N/A	49	NA	-	
	3. Apparent Rc within spec?	49	49	NA		
	4. Sufficient floodplain access and relief?	49	49	NA	100%	100%
E. Bed General	1. General channel bed aggradation areas (bar formation)	NA	NA	250	93%	
	2. Channel bed degradation - areas of increasing down	NA	NA	70	98%	96%
	cutting or head cutting?				0070	
G. Banks	1. Apparent scour points from channel processes	NA	NA	0	100%	
	Apparent cut points from overland flow	NA	NA	100	97%	
	3. Apparent cut or scour from flood water re-entry to channel (e.g. inadequate floodplain access?)	NA	NA	0	IA 100% IA 100%	
	4. Tension cracks	NA	NA	0	100%	
	5. Bank gradient in excess of 40%?	NA	NA	0	100%	
	6. Collapse/slumping	NA	NA	0	100%	
	7. Ratio of bank height: bankfull height elevated	NA	NA	0	100%	100%
H. Vanes	1. Free of back or arm scour?	28	28	N/A	100%	
	2. Height appropriate?	28	28	N/A		
	3. Angle and geometry appear appropriate?	20	28	N/A		
	4. Free of piping or other structural failures?	28	28	N/A		99%
L Mada/Revidera			0	•		
I. Wads/Boulders	1. Free of scour?	0		N/A	N/A	

Notes:

Table B2. Qualitative Visual Stability AssessmentDate: NOVEMBER 27, 2006GRAY FARM STREAM RESTORATION - REACH 2

Project # 9385.D7

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	% perfor. in stable condition	Feature Perform. Mean or Total
A. Riffles	1. Present?	51	51	NA	100%	
	2. Armor stable (e.g. no displacement)?	51	51	NA	100%	
	3. Facet grade appears stable?	51	51	NA	100%	
	4. Stable interval grade?	51	51	NA	100%	
	5. Feature spacing appropriate?	51	51	NA	100%	
	6. Minimal evidence of embedding/fining?	51	51	NA	100%	
	7. Depth appears appropriate for current discharge?	51	51	NA	100%	
	8. Length appropriate?	51	51	NA	100%	100%
B. Pools	1. Present? (e.g. not subject to severe aggradation?)	52	52	NA	100%	
	2. Suffieciently deep (Max Pool D:Mean Bkf>1.6)	52	52	NA	100%	
1	3. Thalweg located outer bend?	52	52	NA	100%	
	4. Spacing appropriate?	52	52	NA	N/A	
	5. Non-aggrading (not filling)?	52	52	NA	100%	
	6. Length appropriate?	52	52	NA	N/A	100%
C. Thalweg	1. Upstream of meander bend (run/inflection) centering?	51	51	NA	100%	
5	2. Downstream of meander (glide/inflection) centering?		100%	100%		
D. Meanders	1. Outer bend in state of limited/controlled erosion?	51	52	NA	98%	
	2. Of those eroding, # w/ concomitant point bar formation?	N/A	N/A	NA	N/A	
	3. Apparent Rc within spec?	52	52	NA	100%	
	4. Sufficient floodplain access and relief?	52	52	NA	100%	99%
E. Bed General	1. General channel bed aggradation areas (bar formation)	NA	NA	0	100%	
	2. Channel bed degradation - areas of increasing down	NA	NA	0	100%	100%
	cutting or head cutting?			-		
G. Banks	1. Apparent scour points from channel processes	NA	NA	20	98%	
	2. Apparent cut points from overland flow	NA	NA	0	100%	
	3. Apparent cut or scour from flood water re-entry to channel (e.g. inadequate floodplain access?)	NA	NA	0	A 100% A 100% A 98% A N/A A 100% A 100%	
	4. Tension cracks	NA	NA	0	100%	
	5. Bank gradient in excess of 40%?	NA	NA	0	100%	
	6. Collapse/slumping	NA	NA	0	100%	
	7. Ratio of bank height: bankfull height elevated	NA	NA	0	100%	100%
H. Vanes	1. Free of back or arm scour?	52	53	NA	98%	
	2. Height appropriate?	53	53	NA	100%	
	3. Angle and geometry appear appropriate?	52	53	NA	98%	
	4. Free of piping or other structural failures?	52	53	NA	98%	99%
I. Wads/Boulders	1. Free of scour?	0	0	NA	N/A	
	2. Footing stable?	0	0	NA	N/A	N/A

Notes:

Annual Overlays of Cross Section Plots




















📥 Year I 🔶 As Built







GRAY FARM STREAM RESTORATION

GRAY FARM STREAM RESTORATION REACH 1 - CROSS-SECTION 7 (POOL) (STA. 54+45)











APPENDIX B -

Annual Overlays of Longitudinal Plots

GRAY FARM STREAM RESTORATION REACH I - LONGITUDINAL PROFILE (STA. 0+00 TO 18+70)



GRAY FARM STREAM RESTORATION REACH I - LONGITUDINAL PROFILE (STA. 37+50 TO 55+50)



–– Year I 🔶 As-Built –– Bankfull

GRAY FARM STREAM RESTORATION REACH 2 - LONGITUDINAL PROFILE (STA. 4+65 TO 10+65)



10+65

GRAY FARM STREAM RESTORATION REACH 2 - LONGITUDINAL PROFILE (STA. 15+68 TO 20+18)



APPENDIX B -

Annual Overlays of pebble count frequency distribution plots



Pebble Count, Gray Farm Reach 1



Pebble Count, Gray Farm Reach 2

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C –

Integrated Problem Area Plan View















Sec\Jobs7-9k\9385.D7\DRAWING5\Year 1\REACH I-Gray Farm Mont.and PAPV-Year 1.dv



REVISIONS DATE ATR. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	S& EC	Soil & Environmental Consultants, PA 11010 Raven Ridge Road • Raleigh, North Carolina 27614 • Phone: (919) 846-5900 • Fax: (919) 846-9467 www.SandEC.com	Project: GRAY FARM STREAM RESTORATION YEAR I MONITORING Project No.: 9385.D7 Icoation: Operation Proj. Mgr.: IREDELL CO., NC Client: NC ECOSYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM Scale: I" = 50' Sheet Title: Sheet No.: REACH I PROBLEM AREA PLAN VIEW - A G OF I G



50 25

0

50



File: Sec\Jobs7-9k\9385.D7\DRAWINGS\Year 1\REACH 1-Gray Farm Mont.and PAPV-Year 1.dwg



































