FINAL MONITORING REPORT YEAR 1 of 5

Green Valley Farm Site Riparian Buffer Restoration EEP Project ID Number 003994-EEP Site 95012

> Randolph County, North Carolina Cape Fear River Basin HUC 03030003010070



Submitted to:



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

Construction Completed:June 2012Data Collection Period:September 2013Submission Date:December 2013

Provided by:



Environmental Banc & Exchange 909 Capability Drive, Suite 3100 Raleigh, NC 27606 919-829-9909



WK Dickson & Co., Inc. 720 Corporate Center Drive Raleigh, NC 27607 919-782-0495

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
1
1
2
2
2
4

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Project Vicinity Map and Background Tables

Figure 1	Vicinity Map
Table 1	Project Restoration Components
Table 2	Project Activity and Reporting History
Table 3	Project Contacts
Table 4	Project Attributes

Appendix B. Visual Assessment Data

Figure 2	Current Condition Plan View (CCPV)
Table 5	Vegetation Condition Assessment Table
e-Table	Vegetation Problem Area Inventory Table
Photos	Vegetation Plot Photos
e-Photos	Vegetation Problem Area Photos

Appendix C. Vegetation Plot Data

Table 6	Riparian Buffer Vegetation Totals
Table 7	CVS Stem Count Total and Planted with/without Livestakes by Plot and Species
e-Tables	Raw CVS vegetation data sheets

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY / PROJECT ABSTRACT

1.1 Project Goals and Objectives

The Green Valley Buffer Mitigation Project is located in the 03030003 Catalog Unit (CU), in the Cape Fear River Basin. Assets of this CU include the Deep River, the Randleman Reservoir, and major communities including High Point, Asheboro, Siler City, and Sanford. Restoration goals for CU 03030003 as identified in the 2009 Cape Fear River Basin RBRP include protection of several species of mussel and the Cape Fear Shiner. Additional goals include the improvement in water quality to waters draining to Randleman Reservoir.

The Green Valley Buffer Mitigation Project was identified as an opportunity to improve water quality and habitat within the CU. The project goals address stressors identified in the CU. The following table lists the project goals and the project objectives through which the goals will be addressed:

Goals	Objectives
 Nutrient removal Sediment removal 	• Restore minimum 50-foot riparian buffer by planting appropriate bottomland hardwood species to filter runoff.
 Sediment removal Runoff filtration 	• Convert active farm fields to forested buffers.
4. Increase dissolved oxygen concentration	Plant buffer vegetation to shade channel.Restore riparian buffer habitat to appropriate bottomland
5. Restore riparian habitats	hardwood ecosystem.
6. Reduce water temperature	 Restore canopy tree species in the stream buffer areas to shade channel.
	 Eliminate and control exotic invasive species.
	• Replace three (two culverts and one ford) undersized and/or failing channel crossings with appropriately sized
	structures.

1.2 Project Background

The Green Valley Farms Riparian Buffer Mitigation Site is located on Hockett Dairy Road (SR 1938) in Randolph County approximately 12 miles north of Asheboro, NC (**Figure 1**). The site is located in the Cape Fear River Basin within Cataloging Unit 03030003010070 (NCDWQ sub-basin 03-06-08). The site has four unnamed tributaries (UT) that drain into Randleman Lake. The proposed project will result in 8.74 to 9.6 acres of buffer restoration. The upper 400 linear feet of UT 4, which account for the 0.86-acre difference in the buffer restoration acreage range, are not subject to the Randleman Buffer Rules. It is anticipated that performing buffer restoration along the entire length of UT 4 (590 linear feet) will result in a defined channel within the five-year monitoring period, and that the Site will ultimately yield the full 9.6 acres of buffer restoration.

The project site is located in the Piedmont Physiographic Province and in the Carolina Slate Belt. The region is underlain by felsic metavolcanic rocks, which can be seen in the streambed of UT 1 and UT 3. The topography of the project area is generally rolling with elevations ranging from 670 to 760 feet (**Figure 2**). The four unnamed tributaries to Randleman Lake comprise the principle drainage features. The project's watershed is primarily used for agricultural production. Much of the site is currently used for row crop production for dairy silage. These tributaries have limited hardwood trees present within the buffer and lack significant ground cover. The mature trees have a density of less than 100 stems per acre. The project area has been in agricultural use for several decades (**Figure 3**).

The Green Valley Farms mitigation project offers an opportunity for high quality riparian buffer restoration. Stream buffer mitigation for the Green Valley Farms Site involves buffering four streams that flow directly and indirectly into Randleman Lake. The mitigation design divides the site into four distinct reaches (**Figure 6**). Buffer restoration is proposed along all four channels. Three existing farm access crossings will be upgraded and stabilized to prevent erosion.

1.3 Vegetation Condition

The measure of vegetative success for the site is the survival of at least 320 five-year old planted trees per acre at the end of year five of the monitoring period. Year 1 monitoring recorded an average of 625 stems per acre across all vegetation plots. Most plots had a high rate of mortality. In particular, Plots 7, 8, and 10 each had less than 300 stems per acre in Year 1. Other vegetation issues included invasive species and burned vegetation within the easement. Invasive grass (Johnsongrass, *Sorghum halepense*) was common and problematic across the entire site. Additionally, Plot 3 had a high density of morning glory vines that caused several trees to be bent over. Plot 10 had been burned and will need to be re-established. No volunteer stems were observed during Year 1 monitoring activities. CVS Level 2 will be performed in monitoring Year 2 to document any volunteer generation. Overall, vegetation across the site is in fair to poor condition. Due to the vegetation condition and the widespread invasive species problem, the site is scheduled to be re-planted in February 2014. The Current Condition Plan View is provided in **Appendix B**, **Figure 2**.

1.4 Summary Information / Data

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

2.0 METHODOLOGY

In order to determine if the success criteria are achieved and the planted areas are developing toward the target community, NCEEP-CVS Protocol for Recording Vegetation Version 4.2 will be utilized. The vegetation monitoring will include Level I and Level II plots distributed across the planted area. An interim vegetation monitoring will occur in spring after leaf-out has occurred. The CVS monitoring will be conducted toward the end of the growing season. Individual plot data will be provided to NCEEP and CVS following NCEEP-CVS guidance. The annual monitoring requirements are summarized in the following table:

Required	Parameter	Quantity	Frequency	Notes	
		11 Plots		Vegetation will be monitored using the	
X	Vegetation	Located randomly	Annual	Carolina Vegetation Survey (CVS) protocols	
		across the project area		(Level I & Level II)	
	Exotic and			Exotic vegetation will be evaluated and spot	
Х	nuisance	N/A	Semi-Annual	treatment applied as needed	
	vegetation			treatment applied as needed	
	Project			Locations of fence damage, vegetation	
Х	5	N/A	Semi-annual	damage, boundary encroachments, etc. will be	
	boundary			mapped	

Photographs will be used to visually document restoration success. Reference photos will be taken once a year and will be used to visually document restoration success. Reference photo stations are marked with wooden stakes. Reference stations will be photographed immediately following planting and continued annually for at least five years following construction. Photographers will make every effort to maintain the same area in each photo over time. Photographs will be used to subjectively evaluate vegetation establishment. A series of photos over time should indicate successional maturation of riparian vegetation.

3.0 REFERENCES

Lindenmayer, D.B., and J.F. Franklin. (2002), *Conserving forest biodiversity: A comprehensive multiscaled approach*. Island Press, Washington, DC.

N.C. Department of Environment and Natural Resources Ecosystem Enhancement Program. 2004. *Guidelines for Riparian Buffer Restoration*. Available online at http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/eep/process-and-protocol.

N.C. Department of Environment and Natural Resources. 2005. "Basinwide Planning Program : October 2005 Cape Fear River Basinwide Water Quality Plan." October 2005. Available online at http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wq/ps. [Accessed 01 February 2012].

N.C. Department of Environment and Natural Resources Ecosystem Enhancement Program. 2012. *Procedural Guidance and Content Requirements for EEP Monitoring Reports*. Available online at http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/eep/fd-forms-templates.

N.C. Division of Water Quality. 2010. Methodology for Identification of Intermittent and Perennial Streams and their Origins, Version 4.11. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Water Quality. Raleigh, NC.

Peet, R.K., Wentworth, T.S., and White, P.S. (1998), *A flexible, multipurpose method for recording vegetation composition and structure*. Castanea 63:262-274

Radford, A.E., H.E. Ahles and F.R. Bell. 1968. Manual of the Vascular Flora of the Carolinas. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Schafale, M.P. and Weakley, A. S. (1990), *Classification of the Natural Communities of North Carolina, Third Approximation*, NC Natural Heritage Program, Raleigh, NC

United States Geological Survey. 1982. 7.5 Minute Topographic Map, Pleasant Garden, NC.

Young, T.F. and Sanzone, S. (editors). (2002), *A framework for assessing and reporting on ecological condition*. Ecological Reporting Panel, Ecological Processes and Effects Committee. EPA Science Advisory Board. Washington, DC.

Appendix A

Project Vicinity Map and Background Tables



	Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation CreditsGreen Valley, Randolph CountyEEP Project ID Number 003994-EEP Site 95012													
						N	litigation (Credits						
	StreamRiparian WetlandNon-riparian WetlandBufferNitrogen NutrientPhosphorousOffsetNutrient Offset									1				
Туре	N/A	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Re	storation		N/A	N/A		
Totals*	N/A	4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8.74 A	.c. to 9.6 Ac.		N/A	N/A		
						Рі	oject Com							
Reach II	D		tationing Location		xisting Foot (LF)	tage	Approac (PI, PII, et	h	Restoration -or- Restoration Equivalent Restoration Area (acres)		Mitigation Ratio			
Reach U	Reach UT1		N/A		N/A		2,450		N/A		Buffer		3.51	1:1
Reach U	Reach UT2		N/A		1,156		N/A		N/A		Buffer		2.65	1:1
Reach U	Reach UT3		N/A		1,105		N/A		Buffer		2.30	1:1		
Reach U	ch UT4* N/A		Reach UT4*		N/A	N/A)	N/A		Buffer		0.28 to 1.14	1:1
Component Summation														
Restorat	ration Level				Riparian Riverine		verine	Non-Riparian Buffer Up Wetland (acres) (acres)			Upland (acres)			
Restorat	ion*		N	I/A	N/	Ά	N/	A	N/A		8.74 to 9.60	N/A		

*Currently, the upper 400 LF of UT4 is not subject to the Randleman Buffer Rules; however, the lower 190 LF is subject to the buffer rules and consists of 0.28 acres of proposed buffer restoration. It is anticipated that performing buffer restoration along the entire reach (590 LF) will result in a defined channel within the 5-year monitoring period and ultimately yield 1.14 acres of buffer restoration.

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting HistoryGreen Valley, Randolph CountyEEP Project ID Number 003994-EEP Site 95012								
Elapsed time since planting complete: 1 year, 4 months								
Number of reporting years:	1							
Activity or Report	Data Collection							
F	Complete	Completion or Delivery						
Mitigation Plan	January 2012	May 2012						
Final Design - Construction Plans	N/A	May 2012						
Construction	N/A	October 2012						
Temporary S&E mix applied to project area	N/A	June 2012						
Permanent seed mix applied to project area	N/A	June 2012						
Containerized and B&B plantings planted in project area	N/A	June 2012						
Baseline Monitoring Document (Year 0 Monitoring - baseline)	June 2012	May 2013						
Replanting	N/A	February 2014*						
Year 1 Monitoring	October 2013	October 2013						
Year 2 Monitoring	Fall 2014*	Fall 2014*						
Year 3 Monitoring	Fall 2015*	Fall 2015*						
Year 4 Monitoring	Fall 2016*	Fall 2016*						
Year 5 Monitoring	Fall 2017*	Fall 2017*						
*scheduled								

Table 3. Project Contact Table Green Valley, Randolph County EEP Project ID Number 003994-EEP Site 95012					
Designer WK Dickson & Co., Inc.					
Primary project design POC	Daniel Ingram - (919) 782-0495				
Construction Contractor	KBS Earthworks				
Construction contractor POC Kory Strader - (336) 362-0289					
Planting Contractor Taylors Lawn and Landscape					
Planting contractor POC Brant Taylor - (919) 606-2431					
Seeding Contractor	Taylors Lawn and Landscape				
Planting contractor POC	Brant Taylor - (919) 606-2431				
Seed Mix Sources	Evergreen Seed, Inc				
Nursery Stock Suppliers ArborGen					
Monitoring Performers WK Dickson & Co., Inc.					
Vegetation Monitoring POC	Daniel Ingram - (919) 782-0495				

Table 4. Project Baseline Information and AttributesGreen Valley, Randolph CountyEEP Project ID Number 003994-EEP Site 95012				
Proj	ect Information			
Project Name	Green Valley Farm Site - Riparian Buffer Restoration			
County	Randolph			
Project Area (acres)	11.45			
Project Coordinates (latitude and longitude)	35° 54' 17.672" N, 79° 50' 3.490" W			
Project Waters	shed Summary Information			
Physiographic Province	Piedmont Physiographic Province			
River Basin	Cape Fear River Basin			
USGS Hydrologic Unit 8-digit	03030003			
USGS Hydrologic Unit 14-digit	03030003010070			
DWQ Sub-basin	03-06-08			
Project Drainage Area (acres)	389.1			
Project Drainage Area Percentage of	1%			
Impervious Area	1 /0			
	1.01 Residential			
	2.01 Cropland and Pasture			
CGIA Land Use Classification	2.03 Confined Animal Operations			
	2.99 Other Agricultural Land			
	3.02 Passively Managed Forest Stands			

	Green Valle	seline Information ar ey, Randolph County ber 003994-EEP Site		
Parameters	Reach UT1	Reach UT2	Reach UT3	Reach UT4*
Length of reach (linear feet)	2,450	1,156	1,105	190 to 590
Valley Classification	Х	Х	Х	Х
Drainage area (acres)	221	18.5	64	19.4
NCDWQ stream identification score	38	20.5	23	26
NCDWQ Water Quality Classification	WS-IV;CA	WS-IV;CA	WS-IV;CA	WS-IV;CA
Morphological Description (stream type)	С	С	С	С
Evolutionary trend	Stable	Stable	Stable	Stable
Underlying mapped soils	Chewacla loam ChA	Mecklenburg CL MeC2, Wynott- Enon complex WvC2	Wynott-Enon complex WtC	Wynott-Enon complex WtC
Drainage class	somewhat poorly drained	well drained	well drained	well drained
Soil Hydric status	Non-hydric	Non-hydric	Non-hydric	Non-hydric
Slope (ft/ft)	0.002	0.024	0.014	0.010
FEMA classification	Zone AE	Zone AE	Zone AE	N/A
Native vegetation community	Cultivated	Cultivated	Cultivated	Cultivated
Percent composition of exotic invasive vegetation	<1%	<1%	<1%	<1%
	Regulato	ry Considerations		
Regulation	U U	Applicable	Resolved	Supporting Documentation
Waters of the United States - S	ection 404	Yes	Yes	see Mitigation Plan
Waters of the United States - S	ection 401	Yes	Yes	see Mitigation Plan
Endangered Species Act		Yes	Yes	see Mitigation Plan
Historic Preservation Act		Yes	Yes	see Mitigation Plan
Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA)/Coastal Area Management Act (CAMA)		No	N/A	N/A
FEMA Floodplain Compliance		No	N/A	N/A
Essential Fisheries Habitat		No	N/A	N/A

Appendix B

Visual Assessment Data



Table 5. Vegetation Condition Assessment Green Valley, Randolph County									
	EEP Project ID Number 003994-EEP Site 95012								
Planted Acreage: Vegetation Category	11.45 Definitions	Mapping Threshold	CCPV Depiction	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Planted Acreage			
1. Bare Areas	Very limited cover of both woody and herbacious material.	0.1 acres	N/A	0	0.00	0%			
2. Low Stem Density Areas	Woody stem densities clearly below target levels based on MY3, 4, or 5 stem count criteria.	0.1 acres	vertical yellow line fill	2	2.93	26%			
3. Areas of Poor Growth	Areas with woody stems of a size that are	[Total:	2	2.93	26%			
Rates or Vigor	obviously small given the monitoring year.	0.25 acres	N/A	0	0.00	0%			
8		Cur	mulative Total:	2	2.93	26%			
Easement Acreage:	11.45								
Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold	CCPV Depiction	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Planted Acreage			
4. Invasive Areas of Concern	Areas or points (if too small to render as polygons at map scale)	1000 SF	horizontal red line fill	4	11.45	100%			
5. Easement Encroachment Areas	Areas or points (if too small to render as polygons at map scale)	none	N/A	0	0.00	0%			

Vegetation Plot Photos



Vegetation Plot 1



Vegetation Plot 3



Vegetation Plot 5



Vegetation Plot 2



Vegetation Plot 4



Vegetation Plot 6



Vegetation Plot 7



Vegetation Plot 9



Vegetation Plot 8



Vegetation Plot 10



Vegetation Plot 11

Appendix C

Vegetation Plot Data

Table 6. Riparian Buffer Vegetation Totals Green Valley, Randolph County EEP Project ID Number 003994-EEP Site 95012													
	Riparian Buffer Success Criter												
Plot #	Stems ¹	Met?											
1	567	Yes											
2	647	Yes											
3	1133	Yes											
4	971	Yes											
5	486	Yes											
6	850	Yes											
7	243	No											
8	283	No											
9	809	Yes											
10	202	No											
11	688	Yes											
Project Avg	625	Yes											

Stem Class ¹Buffer Stems characteristics

Native planted hardwood trees. Does NOT include shrubs. No pines. No vines.

Table 7. CVS Stem Count Total and Planted with/without Livestakes by Plot and Species Green Valley, Randolph County EEP Project ID Number 003994-EEP Site 95012

	-		Current Plot Data (MY1 2013)														-						
		Species	95012-01-0001		95012-01-0002			95012-01-0003			95012-01-0004			95012-01-0005			95012-01-0006			95012-01-0007			
Scientific Name	Common Name	Туре	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree							3	3	3												
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	2	2	2	8	8	8	4	4	4	11	11	11	2	2	2	7	7	7	1	1	
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	8	8	8	7	7	7	21	21	21	5	5	5	9	9	9	5	5	5	3	3	
Quercus	oak	Tree	3	3	3	1	1	1				8	8	8				8	8	8	2	2	2
Quercus falcata	southern red oak	Tree	1	1	1										1	1	1	1	1	1			
St		tem count	14	14	14	16	16	16	28	28	28	24	24	24	12	12	12	21	21	21	6	6	e
	s	ize (ares)	1			1			1			1			1			1			1		
size (ACRES		(ACRES)	0.02			0.02			0.02		0.02		0.02			0.02			0.02				
Species		ies count	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	
Stems pe		er ACRE	566.56	566.56	566.56	647.5	647.5	647.5	1133.1	1133.1	1133.1	971.25	971.25	971.25	485.62	485.62	485.62	849.84	849.84	849.84	242.81	242.81	242.81

				Current Plot Data (MY1 2013)										Annual Means						
		Species	95012-01-0008		95012-01-0009			95012-01-0010			950	12-01-0	011	MY1 (2013)			MY0 (2012)			
Scientific Name	Common Name	Туре	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree										2	2	2	5	5	5	37	37	37
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	2	2	2	11	11	11				10	10	10	58	58	58	61	61	61
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	2	5	5	5	72	72	72	99	99	99
Quercus	oak	Tree				5	5	5	3	3	3				30	30	30	55	55	55
Quercus falcata	southern red oak	Tree	1	1	1	1	1	1							5	5	5			
Stem		em count	7	7	7	20	20	20	5	5	5	17	17	17	170	170	170	252	252	252
	size (ares)			1			1			1			1		11			11		
size (ACRES)			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.27			0.27		
Species count			3	3	3	4	4	4	2	2	2	3	3	3	5	5	5	4	4	4
Stems per ACRE			283.28	283.28	283.28	809.37	809.37	809.37	202.34	202.34	202.34	687.97	687.97	687.97	625.42	625.42	625.42	927.1	927.1	927.1

Color Key for Density

Exceeds requirements by 10%

Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10%

Fails to meet requirements, by less than 10%

Fails to meet requirements by more than 10%