FINAL ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT YEAR 5 (2013) McCAIN STREAM RESTORTION SITE RANDOLPH COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA (EEP Project No. 443, Contract No. 004807) Construction Completed March 2009



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



October 2013

FINAL ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT YEAR 5 (2013) McCAIN STREAM RESTORTION SITE RANDOLPH COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA (EEP Project No. 443, Contract No. 004807) Construction Completed March 2009



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

> Prepared by: Axiom Environmental, Inc. 218 Snow Avenue Raleigh, North Carolina 27603





October 2013

Table of Contents

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	. 1
2.0 METHODOLOGY	
2.1 Vegetation Assessment	3
2.2 Stream Assessment	
3.0 REFERENCES	

Appendices

APPENDIX A. PROJECT VICINITY MAP AND BACKGROUND TABLES
Figure 1. Site Location Map
Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Credits
Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History
Table 3. Project Contacts Table
Table 4. Project Attributes Table
APPENDIX B. VISUAL ASSESSMENT DATA
Figures 2 and 2A-2B. Monitoring Plan View
Tables 5A-5B. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Tables
Table 6. Vegetation Condition Assessment Table Final Station Photon
Fixed-Station Photos
Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos APPENDIX C. VEGETATION PLOT DATA
Table 7. Vegetation Plot Criteria Attainment
Table 8. CVS Vegetation Plot Metadata
Table 9. Total and Planted Stems by Plot and Species
APPENDIX D. STREAM SURVEY DATA
Cross-section Plots
Longitudinal Profile Plot
Substrate Plots
Table 10a. Baseline Stream Data Summary
Table 10b. Baseline Stream Data Summary (Substrate, Bed, Bank, and Hydrologic Containment
Parameter Distributions)
Table 11a. Monitoring Data – Dimensional Morphology Summary (Dimensional Parameters –
Cross Sections)
Table 11b. Monitoring Data – Stream Reach Data Summary
APPENDIX E. HYDROLOGY DATA
Table 12. Verification of Bankfull Events

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program (NCEEP) has completed stream restoration at the McCain Stream Restoration Site (hereafter referred to as the "Site") to assist in fulfilling stream mitigation goals in the area. Site activities consisted of restoration of 2470 linear feet of stream; however, 53 linear feet of channel is located within a power line utility right-of-way and has therefore been excluded from credit assets, resulting in 2417 stream mitigation units. This report (compiled based on NCEEP's *Procedural Guidance and Content Requirements for EEP Monitoring Reports* Version 1.4 dated 11/7/11) summarizes data for year 5 (2013) monitoring.

The Site is located one mile southeast of the intersection of Lake Lucas Road (SR 1518) and Spero Road (SR 1504) in Sophia, Randolph County, North Carolina. The Site will be protected by a permanent conservation easement held by the State of North Carolina and is contained within a parcel owned by Ms. Sigrid N. McCain. The project reach is located within United States Geological Society (USGS) Hydrologic Unit 03040103050050 (Yadkin River Basin), in a non-targeted portion of the North Carolina Division of Water Quality (NCDWQ) Sub-basin 03-07-09.

The drainage area at the Site outfall is 0.88 square miles. The contributing drainage area consists of: forest (67%), agriculture (16%), rangeland (12%), and urban (4%) land use/land cover.

Prior to construction, the Site was characterized by an active farm with a portion of the property dedicated to pasture and livestock grazing. Primary land uses on the property include rangeland, agriculture (small grain), and hardwood forest. Site streams were characterized by entrenched, narrow, deep, step-pool channels with low to moderate sinuosity. The project was initiated by NCDOT in April 2003 and was transferred to EEP prior to restoration planning. Project construction was completed in March 2009. The project restored 2470 linear feet of stream using Priority 2 restoration by constructing a new meandering channel within and excavated floodplain bench (of that 53 linear feet of channel is located within a power line utility right-of-way and has therefore been excluded from credit assets). Site activities provide 2417 Stream Mitigation Units.

Project Goals:

- Restore stable stream channel morphology that is capable of moving flows and sediment provided by its watershed.
- Restore riparian buffer habitat and functions.
- Improve water quality to the receiving watershed by reducing bank erosion and bed degradation.
- Improve aquatic habitat.

Project Objectives:

- Build an appropriate C4 channel with stable channel dimensions.
- Plant a functional Bottomland Hardwood Forest community to create an effective riparian buffer.
- Exclude livestock from the riparian areas.

Seven vegetation monitoring plots were monitored on September 9, 2013 for monitoring year 5 (2013). Vegetation success criteria dictate an average density of 320 stems per acre must be surviving in the first three monitoring years. Subsequently, 288 stems per acre must be surviving in year 4 and 260 stems per acre in year 5. Stem counts will be based on an average of the evaluated vegetation plots. Based on the number of stems counted, average densities were measured at 358 planted stems per acre (excluding

livestakes) surviving in year 5 (2013). The dominant planted species identified at the Site included river birch (*Betula nigra*), silky dogwood (*Cornus amomum*), green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), American sycamore (*Platanus occidentalis*), and willow oak (*Quercus phellos*). Six of the seven individual plots met success criteria based on planted stems alone. Plot 7 was below success criteria based on planted stems alone; however, when including naturally recruited stems of box elder (*Acer negundo*), green ash, tulip poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera*), and American sycamore plot 7 was well-above 260 stems per acre. For additional information relating to vegetation, see Appendix C.

The dominant herbaceous vegetation throughout the Site is mainly comprised of planted grasses such as fescue (*Festuca* sp.) and naturally recruited Japanese stiltgrass (*Microstegium vimineum*). Although fescue occurs throughout the Site, the northernmost end of the Site is characterized by dense fescue resulting in planted stem mortality and minimal growth of remaining planted trees; the extent of this area is illustrated on Figure 2A (Appendix B). Additional vegetation areas of concern include three small Japanese stiltgrass populations on stream banks located at stations 13+00, 17+50, and 22+10. On the right bank of the southernmost end of the Site, a small population of Chinese privet (*Ligustrum sinense*) has established; however, the area is small enough to not be problematic at this time. In addition, there are several large populations of multiflora rose (*Rosa multiflora*) within the easement that do not appear to pose a threat to planted tree growth at this time.

Success criteria for stream restoration will be assessed using measurements of stream dimension, pattern, and profile; site photographs; visual assessments; and vegetation sampling. Stream success criteria are based on significant changes in channel morphology between baseline measurements and the present monitoring year.

Stream areas of concern include areas of minor bank erosion/scour in the upstream 300 linear feet of the Site (Reach 1). Stream areas of concern do not appear to be worsening and no immediate maintenance actions are recommended at this time. Many areas considered areas of concern during previous monitoring years have recovered and vegetation has established. Current stream areas of concern are depicted on Figures 2A-2B (Appendix B) and include the following.

Station	Notes
10+00	Area of poor vegetation along eroded, undercut, outer bend at beginning of restoration reach
12+90	Eroded outer bend lacking deep-rooted vegetation with some scour in pool
26+50	Minor erosion and poor vegetation development
	10+00 12+90

*Map labels on Figures 2A-2B, Appendix B

Success criteria for stream restoration will include documentation of two bankfull channel events during the monitoring period. In the event that less than two bankfull events occur during the first five years, monitoring will continue until the second event is documented. In addition, bankfull events must occur during separate monitoring years. A crest gauge is located within the Site to assist with documentation of bankfull events (Figures 2-2A, Appendix B). Three bankfull events were documented during the year 5 (2013) monitoring season. A total of five bankfull events have been documented to occur during the five year monitoring period; in addition, bankfull events occurred in separate monitoring years (2009, 2010, and 2013).

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 tables and figures within this report's 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 NCEEPs website. All raw data supporting the tables and figures in the appendices is available from NCEEP upon request.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Vegetation Assessment

Seven vegetation plots were established and marked after construction with half inch metal conduit demarking the corners with a five-foot, three-quarter inch PVC at the origin. The plots are 10 meters square and are located randomly within the Site. These plots were surveyed on September 9, 2013 for the year 5 (2013) monitoring season using the *CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.2* (Lee et al. 2008) (http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/methods.htm); results are included in Appendix C. The taxonomic standard for vegetation used for this document was *Flora of the Carolinas, Virginia, Georgia, and Surrounding Areas* (Weakley 2007).

2.2 Stream Assessment

Annual stream monitoring was conducted for 2550-linear feet of channel. Six permanent cross-sections (four in riffles and two in pools) were established and will be used to evaluate stream dimension; locations are depicted on Figures 2A-2B (Appendix B). Cross-sections are permanently monumented with half inch rebar at each end point. Cross-sections were surveyed to provide a detailed measurement of the stream and banks including points on the adjacent floodplain, top of bank, bankfull, breaks in slope, edge of water, and thalweg. Data will be used to calculate width-depth ratios, entrenchment ratios, and bank-height ratios for each cross-section. Photographs were taken and pebble counts were conducted at each permanent cross-section location annually. Thirteen permanent photo points were established throughout the restoration reach; locations are depicted on Figures 2A-2B (Appendix B). In addition, visual stream morphology stability assessments were completed in each of the monitoring reaches to assess the channel bed, banks, and in-stream structures (Tables 5A-5B, Appendix B).

3.0 REFERENCES

- Lee, Michael T., R.K. Peet, S.D. Roberts, and T.R. Wentworth. 2008. CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.2. (online). Available: http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/methods.htm.
- 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.
- Weather Underground. 2013. Station at Asheboro Airport, North Carolina. (online). Available: http://www.wunderground.com/history/airport/KHBI/2013/2/1/CustomHistory.html?dayend=6& monthend=6&yearend=2013&req_city=NA&req_state=NA&req_statename=NA [September 16, 2013]. Weather Underground.

APPENDIX A

PROJECT VICINITY MAP AND BACKGROUND TABLES

Figure 1. Site Location Map

- Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Credits
- Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History
- Table 3. Project Contacts Table
- Table 4. Project Attributes Table



Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation CreditsMcCain Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 443)

ie cum streu			110jeer11u	/					
				Mit	igation Credits				
		Sti	eam			Riparian W	Vetland		Buffer
Туре	R	estoration	Restoratio	n Equivalent	Restoratio	Restoration		alent	Dunier
Totals		2417							
				Projects Comp	onents	•			
Project Component/ Reach ID	Station Range	Existing Linear Footage/ Acreage	Priority Approach	Restoration/ Restoration Equivalent	Restoration Linear Footage/ Acreage	Mitigation Ratio	(Comment	
Reach 1	10+00– 12+86	490	P2	Restoration	286	1:1	Priority 2 stream restoration.		oration.
Reach 2	12+87- 34+70	1955	P2	Restoration	2131*	1:1	Priority 2 stream restoration.		oration.
			•	Comp	onent Summation				
	Restoration Level Stream (linear footage) Riparia		n Wetland (acres)	Buffer	(square footage)				
	Re	storation			2417				
		Totals			2417				
	Mitig	ation Units		241	17 SMUs				

*Site activities restored 2183 linear feet of Reach 2; however, 53 linear feet of this reach are located within a power line utility right-of-way have been excluded from credit asset calculations.

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting HistoryMcCain Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 443)

Elapsed Time Since Grading Complete: 4 years 7 months Elapsed Time Since Planting Complete: 4 years 7 months Number of Reporting Years: 5

	Data Collection	Completion
Activity or Deliverable	Complete	or Delivery
Project Initiated by NCDOT		April 2003
Restoration Plan	2003/2004	June 2005
Final Design – Construction Plans		May 2006
Construction Complete		March 2009
Temporary S&E mix applied to entire project area		March 2009
Permanent seed mix applied to entire project area		March 2009
Mitigation Plan / As-built (Year 0 Monitoring – baseline)	May 2009	July 2009
Year 1 Monitoring (2009)	October 2009	December 2009
Year 2 Monitoring (2010)	November 2010	November 2010
Year 3 Monitoring (2011)	August 2011	November 2011
Year 4 Monitoring (2012)	October 2012	November 2012
Year 5 Monitoring (2013)	September 2013	October 2013

Table 3. Project Contacts Table

McCain Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 443)

McCain Stream Restoration Site (EEP PI	
Designer	KCI Associates of NC
	Landmark Center II, Suite 220
	4601 Six Forks Rd.
	Raleigh, NC 27609
	Adam Spiller (919) 783-9214
Construction, Planting, and Seeding	Carolina Environmental Contracting, Inc.
Contractor	PO Box 1905
	Mount Airy, NC 27030
	Stephen James (336) 320-3849
Survey Contractor	Unknown
Seed Mix Source	Unknown
Baseline Data Collection and Years 1-3	Ward Consulting Engineers, P.C.
Monitoring Performers	8368 Six Forks Road Suite 104
	Raleigh, NC 27615-5083
	Becky Ward 919-870-0526
Years 4-5 Monitoring Performers	Axiom Environmental, Inc.
	218 Snow Avenue
	Raleigh, NC 27603
	Grant Lewis 919-215-1693

<u> </u>	nformation					
Project Name	McCain Stream Restoration Site					
Project County	Randolph County,	Randolph County, North Carolina				
Project Area	13.34 acres	13.34 acres				
Project Coordinates (NAD83/WGS84)	734162.6573, 1746	5572.2892				
Project Watershed S	Summary Information	1				
Physiographic Region	Piedmont					
Ecoregion	Carolina Slate Belt					
Project River Basin	Yadkin					
USGS 8-digit HUC	03040103					
USGS 14-digit HUC	03040103050050					
NCDWQ Subbasin	03-07-09					
Project Drainage Area	0.88 square miles					
Project Drainage Area Impervious Surface	2%					
Watershed Type	Rural					
Reach Summa	ary Information					
Parameters	Reach 1	Reach 2				
Restored/Enhanced Length	286 linear feet	2184 linear feet				
Drainage Area	0.88 sq. mi.	0.88 sq. mi.				
NCDWQ Index Number	13-2-3-3-(0.3) (UT	to Back Creek)				
NCDWQ Classification	С					
Valley Type/Morphological Description	V/B4c	V/C4				
Dominant Soil Series	Dogue Sandy Loan	n				
Drainage Class	Moderately Well D	Drained				
Soil Hydric Status	Nonhydric					
Slope	0.0066					
FEMA Classification	Zone C					
Native Vegetation Community	Bottomland Hardw	vood Forest				
Percent Composition of Exotic Invasives	>5					
Regulatory	Considerations					
Regulation	Applicable					
Waters of the U.S. –Sections 404 and 401	Yes-Received App	ropriate Permits				
Endangered Species Act	No					
Historic Preservation Act	No					
CZMA/CAMA	No					
FEMA Floodplain Compliance	Unknown					
Essential Fisheries Habitat		Unknown No				

Table 4. Project Attributes TableMcCain Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 443)

APPENDIX B

VISUAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Figures 2 and 2A-2B. Monitoring Plan View Tables 5A-5B. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Tables Table 6. Vegetation Condition Assessment Table Fixed-Station Photos Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos







Table 5AVReach IDRAssessed Length24

Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment

Reach 1 286

Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjusted % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed	1. Vertical Stability (Riffle and Run units)	1. <u>Aggradation</u> - Bar formation/growth sufficient to significantly deflect flow laterally (not to include point bars)					100%			
		2. <u>Degradation</u> - Evidence of downcutting			1	30	90%			
	2. Riffle Condition	1. <u>Texture/Substrate</u> - Riffle maintains coarser substrate	2	2			100%			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	1. Depth Sufficient (Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth \geq 1.6)	3	3			100%			
		 Length appropriate (>30% of centerline distance between tail of upstream riffle and head of downstrem riffle) 	3	3			100%			
	4.Thalweg Position	1. Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	3	3			100%			
		2. Thalweg centering at downstream of meander (Glide)	2	2			100%			
		·						1		
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroding	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion					100%			100%
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely. Does <u>NOT</u> include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat.			1	50	91%			91%
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse					100%			100%
				Totals	1	50	91%	0	0	91%
3. Engineered Structures	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs.	2	2			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill.	2	2			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms.	2	2			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does <u>not</u> exceed 15%. (See guidance for this table in EEP monitoring guidance document)	2	2			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~ Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth ratio \geq 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at base-flow.	2	2			100%			

Table 5BVisual Stream Morphology Stability AssessmentReach IDReach 2Assessed Length2184

Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjusted % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed	1. Vertical Stability (Riffle and Run units)	1. <u>Aggradation</u> - Bar formation/growth sufficient to significantly deflect flow laterally (not to include point bars)			1	30	99%			
		2. <u>Degradation</u> - Evidence of downcutting			1	125	94%			
	2. Riffle Condition	1. <u>Texture/Substrate</u> - Riffle maintains coarser substrate	16	17			94%	1		
	3. Meander Pool Condition	 <u>Depth</u> Sufficient (Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6) 	16	18			89%	1		
		 Length appropriate (>30% of centerline distance between tail of upstream riffle and head of downstrem riffle) 	18	18			100%			
	4.Thalweg Position	1. Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	15	17			88%	1		
		2. Thalweg centering at downstream of meander (Glide)	16	17			94%			
	•	•								
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroding	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion					100%			100%
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely. Does <u>NOT</u> include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat.					100%			100%
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse					100%			100%
	_		-	Totals	0	0	100%	0	0	100%
3. Engineered Structures	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs.	8	8			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill.	8	8			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms.	8	8			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does <u>not</u> exceed 15%. (See guidance for this table in EEP monitoring guidance document)	5	6			83%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~ Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth ratio \geq 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at base-flow.	6	6			100%			

McCain Property

Table 6 Planted Acreage ¹	Vegetation Condition Assessment 7.98					
Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold	CCPV Depiction	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Planted Acreage
1. Bare Areas		<0.1 acres	N/A	0	0.00	0.0%
2. Low Stem Density Areas	Low woody stem densities based on visual observations.	0.1 acres	Light Green	1	1.41	17.7%
			Total	1	1.41	17.7%
3. Areas of Poor Growth Rates or Vigor	Woody stems are small given the monitoring year. These areas are included in the "Low Stem Density Areas" and are therefore not shown separately.	0.25 acres	N/A	0	0.00	0.0%
			Cumulative Total	1	1.41	17.7%

Easement Acreage ²	13.34					
Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold	CCPV Depiction	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Easement Acreage
4. Invasive Areas of Concern ⁴	Microstegium, tall fescue, multiflora rose, Chinese privet	1000 SF	Bright Green/Dark Green	4	0.10	0.7%
5. Easement Encroachment Areas ³		none	NA	0	0.00	0.0%

1 = Enter the planted acreage within the easement. This number is calculated as the easement acreage minus any existing mature tree stands that were not subject to supplemental planting of the understory, the channel acreage, crossings or any other elements not directly planted as part of the project effort.

2 = The acreage within the easement boundaries.

3 = Encroachment may occur within or outside of planted areas and will therefore be calculated against the overall easement acreage. In the event a polygon is cataloged into items 1, 2 or 3 in the table and is the result of encroachment, the associated acreage should be tallied in the relevant item (i.e., item 1,2 or 3) as well as a parallel tally in item 5.

4 = Invasives may occur in or out of planted areas, but still within the easement and will therefore be calculated against the overall easement acreage. Invasives of concern/interest are listed below. The list of high concern spcies are those with the potential to directly outcompete native, young, woody stems in the short-term (e.g. monitoring period or shortly threreafter) or affect the community structure for existing, more established tree/shrub stands over timeframes that are slightly longer (e.g. 1-2 decarage, lar-2 decarage, density or distribution is suppressing the viability, density, or growth of planted woody stems. Decisions as to whether remediation will be needed are based on the integration of risk factors by EEP such as species present, their coverage, distribution relative to native biomass, and the practicality of treatment. For example, even modest amounts of Kudzu or Japanese Knotweed early in the projects history will warrant control, but potentially large coverages of Microstegium in the herb layer will not likely trigger control because of the limited carpacities to impact tree/shrub layers within the timeframes discussed and therefore age not expected to be species with the "watch list" designator in gray shade are of particular interest given their externer risk/threat level for mapping as points where "watch list" designator in gray shade are of particular interest given their externe risk/threat level for mapping as points where the condition for an area is somewhere between isolated specimens and dense, discreet patches. In any case, the point or polygon/area feature can be symbolized to describe things like high or low concern and species can be listed as a map inset, in legend items if the number of species are limited or in the executive summary.

McCain Fixed-Station Photographs Taken September 2013





Axiom Environmental, Inc.

McCain Stream Fixed-Station Photographs Taken September 2013 (continued)











McCain Stream Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photographs Taken September 2013



Axiom Environmental, Inc.

APPENDIX C

VEGETATION PLOT DATA

Table 7. Vegetation Plot Criteria Attainment

Table 8. CVS Vegetation Plot Metadata

Table 9. Total and Planted Stems by Plot and Species

Vegetation Plot ID	Vegetation Survival Threshold Met?	Tract Mean
1	Yes	
2	Yes	
3	Yes	
4	Yes	86%
5	Yes	
6	Yes	
7	No*	

Table 7. Vegetation Plot Criteria AttainmentMcCain Creek Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 443)

*Based on planted stems alone, this plot doesn't meet success criteria; however, when including naturally recruited stems of box elder (*Acer negundo*), green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), tulip poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera*), and American sycamore (*Platanus occidentalis*) plot 7 was well-above 260 stems per acre.

Table 8. CVS Vegetation Plot Metadata

Report Prepared By	Corri Faquin
Date Prepared	9/16/2013 15:09
database name	Axiom-EEP-2013-A-v2.3.1.mdb
database location	\\AE-SBS\RedirectedFolders\pperkinson\Desktop
computer name	PHILLIP-PC
file size	65798144
DESCRIPTION OF WORKSHEETS IN	THIS DOCUMENT
Metadata	Description of database file, the report worksheets, and a summary of project(s) and project data.
Proj, planted	Each project is listed with its PLANTED stems per acre, for each year. This excludes live stakes. Each project is listed with its TOTAL stems per acre, for each year. This includes live stakes, all planted stems, and all natural/volunteer
Proj, total stems	stems.
Plots	List of plots surveyed with location and summary data (live stems, dead stems, missing, etc.).
Vigor	Frequency distribution of vigor classes for stems for all plots.
Vigor by Spp	Frequency distribution of vigor classes listed by species.
Damage	List of most frequent damage classes with number of occurrences and percent of total stems impacted by each.
Damage by Spp	Damage values tallied by type for each species.
Damage by Plot	Damage values tallied by type for each plot.
Planted Stems by Plot and Spp	A matrix of the count of PLANTED living stems of each species for each plot; dead and missing stems are excluded. A matrix of the count of total living stems of each species (planted and natural volunteers combined) for each plot; dead and missing
ALL Stems by Plot and spp	stems are excluded.
PROJECT SUMMARY	
Project Code	443
project Name	McCain
Description	Stream restoration site located in the Yadkin River Basin
River Basin	Yadkin-Pee Dee
length(ft)	2450
stream-to-edge width (ft)	50
area (sq m)	22758.94
Required Plots (calculated)	7
Sampled Plots	7

Table 9. Total Planted and Natural Recruits Stems by Plot and SpeciesEEP Project Code 443. Project Name: McCain

			Current Plot Data (MY5 2013)														·						
			E4	43-A-00	001	E4	43-A-0	002	E4	43-A-0	003	E4	43-A-00	004	E443-A-0005			E4	43-A-00	006	E443-A-0007		
Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т
Acer negundo	boxelder	Tree																					4
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																					
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree	2	2	2	1		1	1 6	6 6	6 6	2	2 2	2	1	1	1	4	4	. 4	l 1	1	1
Carya	hickory	Tree															1						
Cercis canadensis	eastern redbud	Tree							1	. 1	. 1												
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub					8	3	8 1	. 1	. 1					3	3	1	1	1	1	5	5
Diospyros virginiana	common persimmon	Tree				1		1	1			1	. 1	1	2	2	2						
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree				4	. 4	1 ·	7 1	. 1	. 1	3	3	4	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	12
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree			1				1														
Juniperus virginiana	eastern redcedar	Tree							1														
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree									1						17						7
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree							3	3	3	1	. 1	1							1	1	2
Pinus taeda	loblolly pine	Tree							1														
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree				1		1	1 4	. 4	. 4				1	1	1	1	1	1	1 1	1	2
Quercus	oak	Tree																					
Quercus falcata	southern red oak	Tree										1	. 1	1									
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree							2	2	2												
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree	5	5	5							1	. 1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	L		
Rosa multiflora	multiflora rose	Exotic																					
Salix nigra	black willow	Tree					(6	6							1	1						
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub						1	1							4	4					3	3
Sambucus	elderberry	Shrub																					
Unknown		Shrub or Tree																					
		Stem count	7	7	8	7	22	2 2	8 18	18	19	9	9	10	8	16	34	8	8	8	3 5	12	36
		size (ares)		1		1				1			1			1			1			1	
		size (ACRES)				0.02				0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02	
		Species count		—	3	4		7 1		7	8	6	Ŭ	Ŭ	5	8	=0		5	5	5 5	6	8
		Stems per ACRE	283.3	283.3	323.7	283.3	890.3	3 113	3 728.4	728.4	768.9	364.2	364.2	404.7	323.7	647.5	1376	323.7	323.7	323.7	202.3	485.6	1457

Color 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%

PnoLS = Planted excluding livestakes

P-all = Planting including livestakes

T = All planted and natural recruits including livestakes

T includes natural recruits

Table 9. Total Planted and Natural Recruits Stems by Plot and Species (cont'd)EEP Project Code 443. Project Name: McCain

	Annual Means																		
			N	IY5 (201	.3)	Μ	IY4 (201	.2)	Μ	IY3 (201	.1)	Μ	Y2 (20:	10)	N	IY1 (200	9)	N	IYO (20
Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	PnoLS	P-all	т	PnoLS	P-all	т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all
Acer negundo	boxelder	Tree			4						5								
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree						17											
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree	17	17	17	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	19	19	19	20	20
Carya	hickory	Tree			1														
Cercis canadensis	eastern redbud	Tree	1	1	1	1	1	1											
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub	3	18	18	3	18	18	3	18	18	3	18	18	5	20	20	5	26
Diospyros virginiana	common persimmon	Tree	4	4	4	4	4	4			5								
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	13	13	28	12	12	13	4	4	27	4	4	. 4	4	4	4	4	4
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree			2														
Juniperus virginiana	eastern redcedar	Tree			1														
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree			25			17			9								
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree	5	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	6	5	5	5	6	6	6	6	(
Pinus taeda	loblolly pine	Tree			1														
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	8	8	9	8	8	8	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	(
Quercus	oak	Tree																7	
Quercus falcata	southern red oak	Tree	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	. 1	. 1	1	1		
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree	8	8	8	8	8	8	7	7	7	6	6	6	5 7	7	7	2	
Rosa multiflora	multiflora rose	Exotic									1								
Salix nigra	black willow	Tree		7	7		7	7		8	8		7	7 7	'	9	9		ç
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub		8	8		8	8		8	8		8	8	5	8	8		8
Sambucus	elderberry	Shrub																	-
Unknown		Shrub or Tree																1	2
		Stem count	: 62	92	143	62	92	127	50	81	125	49	79	79	54	86	86	58	98
		size (ares)		7			7			7			7			7			7
		size (ACRES)		0.17			0.17			0.17			0.17			0.17			0.17
		Species count	: 10	12	18	10	12	14	8	10	14	8	10	10	8	10	10	9	12
		Stems per ACRE	358.4	531.9	826.7	358.4	531.9	734.2	289.1	468.3	722.7	283.3	456.7	456.7	312.2	497.2	497.2	335.3	566.6

Color 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%

PnoLS = Planted excluding livestakes

P-all = Planting including livestakes

T = All planted and natural recruits including livestakes

T includes natural recruits

) (200	9)
all	Т
20	20
26	26
4	4
4	4
6	6
9	9
9 7 4	9 7 4
4	4
2	2
0	
9 8	9
8	8 1
2	2
98	98
7	50
,).17	
12	12
66.6	566.6

APPENDIX D

STREAM SURVEY DATA

Cross-section Plots

Longitudinal Profile Plot

Substrate Plots

Tables 10a-b. Baseline Stream Data Summary

Tables 11a-b. Monitoring Data

Project:		McCain Pr	roperty				Sum	mary (bank	full)									
Cross Se	ction:	Cross Sec				MY0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5							
Feature		Riffle Rea	ch 1		A (BKF)	18.6	20.8	18.7	17.8	18.1	19.0							
Station:		12+11.30			W (BKF)	16.9	17.2	18.1	16.2	16.7	15.2							
Date: Crew:		5/30/13 PP, KJ			Max d Mean d	1.5 1.1	1.6 1.2	1.6 1.0	1.7 1.1	1.6 1.1	1.7 1.3							
Ciew.		FF, NJ			W/D	15.4	14.2	17.5	14.8	15.5	12.2							
	MY00-200	9		MY01-200		10.1	MY02-2010		11.0	MY03-2011			MY04-2012			MY05-2013	3	
Station			Station	Elevation	n Notes	Station	Elevation	Notes	Station	Elevation	Notes	Station	Elevation	Notes	Station	Elevation	Notes	
	548.39	LPIN		548.39			548.39	LPIN		548.39	LPIN	-0.30	548.26	LPIN		548.32	LPIN	
6.50	547.76		0.30	548.19		0.10	548.26		0.05	548.29		2.67	548.03		10.05	547.20		
14.00 21.10	546.79 546.16		6.00 13.40	547.72 546.76		2.80 9.25	548.15 547.37		5.83 12.62	547.82 546.94		9.95 20.17	547.23 546.32		17.64 25.07	546.53 545.27	TOBL BKFL	1. 如何,这些人也是不是你的。""你,你们还是不少的。"
25.50	545.21		22.10	545.85		14.42	546.82		20.31	546.45		25.41		FOBL BKFL	30.71	544.80	TODE DIG E	
30.60	544.82	TOBL BKF		545.16		21.29	546.18		24.04	545.38		30.41	545.03	-	33.82	543.74		
34.10	543.31		27.40	545.05		24.14	545.36		28.52	545.04		33.37	544.06		35.93	543.52		
36.20	543.19		29.40	544.79		26.88	545.13		30.27		TOBL BKF		543.58	-	38.07	542.77		
38.70 40.50	543.11 543.01		30.60 32.30	544.68 544.06		30.72 32.01	544.75 544.09	TOBL BKFL	32.31 34.81	544.35 543.63		37.75 40.22	542.78 542.98	TW	40.20 41.52	542.86 543.01		
40.50	543.01		32.30	543.25		34.33	543.58		36.83	542.97	TOE L	40.22	542.98		41.52	542.91		
45.20	542.91	TW	35.60	542.88		35.79	543.04	TOE L	38.90	542.70	TW	45.29	543.06		43.80	542.82	TW	
45.70	543.12		37.40	542.76		37.32	542.96		41.08	542.95		47.83	543.82		45.08	542.93		
47.10	543.83		38.30	542.66		38.96	542.80	TW	43.22	543.04		50.09		OBR BKF	46.81	543.63		
48.40	544.42	FOBR BKF		542.70		40.26	542.86		45.19	542.99	TOE R	53.26	544.85		47.91	543.90		
54.20 56.50	545.10 545.81		42.60 45.50	542.84 542.84		42.10 44.62	543.01 543.00	TOE R	46.40 47.56	543.72 543.93		56.66 60.38	545.56 546.50		50.20 53.12	544.74 544.83	OBR BKFR	
59.70	546.45		46.60	543.50		44.02	543.34	IUER	47.50		OBR BKF		540.50		55.56	545.17		
64.50	547.03		48.70	544.32			543.97		52.94	544.89	Dit Brai	67.70	547.38		59.29	546.12		
69.00	547.76		52.70	544.82		50.16	544.56	FOBR BKFF	54.97	545.21		73.25	548.00	RPIN	62.41	546.67		
72.60	548.15	RPIN	55.60	545.44		53.54	544.93		57.36	546.08					66.97	547.35		
			58.50 62.40	546.15 546.77		57.71 61.30	545.95 546.66		61.77 66.47	546.79 547.42					73.37	548.00	RPIN	
			67.40	540.77		65.01	540.00		72.63	548.02								
			71.90	547.93		68.96	547.59		72.79	548.25	RPIN							
			72.70	548.13		72.76	547.99											
						72.79	548.14	RPIN										
Elevation (Feet)	549.00 548.00 547.00 546.00 545.00																	
	544.00 543.00 542.00																	
	0.00			10.	.00		20	0.00			30.00			40.00			50.00	60.00 70.00 80.00
													Sta	tion (Feet	:)			
															-			
											As	s-Built -	-Year 1 -	- Year 2	Yei	ar 3 🛶 \	rear 4 🛁	-Year 5 → BKF






















											am Da														
	2				McC					e/Proj	ect No.			,			1			1					
Parameter	Gauge ²	Reg	ional C	urve		Pre	Existin	g Cond	ition			Refer	ence Re	each(es) Data			Design			Мо	onitorin	g Base	ine	
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle Only		LL	UL	Eq.	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD⁵	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD ⁵	n	Min	Med	Max	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD⁵	n
Bankfull Width (ft)					14.6	18.7	25.9	29.3		4	10.4			27.1				18			16.9				
Floodprone Width (ft)					34	95	125	125		3	150			200							35				
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)					1.1	1.4	1.4	1.7		4	0.8			1.5				1.4			1.1				
¹ Bankfull Max Depth (ft)				1.7	2.7	2.8	3.5		4	1.4			2				2			1.5				
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)					21.3	25.6	25.9	29.3		4	12.5			22.3				24.6			18.6				
Width/Depth Ratio)				8.3	14	15	17.6		4	11.6			18.5				13.2			15.4				
Entrenchment Ratio					1.8	5.6	6.4	8.5		3	7.4			14.4							2.1				
¹ Bank Height Ratio	D				1	1.2	1.1	1.7		4	1			1				1			1				
Profile																									
Riffle Length (ft)											9			108				58		54	63	63	72	12	2
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)											0.01			0.0756				0.0068		0.0048	0.0059	0.0059	0.007	0.0016	2
Pool Length (ft)											28			108				38		16	21	22	25	4	3
Pool Max depth (ft)											1.8			3.1				3							
Pool Spacing (ft)											38			181				95		107	113	113	119	8	2
Pattern																									
Channel Beltwidth (ft)											75			135							78				
Radius of Curvature (ft)											14.5			26.8			30		35	35	38	38	40		2
Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)											1			1.6			1.7		1.9	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.4		
Meander Wavelength (ft)											70			148				190			204				1
Meander Width Ratio											3.6			13							4.6				
Transport parameters																									
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/f	2																								
Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankful																									
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m ²	2																								
Additional Reach Parameters																									
Rosgen Classification	1						B4c/E	4/C4-5					B4c/0	C3/C4				B4c				В	4c		
Bankfull Velocity (fps))																	3.9							
Bankfull Discharge (cfs))																								
Valley length (ft)			-	-			21	55																	
Channel Thalweg length (ft)							24	75										285				2	86		
Sinuosity (ft)								15					1.50	-1.70				1.17				1	.3		
Water Surface Slope (Channel) (ft/ft)													0.0070	-0.0120				0.0067				0.0	068		
BF slope (ft/ft)													0.0070	-0.0120				0.0067				0.0	065		
³ Bankfull Floodplain Area (acres)																								
⁴ % of Reach with Eroding Banks	5																								
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric	;																								
Biological or Other	·																								

Shaded cells indicate that these will typically not be filled in.

1 = The distributions for these parameters can include information from both the cross-section surveys and the longitudinal profile. 2 = For projects with a proximal USGS gauge in-line with the project reach (added bankfull verification - rare).

3. Utilizing survey data produce an estimate of the bankfull floodplain area in acres, which should be the area from the top of bank to the toe of the terrace riser/slope.

4 = Proportion of reach exhibiting banks that are eroding based on the visual survey for comparison to monitoring data; 5. Of value/needed only if the n exceeds 3

											am Da														
					McC	ain Stre	eam Re	estorat	ion Site	e/Proje	ct No.	443 - F	leach:	2 (218	4 feet)		1								
Parameter	Gauge ²	Reg	jional C	urve		Pre	Existin	g Cond	ition			Refer	ence R	each(es) Data			Design	<u>ا</u>		Мо	onitorin	g Basel	ine	
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle Only		LL	UL	Eq.	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD⁵	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD⁵	n	Min	Med	Max	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD ⁵	n
Bankfull Width (ft))				14.6	18.7	25.9	29.3		4	10.4			27.1			18	20	24	20.6	22.8	23.3	24.6	0.9	3
Floodprone Width (ft))				34	95	125	125		3	150			200						47	54	51	63	6.2	3
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft))				1.1	1.4	1.4	1.7		4	0.8			1.5			1	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.5	0.1	3
¹ Bankfull Max Depth (ft)				1.7	2.7	2.8	3.5		4	1.4			2			1.3	1.7	2	1.8	1.9	1.8	2.1	0.2	3
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft ²))				21.3	25.6	25.9	29.3		4	12.5			22.3			25	25.5	26	30.8	31.89	31.2	33.7	1.3	3
Width/Depth Ratio	þ				8.3	14	15	17.6		4	11.6			18.5			12.7	15.6	23	13.8	16.4	17.4	18	0.8	3
Entrenchment Ratio	þ				1.8	5.6	6.4	8.5		3	7.4			14.4						2	2.3	2.5	2.5	0.1	3
¹ Bank Height Ratio	b				1	1.2	1.1	1.7		4	1			1				1		1	1	1	1	0	3
Profile																									
Riffle Length (ft))										9			108			59	67	88	20	68	76	97	23	13
Riffle Slope (ft/ft))										0.01			0.0756			0.008	0.008	0.0104	0.0028	0.0087	0.0075	0.019	0.004	13
Pool Length (ft))										28			108			47	52	59	12	22	23	33	6	13
Pool Max depth (ft))										1.8			3.1			2.3	2.8	3.3	2.2	2.5		2.8		2
Pool Spacing (ft))										38			181			106	118	147	56	117	123	150	25	12
Pattern																									
Channel Beltwidth (ft))										75			135						20	66	62	97	24	10
Radius of Curvature (ft))										14.5			26.8			35		60	35	49	43	80	14	12
Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft))										1			1.6			1.8		3.1	1.5	2.2	2.2	3.3		
Meander Wavelength (ft))										70			148			212	236	294	158	221	229	261	36	10
Meander Width Ratio	D										3.6			13						1.9	3.1	2.7	4.8		
Transport parameters																									
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/f	2																								
Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankful	I																								
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m ²	2																								
Additional Reach Parameters																									
Rosgen Classification	ı						B4c/E	4/C4-5			1		B4c/	C3/C4				B4c				В	4c		
Bankfull Velocity (fps))																	3.9							
Bankfull Discharge (cfs))		Ĩ		Γ																				
Valley length (ft))						21	55																	
Channel Thalweg length (ft))						24	75										285				2	86		
Sinuosity (ft))						1.	15					1.50	-1.70				1.17				1	.3		
Water Surface Slope (Channel) (ft/ft))												0.0070	-0.0120				0.0067				0.0	068		
BF slope (ft/ft))												0.0070	-0.0120				0.0067				0.0	065		
³ Bankfull Floodplain Area (acres)																								
⁴ % of Reach with Eroding Banks	6																								
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric																									
Biological or Other	r																								

Shaded cells indicate that these will typically not be filled in.

1 = The distributions for these parameters can include information from both the cross-section surveys and the longitudinal profile. 2 = For projects with a proximal USGS gauge in-line with the project reach (added bankfull verification - rare).

3. Utilizing survey data produce an estimate of the bankfull floodplain area in acres, which should be the area from the top of bank to the toe of the terrace riser/slope.

4 = Proportion of reach exhibiting banks that are eroding based on the visual survey for comparison to monitoring data; 5. Of value/needed only if the n exceeds 3

Table 10b. Baseline Stream Data Summary (Substrate, Bed, Bank, and Hydrologic Containment Parameter Distributions) McCain Stream Restoration Site/Project No. 443 - Entire Stream (2470 lf)

Parameter	P	re-Exis	ting Co	ondition	F	Referen	e Rea	ch(es)	Data		D	esign			As-bu	ilt/Bas	seline	
¹ Ri% / Ru% / P% / G% / S%										56%	40%							
¹ SC% / Sa% / G% / C% / B% / Be%																		
¹ d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95 / di ^p / di ^{sp} (mm)																		
² Entrenchment Class <1.5 / 1.5-1.99 / 2.0-4.9 / 5.0-9.9 / >10																		
³ Incision Class <1.2 / 1.2-1.49 / 1.5-1.99 / >2.0																		

Shaded cells indicate that these will typically not be filled in.

1 = Riffle, Run, Pool, Glide, Step; Silt/Clay, Sand, Gravel, Cobble, Boulder, Bedrock; dip = max pave, disp = max subpave

2 = Entrenchment Class - Assign/bin the reach footage into the classes indicated and provide the percentage of the total reach footage in each class in the table. This will result from the measured cross-sections as well as visual estimates

3 = Assign/bin the reach footage into the classes indicated and provide the percentage of the total reach footage in each class in the table. This will result from the measured cross-sections as well as the longitudinal profile

Footnotes 2,3 - These classes are loosley built around the Rosgen classification and hazard ranking breaks, but were adjusted slightly to make for easier assignment to somewhat coarser bins based on visual estimates in the field such that measurement of every segment for ER would not be necessary.

The intent here is to provide the reader/consumer of design and monitoring information with a good general sense of the extent of hydrologic containment in the pre-existing and the rehabilitated states as well as comparisons to the reference distributions.

ER and BHR have been addressed in prior submissions as a subsample (cross-sections as part of the design survey), however, these subsamples have often focused entirely on facilitating design without providing a thorough pre-constrution distribution of these parameters, leaving the reader/consumer with a sample that is weighted heavily on the stable sections of the read. This mean that the distributions for these parameters should include data from both the cross-sections and therefore can be readily integrated and provide and provide and provide sample isother samples, the typical longitudinal profile permits sampling of the BHR at tiffles beyond those subject to cross-sections and therefore can be readily integrated and provide and provide and provide sample isother samples the typical comparisons.

Table 11a. Monitor	ring D	Data -	Dime	nsion	al Mo	orpho	logy	Sumn	hary (Dime	nsion	al Pai	ramet	ers –	Cros	s Sec	tions)			
			McC	ain S	trean	n Rest	torati	on Si	te/Pro	ject l	No. 44	13									
		Cross	Sectio	on 1 (Re	each 1-	Riffle)			Cross	Sectio	on 2 (Re	each 2-	Riffle)			Cross	s Sectio	on 3 (R	each 2	-Pool)	
Based on fixed baseline bankfull elevation ¹	Base	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+	Base	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+	Base	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+
Record elevation (datum) used	544.4	544.3	544.4	544.4	544.4	544.5		541	540.9	541	541	541	541.1		535.6	535.5	535.6	535.6	535.6	535.5	
Bankfull Width (ft)	16.9	17.2	18.11	16.22	16.7	15.2		24.6	25.2	27.87	26.32	25.3	25.2		22.6	23	22.25	22.08	22.9	22.7	
Floodprone Width (ft)	35	37	35	35	46	46		63	>75	63	63	63	63		-	-	-	-	-	-	
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	1.1	1.2	1.033	1.096	1.1	1.3		1.4	1.7	1.584	1.645	1.5	1.6		1.5	1.5	1.384	1.388	1.4	1.4	
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.7		18	2.5	2.55	2.61	2.3	2.4		2.2	2.2	2.36	2.57	2.5	2.3	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)	18.6	20.8	18.71	17.77	18.1	19		33.7	42.7	44.14	43.3	38.3	39.3		33.6	34.1	30.8	30.65	32.5	31.4	
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	15.4	14.2	17.52	14.79	15.5	12.2		18	14.9	17.59	16	16.7	16.2		-	-	-	-	-	-	
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	2.1	2.2	1.933	2.158	2.7	3		2.5	>3.0	2.261	2.394	2.5	2.5		-	-	-	-	-	-	
Bankfull Bank Height Ratio	1	1	1.1	1.188	1.3	1.17		1	1		0.954	1	1		-	-	-	-	-	-	
Cross Sectional Area between end pins (ft ²)	174.2	182		184.2				119	137		136.9				97	87	90	167.3			
d50 (mm)	21	18	13.5	32.9	49.1	33.9		19	17	24.2	32	36.7	18.8		8.1	1.7	31	43.1			
		Cross	Sectio	on 4 (Re	each 2-	Riffle)			Cross	Section Section	on 5 (R	each 2	-Pool)			Cross	Section	on 6 (Re	each 2-	Riffle)	
Based on fixed baseline bankfull elevation ¹	Base	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+	Base	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+	Base	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+
Record elevation (datum) used	534.5	534.4	534.5	534.5	534.5	534.5		531.3	531.2	531.3	531.3	531.3	531.3		531.3	531	531.3	531.3	531.3	531.2	
Bankfull Width (ft)	23.3	23.4	23.99	24.32	23.9	23		18.1	14.3	16.46	13.96	14.4	15		20.6	18.4	20.79	20.6	21.4	19.4	
Floodprone Width (ft)	47	52	47	47	47	47		-	-	-	-	-	-		51	50.5	51	51	51	51	
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	1.3	1.3	1.234	1.246	1.2	1.2		1.2	1.2	1.282	1.339	1.3	1.3		1.5	1.4	1.339	1.363	1.4	1.4	
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	1.8	2	1.99	2.02	1.9	1.9		2.8	2.5	2.88	2.77	2.8	2.9		2.1	2	2.18	2.3	2.4	2.3	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)	31.2	29.7	29.61	30.29	27.6	27		22.2	17.8	21.1	18.69	18.8	19.6		30.8	25.2	27.84	28.08	29.6	26.8	
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	17.4	18.4	19.44	19.53	20.8	19.6		-	-	-	-	-	-		13.8	13.4	15.52	15.11	15.5	14.1	
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	2	2.2	1.959	1.932	2	2		-	-	-	-	-	-		2.5	2.7		2.476	2.4	2.6	
Bankfull Bank Height Ratio	1	1	1.095	1.084	1.05	1.05		-	-	-	-	-	-		1	1	1.069	1.026	1	1	
Cross Sectional Area between end pins (ft ²)	103	120	132.3	124.2				146	148	158.3	155.8				133	159	157.1	159.2			
d50 (mm)	17	14	24	29	53.7	45		0.6	3	9.3	16.9				11	4.6	16.8	26	24.2	32	

Table 11a Manitaring Data Dimensional Marphology Summary (Dimensional Parameters, Cross Sections)

1 = Widths and depths for monitoring resurvey will be based on the baseline bankfull datum regardless of dimensional/depositional development. Input the elevation used as the datum, which should be consistent and based on the baseline datum established. If the performer has inherited the project and cannot acquire the datum used for prior years this must be discussed with EEP. If this cannot be resolved in time for a given years report submission a footnote in this should be included that states: "It is uncertain if the monitoring datum has been consistent over the monitoring history, which may influence calculated values. Additional data from a prior performer is being acquired to provide confirmation. Values will be recalculated in a future submission based on a consistent datum if determined to be necessary."

																	Monit toratio																			
Parameter			Bas	eline					M	Y-1					M	Y-2					MY	′- 3					M	(- 4					MY	- 5		
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle only	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD^4	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD^4	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD^4	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD^4	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD^4	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD ⁴	n
Bankfull Width (ft)		16.9						17.2						17						16.2						16.7						15.2				
Floodprone Width (ft)		35						37						35						35						46						46				
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)		1.1						1.2						0.92						1.1						1.1						1.3				
¹ Bankfull Max Depth (ft)		1.5						1.6						1.42						1.7						1.6						1.7				
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)		18.6						20.8						15.7						17.8						18.1						19				
Width/Depth Ratio		15.4						14.2						18.5						14.8						15.5						12.2				
Entrenchment Ratio		2.1						2.2						2.06						2.16						2.7						3				
¹ Bank Height Ratio		1						1						1.24						1.19						1.3						1.17				
Profile																																				
Riffle Length (ft)	54.0	63.0	63.0	72.0	12.0	2		67.0			1		50.5	54.9	54.9	59.3	6.23	2	43.9	49.6	49.6	55.4		2	7	42	32	123	29		5	30	22	88	20	33
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.005	0.006	0.006	0.007	0.002	2		0.007					0.002	0.005	0.005	0.009	0.005	2	0.005	0.007	0.007	0.008		2	0.000	0.010	0.008	0.049	0.010		0.0011	0.0140	0.0103	0.0598	0.0131	
Pool Length (ft)	16.0	21.0	22.0	25.0	4.0	3	25.0		30.0	31.0			93	97	97	101	5.57	2	28.9	63.2	58.6	102	36.9	3	7	25	22	66	15		3	25	21	77	18	41
Pool Max depth (ft)													3.72	4.82	4.82	5.91	1.55	2	3.31	4.35	3.39	6.35	1.73	3	2.5		2.6	2.8			2.3		2.6	2.9		
Pool Spacing (ft)	107.0	113.0	113.0	119.0	8.0	2	112.0		125.0	194.0				127				1	104	118	118	131		2	7	58	59	66	29		6	60	57	147	32	41
Pattern																																				
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	1	78				1																														
Radius of Curvature (ft)	35	38	38	40	Î	2										Detter	n data w						الم ما ما				la data l									
Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.4												Patteri	n data w	II not ty	Dically D				n baseli		nal data	or prom	le data i	ndicate								
Meander Wavelength (ft)		204																																		
Meander Width Ratio		4.6																																		
	_						-																													
Additional Reach Parameters	1																		_																	_
Rosgen Classification				4c						24						4c					B4							4c						4c		
Channel Thalweg length (ft)				86						86						86					28							86					28			
Sinuosity (ft)				.3			_			.3						.3						.3						.3					1.			
Water Surface Slope (Channel) (ft/ft)				068					0.	.65					0.0						0.0						0.0	078					0.0)75		
BF slope (ft/ft)		1	0.0	065	1	_	_	1	1	r	r		000/	100/	0.0		1		047	5.00	0.0				40	40			1		10		 41		——	
³ Ri% / Ru% / P% / G% / S% ³ SC% / Sa% / G% / C% / B% / Be%													38%	10%	47% 65%		00/	4.0/		5.62 9%	45.8 68%		40/	00/	43	13	27	17		0	42 20%	8	10 20%	- 00/	0%	
³ d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95 /		-		-			-	-	-	-	-		4% 0.2	19%		11% 58.2	0% 90	1%			68% 32.9		1%	0%	15 6.3	0	46	38	0 117	0	20% NA	16% 0.92		0% 103	0%	
							-						0.2	14.2			90		'	18.4			163		6.3	32.4	49.1		117		NA	0.92	33.9	72	103	
² % of Reach with Eroding Banks									1	%			I		2	1%					99	%					10)%			ļ		9	6		
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric	I												I																		I					
Biological or Other																																				

Shaded cells indicate that these will typical of orbit of the fulled in. 1 = The distributions for these parameters can include information from both the cross-section surveys and the longitudinal profile. 2 = Proportion of reach exhibiting banks that are eroding based on the visual survey from visual assessment table 3 = Riffle, Run, Pool, Gilde, Step; Sitl/Class, Sand, Gravel, Cobble, Boulder, Bedrock; dip = max pave, disp = max subpave 4. = Of value/needed only if the n exceeds 3

																le 11b am Re																						
Parameter			Base	eline					M	Y-1					MY	-2					M	′- 3					MY	(- 4					MY-	5				
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle only	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD^4	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD^4	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD^4	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD^4	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD^4	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD ⁴	n		
Bankfull Width (ft)	20.6	22.8	23.3	24.6	0.9	3	18.4	22.33	23.4	25.2	3.523	3	20.791	23.08	23.99	24.44	1.992	3	20.6	23.75	24.32	26.32	2.904	3	21.4	23.5	23.9	25.3	2		19.4	22.5	23	25.2	2.9			
Floodprone Width (ft)	47	54	51	63	6.2	3	51	55.33	52	63	6.658	3	47	53.67	51	63	8.327	3	47	53.67	51	63	8.327	3	47	53.7	51	63	8.3		47	53.7	51	63	8.3			
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.5	0.1	3	1.3	1.467	1.4	1.7	0.208	3	1.2805	-	1.339	1.655		3	1.246	1.418	1.363	1.645	0.205	3	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.5	0.2		1.2	1.4	1.4	1.6	0.2			
¹ Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	1.8	1.9	1.8	2.1	0.2	3	2	2.167	2	2.5	0.289	3	2.06	2.197	2.18	2.35	0.146	3	2.02	2.31	2.3	2.61	0.295	3	1.9	2.2	2.3	2.4	0.3		1.9	2.2	2.3	2.4	0.3			
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)	30.8	31.89	31.2	33.7	1.3	3		32.53	29.7							39.71			28.08	33.89			8.222		27.6	31.8	29.6	38.3			26.8	31	27	39.3	7.2			
Width/Depth Ratio	13.8	16.4	17.4	18	0.8	3		15.57	14.9	18.4		3				19.09		3	15.11				2.335	3	15.3	17.4	16.9	19.9			13.9	16.3	15.8	19.2	2.7			
Entrenchment Ratio	2	2.3	2.5	2.5	0.1	3	2.2	2.467	2.5	2.7	0.252	3	1.9228			2.626				2.267			0.200	3	2	2.3	2.4	2.5	0.3		2	2.4	2.5	2.6	0.3			
¹ Bank Height Ratio	1	1	1	1	0	3	1	1	1	1	0	3	1.0511	1.059	1.058	1.069	0.009	3	0.954	1.021	1.026	1.084	0.065	3	1	1	1	1.1	0		1	1	1	1.1	0			
Profile	_																																					
Riffle Length (ft)	20.0	68.0	76.0	97.0	23.0	13	16.0		37.6	86.8			13.0	65.8	69.2	112.0	29.3	17	15.63	74.41	69.7	196	37.61	17	7	42	32	123	29		5	5 30 22 88 0.011 0.0140 0.0103 0.0598 3 25 21 77 2.3 2.6 2.9 147						
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.003	0.009	0.008	0.019	0.004	13	0.001		0.012	0.027			0.002	0.011	0.007	0.059	0.013	17	0.000	0.005	0.006	0.011	0.003	16	0.000	0.010	0.008	0.049	0.010)	0.0011	0.0598	0.0131					
Pool Length (ft)	12.0	22.0	23.0	33.0	6.0	13	12.0		29.2	44.3			29.4	57.0	50.1	160.4	30.6	19	26.74	48.29	45.31	78.75	14.47	18	7	25	22	66	15		3	77	18	41				
Pool Max depth (ft)	2.2	2.5		2.8		2							1.8	3.1	2.8	5.9	0.9	19	2.15	3.372	3.405	4.43	0.655	18	2.5		2.6	2.8			2.3							
Pool Spacing (ft)	56.0	117.0	123.0	150.0	25.0	12	52.0		144.0	317.0			76.9	121.5	116.5	183.7	30.7	18	48.5	124.9	121	241.2	43.89	17	7	58	59	66	29		6	60	57	147	32	41		
Pattern																																						
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	20	66	62	97	24	10																																
Radius of Curvature (ft)	35	49	43	80	14	12										Detter		ببالمعم الأب	minellu I	be collec	مامدامة		له منعاد ا		ما مامام ام		ارما منمار	Lanta										
Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)	1.5	2.2	2.2	3.3												Patter	n data v	will not t	/pically i				m basel			rprome	data ind	licate										
Meander Wavelength (ft)	158	221	229	261	36	10																			-													
Meander Width Ratio	1.9	3.1	2.7	4.8																																		
Additional Reach Parameters							·																															
Rosgen Classification			С							24					C							4						24					C4					
Channel Thalweg length (ft)			21	82					21	182					218	32					21	82					22	28					2228					
Sinuosity (ft)			1.1							.18					1.1							18					1.	18					1.18					
Water Surface Slope (Channel) (ft/ft)			0.0	068					0.0	067					0.00	66					0.0	066					0.0	064				0.0058						
BF slope (ft/ft)			0.0	065					0.0	067					0.00			_				063		-						_		 39% 3% 44% 11%						
³ Ri% / Ru% / P% / G% / S%													54%	2%	32%	16%			61%	2%	33%		<u> </u>		52%	13%	21%	14%	<u> </u>		39%							
³ SC% / Sa% / G% / C% / B% / Be%													11%	10%	71%	7%	0%	1%	5%	7%	71%		1%	1%	13	3	40	27	1	16	8%	17%	33%	25%	0% 122	0%		
³ d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95 /													1.6	6.22	14.06	41.34	97.76		5	15.68	29	74.88	163.6		0.1	18.2	36.5	90	127		0.5							
² % of Reach with Eroding Banks									0	1%					19	6					0	%					0'	%				0%						
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric							<u> </u>																		<u> </u>													
Biological or Other																																						

Biological or Other Shaded cells indicate that these will typically not be filled in. 1 = The distributions for these parameters can include information from both the cross-section surveys and the longitudinal profile. 2 = Proportion of reach exhibiting banks that are eroding based on the visual survey from visual assessment table 3 = Riffle, Run, Pool, Gilde, Step; SilVClay, Stand, Gravel, Cobble, Boulder, Bedrock, dip = max pave, disp = max subpave 4. = Of value/needed only if the n exceeds 3

APPENDIX E HYDROLOGY DATA Table 12. Verification of Bankfull Events

Table 12. Verification of Bankfull Events

	McCain Site St	tream Restoration-Project No. 443	
Date of Data Collection	Date of Occurrence	Method	Photo #
November 17, 2009	November 13, 2009	Site visit to evaluate indicators of stage after storm events	
September 30, 2010	September 30, 2010	NWS COOP Station and site visit for confirmation	Bankfull Photo 1
June 7, 2013	May 6, 2013	Wrack observed on top of banks as well as crest gauge observation indicated overbank after approximately 1.17 inches of rain documented* on May 6, 2013 following 1.9 inches of rain documented the prior week.	Bankfull Photo 2
September 9, 2013	June 7, 2013	Crest gauge observation indicated overbank after approximately 3.64 inches of rain documented* between June 2-7, 2013	-
September 9, 2013	July 11, 2013	Crest gauge observation indicated overbank after approximately 2.06 inches of rain documented* between July 10-11, 2013 following 4.31 inches of rain documented the previous two weeks.	

*Asheboro Airport (KHBI) weather station (Weather Underground 2013)





Axiom Environmental, Inc.

APPENDIX F ADDITIONAL SITE MAPPING Restoration Plan Figure 2. Project Drainage (USGS Topo Map) Restoration Plan Figure 3. Soils





APPENDIX G

ADDITIONAL SITE PHOTOGRAPHS

Preconstruction Site Photographs Asbuilt Site Photographs

Preconstruction Photographs

















McCain Stream Restoration Site (FINAL) EEP Project Number 443 Randolph County, North Carolina

Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Monitoring Year 5 of 5 (2013) October 2013 Appendices

Preconstruction Photographs (continued)

















McCain Stream Restoration Site (FINAL) EEP Project Number 443 Randolph County, North Carolina

Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Monitoring Year 5 of 5 (2013) October 2013 Appendices



McCain Stream Restoration Site (FINAL) EEP Project Number 443 Randolph County, North Carolina

Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Monitoring Year 5 of 5 (2013) October 2013 Appendices