### FINAL AS-BUILT BASELINE MONITORING REPORT MUD LICK CREEK MITIGATION SITE

Chatham County, North Carolina

NCDMS Project No. 93482 Contract No. 7683 USACE Action ID No. SAW-2014-00736 & DWR Project No 2014-1127 SCO No. 1209857-01 Data Collection: July 2018 Submission: September 2018



### **PREPARED FOR:**

N.C. DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY DIVISION OF MITIGATION SERVICES 1601 MAIL SERVICE CENTER RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27699-1601

### FINAL AS-BUILT BASELINE MONITORING REPORT MUD LICK CREEK MITIGATION SITE

Chatham County, North Carolina

NCDMS Project No. 93482 Contract No. 7683 USACE Action ID No. SAW-2014-00736 & DWR Project No 2014-1127. SCO No. 1209857-01 Data Collection: July 2018 Submission: September 2018



PREPARED BY: AXIOM ENVIRONMENTAL, INC. 218 SNOW AVENUE RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27603

From:	Haupt, Mac
To:	Tugwell, Todd J CIV USARMY CESAW (US); Schaffer, Jeff
Cc:	andrea.w.hughes@usace.army.mil; Kim Browning
Subject:	RE: [External] RE: Mud Lick Creek (DMS #93482) As-Built Baseline-Mitigation Plan Amendment Reuest
Date:	Thursday, November 01, 2018 10:13:07 AM

Fine with me...

-----Original Message-----

From: Tugwell, Todd J CIV USARMY CESAW (US) [mailto:Todd.J.Tugwell@usace.army.mil] Sent: Thursday, November 1, 2018 10:07 AM To: Schaffer, Jeff <jeff.schaffer@ncdenr.gov>; Haupt, Mac <mac.haupt@ncdenr.gov> Cc: andrea.w.hughes@usace.army.mil; Kim Browning <Kimberly.D.Browning@usace.army.mil> Subject: RE: [External] RE: Mud Lick Creek (DMS #93482) As-Built Baseline-Mitigation Plan Amendment Reuest

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Send all suspicious email as an attachment to Report Spam.<<u>mailto:report.spam@nc.gov</u>>

OK, sounds good. Thanks

-----Original Message-----

From: Schaffer, Jeff [mailto:jeff.schaffer@ncdenr.gov] Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2018 10:06 AM To: Tugwell, Todd J CIV USARMY CESAW (US) <Todd.J.Tugwell@usace.army.mil>; Haupt, Mac <mac.haupt@ncdenr.gov> Cc: Hughes, Andrea W CIV USARMY CESAW (US) <Andrea.W.Hughes@usace.army.mil>; Browning, Kimberly D CIV USARMY CESAW (US) <Kimberly.D.Browning@usace.army.mil> Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: [External] RE: Mud Lick Creek (DMS #93482) As-Built Baseline-Mitigation Plan Amendment Reuest

Todd,

Thank you for getting back to me on this. Here are my responses to your questions:

1. Reductions made to channel leaving the easement? No, the easement boundaries were not changed from approved mitigation plan to as-built/baseline. For some unexplained reason, during their design Wildlands carried the channel measurements outside the easement and that was not discovered until the as-built survey was done.

2. Additional culvert added? No, there are only 2 crossings, both of which were shown in the approved mitigation plan, but the linear footage was not removed from the credit calculations by Wildlands. I did misstate in my memo in item 2d that the culvert was realigned on East Branch Reach 2 when the culvert is actually on North Branch Reach 3 (formerly North Branch Reach 2).

3. Updating of the approved mitigation plan - I have updated maps and an updated asset table that are includeed in the As-built Baseline Report (prepared by Axiom) and are based upon the as-built survey done by North State (contractor) and approved by Wildlands. The asset table in the As-built Baseline Report shows the mitigation plan assets (linear footage) as well as the as-built baseline assets and the differences are explained in footnotes and comments. I will also add a copy the DMS request memo and this email that documents the IRT concurrence with the requested changes behind the cover page of the As-built Baseline Report.

Based on this email and if you are in agreement with my responses, I will update the assets in our database and have the As-built Credit ledger prepared, and provide hardcopies of the As-built Baseline Report to both you and Mac.

Jeff Schaffer

Eastern Supervisor, Project Management Division of Mitigation Services (Blockedhttps://deq.nc.gov/about/divisions/mitigation-services) NC Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ)

(919) 707-8308 office (919) 812-2634 mobile Jeff.Schaffer@ncdenr.gov

217 West Jones St., Suite 3000A 1652 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1652

Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

-----Original Message-----From: Tugwell, Todd J CIV USARMY CESAW (US) <Todd.J.Tugwell@usace.army.mil> Sent: Thursday, November 01, 2018 9:03 AM To: Schaffer, Jeff <jeff.schaffer@ncdenr.gov>; Haupt, Mac <mac.haupt@ncdenr.gov> Cc: andrea.w.hughes@usace.army.mil; Kim Browning <Kimberly.D.Browning@usace.army.mil> Subject: [External] RE: Mud Lick Creek (DMS #93482) As-Built Baseline-Mitigation Plan Amendment Reuest

CAUTION: External email. Do not click links or open attachments unless verified. Send all suspicious email as an attachment to Report Spam.<<u>mailto:report.spam@nc.gov</u>>

Jeff,

Mac and I discussed this yesterday. We don't necessarily have any problems with the changes you discuss, but it was not clear why were the reductions made for the channel leaving the easement - were the easement boundaries changed, and was an additional crossing added? We also need to make sure that we get the approved mit plan updated. Specifically, we need to make sure that we have updated maps and changes made to the credit determination (table 12 in the approved mitigation plan). I guess in this case these changes can be made in the asbuilt report, but we need to make sure that they are memorialized somewhere so when we get around to future credit releases, it is clear. I would also add a copy of this email, which concurs with the requested changes, to the record for the site.

Thanks,

Todd Tugwell Mitigation Project Manager Wilmington District, US Army Corps of Engineers 3331 Heritage Trade Drive, Suite 105 Wake Forest, North Carolina 27587 (919) 554-4884 ext. 58

-----Original Message-----From: Schaffer, Jeff [mailto:jeff.schaffer@ncdenr.gov] Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2018 9:41 AM To: Haupt, Mac <mac.haupt@ncdenr.gov>; Tugwell, Todd J CIV USARMY CESAW (US) <Todd.J.Tugwell@usace.army.mil> Cc: Hughes, Andrea W CIV USARMY CESAW (US) <Andrea.W.Hughes@usace.army.mil> Subject: [Non-DoD Source] RE: Mud Lick Creek (DMS #93482) As-Built Baseline-Mitigation Plan Amendment Reuest

My original email sent on 9/27/18 had and amendment request letter attached. To save you all from hunting for the original email, please see the attached.

Jeff Schaffer

Eastern Supervisor, Project Management Division of Mitigation Services (BlockedBlockedhttps://deq.nc.gov/about/divisions/mitigation-services) NC Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ) (919) 707-8308 office (919) 812-2634 mobile Jeff.Schaffer@ncdenr.gov>

217 West Jones St., Suite 3000A 1652 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1652

Email correspondence to and from this address is subject to the North Carolina Public Records Law and may be disclosed to third parties.

From: Haupt, Mac Sent: Wednesday, October 31, 2018 9:34 AM To: Schaffer, Jeff <jeff.schaffer@ncdenr.gov>; Todd Tugwell <todd.tugwell@usace.army.mil> Cc: andrea.w.hughes@usace.army.mil Subject: RE: Mud Lick Creek (DMS #93482) As-Built Baseline-Mitigation Plan Amendment Reuest

Jeff,

What was the reason for the reduction? There was nothing to really review other than your email, correct?

Thanks,

Mac

From: Schaffer, Jeff Sent: Thursday, September 27, 2018 8:15 AM To: Todd Tugwell <Todd.Tugwell@usace.army.mil <<u>mailto:Todd.Tugwell@usace.army.mil</u>> > Cc: andrea.w.hughes@usace.army.mil <<u>mailto:andrea.w.hughes@usace.army.mil</u>> ; Haupt, Mac <mac.haupt@ncdenr.gov <<u>mailto:mac.haupt@ncdenr.gov</u>> > Subject: Mud Lick Creek (DMS #93482) As-Built Baseline-Mitigation Plan Amendment Reuest

Todd,

This email is to notify you of changes in assets from Approved Mitigation Plan to As-Built Baseline for which I am seeking IRT approval to amend the mitigation plan in accordance with your October 5, 2017 correspondence regarding Mitigation Credit Calculation. Overall there is a reduction of stream credit from 2,938 at approved mitigation plan to +/-2,832 at as-built (rounded). Once I receive IRT approval, I will post the As-Built Baseline Report with the approved changes.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need to discuss this further.

Thanks!

Jeff Schaffer Eastern Supervisor, Project Management Division of Mitigation Services (https://deq.nc.gov/about/divisions/mitigation-services> ) NC Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ)





September 27, 2018

### MEMORANDUM

TO: Todd Tugwell, USACE; Chairman of IRT

FROM: Jeff Schaffer, DMS, Eastern Supervisor/Project Manager

SUBJECT: Amendment to Approved Mitigation Plan Mud Lick Creek – DMS #93482 Cape Fear 03030003; Chatham County

The assets/credits have changed from Approved Mitigation Plan to As-Built Baseline on the Mud Lick Creek project. In keeping with the October 5, 2017 correspondence regarding Mitigation Credit Calculation, DMS is requesting IRT approval to amend the approved mitigation plan for the subject project.

- 1. All measurements are based on center of the wetted perimeter of the stream channel in accordance with the October 5, 2017 memorandum.
- 2. Specific changes are:
  - a. Decrease of credits on North Branch R1 due to footage removal of stream lengths that were outside the conservation easement.
  - b. Increase of credits on North Branch Reach 2 due to channel realignment due to bedrock identified during construction.
  - c. Decrease of credits on North Branch Reach 3 due to channel realignment due to bedrock and removal of 20 lf/credit to account for an easement break for a crossing.
  - d. Increase of credits on East Branch Reach 2 due to minor stream channel and culvert realignment because of bedrock identified during construction.
  - e. Decrease of credits on East Branch R1 due to footage removal of stream lengths that were outside the conservation easement.
  - f. Decrease of credits on Mud Lick Creek R1 due to footage removal of stream lengths that were outside the conservation easement.
  - g. Decrease of credits on Mud Lick Creek R2 due to removal of 31 lf/credit to account for an easement break for a crossing.
  - h. Decrease of credits on Mud Lick Creek R3 due to footage removal of stream lengths that were outside the conservation easement.
- 3. Overall there is a reduction of stream credit from 2,938 at approved mitigation plan to  $\pm 2,832$  at as-built (rounded). This is a reduction of  $\pm 106$  stream credits.

DMS looks forward to your approval to amend the approved mitigation plan for the Mud Lick Creek project. Please let me know if you need any additional information or if you would like to discuss this further. I can be reached at (919) 707-8308, or via email at jeff.schaffer@ncdenr.gov.

cc: Andrea Hughes, USACE Mac Haupt, DWR File

Axiom Environmental, Inc.



218 Snow Avenue, Raleigh, NC 27603 919-215-1693

September 19, 2018

Mr. Jeff Schaffer North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality Division of Mitigation Services 1652 Mail Service Center Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-1652

RE: Mud Lick Creek (DMS Project # 93482, Contract #7683) Final Asbuilt Baseline Monitoring Report

12-004.22

Dear Jeff:

Axiom Environmental, Inc. (AXE) is pleased to provide you with 3 hardcopies and 1 CD of digital files for the Final Mud Lick Creek Asbuilt Baseline Monitoring Report. Axiom received your additional comment letter dated September 18, 2018 and have addressed them as follows:

- 1. Digital files:
  - a. GIS files: Change geographic reference for MudLickGraded from GCS\_NAD\_1983\_CORS96 to Geographic Coordinate System, NAD 1983 State Plane North Carolina (US Feet). *The geographic referenced was changed for this shapefile.*
- Appendix B, Figure 2: Please identify all reaches as named in the <u>revised</u> Table 1. (3 reaches on North Branch and 2 reaches on East Branch)
   Figure 2 was utdated to meth the revised Table 1. The centerline shateful was also utdated to reflect the correct result.

Figure 2 was updated to match the revised Table 1. The centerline shapefile was also updated to reflect the correct reach breaks.

3. Appendix D: Please have a look at the stream type for the baseline in table 7a. It seems that based on the W/D ratios it should be a E/C type as the pre-con assessment indicated. *The Rosgen Classification in Table 7a was changed to indicate an E/C type channel.* 

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments regarding any component of this submittal. Thank you for the opportunity to continue to assist the Division of Mitigation Services with this important project.

Sincerely, AXIOM ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.

Kenan R. Jernigan Project Scientist

Attachments: 3 hard copies Final Mud Lick Creek MY0 Baseline Monitoring Report & CD with electronic copy and digital support files



218 Snow Avenue, Raleigh, NC 27603 919-215-1693

September 10, 2018

Mr. Jeff Schaffer North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality Division of Mitigation Services 1652 Mail Service Center Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-1652

RE: Mud Lick Creek (DMS Project # 93482, Contract #7683) Final Asbuilt Baseline Monitoring Report

12-004.22

Dear Jeff:

Axiom Environmental, Inc. (AXE) is pleased to provide you with an electronic copy of the revised document and digital files for the Final Mud Lick Creek Asbuilt Baseline Monitoring Report. Axiom received your comments dated August 31, 2018 and have addressed them as follows:

1. Digital files:

a. GIS files: Ensure that all data sources are using the correct Geographic Coordinate System, NAD 1983 State Plane North Carolina (US Feet). (CVS\_Plot, Invasives, Monitoring\_XS, Origins, SAC & Structures using GCS\_NAD1983\_2011; Fish\_Benthics using GCS\_NAD\_1983\_CORS96). Please also make sure that the stream centerlines are properly segmented to reflect reach breaks, break in the easement and/or any specialized credit ratios in the shapefile. Attributing these features with reach IDs, restoration level, and lengths is required. *All shapefiles are now using the correct coordinate system. The stream centerline shapefile is now segmented and attributed to indicate reach ID, restoration level, and length.* 

b. Spatial Data Reference missing for MLC\_Stationing and MLD\_Station Ticks. *Spatial data has been updated to NAD 1983 State Plane North Carolina (US feet) for these shapefiles.* 

c. Crest gauges and their locations are not included in the digital/GIS files. A shapefile depicting Crest Gauge locations has been included in the digital submittal.

d. Per your contract the information for Warranty Transects is to be included in the MY1 report not the Baseline Report. When you submit with MY 1, please include GIS shapefiles and show on CCPV. *Warranty transect information will be submitted with the MY1 report.* 

2. Cover Sheets: Please just list the Axiom Monitoring Contract number since this deliverable is specific to your contract only. *The contract number was changed on the cover sheets to 7683*.

3. Project Summary, page i: insert CU: 03030003 and 14-digit HUC 03030003070010. These were added to the first paragraph of page i.

4. Page ii after Visual Assessments: Please insert the following text "As per sections 7.2 and 12.4 of the Mitigation Plan, physico-chemical and biological parameters may have been included as part of specialized monitoring, depending on the data that could be obtained during the baseline period. Monitoring of these parameters was for investigative purposes only and not tied to mitigation success or credit. The sample size and variability of the pre-con physico-chemical data was inadequate for the purposes of post-construction

comparison and therefor these will not be monitored moving forward. However, fish and macro-benthos will be monitored at the stations indicated in the asset and monitoring features map." *This was added to the text.* 

5. Monitoring Summary Table, page 1:

a. Streams: The morphological parameters that will be tallied should include BHR (Calculated by holding the As-built XSA constant and comparing to subsequent year) and the ER. *This was added in the stream monitoring section of the text.* 

b. Vegetation Monitoring: Would say vegetation monitoring will be completed after most of the growing season has passed. *This was changed in the vegetation monitoring section of the text.* 

6. Appendix A, Table 1:

a. North Branch R1: revise reach IDs to differentiate between the Enhancement II and Restoration sections of this reach (i.e. North Branch R1a and North Branch R1b) or break North Branch into three reaches. *These were broken out into North Branch R1*, *R2*, and *R3*.

b. East Branch: revise reach IDs to differentiate between the Enhancement II and Restoration sections of this reach (i.e. East Branch R1 and East Branch R2). *These were broken out into East Branch R1 and R2*.

c. Show credits out to 3 decimals. Credits are shown to 3 decimal places.

7. Appendix A, Table 3: make the following changes: add the following contact information:

a. Add Michael Anderson (336) 725-2010 to contact for Construction Contractor. *The contact was added.* 

b. Add Stephen Joyce (336) 725-2010 to contact for Planting Contractor. *The contact was added*.
c. Delete Turner Land Surveying from As-built Surveyors. They did survey for original construction plans that were the basis of the redline (record) drawings. Turner had nothing to do with As-builts. *Turner Land Surveying was deleted from the table*.

### 8. Appendix B, Figure 2:

a. Please identify all reaches as named in Table 1. *All reaches were labeled on the figure to match Table 1.* b. Please show locations of the three crest gauges installed at the site. Also make sure that these are included in the digital/GIS files (see comment 1.c. above). *These have been added to Figure 2 and the shapefiles are included in the in the digital submittal.* 

c. Color code vegetation plots to differentiate between those that are above and below success criteria. *Plots were color coded based on success criteria on the CCVP*.

d. A stream area of concern is shown on Mud Lick Creek Reach 2, but there are no photographs as described in the Project Boundaries & Visual Assessments section on page 2. Unfortunately, a photograph of the stream area of concern could not be found. A brief description of the area was added to the Stream discussion on page 1 of the report. Photographs of all areas of concern will be provided during all subsequent monitoring years.

e. Please symbolize the sections of Mud Lick mainstem that were graded *A layer was added to show the sections of Mud Lick Creek that were graded.* 

### 9. Appendix B, Table 5:

a. Verify this list against the list on sheet 2.1 of the Record Drawings (see next to last page in Appendix E). There appear to be some differences between the two. *The list was verified to be the same; however, the order of the species listed was different so it was reordered to match the record drawings order.*b. Correct spelling for Eastern Hophornbeam. *This was corrected.*

### 10. Appendix B, Table 6:

a. Boxelder, red maple, hazel alder, sugarberry, and willow oak are listed as a planted species in various plots but are not listed in Table 5 which is the list of planted species provided by the planting contractor. Explain why these show up in Table 6 as planted. *Bare root stems found during asbuilt monitoring were identified as accurately as possible. Generally, planted stems are easily discernable due to the grid-like* 

pattern in which they are planted, and in many cases during asbuilt monitoring, the signs of planting (dibble bar holes, etc.) are obvious. Therefore, when this evidence is observed at a woody stem, it is catalogued as a planted stem, regardless of whether the species was found on the planting list or not. Additionally, the red maple and box elder were changed from planted stems to natural recruits.

b. American elm, Eastern hophornbeam, Elderberry, Witch hazel, Swamp tupelo and Tulip poplar are listed among the planted stems in Table 5 but do not appear in Table 6. Please explain. *These* species were not found in any of the vegetation plots during monitoring. The dense herbaceous layer was an important factor to consider during asbuilt vegetation monitoring, as it was performed in late summer. Each monitoring year, all plots are thoroughly searched for stems, and it is possible some of these species were covered/hidden and will be found during subsequent monitoring years.

c. Explain why there are two lines for sweet gum. The species was not listed for one of the sweetgum entries in the CVS database that generates this table. The species was added to this entry which corrected the issue.

d. Verify if the "unknown" planted stems could be one or more of the missing planted stems in comment 8.b. The unknown planted stems could certainly be one or more of the missing planted stem species, however these stems were very small, in some cases leafless, and they could not be identified with confidence.
e. For consistency between Tables 5 and 6, change American hornbeam to Ironwood. This has been changed in the table.

11. Appendix D: Need to re-evaluate the bankfull cross-sectional areas for Mud Lick mainstem in the context of the designer's calls. It was acknowledged that the bank height ratios for this reach were not going to be 1 in many places. They would be 1.2, 1.3 in many places, but it was proposed that since the reach had found its pattern and beltwidth, that an intensive EII with areas of bank reshaping would be pursued. The designer identified the bankfull XSA for this reach in the 40-50 SF range. The bankfull area calls should probably better approximate those even if it makes for BHRs of 1.2 or so. This was not a full restoration reach. Reexamine/ Recalculate in the context of this discussion the XS parameters for Mud Lick mainstem and update table 7a for Mud Lick *The Mud Lick mainstem cross-sections were updated with consideration for the design approach and where possible were adjusted to the 40-50 sq ft range*.

XS 10 seems to be outright incorrect for its XSA calculation. This was incorrect; the correct data was input and updated throughout.

Also, for Table 7a-c the baseline distribution should be restricted to riffle cross sections. Baseline data is limited to riffle cross-sections.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments regarding any component of this submittal. Thank you for the opportunity to continue to assist the Division of Mitigation Services with this important project.

Sincerely, AXIOM ENVIRONMENT'AL, INC.

Kenan R. Jernigan Project Scientist

Attachments: electronic copy Final Mud Lick Creek MY0 Baseline Monitoring Report & digital support files

### **PROJECT SUMMARY**

The North Carolina Division of Mitigation Services (NCDMS) has established the Mud Lick Creek Mitigation Site (Site) located within the Cape Fear River Basin Cataloging Unit (CU) 03030003 in the Upper Rocky River local watershed planning (LWP) area and 14-digit HUC 03030003070010. The Site was identified as a priority mitigation project in the *Detailed Assessment and Targeting of Management Report* (Tetra Tech 2005). The main stressors to aquatic resources identified during the watershed assessments described in the LWP documents include the following.

- Nutrient (nitrogen and phosphorous) loading from farming;
- Sediment loading from overland runoff, disturbed surfaces, and streambank erosion;
- Cattle access to streams increasing bank erosion and fecal coliform contamination; and
- Insufficient bank vegetation.

The project will contribute to meeting management recommendations to offset these stressors as described above for the LWP area by accomplishing the following primary goals.

- Control and reduce nutrient sources from the Site;
- Reduce sediment loads from disturbed areas on the Site and from eroding stream banks;
- Increased aeration of flows within the project extent promoting increases in dissolved oxygen concentrations;
- Reduce sources of fecal coliform pollution;
- Improve instream habitat;
- Reduce thermal loadings;
- Reconnect channels with floodplains and raise local water table; and
- Restore riparian habitat.

These goals will be accomplished through the following objectives:

- Restore riparian vegetation on the Site and thereby reduce sediment loads to streams from stream banks and existing pastures, increase on-Site retention of sediment and nutrients, create riparian habitat, and provide shade for streams to reduce thermal loadings;
- Stabilize eroding streambanks to reduce sediment inputs;
- Install fencing around the perimeter of the conservation easement to eliminate livestock access to streams, thereby reducing sediment, nutrient, and fecal coliform inputs;
- Plant restored and stabilized streambanks with native species to improve stability and habitat;
- Install instream structures to improve stability, create habitat, and help aerate stream flows;
- Raise streambeds to reconnect restored channels to floodplains and raise local water tables; and
- Restore streams and vegetation so the Site looks natural and aesthetically pleasing.

**<u>Stream Success Criteria</u>**: The stream restoration performance criteria for the Site will follow approved performance criteria presented in the 2015 *Mud Lick Creek Mitigation Site Final Mitigation Plan* as described below.

<u>Stream Dimension</u>: Riffle cross-sections on the restoration reaches and enhancement II reaches, where banks were re-graded (three reaches of Mud Lick Creek), should be stable and should show little change in bankfull area, maximum depth, and width-to-depth ratio. Bank-height-ratios shall not exceed 1.2 and entrenchment ratios shall be at least 2.2 for restored channels to be considered stable. All riffle cross-sections should fall within the parameters defined for channels of the appropriate stream type. If any changes do occur, these changes will be evaluated to assess whether the stream channel is showing signs of instability. Indicators of instability include a vertically incising thalweg or eroding channel banks. Changes in the channel that indicate a movement toward stability or enhanced habitat include a decrease in

the width-to-depth ratio in meandering channels or an increase in pool depth. Remedial action would not be taken if channel changes indicate a movement toward stability.

<u>Stream Pattern and Profile</u>: The as-built survey will include a longitudinal profile for the baseline monitoring report. Longitudinal profile surveys will not be conducted during the seven-year monitoring period unless other indicators during the annual monitoring indicate a trend toward vertical and lateral instability.

<u>Substrate</u>: Substrate materials in the restoration reaches should indicate a progression towards or the maintenance of coarser materials in the riffle features and smaller particles in the pool features.

<u>Hydraulics</u>: Two bankfull flow events, in separate monitoring years, must be documented on the restoration reaches and enhancement II reaches where banks were re-graded (three reaches of Mud Lick Creek) within the seven-year monitoring period.

<u>Vegetation Success Criteria</u>: The final vegetative success criteria will be the survival of 210 planted stems per acre in the riparian corridor along restored and enhanced reaches at the end of the required monitoring period (year seven). The interim measure of vegetative success for the Site will be the survival of at least 320 planted stems per acre at the end of the third monitoring year and at least 260 stems per acre at the end of the fifth year of monitoring. If this performance standard is met by year five and stem density is trending towards success (i.e., no less than 260 five year old stems/acre), monitoring of vegetation on the Site may be terminated with written approval by the USACE in consultation with the NC Interagency Review Team. The extent of invasive species coverage will also be monitored and controlled as necessary throughout he required monitoring period (seven years).

**Photo Documentation**: Photographs should illustrate the Site's vegetation and morphological stability on an annual basis. Cross-section photos should demonstrate no excessive erosion or degradation of the banks. Longitudinal photos should indicate the absence of persistent bars within the channel or vertical incision. Grade control structures should remain stable. Deposition of sediment on the bank side of vane arms is preferable. Maintenance of scour pools on the channel side of vane arms is expected.

**<u>Visual Assessments</u>**: Visual assessments should support performance standards as described above.

As per Sections 7.2 and 12.4 of the Mitigation Plan, physio-chemical and biological parameters may have been included as part of specialized monitoring, depending on the data that could be obtained during the baseline period. Monitoring of these parameters was for investigative purposes only and not tied to mitigation success or credit. The sample size and variability of the pre-construction physio-chemical data was inadequate for the purposes of post-construction comparison and therefore, these will not be monitored moving forward. However, fish and macrobenthos will be monitored at the stations indicated in the asset and monitoring features map (Figure 2, Appendix B).

**Site Background**: The Site is located in northwestern Chatham County, north of Siler City and northwest of Silk Hope (Figure 1, Appendix B). The Site is located within the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Hydrologic Unit and Targeted Local Watershed 03030003070010 (North Carolina Division of Water Quality Subbasin 03-06-12) of the Cape Fear River Basin. Prior to construction, the Site was used for agricultural livestock production. The proposed project will improve water quality as well as provide numerous ecological benefits within the Cape Fear River Basin. The project will help meet management recommendations of the *Upper Rocky River Local Watershed Plan* by restoring a vegetated riparian buffer zone, stabilizing eroding stream banks, and removing livestock from streams and riparian zones. These activities will result in reduced nutrient, sediment, and fecal coliform inputs; improved aquatic and riparian habitat, and other ecological benefits.

<u>Mitigation Components</u>: Project mitigation efforts will generate 2832 Stream Mitigation Units (SMUs) as the result of the following.

- Restoration of 1215 linear feet of Site streams
- Enhancement (Level II) of 2426 linear feet of Site streams

Site design was completed in June 2015. Site construction occurred May 24–August 25, 2017 (final walkthrough) and the Site was planted in February 2018. Completed project activities, reporting history, completion dates, project contacts, and project attributes are summarized in Tables 1-4 (Appendix A).

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	METHODS	1
2.0	REFERENCES	3

### APPENDICES

Appendix A. Background Tables
Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Units
Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History
Table 3. Project Contacts Table
Table 4. Project Attributes Table
Appendix B. Visual Assessment Data
Figure 1. Site Location
Figure 2. Current Conditions Plan View
Vegetation Plot Photographs
Appendix C. Vegetation Data
Table 5. Planted Bare Root Woody Vegetation
Table 6. Total Stems by Plot and Species
Appendix D. Stream Measurement and Geomorphology Data
Cross-section Plots
Tables 7A-7C. Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary
Tables 8A-8F. Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary
Appendix E. As-built Plan Sheets

### 1.0 METHODS

Monitoring of restoration efforts will be performed for seven years, or until success criteria are fulfilled. Monitoring is proposed for the stream channel and vegetation. In general, the restoration success criteria, and required remediation actions, are based on the *Stream Mitigation Guidelines* (USACE et al. 2003). Monitoring features are summarized in the following table and described below; monitoring features are depicted on Figure 2 (Appendix B).

Parameter	<b>Monitoring Feature</b>	Quantity	Frequency							
	Streams									
Dimension	Cross-sections	7 riffles & 3 pools	annually							
Substrate	Pebble counts	3 riffles	annually							
Hydrology	Crest gauges	3	annually							
Vagatation	Vegetation Plots	12	annually							
vegetation	Warranty Plots	10	MY1							
Visual as	sessments	Entire Site	biannually							
Exotic & nui	sance species	Entire Site	annually							
Project l	ooundary	Entire Site	annually							
Reference	ohotographs	22	annually							
	Supplementa	l Monitoring								
	Maarabanthaa	5 sites (Preconstruction only)								
Dialagiaal	Macrobentinos	3 sites (MY3, MY5, & MY7)								
Biological	Fish	3 sites (Precon	struction only)							
	L ISU	2 sites (MY4 & MY7)								

### **Monitoring Summary**

### <u>Streams</u>

The restored stream reaches are proposed to be monitored for geometric activity as follows.

- 7 permanent riffle cross-sections
- 3 permanent pool cross-sections
- 3 riffle pebble count samples for substrate analysis
- 3 stream crest gauges

The data will be presented in graphic and tabular format. Data to be presented will include 1) crosssectional area, 2) bankfull width, 3) average depth, 4) maximum depth, and 5) width-to-depth ratio. Substrate analysis will be evaluated through pebble counts at three riffle cross-sections and data presented as a D50 for stream classification and tracking purposes. The stream will subsequently be classified according to stream geometry and substrate (Rosgen 1996). Significant changes in channel morphology including bank-height-ratios and entrenchment ratios will be tracked and reported by comparing data to asbuilt measurements in addition to each successive monitoring year. Annual photographs will include 22 fixed station photographs (12 vegetation plots and 10 cross-sections) (Appendix B). In addition, the Site contains three stream crest gauges to assist with documentation of bankfull events.

One stream area of concern was observed along a large bend in Mud Lick Creek Reach 2 (Figure 2, Appendix B). Approximately 50 feet of the right bank and 20 feet of the left bank have eroded to the point of bank sloughing. This area currently appears relatively unstable, and it will be closely monitored during year 1.

### **Vegetation**

Restoration monitoring procedures for vegetation will monitor plant survival and species diversity. Planting occurred within the entire Site. After planting of the area was completed, 12 vegetation plots were installed and monitored at the Site; baseline results can be found in Appendix C. Annual measurements of vegetation will consist of the following.

- 10 plant warranty inspection plots (only MY1)
- 12 CVS vegetation plots

A photographic record of plant growth should be included in each annual monitoring report; baseline photographs are included in Appendix B. During the first year, vegetation will receive a cursory, visual evaluation on a periodic basis to ascertain the degree of overtopping of planted elements by nuisance species. Subsequently, quantitative sampling of vegetation will be performed as outlined in the *CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.2* (Lee et al. 2008) in late fall/early winter of the first monitoring year and annually toward the end of the growing for the remainder of the monitoring period until vegetation success criteria are achieved.

Locations of exotic and nuisance vegetation will be recorded using a GPS and included on mapping.

### Project Boundaries & Visual Assessments

Locations of any fence damage, vegetation damage, boundary encroachments, etc. will be recorded using a GPS and included on mapping.

Visual assessments will be performed along all streams on a bi-annual basis during the seven year monitoring period. Problem areas will be noted such as channel instability (i.e. lateral and/or vertical instability, in-stream structure failure/instability and/or piping, headcuts), vegetated buffer health (i.e. low stem density, vegetation mortality, invasive species or encroachment), beaver activity, or livestock access. Areas of concern will be mapped and photographed accompanied by a written description in the annual report. Problem areas will be re-evaluated during each subsequent visual assessment.

### **Supplementary Monitoring**

Supplemental monitoring will include biological monitoring in the Spring as follows.

- 3 benthos sampling sites (MY3, MY5, & MY7)
- 2 fish sampling sites (MY4 & MY7)

These parameters are being monitored for analytical purposes and are not tied to mitigation success and associated credit releases. The primary criteria for indication of improvement for the benthos and fish will be an increase of at least one bioclassification between the pre-con assessment and the post-con monitoring. Richness and EPT metrics will be analyzed as well.

### 2.0 REFERENCES

- Lee, M.T., R.K. Peet, S.D. Roberts, and T.R. Wentworth. 2008. CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation. Version 4.2. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Ecosystem Enhancement Program. Raleigh, North Carolina.
- North Carolina Division of Mitigation Services (NCDMS) 2015. Mud Lick Creek Mitigation Site Final Mitigation Plan.
- Rosgen D. 1996. Applied River Morphology. Wildland Hydrology. Pagosa Springs, Colorado.
- Tetra Tech, 2005. Upper Rocky River Local Watershed Plan Preliminary Findings Report. Prepared for the North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program.
- United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission (NCWRC), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and North Carolina Division of Water Quality (NCDWQ). 2003. Stream Mitigation Guidelines. State of North Carolina.

### Appendix A. Background Tables

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

### Table 1. Mud Lick Creek (ID-93482) - Mitigation Assets and Components

					-	-	-		•	
Project	Wetland	Existing	Stationing	Mitigation	As-Built	Restoration	Approach	Mitigation	Mitigation	
Component	Position and	Footage		Plan	Footage	Level	Priority	Ratio (X:1)	Credits	
(reach ID, etc.)	HydroType			Footage	*		Level			Notes/Comments
North Branch R1		318	100+10 - 103+28	327	318	EII	-	1.5	212.000	Planting, fencing
North Branch R2		522	103+28 - 108+66	520	538	R	PI	1	538.000	
North Branch R3		351	108+66 - 111+51	303	265	R	P2	1	265.000	20 LF of restoration was removed from North Branch Reach 3 in order to account for an easement break
East Branch R1		165	200+05 - 201+69	168	164	EII	-	1.5	109.333	Planting, fencing
East Branch R2		315	201+69 - 205+81	409	412	R	P2	1	412.000	
Mud Lick Creek R1		525	300+72 - 306+23	623	551	EII	-	1.5	367.333	Planting, fencing, bank repairs
Mud Lick Creek R2		718	306+23 - 313+14	693	660	EII	-	1.5	440.000	Planting, fencing, bank repairs; 31 LF of enhancement II was removed from Mud Lick Creek Reach 2 in order to account for an easement break
Mud Lick Creek R3		733	313+14 - 320+47	748	733	EII	-	1.5	488.667	Planting, fencing, bank repairs

\*Reach start and end stationing may differ slightly from the mitigation plan due to removal of stream lengths that are outside the conservation easement. The upstream ends of Mud Lick Creek, North Branch, and East Branch experienced footage reductions of 72', 10', and 5' respectively, while the downstream end of Mud Lick Creek experienced a footage reduction of 17'.

### Length and Area Summations by Mitigation Category

Restoration Level	Stream (linear feet)	Riparian Wetland (acres)		Non-riparian Wetland (acres)
		Riverine	Non-Riverine	
Restoration	1215			
Enhancement				
Enhancement I				
Enhancement II	2426			
Creation				
Preservation				
High Quality Pres				

### **Overall Assets Summary**

	Overall
Asset Category	Credits
Stream	2,832.333

### Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History Mud Lick Creek (ID-93482)

Elapsed Time Since Grading Complete: 1 year 1 month Elapsed Time Since Planting Complete: 5 months Number of Reporting Years: 0

	<b>Data Collection</b>	Completion
Activity or Deliverable	Complete	or Delivery
Project Institution		February 13, 2013
Mitigation Plan		December 2015
404 Permit Date		March 25, 2016
Final Design – Construction Plans		June 2015
Construction		August 25, 2017
Bare Root; Containerized; and B&B Plantings for the Entire Project Site	February 2018	February 2018
Baseline Monitoring Document (Year 0 Monitoring Baseline)	July 2018	August 2018

Designer	Wildlands Engineering Inc. (License No. E-0831)
Designer	312 West Millbrook Rd, Suite 225
	Raleigh NC 27609
	Angela N. Allen, PE (919) 851-9986
Construction Plans and Sediment and	Wildlands Engineering, Inc. (License No. F-0831)
Erosion Control Plans	312 West Millbrook Rd, Suite 225
	Raleigh, NC 27609
	Angela N. Allen, PE (919) 851-9986
Construction Contractor	North State Environmental, Inc.
	2889 Lowery Street
	Winston Salem, NC 27101
	Michael Anderson (336) 725-2010
Planting Contractor	North State Environmental, Inc.
	2889 Lowery Street
	Winston Salem, NC 27101
	Stephen Joyce (336) 725-2010
As-built Surveyors	Allied Associates, PA
	4720 Kester Mill Road
	Winston Salem, NC 27103
	David Alley (336) 765-2377
Baseline Data Collection	Axiom Environmental, Inc.
	218 Snow Avenue
	Raleigh, NC 27603
	Grant Lewis (919) 215-1693

# Table 4. Project Baseline Information and Attributes Mud Lick Creek (ID-93482)

Project Information							
Project name	Mud Lick Creek Mitigation Site						
Project county	Chatham County, North Carolina						
Project area (Acres)		11.2					
Project coordinates (lat/long)			35.8128°N,	79.4350°W			
Planted Acres			9	.6			
Project Watershed Summary Information							
Physiographic region	C	Carolina Slate H	Belt of the Piec	lmont Physiog	graphic Province	2	
Project river basin			Cape Fear I	River Basin			
USGS hydrologic unit (8 digit/14-			02020002/020	20002070010			
digit)			03030003/030	300030/0010			
NCDWR Sub-basin			03-0	6-12			
Project drainage area (mi <sup>2</sup> )			3.	64			
% Drainage area impervious			< ]	1%			
CGIA land use classification	Develop	ed, Forested/S	crubland, Agr	iculture/Manag	ged Herb., Oper	n Water	
	Reac	h Summary II	nformation				
Parameters	Mud Lick	Mud Lick	Mud Lick	North	North	East	
	Creek –	Creek –	Creek –	Branch –	Branch –	East	
	R1	R2	R3	R1	R2	Branch	
Restored length (linear feet)	551 660 733			856	265	576	
Valley confinement		S	lightly confine	ed - unconfine	d		
Drainage area (acres/mi <sup>2</sup> )	1747/2.73	2170/3.39	2330/3.64	236.8/0.37	416/0.65	172.8/0.27	
Perennial (P), Intermittent (I)	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	Р	
NCDWR water quality	NCDWR water quality						
classification			w 5-11	II, CA			
Stream Classification (existing)	E4	C4	E4	E4	B4c	B4c	
Stream Classification (proposed)	E4	C4	E4	C4	C4	C4	
Evolutionary trend (Simon &	$\mathbf{W} / \mathbf{V}$	$\mathbf{W} / \mathbf{V}$	$\mathbf{W} \mathbf{A}$	IV	IV	IV	
Hupp)	1 V / V	1 v / v	1 v / v	1 v	1 v	1 v	
FEMA classification	AE	AE	AE	AE	AE	AE	
	Reg	ulatory Consi	derations				
Regulation	Applicable?	Resol	ved?	Suppo	rting Documer	ntation	
Waters of the US – Section 404	Yes Yes			S	AW-2014-0073	6	
Waters of the US – Section 401	Yes Yes			S	AW-2014-0073	6	
Endangered Species Act	Ves Ves				No Effect –		
Endangered Species Act			CE Document				
Historic Preservation Act	No NA		CE Document				
Coastal Zone Management Act	No	N	Δ		N۸		
(CZMA/CAMA)	110	IN	n		INA		
FEMA Floodplain Compliance	Yes	Ye	es	Chatha Develo	am County Floc pment Permit #	odplain 14-001	
Essential Fisheries Habitat	No	N	A		NA		

### Appendix B Visual Assessment Data

Figure 1. Site Location Figure 2. Current Conditions Plan View Vegetation Plot Photos



### Legend

Conservation Easement Stream Restoration Stream Enhancement (Level II) Stationing Structures Graded Sections of Mud Lick Creek Cross-section Locations O Crest Gauge CVS Plots Meeting Success Criteria during MY-0 (2018) CVS Plots Not Meeting Success Criteria during MY-0 (2018) ★ CVS Plot Origins ★ Fish & Benthic Sites Invasives: Ailanthus altissima (tree-of-heaven) Stream Area of Concern

Mud Lick Greek R<sup>3</sup>

ŝ

X

Sito	Monitoring Fosture	Frequency						
Site	wonitoring reature	Pre-con	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY7		
1	Benthics & Fish	х						
2	Benthics	х	х		х	х		
	Fish	х		х		х		
h	Benthics	х	х		х	х		
3	Fish	х		х		х		
4	Benthics	х						
5	Benthics	х	х		х	х		

301+00

2+00

Stream Area of Concern: Sloughing of both banks at the outerbend.

0



Mud Lick Creek Stream Restoration Site Baseline Vegetation Monitoring Photographs Taken July 2018

















Mud Lick Creek Stream Restoration Site Baseline Vegetation Monitoring Photographs Taken July 2018



### Appendix C. Vegetation Plot Data

Table 5. Planted Bare Root Woody VegetationTable 6. Total Stems by Plot and Species

## Table 5. Planted Bare Root Woody VegetationMud Lick Creek (ID-93482)

Species	Quantity
Green Ash (Fraxinus pennsylvanica)	300
Sycamore (Platanus occidentalis)	400
Eastern Redbud (Cercis canadensis)	400
Cottonwood (Populus deltoides)	300
River birch (Betula nigra)	300
Hackberry (Celtis occidentalis)	300
Black Gum (Nyssa sylvatica)	300
American Elm (Ulmus americana)	300
Eastern Hophornbeam (Ostrya virginica)	300
Elderberry (Sambucus spp.)	300
Black Locust (Robinia psuedoaccia)	300
Silky Dogwood (Cornus ammomum)	300
Witch Hazel (Hamamelis virginica)	550
Buttonbush (Cephalanthus occidentalis)	300
Persimmon (Diospyros virginiana)	300
Ironwood (Carpinus caroliniana)	400
Swamp Tupelo (Nyssa biflora)	100
Swamp Chestnut oak (Quercus michauxii)	100
Water oak (Quercus nigra)	100
Tulip Poplar (Liridendron tulipifera)	300
TOTAL	5950

### Table 6. Total Stems by Plot and Species EEP Project Code 93482. Project Name: Mud Lick Creek

																	Curren	nt Plot E	Data (MN	0 2018)															A	nnual N	<b>/</b> leans	5
			934	82-01-0	0001	934	82-01-000	2	93482-	01-0003	9	3482-01	-0004	934	482-01-0	0005	93482-01-	0006	934	82-01-0	007	934	82-01-0	008	93482	01-0009	)	93482	2-01-00	10	934	32-01-0011	93482	-01-0012		MY0 (2	018)	-
Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all T	P	noLS P-a	III T	Pno	LS P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS	P-all	т	PnoLS P-	all T	Pi	noLS P	-all T		PnoLS	P-all T	PnoLS P	-all T	PnoL	S P-all	Т	
Acer negundo	boxelder	Tree									1					1		3	3		3							1	1	2						1	1	10
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																2	1		3						1			1					L			10
Alnus	alder	Shrub						1			2																											3
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree										1	1	1			2 2	2 2	2			1	1	1												4	4	4
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Tree	1	1	1	3	3	3									1 1	1 1	1 1	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5				1	1 :	. 2	2	2 1	15 1	15	15
Carya	hickory	Tree						1																														1
Celtis laevigata	sugarberry	Tree	1	1	1																															1	1	1
Celtis occidentalis	common hackberry	Tree																										2	2	2	1	1 :				3	3	3
Cephalanthus occidentalis	common buttonbush	Shrub										1	1	1			1 1	1 1	1			1	1	1				1	1	1						4	4	4
Cercis canadensis	eastern redbud	Tree	2	2	2				1	1	1	1	1	1 1	1	1						1	1	1												6	6	6
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub				1	1	1				3	3	3								1	1	1									3	3	3	8	8	8
Diospyros virginiana	common persimmon	Tree																										2	2	2	1	1 :	. 2	2	2	5	5	5
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	2	2	2	1	1	1				1	1	1 7	7 7	8																	1	1	L 1	12 1	12	13
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																																	5			5
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree																			1									3		3	5		3			10
Nyssa biflora	swamp tupelo	Tree				4	4	4											1	1	1										1	1 :				6	6	6
Ostrya virginiana	hophornbeam	Tree																	1	1	1															1	1	1
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	1	1	1				4	4	4	1	1	1														1	1	1						7	7	7
Populus deltoides	eastern cottonwood	Tree																	1	1	1										1	1 :	. 1	1	L	3	3	3
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree																				3	3	3				1	1	1	2	2 2	1	1	L	7	7	7
Quercus nigra	water oak	Tree																	1	1	1				1	1	1	1	1	1						3	3	3
Robinia pseudoacacia	black locust	Tree																													1	1 :				1	1	1
Unknown		Shrub or Tree										1	1	1			2 2	2 2	2																	3	3	3
		Stem count	7	7	7	9	9	11	5	5	8	9	9	9 8	8 8	10	6 6	5 13	3 5	5	12	8	8	8	6	6	7	9	9	14	8	8 11	. 10	10 1	9 9	90 9	<del>)</del> 0 1	129
		size (ares)		1	-		1			1		1			1		1			1			1			1			1			1		1		12		
1		size (ACRES)		0.02			0.02		0.	02		0.02			0.02		0.02			0.02			0.02		0	.02		(	0.02			0.02	(	0.02		0.3	0	
		Species count	5	5	5	4	4	6	2	2	4	7	7	7 2	2 2	3	4 4	4 6	<del>6</del> 5	5	8	6	6	6	2	2	3	7	7	9	7	7 8	6	6	) 1	18 1	18	23
	9	Stems per ACRE	283.3	283.3	283.3	364.2	364.2 44	45.2 2	202.3 20	2.3 32	3.7 <mark>36</mark> 4	.2 364.	2 364.	2 323.7	323.7	404.7	242.8 242.8	3 526.1	202.3	202.3	485.6	323.7	323.7	323.7	242.8 2	42.8 283	3.3 3	64.2 3	364.2 5	566.6	323.7	323.7 445.2	404.7	04.7 768.9	303.	.5 303	.5 ⊿	435

Color for Density

PnoLS = Planted excluding livestakes

P-all = Planting including livestakes

T = All planted and natural recruits including livestakes

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%

T includes natural recruits

### Appendix D. Stream Measurements and Geomorphology Data

Cross Section Plots Tables 7A-7C. Baseline Stream Data Summary Tables 8A-8F. Monitoring Data-Dimensional Data Summary

River Basin:	Cape Fear
Site Name	Mud Lick Creek
XS ID	XS - 1, Riffle (Mud Lick Cr)
Drainage Area (sq mi):	3.64
Date:	7/25/2018
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Smith

Station	Elevation
0.00	99.85
4.71	99.89
8.04	99.95
10.30	99.90
12.12	99.12
13.68	98.19
15.15	97.45
16.19	97.09
18.00	96.16
19.55	95.43
20.72	94.82
21.88	94.45
22.83	94.19
24.88	93.96
25.93	93.79
27.76	93.77
29.45	93.47
31.00	93.48
32.39	93.51
33.02	93.54
34.05	97.26
35.49	97.74
37.53	98.43
40.21	98.69
43.17	98.79
45.90	99.00
47.39	99.09

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	97.3
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	49.8
Bankfull Width:	18.3
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	101.1
Flood Prone Width:	100.0
Max Depth at Bankfull:	3.8
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	2.7
W / D Ratio:	6.7
Entrenchment Ratio:	5.5
Bank Height Ratio:	1.3





River Basin:	Cape Fear
Site Name	Mud Lick Creek
XS ID	XS - 2, Riffle (Mud Lick Cr)
Drainage Area (sq mi):	3.64
Date:	7/25/2018
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Smith

Station	Elevation	
0.00	99.33	
4.49	99.11	
8.40	98.88	
9.81	98.72	
11.51	98.18	
13.54	97.49	
14.98	97.07	
16.26	96.66	
17.44	96.15	
18.32	95.58	
19.24	94.75	
19.71	94.32	
20.59	93.96	
21.44	93.61	
22.12	93.67	
22.96	93.75	
23.83	93.99	
24.58	94.09	
25.58	94.71	
26.63	95.61	
28.13	96.46	
30.95	96.73	
32.79	96.96	
36.10	97.42	
36.44	97.29	
39.40	97.34	

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	97.3
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	33.0
Bankfull Width:	21.0
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	101.0
Flood Prone Width:	100.0
Max Depth at Bankfull:	3.7
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	1.6
W / D Ratio:	13.3
Entrenchment Ratio:	4.8
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0





River Basin:	Cape Fear
Site Name	Mud Lick Creek
XS ID	XS - 3, Pool (North Branch)
Drainage Area (sq mi):	0.65
Date:	7/25/2018
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Smith

Station	Elevation
0.00	98.43
4.32	98.50
8.51	98.38
10.42	98.21
12.60	97.81
13.98	97.34
14.61	97.10
15.27	96.66
16.19	96.41
17.01	96.30
17.68	96.24
18.77	96.13
19.60	96.44
20.43	96.56
21.44	97.42
22.24	97.84
23.48	98.26
24.60	98.78
25.51	98.85
28.85	98.72
31.70	98.92
34.51	99.10

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	98.3
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	15.5
Bankfull Width:	14.2
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	NA
Flood Prone Width:	NA
Max Depth at Bankfull:	2.2
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	1.1
W / D Ratio:	NA
Entrenchment Ratio:	NA
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0





River Basin:	Cape Fear
Site Name	Mud Lick Creek
XS ID	XS - 4, Riffle (North Branch)
Drainage Area (sq mi):	0.65
Date:	7/25/2018
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Smith

Station	Elevation	l
0.00	98.76	
2.51	98.93	
4.46	98.94	
6.31	98.65	
8.79	98.38	
10.22	98.28	
11.38	98.13	
12.37	97.86	
13.11	97.38	
13.73	97.17	
14.19	97.25	
14.52	97.10	
15.36	97.14	
15.99	97.34	
16.60	97.65	
17.30	97.81	
17.95	98.04	
19.07	98.18	
19.77	98.48	
21.91	98.92	
23.48	99.07	
25.39	99.05	
26.82	99.13	

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	98.9
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	14.2
Bankfull Width:	17.7
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	100.7
Flood Prone Width:	100.0
Max Depth at Bankfull:	1.8
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	0.8
W / D Ratio:	22.1
Entrenchment Ratio:	5.6
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0





River Basin:	Cape Fear
Site Name	Mud Lick Creek
XS ID	XS - 5, Pool (North Branch)
Drainage Area (sq mi):	0.65
Date:	7/25/2018
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Smith

Station	Elevation	
0.00	97.97	
2.50	98.15	
5.59	98.21	
6.74	97.80	
7.86	97.32	
9.36	96.74	
10.36	95.86	
11.25	95.43	
12.45	95.29	
14.03	95.17	
14.89	95.49	
16.35	96.69	
17.72	97.03	
18.91	97.50	
19.85	97.75	
23.53	97.94	
26.70	97.90	

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	97.8
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	18.6
Bankfull Width:	14.2
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	NA
Flood Prone Width:	NA
Max Depth at Bankfull:	2.6
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	1.3
W / D Ratio:	NA
Entrenchment Ratio:	NA
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0





River Basin:	Cape Fear
Site Name	Mud Lick Creek
XS ID	XS - 6, Riffle (North Branch)
Drainage Area (sq mi):	0.65
Date:	7/25/2018
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Smith

Station	Elevation	
0.00	98.15	
3.55	98.09	
5.91	97.92	
7.58	97.58	
9.22	97.02	
10.94	96.61	
11.91	96.25	
13.16	96.25	
14.44	96.21	
15.60	96.14	
17.17	96.95	
18.98	97.60	
20.84	97.99	
24.24	98.05	
27.10	98.10	
28.68	98.10	

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	97.9
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	14.5
Bankfull Width:	14.6
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	99.7
Flood Prone Width:	100.0
Max Depth at Bankfull:	1.8
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	1.0
W / D Ratio:	14.8
Entrenchment Ratio:	6.8
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0





River Basin:	Cape Fear
Site Name	Mud Lick Creek
XS ID	XS - 7, Riffle (East Branch)
Drainage Area (sq mi):	0.27
Date:	7/25/2018
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Smith

Station	Elevation
0.00	98.92
2.40	99.07
4.06	99.10
5.44	99.13
6.92	98.70
7.81	98.64
8.63	98.08
9.20	97.62
9.70	97.64
11.18	97.47
12.52	97.66
13.61	97.58
14.53	98.08
15.73	98.41
17.08	98.74
20.63	98.76
22.50	98.92
24.21	98.93

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	98.6
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	6.7
Bankfull Width:	8.9
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	99.8
Flood Prone Width:	100.0
Max Depth at Bankfull:	1.2
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	0.8
W / D Ratio:	11.8
Entrenchment Ratio:	11.3
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0





River Basin:	Cape Fear
Site Name	Mud Lick Creek
XS ID	XS - 8, Pool (East Branch)
Drainage Area (sq mi):	0.27
Date:	7/25/2018
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Smith

Station	Elevation
0.00	100.94
1.47	101.37
3.75	101.35
6.10	101.02
7.45	100.85
9.30	100.30
9.86	99.36
10.96	99.21
11.64	99.16
12.54	98.84
13.18	97.81
14.15	97.57
15.20	98.04
16.03	98.42
16.50	98.80
17.10	100.00
17.80	100.15
19.69	100.54
21.62	100.75
24.06	100.95
27.19	101.11

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	100.0
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	10.5
Bankfull Width:	7.6
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	NA
Flood Prone Width:	NA
Max Depth at Bankfull:	2.4
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	1.4
W / D Ratio:	NA
Entrenchment Ratio:	NA
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0





River Basin:	Cape Fear
Site Name	Mud Lick Creek
XS ID	XS - 9, Riffle (East Branch)
Drainage Area (sq mi):	0.27
Date:	7/25/2018
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Smith

Station	Elevation
0.00	101.08
2.92	101.15
5.86	101.18
8.17	101.10
10.21	100.70
12.06	100.27
12.92	99.89
14.09	99.64
15.13	99.80
16.07	99.88
17.37	100.17
19.06	100.56
21.60	100.85
25.65	101.17
29.56	100.99

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	101.1
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	10.6
Bankfull Width:	16.6
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	102.6
Flood Prone Width:	100.0
Max Depth at Bankfull:	1.5
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	0.6
W / D Ratio:	25.8
Entrenchment Ratio:	6.0
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0





River Basin:	Cape Fear
Site Name	Mud Lick Creek
XS ID	XS - 10, Riffle (Mud Lick Cr)
Drainage Area (sq mi):	3.64
Date:	7/25/2018
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Smith

Station	Elevation	
0.00	97.79	
3.09	97.60	
4.21	97.87	
5.48	97.66	
7.11	97.01	
8.13	96.25	
9.24	95.54	
10.74	95.22	
11.50	94.66	
12.73	94.40	
13.79	94.49	
14.96	94.14	
15.78	93.98	
17.46	94.04	
18.50	95.06	
19.75	95.63	
21.13	96.19	
22.88	96.55	
25.29	97.55	
26.80	98.23	
28.27	98.75	
29.41	99.04	
30.75	99.55	
32.96	99.42	
34.80	99.38	

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	97.6
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	40.4
Bankfull Width:	19.8
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	101.2
Flood Prone Width:	100.0
Max Depth at Bankfull:	3.6
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	2.0
W / D Ratio:	9.7
Entrenchment Ratio:	5.1
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0





### Table 7a. Baseline Stream Data Summary (Mud Lick Creek)Mud Lick Creek Mitigation Project - NCDMS Project Number 93482

Parameter	Gauge		Regional C	urve	Pre-Ex	cisting C	ondition Creek)	n (Mud	Lick		Reference Reach(es) Data						Lick	Monitoring Baseline (Mud Lick Creek)					
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle Only			TIT	Fa	Min	Med	Max	SD	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	Min	Max	Med	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	
BF Width (ft)			UL	124.	18.2	Witcan	22.0	24.6	50	5.3	Witchi	10.8	12.3	50	IVIIII	Мал	Micu	18.3	Witcan	19.8	21	50	3
Floodprone Width (ft)					250.0		306.0	378.0		14		60	125					100		100	100		3
BF Mean Depth (ft)					1.9		2.1	2.3		0.8		1.0	1.8					1.6		2.0	2.7	<u> </u>	3
BF Max Depth (ft)					3.0		4.0	4.2		1.0		1.5	2.6					3.6		3.7	3.8		3
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft <sup>2</sup> )					41.3		46.3	47.5		5.4		10.6	19.7					33.0		40.4	49.8		3
Width/Depth Ratio					8.0		10.5	12.8		5.2		8.6	14.4					6.8		9.9	13.1		3
Entrenchment Ratio					12.4		13.7	17.2		1.7		4.3	>10.2					4.8		5.1	5.5		3
Bank Height Ratio					1.1		1.2	1.2		1.0		1.0	1.1					1.0		1.0	1.3		3
Profile																							
Riffle length (ft)																							
Riffle slope (ft/ft)										0.0040		0.0188	0.0704										
Pool length (ft)																							
Pool Max depth (ft)					3.7		4.4	5.2		1.2		1.8	3.3										
Pool spacing (ft)										9.0		46.0	73.0										
Pattern																							
Channel Beltwidth (ft)					26.1		52.9	69.9		10		41	102										
Radius of Curvature (ft)					9.9		24.8	58.8		11		21	85										
Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)					0.5		1.1	2.39		1.3		2	9.1										
Meander Wavelength (ft)					59.9		159.6	244.4		-		-	-										
Meander Width ratio					1.4		2.2	3.8		1.6		4.4	8.9										
Transport parameters																							
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lbs/ft <sup>2</sup>																							
Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankfull																							
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m <sup>2</sup>																							
Additional Reach Parameters				•	-			•	2			•	•			•				•			4
Rosgen Classification							E/C4					E/C4								E/C-	type		
Bankfull Velocity (fps)						3.	.0 - 3.4					2.2 - 5.6											
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)						123.	9 - 157.4	42				20 - 97											
Valley Length (ft)																							
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)																							
Sinuosity						1.2	20 - 1.37	1				1.0 - 2.3											
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)																							
BF slope (ft/ft)																							
Bankfull Floodplain Area (acres)										<b> </b>													
% of Reach with Eroding Banks		<b></b>								<u> </u>													
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric		I			ļ																		
Biological or Other																							

Table 7b.	<b>Baseline Stream Data Summary (North Branch)</b>
Mud Lick (	Creek Mitigation Project - NCDMS Project Number 93482

Dimensional shadner, single shades and	Parameter	Gauge		Regional C	urve	Pre-Exi	sting Co	ndition	(North ]	Branch)	Reference Reach(es) Data						(North B	ranch)	Monitoring Baseline (North Branch)						
BF Wath (r)NNN <th< th=""><th>Dimension and Substrate - Riffle Only</th><th></th><th>LL</th><th>UL</th><th>Eq.</th><th>Min</th><th>Mean</th><th>Med</th><th>Max</th><th>SD</th><th>Min</th><th>Mean</th><th>Med</th><th>Max</th><th>SD</th><th>Min</th><th>Max</th><th>Med</th><th>Min</th><th>Mean</th><th>Med</th><th>Max</th><th>SD</th><th>n</th></th<>	Dimension and Substrate - Riffle Only		LL	UL	Eq.	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	Min	Max	Med	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	
Bisken pop to 1     I     Bisken pop to 1     I     Bisken pop to 1     I     Bisken pop to 1     Bisken pop t	BF Width (ft)					8.3			10.4		5.3		10.8	12.3		13.8	14.0		14.6		16.2	17.7		2	
Biff Man Deprint Biff Mar Depr	Floodprone Width (ft)					33.3			80.0		14		60	125		30	70		100		100	100		2	
Pickes been day and any any and any	BF Mean Depth (ft)					0.7			1.5		0.8		1.0	1.8		1.0	1.2		0.8		0.9	1.0		2	
BF Cross Sectional Area n'n       Image: Sectional Area n'n       Imag	BF Max Depth (ft)					1.5			2.3		1.0		1.5	2.6		1.3	2.0		1.8		1.8	1.8		2	
Widen/Spent RatioSaS	BF Cross Sectional Area (ft <sup>2</sup> )					7.7			12.7		5.4		10.6	19.7		14.4	16.3		14.2		14.4	14.5		2	
American Amer	Width/Depth Ratio		1			5.4			14.0		5.2		8.6	14.4		12.0	13.0		14.6		18.4	22.1		2	
Mark keigh RainMarkMar	Entrenchment Ratio					1.9			10.1		1.7		4.3	>10.2		2.2	5.0		5.6		6.2	6.8		2	
Profile     Image: Straph (n)	Bank Height Ratio					1.7			2.0		1.0		1.0	1.1		1.0	1.0		1.0		1.0	1.0		2	
Riffle height(f)Image: set of the set of	Profile			•		<b></b>							•												
Riffs shor (nfn)III <td>Riffle length (ft)</td> <td></td> <td>l l</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Riffle length (ft)																					l l			
Pool length (1) Pool Machanic (1)III </td <td>Riffle slope (ft/ft)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>0.0040</td> <td></td> <td>0.0188</td> <td>0.0704</td> <td></td> <td>0.0060</td> <td>0.0340</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Riffle slope (ft/ft)										0.0040		0.0188	0.0704		0.0060	0.0340								
Prol Max depth (1)     Product (1)     <	Pool length (ft)		1		1																				
Pod space (f)III<	Pool Max depth (ft)		1		1	2.1			2.7		1.2		1.8	3.3		1.3	4.7								
Pattern	Pool spacing (ft)										9.0		46.0	73.0		19.0	92.0								
Channel Betwicht (ft)     I <th< td=""><td>Pattern</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>•</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>•</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>-</td></th<>	Pattern								•					-						•				-	
Radius of Curvature (ft)     Image: formation (ft)	Channel Beltwidth (ft)					11		26	38.5		10		41	102		41	125								
Re-Bankfull with (fr,fr)       Image: Construction of the second conseq construction of the second constructing cons	Radius of Curvature (ft)		1			6.1		17	37		11		21	85		25	42								
Meander Wavelength (t)       M	Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)					0.73		1.6	4.46		1.3		2	9.1		1.8	3								
Meander Widh ratio       I.1       2.8       4.6       I.6       4.4       8.9       3       15       .0	Meander Wavelength (ft)					37.9		64.1	100.6		-		-	-		41	168								
Tarsery farmedice       Tarsery farmedice       Reach Shear Stress (competency) lbs/1 <sup>2</sup> <ul> <li>I</li> <li>I<td>Meander Width ratio</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1.1</td><td></td><td>2.8</td><td>4.6</td><td></td><td>1.6</td><td></td><td>4.4</td><td>8.9</td><td></td><td>3</td><td>15</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></li></ul>	Meander Width ratio					1.1		2.8	4.6		1.6		4.4	8.9		3	15								
Transport farameters         Reach Shear Stress (competency lbs/ft <sup>2</sup> Image: Competency lbs/ft <sup>2</sup>																									
Reach Shear Stress (complency) bs/ft <sup>2</sup> Image: second se	Transport parameters					-						-		-											
	Reach Shear Stress (competency) lbs/ft <sup>2</sup>																								
Stream Power (transport capacity Wm <sup>2</sup> Image: Constraint of the constrai	Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankfull																								
Additional Reach Parameters       Sector Secto	Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m <sup>2</sup>																								
Rosgen Classification $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $	Additional Reach Parameters																								
Bankfull Velocity (fp) $\square$ $3.3 \cdot 3.5$ $2.2 \cdot 5.6$ $2.4 \cdot 4.3$ Bankfull Discharge (cfs) $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ Valley Length (ft) $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ Channel Thalweg Length (ft) $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ Sinuosity $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ Mater Surface Slope (ft/ft) $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ Bankfull Floodplain Area (acres) $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\square$ $\emptyset$ of Reach with Eroding Banks $\square$	Rosgen Classification							E5/B5c					E/C4				C4				C-t	уре			
Bankfull Discharge (cfs) $<$ $25.41 \cdot 44.45$ $20.97$ $34.6 \cdot 70.1$ $34.6 \cdot 70.1$ Valley Length (f) $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ </td <td>Bankfull Velocity (fps)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>3.3 - 3.5</td> <td>5</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>2.2 - 5.6</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>,</td> <td>2.4 - 4.3</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Bankfull Velocity (fps)							3.3 - 3.5	5				2.2 - 5.6			,	2.4 - 4.3								
Valley Length (f)Image: Channel Thalweg Length	Bankfull Discharge (cfs)						25.	.41 - 44	.45				20 - 97			34	4.6 - 70.1	l							
Channel Thalweg Length (f)Image: Channel SinuosityImage: Channel	Valley Length (ft)			-	-																				
Sinusity1.22 - 1.321.0 - 2.31.2 - 1.3Water Surface Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Bahfull Floodplain Area (acres)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Mather Stope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Bahfull Floodplain Area (acres)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Mather Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Mather Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Mather Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Mather Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Mather Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Mather Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Mather Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Mather Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Mather Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/f)Image: Slope (fr/	Channel Thalweg Length (ft)																								
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)       Image: Constraint of the state of t	Sinuosity						1.	.22 - 1.3	32				1.0 - 2.3				1.2 - 1.3								
BF slope (ft/ft)       Image: Constraint of the state of	Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)																								
Bankfull Floodplain Area (acres)       Image: Comparison of the comparison of th	BF slope (ft/ft)		Į								<b></b>														
% of Reach with Eroding Banks	Bankfull Floodplain Area (acres)		<u> </u>																						
Channel Stability of Habitat Metric	% of Reach with Eroding Banks																								
	Channel Stability or Habitat Metric																								

Table 7c.	<b>Baseline Stream Data Summary (East Branch)</b>
Mud Lick	Creek Mitigation Project - NCDMS Project Number 93482

Parameter	Gauge		Regional C	urve	Pre-Ex	isting C	Conditio	n (East l	Branch)	Reference Reach(es) Data						(East Bi	ranch)	Monitoring Baseline (East Branch)						
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle Only		LL	UL	Eq.	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	Min	Max	Med	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	
BF Width (ft)						4.3				5.3		10.8	12.3				11.0	8.9		12.8	16.6		2	
Floodprone Width (ft)						23.0				14		60	125		24	55		100		100	100		2	
BF Mean Depth (ft)		1				1.1		1		0.8		1.0	1.8				0.9	0.6		0.7	0.8		2	
BF Max Depth (ft)		1				1.4		1		1.0		1.5	2.6		0.9	1.5		1.2		1.4	1.5		2	
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft <sup>2</sup> )						4.8				5.4		10.6	19.7				9.7	6.7		8.7	10.6		2	
Width/Depth Ratio						3.9				5.2		8.6	14.4				12.4	11.1		19.4	27.7		2	
Entrenchment Ratio						2.1				1.7		4.3	>10.2		2.2	5.0		6.0		8.6	11.2		2	
Bank Height Ratio						1.9				1.0		1.0	1.1		1.0	1.0		1.0		1.0	1.0		2	
Profile																							<u>8</u>	
Riffle length (ft)																								
Riffle slope (ft/ft)		1						1		0.0040		0.0188	0.0704		0.0156	0.0442								
Pool length (ft)																								
Pool Max depth (ft)		1				1.6		1		1.2		1.8	3.3		1.0	3.5								
Pool spacing (ft)		1						1		9.0		46.0	73.0		15.0	73.0								
Pattern			•									•	•											
Channel Beltwidth (ft)										10		41	102		22	98								
Radius of Curvature (ft)										11		21	85		20	30								
Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)										1.3		2	9.1		1.8	3								
Meander Wavelength (ft)										-		-	-		33	132								
Meander Width ratio										1.6		4.4	8.9		3	12								
Transport parameters		-					1	1				1	1	T	1									
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lbs/ft <sup>2</sup>																								
Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankfull																								
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m <sup>2</sup>																								
Additional Reach Parameters																								
Rosgen Classification			-	-			B4c					E/C4				C4				C-t	ype			
Bankfull Velocity (fps)							4.2					2.2 - 5.6				3.3								
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)							20.2					20 - 97				32								
Valley Length (ft)				-																				
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)																								
Sinuosity							1					1.0 - 2.3			1	.20 -1.30								
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)																								
BF slope (ft/ft)		I																						
Bankfull Floodplain Area (acres)																								
% of Reach with Eroding Banks																								
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric																								
Biological or Other		I								1													ŀ	

### Table 8a. Monitoring Data - Dimensional Morphology Summary (Dimensional Parameters - Cross Sections) Mud Lick Creek Mitigation Project - NCDMS Project Number 93482

Muu Elek Creek Mugation Project - Iv	CDIND I	TOJUUT TU	moer 255	104																	
		(	Cross Sec	tion 1 (M	ud Lick C	r)			(	Cross Sec	tion 2 (Mu	d Lick Ci	r)			(	Cross Sect	ion 10 (M	ud Lick C	r)	
Parameter				Riffle							Riffle							Riffle			
Dimension	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY5+	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY5+	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY5+
BF Width (ft)	18.3							21.0							19.8						
Floodprone Width (ft) (approx)	100.0							100.0							100.0						
BF Mean Depth (ft)	2.7							1.6							2.0						
BF Max Depth (ft)	3.8							3.7							3.6						
Low Bank Height	5.0							3.7							3.6						
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft <sup>2</sup> )	49.8							33.0							40.4						
Width/Depth Ratio	6.7							13.4							9.7						
Entrenchment Ratio	5.5							4.8							5.1						
Bank Height Ratio	1.3							1.0							1.0						
d50 (mm)	9.9							9.9							9.9						

### Table 8b. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary

Parameter		Basel	ine (Mu	d Lick C	reek)			М	Y-1 (Mud	Lick Cre	ek)			MY-2 (Mu	d Lick Cree	ek)			MY	2-3 (Mud )	Lick Cre	ek)			M	Y-4 (Mud	Lick Cre	ek)			MY	Y-5 (Mud	Lick Cree	<u>k)</u>
imension and Substrate - Riffle Only	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD n	Min	Mea	n Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD
BF Width (ft)	18.3		19.8	21		3	-																											
Floodprone Width (ft)	100		100	100		3																												
BF Mean Depth (ft)	1.6		2.0	2.7		3																												
BF Max Depth (ft)	3.6		3.7	3.8		3																												
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft <sup>2</sup> )	33.0		40.4	49.8		3																												
Width/Depth Ratio	6.8		9.9	13.1		3																												
Entrenchment Ratio	4.8		5.1	5.5		3																												
Bank Height Ratio	1.0		1.0	1.3		3																												
															Pro	ïle																		
Riffle length (ft)																																		
Riffle slope (ft/ft)																																		
Pool length (ft)																																		
Pool Max depth (ft)																																		
Pool spacing (ft)																																		
															Patt	ern								-										
Channel Beltwidth (ft)																																		
Radius of Curvature (ft)																																		
Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)													_																					
Meander Wavelength (ft)													_																					
Meander Width ratio																																		
														4dd	itional Read	h Param	neters																	
Rosgen Classification			C-t	ype																														
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)																																		
Sinuosity																																		
Water Surface Slope (Channel) (ft/ft)																																		
BF slope (ft/ft)																																		
Ri%/RU%P%G%/S%																																		
SC%/SA%/G%/C%/B%BE%																																		
d16/d35/d50/d84/d95																																		
% of Reach with Eroding Banks																																		
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric																																		
Biological or Other																																		

### Table 8c. Monitoring Data - Dimensional Morphology Summary (Dimensional Parameters - Cross Sections)

Mud Lick Creek Mitigation	Project - NCDMS Proje	ct Number 93482
mud Lick Creek mugation	ridgeet ridbing ridge	ct 1 (umber ) 5402

		(	Cross Sect	ion 3 (No	rth Branc	h)			(	Cross Secti	ion 4 (Nor	th Brancl	h)			(	Cross Secti	ion 5 (Nor	th Branch	ı)			C	ross Secti	on 6 (Nor	th Branc	h)	
Parameter				Pool							Riffle							Pool							Riffle			
Dimension	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY5+	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY5+	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY5+	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY5+
BF Width (ft)	14.2							17.7							14.2							14.6						
Floodprone Width (ft) (approx)	NA							100.0							NA							100.0						
BF Mean Depth (ft)	1.1							0.8							1.3							1.0						
BF Max Depth (ft)	2.2							1.8							2.6							1.8						
Low Bank Height	2.2							1.8							2.6							1.8						
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft <sup>2</sup> )	15.5							14.2							18.6							14.5						
Width/Depth Ratio	NA							22.1							NA							14.7						
Entrenchment Ratio	NA							5.6							NA							6.8						
Bank Height Ratio	1.0							1.0							1.0							1.0						
d50 (mm)								18.8														18.8						

### Table 8d. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary Mud Lick Creek Mitigation Project - NCDMS Project Number 93482

Parameter	CDIIDI	B	niber 294 aseline (No	orth Bran	nch)				MY-1 (Nor	rth Branc	• <b>h</b> )			1	MY-2 (No	orth Bran	ch)		1	1	MY-3 (No	orth Brand	h)		1		MY-4 (No	rth Bran	ch)		1		4Y-5 (No	th Branc	h)	
T ur uniteter			benne (r.	or ur brui						ui Di uite						<u>// 11/ 2/ 11/</u>						i in Di uni	)					i ur Di ur					11 0 (110	ui biune		
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle Only	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n
BF Width (ft)	14.6		16.2	17.7		2																														
Floodprone Width (ft)	100		100	100		2																														
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.8		0.9	1.0		2																														
BF Max Depth (ft)	1.8		1.8	1.8		2																														
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft <sup>2</sup> )	14.2		14.4	14.5		2																														
Width/Depth Ratio	14.6		18.4	22.1		2																														
Entrenchment Ratio	5.6		6.2	6.8		2																														
Bank Height Ratio	1.0		1.0	1.0		2																														
																Pr	ofile																			
Riffle length (ft)																																				
Riffle slope (ft/ft)																																				
Pool length (ft)																																				
Pool Max depth (ft)																																				
Pool spacing (ft)																																				
							_						-			Pa	ttern			_											-					
Channel Beltwidth (ft)																																				
Radius of Curvature (ft)																																				───
Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)																	-		-	_						-				_	-					<u> </u>
Meander Wavelength (ft)						-	-	_									-			-						-			_	_	-					<b> </b>
Meander Width ratio																																				
															Add	itional Re	ach Paran	neters																		-
Rosgen Classification			C-t	ype			1												1												1					-
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)																																				
Sinuosity																																				
Water Surface Slope (Channel) (ft/ft)																																				
BF slope (ft/ft)																																				
Ri%/RU%P%G%/S%																																				
SC%/SA%/G%/C%/B%BE%																																				
d16/d35/d50/d84/d95																																				
% of Reach with Eroding Banks																																			-	
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric																																				
Biological or Other																																				

### Table 8e. Monitoring Data - Dimensional Morphology Summary (Dimensional Parameters - Cross Sections) Mud Liek Crock Mitigation Project - NCDMS Project Number 93482

Mud Elek Creek Mugadon 110jeet - I	CDMBT	Toject Hu	mbci 754	02						~ ~					-		~ ~				
			Cross Sec	tion 7 (Ea	st Branch	.)				Cross Sec	tion 8 (Ea	st Branch	.)				Cross Sec	tion 9 (Ea	st Branch	)	
Parameter				Riffle							Pool							Riffle			
Dimension	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY5+	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY5+	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY5+
BF Width (ft)	8.9							7.6							16.6						
Floodprone Width (ft) (approx)	100.0							NA							100.0						
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.8							1.4							0.6						
BF Max Depth (ft)	1.2							2.4							1.5						
Low Bank Height	1.2							2.4							1.5						
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft <sup>2</sup> )	6.7							10.5							10.6						
Width/Depth Ratio	11.8							NA							26.0						
Entrenchment Ratio	11.2							NA							6.0						
Bank Height Ratio	1.0							1.0							1.0						
d50 (mm)	14.3														14.3						

### Table 8b. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary

Parameter		Bas	seline (Ea	ast Branc	h)				MY-1 (Ea	st Branch	)			1	MY-2 (Ea	st Branch	)			MY	7-3 (Eas	st Branch	)				MY-4 (Ea	ast Branc	:h)				MY-5 (Ea	st Branch	)	
nension and Substrate - Riffle Only	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n
BF Width (ft)	8.9		12.8	16.6		2																														
Floodprone Width (ft)	100		100	100		2																														
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.6		0.7	0.8		2																														
BF Max Depth (ft)	1.2		1.4	1.5		2																														
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft <sup>2</sup> )	6.7		8.7	10.6		2																														1
Width/Depth Ratio	11.1		19.4	27.7		2																														
Entrenchment Ratio	6.0		8.6	11.2		2																														
Bank Height Ratio	1.0		1.0	1.0		2																														
																Pro	file																			
Riffle length (ft)																																				
Riffle slope (ft/ft)																																				
Pool length (ft)																																				Ĺ
Pool Max depth (ft)																																				1
Pool spacing (ft)																																				1
								_								Patt	ern								-			-								
Channel Beltwidth (ft)																																				L
Radius of Curvature (ft)																																				<u> </u>
Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)																																				<u> </u>
Meander Wavelength (ft)								_																												<u> </u>
Meander Width ratio																																				1
															Addit	ional Rea	ch Paramet	ers																		
Rosgen Classification			C-ty	ype																																
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)																																				
Sinuosity																																				
Water Surface Slope (Channel) (ft/ft)																																				
BF slope (ft/ft)																																				
Ri%/RU%P%G%/S%																																				
SC%/SA%/G%/C%/B%BE%																																				
d16/d35/d50/d84/d95																																				
% of Reach with Eroding Banks																																				
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric																																				
Biological or Other							I																								1					_

Appendix E. As-built Plan Sheets



CONCRETE MONUMENT CM CHORD CH SIGHT EASEMENT SE DEED BOOK DB PLAT BOOK PB CURB AND GUTTER C&G REINFORCED CONC PIPE RCP CORRUGATED METAL PIPE CMP CORRUGATED PLASTIC PIPE CPP BOUNDARY LINE RIGHT-OF-WAY LINE . \_\_\_\_\_ UNSURVEYED PROPERTY LINE CONSERVATION EASEMENT FENCE (WIRE) LINE FENCE (WOOD) LINE BANKFULL THALWEG EDGE OF GRAVEL EDGE OF PAVEMENT

TIE LINE

GRADING LIMITS OVERHEAD UTILITY MAJOR CONTOUR LINE MINOR CONTOUR LINE WATER LINE WETLAND ZONE LINE

----- CE ------ CE -----\_\_\_\_\_x \_\_\_\_x \_\_\_\_\_x \_\_\_\_\_ \_\_\_\_\_ x \_\_\_\_ x \_\_\_\_ x \_\_\_\_ ------- -----CONSTRUCTED RIFFLE

LOG VANE BRUSH TOE PROJECT CONTROL NCDOT "THOMAS 2" (NAD83/NAVD 88) NORTHING-750,346.4685' EASTING-1,870,442.8109' ELEVATION-600.80'

PDF processed with CutePDF evaluation edition www.CutePDF.com





C Allied Assoc., P.A. 2017











# SHEET 6 OF 7

AS BUILT SURVEY

# FOR: <u>NORTH STATE</u> <u>ENVIRONMENTAL, INC</u>

OF: "MUD LICK CREEK STREAM RESTORATION"

> <u>OWNER</u>: GRAYSON C. THOMAS, HEIRS 319 AUGUSTA DRIVE STATESVILLE, NC 28625 TAX PIN: 8775–12–3214.000 DEED BOOK JS, PAGE 143 TAX PIN: 8775-01-6345.000 DEED BOOK 411, PAGE 846 <u>N/A</u> ACRES +/- (TOTAL)



COUNTY

SCALE 1" = 20' SURVEYED: PJ TR

MAPPED:

DA

ALBRIGHT CHATHAM NORTH CAROLINA 08/01/17 JOB NO. MAP NO. PA170611 MLC.dwg

TDS MLC © Allied Assoc., P.A. 2017

DATE

STATE

GRAPHIC SCALE

( IN FEET )

1 inch = 20 ft.





# EAST BRANCH

# **NORTH BRANCH**

_		Ì	-							
1		- 48" CMP		ELEV: 58	5.44'					
							* •	-	<b>-</b> , ,	
585.8	585.7	589.2 5	584.2	585.1	583.7	584.6	584.3	583.7	583.1	583.1
19	L	109	L +50	110-	+00	110-	+50	111-	+00	

<u>Sheet 7 of 7</u>

AS BUILT SURVEY FOR: <u>NORTH STATE</u> <u>ENVIRONMENTAL, INC</u>

OF: "MUD LICK CREEK STREAM RESTORATION"

> <u>OWNER</u>: GRAYSON C. THOMAS, HEIRS 319 AUGUSTA DRIVE STATESVILLE, NC 28625 TAX PIN: 8775–12–3214.000 DEED BOOK JS, PAGE 143 TAX PIN: 8775-01-6345.000 DEED BOOK 411, PAGE 846 <u>N/A</u> ACRES +/- (TOTAL)



GRAPHIC	SCALE	
40 I	80 I	160

( IN FEET ) 1 inch = 40 ft.

SCALE TOWNSHIP 1" = 40' SURVEYED: PJ TR

COUNTY STATE ALBRIGHT CHATHAM NORTH CAROLINA 08/01/17 MAPPED: JOB NO. DA

MAP NO. TDS PA170611 MLC.dwg MLC © Allied Assoc., P.A. 2017

DATE

# Mud Lick Creek Mitigation Site Cape Fear River Basin 03030003 Chatham County, North Carolina



Vicinity Map Not to Scale for NCDEQ Division of Mitigation Services



FINAL RECORD DRAWINGS Issued June 2018 Revised 06.12.2018

	Unice	un ongin	3	
Stream	La	titude	Lon	ngitude
North Branch	N 35°	48' 53.73"	W 79°	25' 56.95'
East Branch	N 35°	48' 46.31"	W 79°	25' 56.17"
Mud Lick Creek	N 35°	48' 50.97"	W 79°	26' 07,48"

MILCEL I

Stream Overlay Overview

Stream Overlay Plans

Planting Plan

Title Sheet

Legend

Fencing Plan

### Project Dir

Surveying: Turner Land Surveying, PLLC P.O. Box 41023 Raleigh, NC 27629 David S. Turner, PLS 919-875-1378

Engineering: Wildlands Engineering, Inc License No. F-0831 312 West Millbrook Road, Suite 225 Raleigh, NC 27609 Angela N. Allen, PE 919-851-9986

		WILDLANDS	312 W. Milbrook Road, Ste 225 Raileign, NC 27609 Tel: 919,851,986 Firm License No. F-0831
ndex	7	Conner Co	All
0.1 0.2 0.3 1.1-1.10 2.1 3.1 3.1		Mud Lick Creek Mitigation Site Chatham County, North Carolina	Title Sheet
919-707-8976 DEQ Contract No. D14001i DMS ID No. 93482 SCO No. 1209857-01	Record Drawing	Date: 0.6.12.2018 Job Number: 0.0.42.42 Project Enthreet: A.N.A. Drave By: CLM Checked By: JNN	0.1 [

### **Existing** Features

PL ----- PL ------ Existing Property Boundary



Existing Wetlands

### **Proposed Features**

10+00 Proposed Stream Alignment -Proposed Bankfull - - 520-Proposed 5' Major Contour

Proposed 1' Minor Contour

Proposed Log Vane

Proposed Brush Toe

Proposed Constructed Riffle

Proposed Angled Log Step Pool

Proposed Permanent Ford Crossing



Proposed Angled Log Drop





Proposed Permanent Culvert Crossing





















### NOTES:

- 1. FOR ENHANCEMENT REACHES, THE EXISTING CONDITIONS THALWEG WAS USED TO DEVELOP PROPOSED MITIGATION CREDITS AS OUTLINED IN THE MITIGATION PLAN. BECAUSE THE ALIGNMENTS OF ENHANCEMENT REACHES WERE NOT ALTERED DURING CONSTRUCTION, AS-BUILT ALIGNMENTS ARE ALSO BASED ON THE EXISTING CONDITIONS SURVEY.
- 2. AS-BUILT BANKFULL LINES FOR ENHANCEMENT REACHES ARE BASED ON EXISTING CONDITIONS SURVEY.



 $x \underbrace{1}_{ct} \underbrace{$ MATCHLINE STA 309+50 MUD LICK CREEK NOTES: 1. FOR ENHANCEMENT REACHES, THE EXISTING CONDITIONS THALWEG WAS USED TO DEVELOP PROPOSED MITIGATION CREDITS AS OUTLINED IN THE MITIGATION PLAN. BECAUSE THE ALIGNMENTS OF ENHANCEMENT REACHES WERE NOT ALTERED DURING CONSTRUCTION, AS-BUILT ALIGNMENTS ARE ALSO BASED ON THE EXISTING CONDITIONS SURVEY. 2. AS-BUILT BANKFULL LINES FOR ENHANCEMENT REACHES ARE BASED ON EXISTING CONDITIONS SURVEY.







### NOTES:

- 1. FOR ENHANCEMENT REACHES, THE EXISTING CONDITIONS THALWEG WAS USED TO DEVELOP PROPOSED MITIGATION CREDITS AS OUTLINED IN THE MITIGATION PLAN. BECAUSE THE ALIGNMENTS OF ENHANCEMENT REACHES WERE NOT ALTERED DURING CONSTRUCTION, AS-BUILT ALIGNMENTS ARE ALSO BASED ON THE EXISTING CONDITIONS SURVEY.
- 2. AS-BUILT BANKFULL LINES FOR ENHANCEMENT REACHES ARE BASED ON EXISTING CONDITIONS SURVEY.



							\		-										1
and the second se									-	Streambank Planting Zone									1
							1		Cumber		Live Stake.	s and Herbace Indiv.	cous Plugs	Louis	Lau Phone				
							\$		Cornus	Silky Dogwood	Spacing 8-0	Spacing 2-8 ft	0.5"-1.5" cal	Stratum	# of Stems		Streambank P	lanting Zone	1d
			Buffer Plan Bare R	ting Zone Rout		-			Solix sericen	Silky Willow	8 fL	2-8 ft	0.5"-1.5" cal.	Shrub	50%				1
Species	Common Name	Max Spacing	Indiv. Spacing	Min. Caliper	Stratum	# of Stems	% of Total	×	Juneus offusus	Common Rush	5 fi.	3-5 fi.	1.0"- 2.0" plug	Herb	NIA			KAN A	×
Fraximus	Green Ash	12 ft.	6-12 ft	Size 0.25"-1.0"	Canopy	300	5%		*Noto: Livo sta	kas used on diffe	and outpas	oool boods	Harbacoour		100%	2	0	HIN.	XX
Platanus	Sycamore	12 N.	6-12 fl.	0.25"-1.0"	Canopy	400	7%	/	plugs u	sed at toe of slope	of riffles.	poor berius.	Helbaceous						X
Cercis conadensis	Redbud	12 ft	6-12 N.	0.25"-1.0"	Midstory	400	7%	a.										- XXXX	
Populus deltoides	Cottonwood	12 N.	- 6-12 ft	0.25"-1.0"	Canopy	300	5%	1										IN (IN	X
Celtis accidentalis	Hackberry	12.0	6-12 ft	0.25 -1.0	Савору	300	5%	1											H
Nyssa sylvatica	Black Gum	12 ft.	6-12 ft	0.25"-1.0"	Canopy	300	5%	E.	\	-							Ř		X
Ulmus americana	American Elm	12 ft	6-12 ft.	0.25"-1.0"	Салору	300	5%		L 78 - 1	° \							ý.		H
Sombueny son	Hophornbeam	12.0	6.12 ft	0.25 -1.0	Canopy	300	3%			1 21							le l	SIL	H)
Robinia pseudoacacia	Black Locust	12 ft.	6-12 ft.	0.25*-1.0*	Canopy	300	3% 5%	Buffer 1	Planling Zone	1 =							ALL'S	M (HH)	Ŷ
Cornus amonum	Silky Dogwood	12 ft.	6-12 ft	0.25"-1.0"	Midstory	300	5%				- (1)						ALLES	H) HA	3
Hamamelis virginiana	Witch hazel	12 0.	6-12 ft.	0.25"-1.0"	Shrub	550	9%		TXX		HB.	J.				¢	AHH SH	()))))	
Cephalanthus occidentalis	Buttonbush	12 ft	6-12 ft	0,25"-1,0"	Shrub	300	5%		*		Ky k	X				all a			
virginiana	Persimmon	12.0	0-12 It.	0.25 -1.0	Midstory	300	5%		N/X/	HHHH.	A XO					<u> </u>	H wind	XX ?	
caroliniana Nyssa biflora	Swamp Tupelo	12 ft	6-12 0	0.25 -1.0	Canopy	100	2%		F			CAN.				- ANDINI D			
Quercus michanxii	Swamp Chestnut Oak	12.0.	6-12 ft.	0.25"-1.0"	Canopy	100	2%		Ŷ		X}X	K CAN			B				
Quercus nigra	Water Oak	12 ft.	6-12 ft.	0.25"-1.0"	Сапору	100	2%						ATT SE	NXXX	Ø B			SXXXX	
tulipifera	. imp i opar	12 1.	0-12.10	0,25 -1.0	Canopy	5.050	370						<u>HHH</u>	HHH	XX V				



