# PLUM CREEK WETLAND MITIGATION PROJECT 2011 MONITORING REPORT MONITORING YEAR 3 OF 5

Brunswick County, NC Lumber River Basin Cataloging Unit: 03040207 EEP Project Number: 92549 EEP Contract Number: D06040-A



**Prepared** for:





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

# 2011 Monitoring Report – Year 3 of 5

Project Construction Completed: 2008 Data Collection for Monitoring Year 3 of 5: 2011 Report Submitted: May 2012

**Prepared** for:





## Prepared by:



The Louis Berger Group, Inc. 1001 Wade Avenue, Suite 400 Raleigh, North Carolina 27605 Tel (919) 866-4400 Fax (919) 755-3502

## **Project Manager:**

Michael O'Rourke Tel (919) 866-4421 Fax (919) 755-3502 morourke@louisberger.com

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Executive Summary/Project Abstract	1
	Methodology	
	Vegetation	
2.2.	Hydrology	5
	Photo Stations	
3.	References	6

### FIGURES

Figure 1:	Project Vicinity Map
Figure 2:	Monitoring Plan View

## TABLES

Table 1:	Project Components and Mitigation Credits
Table 2:	Project Activity and Reporting History
Table 3:	Project Contacts Table
Table 4:	Project Background Table
Table 5:	Veg Plot Criteria Attainment
Table 6:	CVS Vegetation Metadata Table
Table 7:	CVS Stem Count Total and Planted by Plot and Species
Table 8:	Wetland Gauge Attainment Data – 5 percent criteria

## APPENDICES

- Appendix A Project Vicinity Map and Background Tables
- Appendix B Visual Assessment Data
- Appendix C Vegetation Plot Data
- Appendix D Hydrologic Data
- Appendix E Pedon Description Sheets

#### 1. <u>Executive Summary/Project Abstract</u>

The goals of the Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation Project (Appendix A, Figure 1) are to re-establish wetland functions at the Site by restoring wetland hydrology, plant community composition and structure, and wildlife habitat. The project will increase surface water residence time which will improve groundwater recharge. Much of the water budget is influenced by precipitation, as surface flow enters the site from adjoining parcels. A longer residence time will lead to improved biochemical treatment resulting in improved water quality. Restoration of a native wetland vegetative community will enhance floral and faunal habitat diversity benefiting both terrestrial and aquatic wildlife. In order to achieve project goals, the following objectives were implemented:

- Initially the lateral ditches and southern perimeter ditch on the Site were plugged. The west ditch and Boggy Branch were left intact to prevent hydrologic trespass on adjoining properties. Soil to construct ditch plugs was excavated from the Site and the borrow pits were graded to form small, shallow vernal pools. Following Year 2, Berger filled the lateral ditches and southern perimeter ditch completely with on-site soil to facilitate lateral groundwater flow through site.
- Existing vegetation (loblolly pine) was sheared, drum chopped, and left on Site to promote organic matter decomposition. There was no re-grading of the contours of the Site.
- Habitat benefits on Site will be achieved for both terrestrial and aquatic species by increasing micro-habitat diversity and vegetation diversity.

The Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation Site (site) is an 89-acre site located in the Carolina Flatwoods ecoregion of the Middle Atlantic Coastal Plain (Griffith *et al.*, 2002). Prior to the restoration, the Site was a loblolly pine plantation for several generations of timber, owned by Plum Creek Timberlands, Inc. The Site occurs in the headwaters of the Lumber River Basin: USGS Hydrologic Unit 03040207 and North Carolina Division of Water Quality (NCDWQ) subbasin 03-07-59. Boggy Branch, which drains to the Lockwoods Folly River, flows along the eastern side of the Site. Land use immediately surrounding the Site is mostly silviculture with timber stands of varying ages in rotation. The Green Swamp Game Land is located to the northwest of the Site. A swine operation is located to the southeast of the Site.

Overall, the Site met the criteria of 320 planted stems per acre with an average sampled density of 355 planted stems per acre. In Year 1, planted and volunteer stems had a sampled density of 1,929 stems per acre; therefore, it was not necessary to perform another count of volunteer stems in Year 2 or Year 3. Visual inspection during Year 2 and Year 3 monitoring efforts confirmed that the volunteer stem count and species remained consistent. No vegetation problem areas were noted during monitoring Year 3. Vegetation plot data is presented in the summary table below and in Appendix C.

The Site met the vegetation survival rate success criteria in 8 of the 9 monitoring plots. The results from Year 1 had shown that three plots did not meet the criteria; Plots 4, 6, and 7. Year 2 monitoring results showed that Plots 4 and 7 met the criteria because stems that had been labeled missing in Year 1 or were not included in the As-Built inventory were located in Year 2. Plot 6 was one stem less than the 320 stems per acre target and did not meet the criteria. Year 3 monitoring confirmed the findings of Year 2, again with Plot 6 falling one stem short of the success criteria. Additional planted material was rediscovered in plots 1, 3 and 5 which improved the total stems per acre calculation for each plot.

	Summary Table: Vegetation Attainment Data Plum Creek Wetland Restoration EEP Project Number 92549; EEP Contract Number D06040-A						
Veg	Summary of Stems per Acre Results for Years 1 through 5     Veg   Success Criteria Achieved / Total Stems (Stems per acre)						
Plot	Year 1 (2009)	Year 2 (2010)	Year 3 (2011)	Year 4 (2012)	Year 5 (2013)		
$1^{1}$	Yes /11 stems (445)	Yes / 12 stems (485)	Yes / 13 stems (526)				
2	Yes / 8 stems (320)	Yes / 8 stems (320)	Yes / 8 stems (320)				
$3^{2}$	Yes / 9 stems (364)	Yes / 8 stems (320)	Yes / 9 stems (364)				
4 <sup>1</sup>	Yes / 7 stems (283)	Yes / 8 stems (320)	Yes / 8 stems (320)				
5 <sup>1</sup>	Yes / 8 stems (320)	Yes / 8 stems (320)	Yes / 9 stems (364)				
6 <sup>3</sup>	No / 7 stems (283)	No / 7 stems (283)	No / 7 stems (283)				
$7^2$	Yes / 7 stems (283)	Yes / 8 stems (320)	Yes / 8 stems (320)				
8	Yes / 9 stems (364)	Yes / 9 stems (364)	Yes / 9 stems (364)				
9	No / 8 stems (320)	Yes / 8 stems (320)	Yes / 8 stems (320)				

<sup>1</sup> - One additional planted stem was found during Year-3 monitoring.

<sup>2</sup> - During Year 1 monitoring, these plots did not make vegetation criteria due to missing stems. These stems were found during subsequent years monitoring efforts.

 $^{3}$  - One stem short of meeting the 320 stem/ac threshold.

Two wells (22 percent) on Site continuously recorded soil saturation within the upper 12 inches for greater than 12.5 percent of the growing season. Additionally, three wells (33 percent) of the Site continuously recorded hydrology within the upper 12 inches between 5 percent and 12.5 percent of the growing season, and four wells (44 percent) continuously recorded the required saturation for less than 5 percent of the growing season (See summary table below and Appendix D). The wells that recorded saturation for greater than 50 days of the 249 day growing season were located in the central portion of the site. Their dramatic improvement from Year-1 and Year-2 is primarily attributed to the filling of the northern internal, central internal and southern perimeter ditches. While receiving the least rainfall this year of the 3 post construction monitoring seasons, these wells recorded the greatest saturation of any wells in any of the three monitoring years. This suggests that, albeit slowly, the site is recovering its hydrology.

Sun	Summary Table: Wetland Gauge Attainment Data – >5 percent and <12.5 percent criteria Plum Creek Wetland Restoration EEP Project Number 92549; EEP Contract Number D06040-A					
		•				
Gauge	Summary of Groundwater Gauge Results for Years 1 through 5     Success Criteria Achieved / Max Consecutive Days During Growing Season (Percentage)					
	Year 1 (2009)	Year 2 (2010)	Year 3 (2011)	Year 4 (2012)	Year 5 (2013)	
PCW1	No / 3 days	No / 9 days	No / 11 days			
	(1.2 percent)	(3.6 percent)	(4.4 percent)			
PCW2	Yes / 19 days	Yes / 19 days	Yes / 18 days			
	(7.6 percent)	(7.6 percent)	(7.2 percent)			
PCW3	No / 9 days	Yes / 15 days	No / 9 days			
	(3.6 percent)	(6 percent)	(3.6 percent)			
PCW4	Yes / 22 days	Yes / 18 days	Yes / 15 days			
	(8.8 percent)	(7.2 percent)	(6.0 percent)			
PCW5	Yes / 41 days	Yes / 20 days	Yes / 22 days			
	(16.5 percent)	(8 percent)	(8.8 percent)			
PCW6	No / 3 days	No / 8 days	No / 7 days			
	(1.2 percent)	(3.2 percent)	(2.8 percent)			
PCW7	Yes / 24 days	Yes / 18 days	Yes / 58 days			
	(9.6 percent)	(7.2 percent)	(23 percent)			
PCW8	Yes / 22 days	Yes / 19 days	Yes / 50 days			
	(8.8 percent)	(7.6 percent)	(20 percent)			
PCW9	No / 12 days	Yes / 15 days	No / 12 days			
	(4.8 percent)	(6 percent)	(4.8 percent)			

The Site is still recovering from a severe drought in the region that has lasted for several years. For Year-3, the region was classified as having moderate to extreme drought conditions for more than 72 percent of the growing season, and was abnormally dry for the other 28 percent of the time. Moreover, for 72 of 108 weeks of the last 3 growing seasons, (74.1 percent of the time), the site has been classified as abnormally dry or having varying degrees of drought conditions. Drought classification data for monitoring years 1, 2 and 3 can be found in the summary table below. Precipitation measured well below average for all of the growing season except for July and August which were average months. The average annual rainfall over the last 30 years at the nearest weather station in Shallotte is approximately 48.3 inches with the least amount of rain recorded in that period is 33.3 inches. The 2011 rainfall on site totaled only 25.0 inches, which is 23.3 inches below average, or 51.7 percent of the average annual rainfall over the past 30 years. Precipitation data can be found in Appendix D. Reference well locations can be found on Appendix A, Figure 1. Soil profiles were dug at each well location. All profiles displayed hydric soil characteristics of low chroma soil color. Pedon description sheets for each soil profile can be found in Appendix E.

Summary Table: Drought Conditions During Growing Seasons   Plum Creek Wetland Restoration   EEP Project Number 92549; EEP Contract Number D06040-A   Summary of Drought Classifications for Years 1 through 5   Drought Rating per Week During Growing Season (Percentage)						
	Not RatedAbnormallyModerateSevereExtremeDryDroughtDroughtDroughtDrought					
Year 1 (2009)	7 weeks (19.4 percent)	28 weeks (77.8 percent)	1 week (2.8 percent)	0 weeks (0.0 percent)	0 weeks (0.0 percent)	
Year 2 (2010)	21 weeks (58.3 percent)	12 weeks (33.3 percent)	3 weeks (8.3 percent)	0 weeks (0.0 percent)	0 weeks (0.0 percent)	
Year 3 (2011)	0 weeks (0.0 percent)	10 weeks (27.8 percent)	13 weeks (36.1 percent)	7 weeks (19.4 percent)	6 weeks (16.7 percent)	
Year 4 (2012)						
Year 5 (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 the tables and figures in the report appendices. Narrative background and supporting information formerly found in these reports can be found in the Baseline Monitoring Report (formerly Mitigation Plan) and in the Mitigation Plan (formerly the Restoration Plan) documents available on EEP's website. All raw data supporting the tables and figures in the appendices is available from EEP upon request.

## 2. <u>Methodology</u>

#### 2.1. Vegetation

Vegetative data will be sampled every monitoring year for five years. Survival criteria of planted woody stems will be 320 stems per acre in Year 3, 288 stems per acre in Year 4, and 260 stems per acre at the completion of the project monitoring period at Year 5.

Nine vegetation plots were established on Site. All plots are 10 meters by 10 meters in size. Plots were established at each monitoring well location (Appendix B, Figure 2). Each plot is identified by its corresponding well as shown on Appendix B, Figure 2. The plots were established throughout the Site in order to gain a representative view of the overall success of the plant community.

The CVS-EEP Level 1 was used for assessing vegetative success (Lee *et al.*, 2006). Level 1 is the inventory of planted stems. Berger is only required to perform a Level 1 assessment under the existing contract. Although Berger performed a Level 2 assessment in Year 1, it was not done in Year 2. Visual inspection during Year 2 and Year 3 monitoring efforts confirmed that the volunteer stem count and species remained consistent; therefore, a Level 2 assessment was not necessary.

### 2.2. Hydrology

Hydrology will be considered successful by two metrics, per the USACE wetland delineation manual (Environmental Laboratory, 1987). One criterion provides for hydrologic success if the soil is ponded, flooded, or saturated within 12 inches of the soil surface continuously for at least 12.5 percent of the growing season, assuming normal precipitation. The second alternative measurement of success would be to attain ponded, flooded, or saturated conditions within 12 inches of the soil surface continuously between 5 and 12.5 percent of the growing season, provided the hydric soil and hydrophytic vegetation wetland criteria are also met. In Brunswick County, the growing season is typically 249 days, assuming a temperature of above 28 degrees F and a frequency of 5 of 10 years (NRCS, 2009). The growing season in Brunswick County typically occurs between approximately March 15 and November 18 in a given calendar year. As a result, 5 to 12.5 percent of the growing season is 12 to 31 days.

The groundwater hydrology of the Plum Creek Site is monitored during the growing season in accordance with USACE guidelines through the use of shallow monitoring wells with automatic data loggers (USACE, 2003). Groundwater data is collected from 15 monitoring wells. Nine wells were established throughout the site to accurately obtain a representative view of the groundwater hydrology. Six additional wells were installed in the western central portion of the site, perpendicular the western border ditch (Appendix B, Figure 2). The purpose of these wells is to show the linear extent of drawn down effect of this ditch on the restored wetland.

A stream gauge was installed in Boggy Branch, within the property boundaries, for informational purposes only. The stream gauge keeps records of the level of water in Boggy Branch. No success criteria are attached to the gauge.

#### 2.3. Photo Stations

Eight fixed photo stations were established throughout the Site. These locations are presented in Figure 2, Appendix B. Photographs were taken during the monitoring efforts in November 2011. Photographs can be found in Appendix B.

#### 3. <u>References</u>

- Environmental Laboratory, 1987. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual, Technical Report Y-87-1, US Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
- Griffith, Glenn, J. Omernik, J. Comstock, 2002. Ecoregions of North Carolina Regional Descriptions. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Corvallis, OR.
- Lee, Michael T., R. K. Peet, S. D. Roberts, and T. R. Wentworth. 2006. CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.0 Available URL: <u>http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/methods.htm</u>.
- Natural Resources Conservation Service. Climate Information Wetlands Retrieval for North Carolina. Brunswick County. Available URL: <u>http://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/cgibin/getwetco.pl?state=nc</u>. Accessed: January 15, 2009.
- US Army Corps of Engineers, 2003. Stream Mitigation Guidelines. Prepared by: USACE, NCDWQ, USEPA, NCWRC.

Appendix A: Project Vicinity Map and Background Tables



Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation Project EEP Project Number 92549; EEP Contract Number D06040-A							
ProjectTotal Acres*TypeRestorationCommentComponent or Reach IDEvel and Ratioand Ratio							
Planting Zone 1	77	Non-riverine/ Non-riparian	Restoration 1:1	Pond Pine Woodland Community			
Existing Wetland WA	6	Non-riverine/ Non-riparian	Enhancement 2:1	Pond Pine Woodland Community			

\* The remaining acreage is either unsuitable for mitigation or will remain as upland.

Table 2: Project Activity and Reporting History Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation ProjectEEP Project Number 92549; EEP Contract Number D06040-AElapsed Time Since Vegetation Removal Complete: 3 yrs 6 months Elapsed Time Since Planting Complete: 3 yrs 1 month Number of Reporting Years: 3						
Activity or Report						
Technical Proposal	Complete January 2006	Delivery March 2006				
Categorical Exclusion	January 2007	February 2007				
Restoration Plan	April 2008	July 2008				
Existing Vegetation Removal	N/A	July 2008				
Construction	N/A	October 2008				
Planting	N/A	December 2008				
Mitigation Plan / As-built (Year 0 Monitoring						
– baseline)	January 2009	April 2009				
Year 1 Monitoring	November 2009	February 2010				
Year 2 Monitoring	November 2010	February 2011				
Year 3 Monitoring	November 2011	December 2011				

Table 3: Project Contacts Table					
	Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation Project EEP Project Number 92549; EEP Contract Number D06040-A				
Designer	The Louis Berger Group, Inc.				
Designer	1001 Wade Avenue, Suite 400				
	Raleigh, North Carolina 27605				
Primary project design POC	Michael O'Rourke (919-866-4421)				
Construction Contractor	River Works, Inc				
Construction Contractor	4117 Pleasant Garden Road				
	Greensboro, NC 27406				
Construction contractor POC	Bill Wright (336-279-1002)				
Planting Contractor	Superior Forestry Services, Inc.				
	36462 Highway 27				
	Tilley, AR 72679				
Planting contractor POC	John Foley (870-496-2442)				
Nursery Stock Suppliers	Division of Forest Resources –				
	Claridge Nursery (919-731-7988)				
	Coastal Plain Nursery (252-482-5707)				
Monitoring Performers	The Louis Berger Group, Inc.				
	1001 Wade Avenue, Suite 400				
	Raleigh, North Carolina 27605				
	EEE Consultants, Inc				
	3834 Althorp Drive				
	Raleigh, NC 27616				
Stream Monitoring POC	N/A				
Vegetation Monitoring POC	Ray Bode, PWS (919-545-0256)				
	Tina Sekula, PWS (919-696-9506)				
Wetland Monitoring POC	Ray Bode, PWS (919-545-0256)				
······································	Tina Sekula, PWS (919-696-9506)				

Table 4: Project Background Table Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation Project EEP Project Number 92549; EEP Contract Number D06040-A						
Project Information						
Project Name	Plum Creek W	Vetland Mitiga	ation Project			
County	Brunswick Co	ounty				
Project Area (acres)	Approximatel					
Project Coordinates (latitude and longitude)	34.068850, -	78.229486				
Project Watershed	<b>Summary Info</b>	rmation				
Physiographic Province	Middle Atlant	tic Coastal Pla	in			
River Basin	Lumber River	•				
USGS Hydrologic Unit 8-digit	03040208					
USGS Hydrologic Unit 12-digit	03040208010	2				
NCDWQ Sub-basin	Long Bay Sub	obasin				
Project Drainage area (acres)	110 acres					
Project Drainage Area Percentage of	0%					
Impervious Area						
CGIA Land Use Classification	Other Needlel		Forests			
Wetland Sum	mary Informat	ion				
Size of Wetland (acres)	83 acres					
Wetland Type	Non-Riparian, non-riverine					
Mapped Soil Series	Torhunta Mucky Fine Sandy Loam					
Drainage class	Very poorly drained soils					
Soil Hydric Status	Hydric					
Source of Hydrology	Precipitation /	Groundwate	r			
Hydrologic Impairment	Previous Ditc	hing				
Native Vegetation Community	Pond Pine Wo	odland Com	nunity			
Percent Composition of exotic invasive	<5%					
vegetation						
Regulatory	Considerations	5				
Regulation	Applicable?	Resolved?	Supporting Documentation			
Waters of the United States – Section 404	Yes	Yes	Jurisdictional			
			Determination			
Waters of the Unites States – Section 401	No					
Endangered Species Act	No					
Historic Preservation Act	No					
CZMA / CAMA	No					
FEMA Floodplain Compliance	No					
Essential Fisheries Habitat	No					

Appendix B: Visual Assessment Data



## **Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos**



Veg Plot 1, view from southwest corner January 7, 2009



Veg Plot 1, view from southwest corner November 15, 2011



Veg Plot 1, view from southwest corner November 15, 2010



Veg Plot 2, view from southwest corner January 7, 2009



Veg Plot 2, view from southwest corner November 15, 2010



Veg Plot 2, view from southwest corner November 15, 2011



Veg Plot 3, view from southwest corner January 8, 2009



Veg Plot 3, view from southwest corner November 16, 2010



Veg Plot 3, view from southwest corner November 16, 2011



Veg Plot 4, view from southwest corner January 8, 2009



Veg Plot 4, view from southwest corner November 16, 2010



Veg Plot 4, view from southwest corner November 16, 2011



Veg Plot 5, view from southwest corner January 8, 2009



Veg Plot 5, view from southwest corner November 15, 2010



Veg Plot 5, view from southwest corner November 16, 2011



Veg Plot 6, view from southwest corner January 7, 2009



Veg Plot 6, view from southwest corner November 15, 2010



Veg Plot 6, view from southwest corner November 15, 2011



Veg Plot 7, view from southwest corner January 7, 2009



Veg Plot 7, view from southwest corner November 15, 2010



Veg Plot 1, view from southwest corner November 15, 2011



Veg Plot 8, view from southwest corner January 7, 2009



Veg Plot 8, view from southwest corner November 15, 2010



Veg Plot 8, view from southwest corner November 15, 2011



Veg Plot 9, view from southwest corner, January 7, 2009



Veg Plot 9, view from southwest corner November 15, 2010



Veg Plot 9, view from southwest corner November 15, 2011

## **Photo Stations**



Photo Station 1, view looking north October 28, 2009



Photo Station 1, view looking north November 15, 2011



Photo Station 1, view looking north November 15, 2010



Photo Station 2, view looking east October 28, 2009



Photo Station 2, view looking east November 15, 2010



Photo Station 2, view looking east November 15, 2011



Photo Station 3, view looking east October 28, 2009



Photo Station 3, view looking east November 15, 2010



Photo Station 3, view looking east November 15, 2011



Photo Station 4, view looking east October 29, 2009



Photo Station 4, view looking east November 15, 2010



Photo Station 4, view looking east November 15, 2011



Photo Station 5, view looking east October 29, 2009



Photo Station 5, view looking east November 15, 2010



Photo Station 5, view looking east November 16, 2011



Photo Station 6, view looking west October 29, 2009



Photo Station 6, view looking west November 15, 2010



Photo Station 6, view looking west November 16, 2011



Photo Station 7, view looking east October 29, 2009



Photo Station 7, view looking east November 15, 2010



Photo Station 7, view looking east November 16, 2011


Photo Station 8, view looking north October 29, 2009



Photo Station 8, view looking north November 15, 2010



Photo Station 8, view looking north November 16, 2011

Appendix C: Vegetation Plot Data

Table 5: Veg Plot Criteria Attainment Plum Creek Wetland Restoration EEP Project Number 92549; EEP Contract Number D06040-A							
Tract Veg Plot ID Stems Per Acre Veg Survival Tract Mea   Threshold Met? (320 stems per acre) acre)							
Plum Creek Wetland	1	526	Y	89%			
<b>Restoration Site</b>	2	320	Y				
	3	364	Y				
	4	320	$Y^1$				
	5	364	Y				
	6	280	$N^2$				
	7	320	$\mathbf{Y}^1$	]			
	8	364	Y				
	9	320	Y				

<sup>1</sup> - During Year 1 monitoring, these plots did not make vegetation criteria due to missing stems. These stems were found during Yr-2's monitoring efforts.
<sup>2</sup> - One stem short of meeting the 320 stem/ac threshold.

Table 6: CVS Vegetation Metadata Table     Plum Creek Wetland Restoration     EEB Project Number 02540: EEB Contract Number D06040 A							
EEP Project Number 92549; EEP Contract Number D06040-A     3. Report Prepared By   4. Tina Sekula							
5. Date Prepared	6. 11/28/2011 2:02:16 PM						
7.	8.						
9.	10.						
11. database name	12. The Louis Berger Group-Plum-2011-A.mdb						
13. database location	14. C:\Users\tsekula\Desktop\Plum						
15. computer name	16. TINASEKULA-WIN7						
17. file size	18. 37466112						
19.	20.						
21.	22.						
23. DESCRIPTION OF							
WORKSHEETS IN THIS DOCUMENT	24.						
25. Metadata	26. Description of database file, the report worksheets, and a summary of project(s) and project data.						
27. Proj, planted	28. Each project is listed with its PLANTED stems per acre, for each year. This excludes live stakes.						
29. Proj, total stems	30. Each project is listed with its TOTAL stems per acre, for each year. This includes live stakes, all planted stems, and all natural/volunteer stems.						
31. Plots	32. List of plots surveyed with location and summary data (live stems, dead stems, missing, etc.).						
33. Vigor	34. Frequency distribution of vigor classes for stems for all plots.						

Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation Project; EEP Project Number 92549; EEP Contract Number D06040-A; Year 3 of 5; Submitted: May 2012 Appendix C

Table 6: CVS Vegetation Metadata Table     Plum Creek Wetland Restoration					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	r 92549; EEP Contract Number D06040-A				
35. Vigor by Spp	36. Frequency distribution of vigor classes listed by species.				
	38. List of most frequent damage classes with number of				
37. Damage	occurrences and percent of total stems impacted by each.				
<b>39. Damage by Spp</b>	40. Damage values tallied by type for each species.				
41. Damage by Plot	42. Damage values tallied by type for each plot.				
	44. A matrix of the count of PLANTED living stems of each species for each plot; dead and missing stems are				
43. Planted Stems by Plot and Spp	excluded.				
45.	46.				
47.	48.				
49. PROJECT SUMMARY					
	50.				
51. Project Code	52. 92549				
53. project Name	54. Plum Creek Wetland Restoration Site				
	56. The project involves the construction of approximately 80				
55. Description	acres of non-riverine wetland restoration.				
57. River Basin	58. Lumber				
59. length(ft)	60. NA				
61. stream-to-edge width (ft)	62. NA				
63. area (sq m)	64. 323, 748 mi <sup>2</sup>				
65. Required Plots (calculated)	66. 9				
67. Sampled Plots	68. 9				

	Table 7: CVS Stem Count Total and Planted by Plot and SpeciesPlum Creek Wetland RestorationEEP Project Number 92549; EEP Contract Number D06040-A														
	Comment	Species	Common Name	Total Planted Stems	# plots	avg# stems	plot 92549-01-1- year:3	plot 92549-01-2- year:3	plot 92549-01-3- year:3	plot 92549-01-4- year:3	plot 92549-01-5- year:3	plot 92549-01-6- year:3	plot 92549-01-7- year:3	plot 92549-01-8- year:3	plot 92549-01-9- year:3
		Chamaecyparis thyoides	Atlantic white cedar	4	3	1.33			1		2				1
		Gordonia lasianthus	loblolly bay	11	7	1.57	1	1	2	2	2			1	2
		Pinus serotina	pond pine	62	9	6.89	10	7	6	6	5	7	8	8	5
		Quercus laurifolia	laurel oak	1	1	1.00	1								
		Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	1	1	1.00	1								
TOT:	0	5	5	79	5		13	8	9	8	9	7	8	9	8
Projec	ct Cod	le	Project Name			River Basin Year 2 Stem Count									
92549	)		Plum Creek W	etland R	lestora	ation Si	te	Lum	ber		355.	224064	415569		

Appendix D: Hydrologic Data

	Table 8: Wetland Gauge Attainment Data – >5 percent and <12.5 percent criteria Plum Creek Wetland Restoration EEP Project Number 92549; EEP Contract Number D06040-A						
		*	•				
Gauge	Summary of Groundwater Gauge Results for Years 1 through 5       Gauge     Success Criteria Achieved / Max Consecutive Days During Growing Season (Percentage)						
	Year 1 (2009)	Year 2 (2010)	Year 3 (2011)	Year 4 (2012)	Year 5 (2013)		
PCW1	No / 3 days	No / 9 days	No / 11 days				
	(1.2 percent)	(3.6 percent)	(4.4 percent)				
PCW2	Yes / 19 days	Yes / 19 days	Yes / 18 days				
	(7.6 percent)	(7.6 percent)	(7.2 percent)				
PCW3	No / 9 days	Yes / 15 days	No / 9 days				
	(3.6 percent)	(6.0 percent)	(3.6 percent)				
PCW4	Yes / 22 days	Yes / 18 days	Yes / 15 days				
	(8.8 percent)	(7.2 percent)	(6.0 percent)				
PCW5	Yes / 41 days	Yes / 20 days	Yes / 22 days				
	(16.5 percent)	(8.0 percent)	(8.8 percent)				
PCW6	No / 3 days	No / 8 days	No / 7 days				
	(1.2 percent)	(3.2 percent)	(2.8 percent)				
PCW7	Yes / 24 days	Yes / 18 days	Yes / 58 days				
	(9.6 percent)	(7.2 percent)	(23.3 percent)				
PCW8	Yes / 22 days	Yes / 19 days	Yes / 50 days				
	(8.8 percent)	(7.6 percent)	(20.1 percent)				
PCW9	No / 12 days	Yes / 15 days	No / 12 days				
	(4.8 percent)	(6.0 percent)	(4.8 percent)				



**Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation** Gauge G-1 (Serial No. EBD3BBC)











**Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation** 







**Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation** Gauge G-9 (Serial No. EBD5020)



Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation Gauge 'Ditch25' (Serial No. EBD3EDF) Project Site



Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation Gauge 'Ditch50' (Serial No. EBD64BE) Project Site



Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation Gauge 'Ditch75' (Serial No. EBDBA05) Project Site



## Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation Gauge 'Ditch100' (Serial No. 11310FEA) Project Site



Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation Gauge 'Ditch185' (Serial No. 11313BC2) Project Site



Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation Gauge ''Ditch235' (Serial No. A28C5CB) Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation Reference Site FOREST GUAGE {Formerly REF 2} (Serial No. EBCFCF6)



Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation Reference Guage ROAD GUAGE {Formerly PLUM REF} (Serial No. 9DE6C99)



Plum Creek Wetland Mitigation Reference Site POND GUAGE {Formerly PC-REF1} (Serial No. EBD2B2F)



Plum Creek 30-70 Percentile Graph Shallotte, North Carolina



## Plum Creek 30-70 Percentile Graph Shallotte, North Carolina



Appendix E: Pedon Description Sheets

		Pedon Descript	ion Sheet		
Sampling L	ocation: Well 1	Time: 2-5PM	Date: 11/15/2011	Weather: Sunny 65°F	
	Sekula/Bode		Landscape Position: Headwater wetland		
Depth to S	aturation or Free Water:	saturation at 18in	Vegetative Cover: So	crub-shrub	
Parent Ma	terial(s):		Hydric Soil: Yes	No Hydric Soil Indicator: S7	
Soil Series:	Torhunta		HGM Wetland Class	: Slope	
Depth:	Matrix Color/Colors:	Redox Concentrations	Texture	Roots	
		percent/size/color/location/type	% rock frags & size	size & abundance	
2" - 0			organic matter		
0-7"	10 YR 2/1		sandy loam		
7"-18"	10 YR 2/2		sandy loam		

		Pedon Descripti	on Sheet		
Sampling L	ocation: Well 2	Time: 2-5PM	Date: 11/15/2011	Weather: Sunny 65°F	
	Sekula/Bode	•	Landscape Position: Headwater wetland		
Depth to Sa	aturation or Free Water:	saturation at 23in	Vegetative Cover: So	crub-shrub	
Parent Mat	erial(s):		Hydric Soil: Yes	No Hydric Soil Indicator: S7	
Soil Series:	Torhunta		HGM Wetland Class	: Slope	
Depth:	Matrix Color/Colors:	Redox Concentrations	Texture	Roots	
		percent/size/color/location/type	% rock frags & size	size & abundance	
0-24"	10 YR 2/1		sandy loam		

		Pedon Descriptio	n Sheet		
Sampling Lo	ocation: Well 3	Time: 8-11AM	Date: 11/16/2011	Weather: Sunny 55°F	
Describer: Sekula/Bode			Landscape Position: Headwater wetland		
Depth to Sa	turation or Free Water:	saturation at 18in and free water at	Vegetative Cover: Sc	rub-shrub	
20in					
Parent Mat	erial(s):		Hydric Soil: Yes	No Hydric Soil Indicator: S7	
Soil Series:	Torhunta		HGM Wetland Class:	Slope	
Depth:	Matrix Color/Colors:	Redox Concentrations	Texture	Roots	
		percent/size/color/location/type	% rock frags & size	size & abundance	
0-7"	10 YR 2/1		sandy loam	oxidozed rhizospheres	
7"-18"	10 YR 3/1		sandy loam	oxidozed rhizospheres	

		Pedon Descript	ion Sheet		
Sampling Lo	ocation: Well 4	Time: 8-11AM	Date: 11/16/2011	Weather: Sunny 55°F	
Describer: Sekula/Bode			Landscape Position: Headwater wetland		
Depth to Saturation or Free Water: saturation at 22in			Vegetative Cover: Scrub-shrub		
Parent Mate	erial(s):		Hydric Soil: Yes	No Hydric Soil Indicator: S7	
Soil Series:	Torhunta		HGM Wetland Class	: Slope	
Depth:	Matrix Color/Colors:	Redox Concentrations	Texture	Roots	
		percent/size/color/location/type	% rock frags & size	size & abundance	
0-11"	10 YR 2/1		sandy loam	oxidozed rhizospheres at 6"	
11"-24"	10 YR 3/1		sandy loam	oxidozed rhizospheres	

		Pedon Descript	ion Sheet		
Sampling Lo	ocation: Well 5	Time: 8-11AM	Date: 11/16/2011	Weather: Sunny 55°F	
Describer: Sekula/Bode			Landscape Position: Headwater wetland		
Depth to Sa	turation or Free Water:	saturation at 19in	Vegetative Cover: So	crub-shrub	
Parent Mat	erial(s):		Hydric Soil: Yes	No Hydric Soil Indicator: S7	
Soil Series:	Torhunta		HGM Wetland Class	: Slope	
Depth:	Matrix Color/Colors:	Redox Concentrations	Texture	Roots	
		percent/size/color/location/type	% rock frags & size	size & abundance	
0-24"	10 YR 2/1		sandy loam	oxidized rhizospheres at 12"	

		Pedon Descript	ion Sheet			
Sampling Lo	ocation: Well 6	Time: 2-5PM	Date: 11/15/2011	Weather: Sunny 65°F		
Describer: Sekula/Bode			Landscape Position: Headwater wetland			
Depth to Sa	turation or Free Water:	saturation at 13in	Vegetative Cover: Scrub-shrub			
Parent Mat	erial(s):		Hydric Soil: Yes	No Hydric Soil Indicator: S7		
Soil Series:	Torhunta		HGM Wetland Class	: Slope		
Depth:	Matrix Color/Colors:	Redox Concentrations	Texture	Roots		
		percent/size/color/location/type	% rock frags & size	size & abundance		
0-13"	10 YR 2/1		sandy loam			
13"-18"	10 YR 2/2		sandy clay			

		Pedon Descript	ion Sheet		
Sampling Lo	ocation: Well 7	Time: 2-5PM	Date: 11/15/2011	Weather: Sunny 65°F	
	Sekula/Bode		Landscape Position: Headwater wetland		
Depth to Sa	aturation or Free Water:	saturation at 8in	Vegetative Cover: So	crub-shrub	
Parent Mat	erial(s):		Hydric Soil: Yes	No Hydric Soil Indicator: S7	
Soil Series:	Torhunta		HGM Wetland Class	: Slope	
Depth:	Matrix Color/Colors:	Redox Concentrations	Texture	Roots	
		percent/size/color/location/type	% rock frags & size	size & abundance	
0-18"	10 YR 2/1		sandy loam		
				1	

Pedon Description Sheet						
Sampling Lo	ocation: Well 8	Time: 2-5PM	Date: 11/15/2011	Weather: Sunny 65°F		
Describer: S	Sekula/Bode		Landscape Position: Headwater wetland			
Depth to Sa	turation or Free Water:	saturation at 15in	Vegetative Cover: Scrub-shrub			
Parent Mat	erial(s):		Hydric Soil: Yes	No Hydric Soil Indicator: S7		
Soil Series:			HGM Wetland Class	: Slope		
Depth:	Matrix Color/Colors:	Redox Concentrations	Texture	Roots		
		percent/size/color/location/type	% rock frags & size	size & abundance		
0-18"	10 YR 2/1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	sandy loam			

Pedon Description Sheet								
Sampling Location: Well 9		Time: 2-5PM	Date: 11/15/2011	Weather: Sunny 65°F				
	Sekula/Bode	•	Landscape Position: Headwater wetland					
Depth to Sa	aturation or Free Water:	saturation at 9in	Vegetative Cover: Scrub-shrub					
Parent Mat	erial(s):		Hydric Soil: Yes	No Hydric Soil Indicator: S7				
Soil Series:	Torhunta		HGM Wetland Class: Slope					
Depth:	Matrix Color/Colors:	Redox Concentrations	Texture	Roots				
		percent/size/color/location/type	% rock frags & size	size & abundance				
0-18"	10 YR 2/1		sandy loam					
			_					