#### **BASELINE MONITORING DOCUMENT AND AS BUILT BASELINE REPORT**

#### **FINAL VERSION**

**Charles Williams Stream Wetland and Buffer Site** 

Randolph County, NC State Construction Project No. 07-07125-01A EEP Project No. 80



Prepared for the NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources Ecosystem Enhancement Program

> 217 West Jones Street, Suite 3000A Raleigh, NC 27603



September 25, 2013

#### Prepared by:



1151 SE Cary Parkway, Suite 101 Cary, NC 27518 919.557.0929

S. Jane Saul 4.

G. Lane Sauls, Jr., Principal

Under Contract with:



This assessment and report are consistent with NCDENR Ecosystem Enhancement Program Template Version 2.0 (10/14/10) for Baseline Monitoring Document Format, Data Requirements and Content Guidance.

### **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1.0	Executive Summary/ Project Abstract1
2.0	Project Goals, Background and Attributes.22.1 Location and Setting22.2 Project Goals and Objectives32.3 Project Structure, Restoration Type and Approach32.4 Project History, Contacts and Attribute Data5
3.0	Success Criteria53.1 Morphologic Parameters and Channel Stability53.2 Hydrology53.3 Vegetation5
4.0	Monitoring Plan Guidelines64.1 Hydrology64.2 Stream Channel Stability and Geomorphology64.3 Vegetation64.4 Digital Photographs6
5.0	Maintenance and Contingency Plans6
6.0	Baseline Condition76.1 Record Drawings76.2 Baseline Data Collection7
7.0	Report and Data Submission7
8.0	References9
Аррен	ndix A. General Figures and Tables Figure 1. Vicinity Map Figure 2. Aerial Photograph and Mitigation Components Figure 3. Site Features

<u>Page</u>

- Figure 4. Tree Planting and Invasive Treatment Areas
- Figure 5. Permanent Seeding Zones
- Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Credits
- Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History
- Table 3. Project Contact Table
- Table 4. Project Baseline Information and Attributes

Appendix B. Cross Section and Profile Data Appendix C. Baseline Photographs Appendix D. Record Drawings

# **1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY/ PROJECT ABSTRACT**

The Charles Williams Stream, Wetland and Buffer Site, hereinafter referred to as the "Project Site" or "Site," is located in Randolph County, North Carolina, within US Geological Survey (USGS) 8-digit Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) 03030003 and NC Division of Water Quality (NCDWQ) sub-basin 03-06-09 of the Cape Fear River Basin (Figure 1). The project involved the enhancement of 1,753 linear feet of an unnamed tributary (UT) to Sandy Creek, 1.96 acres of wetlands and 4.7 acres of riparian buffer. The Site is protected for perpetuity under a conservation easement purchased from Mr. Charles Williams in 2006.

Existing land use and practices, including unrestricted livestock access were the main reasons for degradation throughout the Site. The establishment of a protected conservation easement along these areas, channel enhancements, and the planting of supplemental vegetation will ultimately uplift existing natural and biological processes. It will also improve the overall function and habitat associated with both the UT and its receiving stream, Sandy Creek.

The Project Site is located in the 14-digit Upper Cape Fear Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) 03030003020010, identified as the Sandy Creek Watershed. This HUC is identified as a Targeted Local Watershed (TLW) in EEP's Draft 2009 Cape Fear River Basin Restoration Priority (RBRP) Plan (available at the EEP web site under the link <a href="http://www.nceep.net/pages/lwplanning.htm">http://www.nceep.net/pages/lwplanning.htm</a>).

The Project's goals were to:

- reduce nutrient and sediment water quality stressors,
- provide for uplift in water quality functions,
- improve instream and wetland aquatic habitats, including riparian terrestrial habitats, and
- provide for greater overall instream and wetland habitat complexity and quality.

Stream enhancement, the primary component, served as the dominant input for achieving this goal.

No restoration goals were identified in the Cape Fear River Basinwide Management Plan (NCDWQ, 2005) with regard to the Sandy Creek watershed. There were no sources or stressors listed for the watershed area associated with the Project Site. The NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources Ecosystem Enhancement Program (EEP) develops River Basin Restoration Priorities (RBRP) to guide its restoration activities within each of the state's 54 cataloging units. RBRPs delineate specific watersheds that exhibit both the need and opportunity for wetland, stream and riparian buffer restoration. These watersheds are called Targeted Local Watersheds (TLWs) and receive priority for EEP planning and restoration project funds. The 2009 Draft Cape Fear River RBRP identified HUC 03030003020010, which includes the Project Site, as a Targeted Local Watershed. The following information is taken directly from the RBRP. "...This is a largely rural HU. The main stream, Sandy Creek, flows through Randolph County to Sandy Creek Reservoir, a drinking water supply for Ramseur and Franklinville. As of 2006, the HU had no streams on DWQ's list of impaired waters, however, the reservoir shows indications of high nutrient levels, likely related to the large number of animal operations in the HU. The HU is a Water Supply Watershed and a long portion of Sandy Creek is recognized by the State's NHP as a Significant Natural Heritage Area. EEP has been active in the HU with five projects that include components of preserving wetlands (3 acres) and streams (5,100 linear feet) and restoring wetlands (15 acres) and streams (15,000 linear feet). Piedmont Land Conservancy has also been active in protecting streamside buffers in the HU. Continued implementation of practices to reduce nutrient inputs to Sandy Creek Reservoir is recommended for this HU."

#### 2.0 PROJECT GOALS, BACKGROUND AND ATTRIBUTES

#### 2.1 Location and Setting

The Project Site is situated in northeastern Randolph County, west-southwest of the town of Liberty, and six miles north of Ramseur (Figure 1). It is bordered to the north and west by undeveloped land, the east by Ramseur-Julian Road and the south by Sandy Creek. Northeastern Randolph Middle School is on the property opposite of Sandy Creek, to the south. The Project Site can be accessed by using the following directions from US Highway 64.

- Turn north on US 421 in Siler City, towards the Town of Liberty.
- Proceed approximately 9.5 miles and turn south (left) onto NC 49.
- Proceed approximately 0.7 miles along NC 49 and turn north (right) onto SR 2459 (Sandy Creek Church Road).
- Follow Sandy Creek Church Road approximately 4.5 miles until it intersects with SR 2442 (Ramseur-Julian Road) and turn north (right),
- Follow Ramseur-Julian Road approximately 0.3 miles, crossing over Sandy Creek. The Charles Williams Site is on the west (left) side of the roadway, immediately north of Sandy Creek.

Situated in the Piedmont physiographic province and the Cape Fear River Basin, the Project Site encompasses approximately 18 acres of former pasture and existing riparian forest. Elevations across the Site range between approximately 550 and 560 feet above Mean Sea Level. The following chart depicts pre-implementation existing condition information regarding the Site.

Physiographic Province	Piedmont	County	Randolph									
River Basin Name	Cape Fear	Property Owner Name	Charles Williams									
USGS 8-digit HUC	03030003											
USGS 14-digit HUC	03030002020010	Stream #1 Name	UT to Sandy Creek									
NCDWQ Subbasin	03-06-09	Drainage Area	4.9 sq. mi.									
Underlying Mapped Soil(s)	Chewacla loam	NCDWQ Score	(Perennial)									
Drainage Class	Somewhat poorly drained	<b>Rosgen Classification</b>	C5									
Hydric Status	В											
Slope	0-2 %											
Available Water Capacity	Moderate to High											
FEMA Classification	Zone AE											
Exotic Vegetation Observed	Multiflora rose (Rosa multifl	lora)										
	Chinese privet (Ligustrum si	Chinese privet (Ligustrum sinense)										

#### **Pre-Implementation Existing Conditions Summary**

#### 2.2 Project Goals and Objectives

The Project goals are to:

- reduce nutrient and sediment water quality stressors,
- provide for uplift in water quality functions,
- improve instream and wetland aquatic habitats, including riparian terrestrial habitats, and
- provide for greater overall instream and wetland habitat complexity and quality.

Stream enhancement, the primary component, serves the dominant input for achieving this goal.

Historic and contemporary land management practices have been the main reasons for the degradation of biological processes within the Project area. The absence of barriers to livestock movement had resulted in stream bank erosion, degradation of in-stream habitat, and of suppression of forest succession within the riparian zone and adjacent wetland areas. Project enhancements were designed to combat various watershed stressors through the following strategies:

Key Watershed Stressors	Management Strategies
Stream bank erosion	riparian buffers & livestock exclusion
Absence of vegetative buffer	riparian buffers & livestock exclusion
Livestock access to streams	Livestock exclusion
Nutrients	agricultural BMPs, riparian buffers & livestock exclusion
Fecal coliform	agricultural BMPs, riparian buffers & livestock exclusion

The objectives were to exclude livestock in their entirety from the Conservation Easement area, install stream structures and plantings designed to maintain vertical stability, lateral stability and habitat, eradicate non-native invasive vegetation, and re-vegetate and supplement those areas lacking suitable vegetation along the easement area. In addition all areas void of woody vegetation (former pasture) were ripped to alleviate soil compaction and to facilitate growth of supplemental plantings.

An alternative water supply and livestock exclusion fencing were provided by the Randolph County Soil and Water Conservation District. The combination of physical improvements to the riparian corridor and improved land use practices in and around the project area will stabilize sediment export and provide an increase in pollutant and nutrient uptake of overland flows prior to entering the stream channel.

Current monitoring protocols require baseline data to be collected 21 days after the project is accepted as complete by EEP and the State Construction Office. However, delays were encountered during the contracting process between project implementation and the collection of baseline data. This resulted in the stream baseline data collection being delayed approximately six months.

#### 2.3 Project Structure, Restoration Type, and Approach

Two main mitigation components exist at the Site: (1) riparian, riverine wetland enhancement and (2) stream enhancement (Level I). These components are depicted on Figure 2 and summarized in Table 1.

As previously noted in Section 1.0, historical landuse activities were primarily responsible for the degradation of the streams, wetland and riparian areas at the Site. With no barriers to livestock the unnamed tributary exhibited severe erosion due to cattle-hoof shear, lack of vegetation and lack of grade control. The overall enhancement of the Site included livestock exclusion from the riparian corridor, stabilization of the stream banks and livestock crossings, eradication of non-native invasive vegetation and the planting of native hardwood vegetation.

Enhancement (Level I) of the UT utilized natural channel design methodologies consistent with Priority Level IV stream restoration protocols. These protocols specifically include the stabilization of the existing channel in place. A Conservation Easement recorded on February 22, 2006 affords protection to the Project Site for perpetuity. Stream enhancement will ultimately result in the reduction of bank erosion and associated sediment contributions as well as the enhancement and improvement of aquatic and terrestrial habitats.

Wetland enhancement work was performed throughout the existing wetland areas. These wetlands were severely degraded as a result of continuous soil compaction and grazing from livestock. The enhancement work included livestock removal via exclusion fencing and supplemental plantings. Benefits include water quality improvement by trapping nutrients such as nitrogen and phosphorous, toxic substances and disease-causing microorganisms. Wetlands also slow and intercept surface runoff, protect stream banks from erosion, protect upland areas from flooding, as well as provide valuable habitat for wildlife.

Riparian buffers, extending a minimum of 50 feet from the top of bank outward, have been established along both sides of the UT and the north side of Sandy Creek. These areas will be enhanced with the installation of supplemental plantings during the 2013-2014 dormant season (Figure 4). Buffers are one of the most functionally beneficial and biologically diverse systems that also provide services of great economic and social value. The benefits associated with a forested buffer include water quality enhancement, stormwater and floodwater management, stream bank stabilization, water temperature modification, wildlife habitat protection and absorption of airborne pollutants. This enhancement, along with stream and wetland enhancement, will aid in reducing overall sediment inputs at the site, as well as downstream. The newly established buffer areas have been afforded protection from livestock grazing through the installation of livestock exclusion fencing. Additionally, two non-native invasive species (Chinese privet and multiflora rose) dominated the stream side vegetation along UT to Sandy Creek. These species were removed mechanically and herbicide was applied to all remaining stumps and stems. Herbicide was also applied to the non-native invasive plants (multiflora rose and Japanese stilt grass) found within the riparian and wetland areas (Figure 5).

The project also offered EEP an opportunity to test multiple permanent seed mixes. Three seeding variations were developed for a cost benefit analysis of seed mix and application rates. Additional goals of this test include the evaluation of less expensive seed mixes, evaluation of reduced seed application rates, evaluation of shade tolerant species, evaluation of nitrogen-fixing legumes and the evaluation of red fescue for sediment and erosion control. Along UT to Sandy Creek, upstream of the culvert, the riparian area was divided into two planting zones. Downstream of the culvert the riparian area was also divided into two planting zones. Downstream of the culvert the riparian area was also divided into two planting zones. The riparian area along Sandy Creek was designated as a third planting zone (Figure 6). Zone 1 received a seed mix of red fescue, red clover, little bluestem, Virginia wild rye, deer tongue, river oats, and upland bentgrass. Zone 2 received the same species with the exception of red fescue. The seed mixes were applied at a rate of 30 pounds per acre in both Zones 1 and 2. Zone 3 received the same mix of species as Zone 2; however, the application rate in Zone 3 was half (15 pounds per acre) of the rate applied in Zone 2. EEP will monitor and collect data throughout the monitoring period to evaluate germination success, effectiveness in site stabilization, and benefits to the tree seedling installations. It is important to note the testing of permanent seed mixes is not a regulatory requirement of the project.

#### 2.4 Project History, Contacts and Attribute Data

A mitigation feasibility study and draft mitigation plan for the Site was developed by the NC Department of Transportation (NCDOT) in 1999 for stream and wetland mitigation needs related to the Greensboro Bypass and other transportation projects in the Cape Fear River Basin. The Site was not immediately developed by the NCDOT and it was eventually transferred to EEP for implementation. In 2006, NCDOT acquired a conservation easement from Mr. Charles Williams (Book 102, Page 99). Mitigation implementation including stream and wetland enhancement, fencing, stream crossings, and live-stake planting was completed in early 2013.

Tables 2, 3 and 4 provide project reporting and milestone history, project consultants, contractors and suppliers and relevant attributes/data at the project level and for the individual restoration components. These tables are provided as a summary of background data.

## **3.0 SUCCESS CRITERIA**

Mitigation success criteria at the Site will be based on USACE (2003) stream mitigation guidelines, Monitoring Level I Criterion.

#### 3.1 Morphologic Parameters and Channel Stability

The morphologic contribution to uplift in hydrologic, water quality and habitat functions stem from two main objectives. The first being the maintenance of a restored or enhanced floodplain connection and associated dimension that facilitates the transport of in-stream sediment loads in equilibrium and dissipates energy associated with floodflows. The second is the maintenance of a longitudinal profile/gradient, which supports these same transport and energy management outcomes. Monitoring will assess and compare the annual dimension adjustments via cross section overlays and measurements of the substrate at each of the four established cross sections. It will also assess the longitudinal profile via the annual measurement along thalweg of the channel. Any trends occurring with regards to cross-sectional area, aggradation or degradation will be noted. Pattern measurements will not be necessary since no changes were performed as part of overall implementation.

#### 3.2 Hydrology

A minimum of two bankfull events must be documented within the standard five-year monitoring period. In order for the hydrology-based monitoring to be considered complete, the two events must occur in separate monitoring years.

#### 3.3 Vegetation

The criteria for vegetation success are dictated by the desired mitigation. Vegetation within the stream and wetland mitigation areas will meet the USACE Wilmington Regulatory District's guidance for stream and wetland mitigation. The Wilmington District requires the survival of a minimum of 320 planted woody stems per acre after monitoring year 3 (MY3). A 10% mortality rate will be allowed for the subsequent monitoring years with a final requirement of 260 stems per acre survival in monitoring year 5 (MY5). Riparian buffer mitigation areas will meet the NC Division of Water Resources criteria for buffer mitigation. NCDWR requires the survival of 320 stems per acres in monitoring year 5 (MY5). Success criteria will also require treatment and

removal of all non-native invasive species prior to project closeout. Bare-root and containerized tree species will be planted between December 15, 2013 and March 15, 2014.

#### 4.0 MONITORING PLAN GUIDELINES

#### 4.1 Hydrology

A crest gage was installed near the downstream end of the Site (Figure 3). This gage will verify the on-site occurrences of bankfull events. In addition, observations of wrack and deposition will serve to validate gage observations. Documentation of the highest stage during the monitoring interval will be assessed during each Site visit and the gage will be reset. The data related to bankfull verification will be summarized in each annual report. Based on the elevation of the crest gage, any readings observed higher than 20 inches on the gage will reflect a bankfull or above bankfull event.

In addition, daily precipitation amounts will be ascertained from the weather station at the Siler City Airport (SILR), approximately 12 miles southwest of the Site. These amounts will be used to help determine the dates of important rainfall events.

#### 4.2 Stream Channel Stability and Geomorphology

As previously mentioned, four cross sections have been strategically placed along the UT (Figure 3). Exhibit Tables 5 and 6 depict the project's hydraulic and geomorphic data. This data is also graphically depicted in Appendix B.

#### 4.3 Vegetation

Once vegetation has been planted, it will be assessed using plot layouts consistent with the EEP/Carolina Vegetation Survey (CVS) Level II Vegetation Protocol. Stem count data will be ascertained from 12 permanently placed 100 meter<sup>2</sup> vegetation plots (Figure 3). Assessments will be conducted for both planted and natural stems.

#### 4.4 Digital Photographs

Baseline photographs were taken in June 2013 to document existing conditions at the Site (Appendix C). Included are 20 individual, strategically placed photostations (Figure 3). Each annual monitoring assessment and report will depict photographs taken at the same location for that particular year. This will result in a visual depiction of vegetation succession at the Site.

#### 5.0 MAINTENANCE AND CONTINGENCY PLANS

Annual reports submitted for a minimum of six consecutive years (vegetation only in MY6) will document any observed or anticipated problems with achieving success. Recommendations including increased monitoring, maintenance or repair may be documented in these reports. Problem areas will be depicted on the monitoring report plan view and described in detail. In addition, problem severity, as well as probable cause will also be noted.

### 6.0 **BASELINE CONDITION**

#### 6.1 Record Drawings

Record Drawings were submitted in early 2013 once construction implementation activities were completed. A copy of the drawing set is presented in Appendix D.

#### 6.2 Baseline Data Collection

Monitoring feature installation and baseline data collection occurred during June 2013. These assessments covered the easement area (visually), enhanced stream channel and crest gage. Vegetation plots were not included under this assessment since bare-rooted and containerized vegetation implementation will not occur until the winter/spring of 2013/2014. The actual plot locations were established however. They consist of 12 vegetation plots existing as either 10-meter by 10-meter squares or 5-meter by 20-meter rectangles with corners consisting of  $1'' \times 5'$  PVC pipes attached to  $1/2'' \times 2''$  rebar posts. The crest gage was purchased from Remote Data Systems (RDS) and attached to a steel L-brace buried in the streambank. It was reset upon evaluation. Photographs were taken at each of the 20 established photostations. These photostations are not individually denoted in the field but tied generally with an identified object (i.e., vegetation plot corner or cross section).

During June and July 2013, approximately two bankfull events were documented on the crest gage. These events occurred during early June and late/early June/July 2013. The following chart depicts information from the nearby weather station.

Observation Date(s)	<b>Observation Amount (inches)*</b>	Bankfull Event
6/2/2013 to 6/10/2013	4.36	Likely
6/26/2013 to 7/3/2013	4.16	Likely

\*Precipitation data from Siler City Airport (SILR) weather station, approximately 12 miles southwest of the Project Site (NC State Climate Office, 2013).

### 7.0 Report and Data Submission

Monitoring reports will be submitted to the regulatory agencies on an annual basis. All assessments and reporting will follow EEP protocols established during the project period. It is understood that EEP will coordinate any necessary monitoring report submittals with the regulatory agencies. If the monitoring reports indicate any deficiencies in achieving the success criteria on schedule, EEP will coordinate with the resource agencies, as applicable, to determine the extent of remedial actions necessary. In some cases, EEP may be required to submit a remedial action plan, as necessary, as part of the annual monitoring report. Vegetative monitoring will be conducted during the late summer months (growing season) of each monitoring year. Monitoring reports will be provided no later than December 15. The proposed schedule is provided below detailing the monitoring dates.

#### Proposed Monitoring Schedule

February 2013	Construction activities completed.
October 2013	Complete Year One Monitoring.
December 2013	Submit Year One Monitoring Report.
August 2014	Complete Year Two Monitoring.
December 2014	Submit Year Two Monitoring Report.
August 2015	Complete Year Three Monitoring.
December 2015	Submit Year Three Monitoring Report.
August 2016	Complete Year Four Monitoring.
December 2016	Submit Year Four Monitoring Report.
August 2017	Complete Year Five Monitoring.
December 2017	Submit Year Five Monitoring Report.
August 2018	Complete Year Six Monitoring Report (vegetation only)
December 2018	Submit Year Six Monitoring Report (vegetation only)

#### 8.0 References

- Lee, Michael T., R.K. Peet, S.D. Roberts and T.R. Wentworth, 2006. CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.0 (http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/methods.htm).
- NCDENR Ecosystem Enhancement Program, 2013. Charles Williams Site Final Report. Prepared by Ecological Engineering, LLP.
- NCDENR Ecosystem Enhancement Program, 2010. Charles Williams Site Final Mitigation Plan. Prepared by Ecological Engineering, LLP.
- NC State Climate Office, 2013. Daily Precipitation Data from Siler City Airport (SILR), Chatham County (<u>www.nc-</u> <u>climate.ncsu.edu</u>).
- Piedmont Triad Council of Government (PTCOG), 2008. Little Alamance, Travis and Tickle Creek Watershed Restoration Plan. Prepared for and Funded by EEP. Available: <u>http://www.nceep.net/pages/lwplanning.htm</u>.).
- US Army Corps of Engineers, US Environmental Protection Agency, NC Wildlife Resources Commission and NC Department of Environment Division of Water Quality, 2003. Stream Mitigation Guidelines.
- US Army Corps of Engineers, 1987. Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual. Technical Report Y-87-1. AD/A176.

# Appendix A.

General Figures and Tables













	Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Credits     Charles Williams Stream, Wetland and Buffer Site / 80														
	Mitigation Credits														
	Stre	am	Riparian	Wetland	Non-riparia	n wetland	Buffer	Nitrogen Nutrient Offset	Phosphorus Nutrient Offset						
Туре	R	RE	R	RE	R	RE									
Totals		1,169		0.98			94,351.00								
	Project Components														
Project	Component	Stationing	g/Location	Existing Ac	g Footage/ reage	Approach	Restoration or Restoration Equivalent	Restoration Footage or Acreage	Mitigation Ratio						
UT to S	andy Creek	10+00 t	o 27+53	1,753 li	nearfeet	EI	RE	1,165.16	1.5 : 1						
Sano Ripari	dy Creek ian Buffer	area adj Sandy	acent to Creek	94,351 s	quare feet	R	R	94,351.00	1:1						
Riverin A	e Wetland rea A	area eas Sandy	t of UT to Creek	1.65	a cre s	E	RE	0.825	2:1						
Riverin A	e Wetland rea B	area wes Sandy	t of UT to Creek	0.31	acres	E	RE	0.155	2:1						
				Com	nponent Summ	ation		·							
Restor	ation Level	Stream (li	near feet)	Riparian W	etland (acres)	Non-ripa (	irian Wetland acres)	Buffer (square feet)	Upland (acres)						
				Riverine	Non-riverine										
Res	toration														
Enha	incement			1.96				94,351.00							
Enha	ncement I	1,7	/53												
Enhar	ncement II														
Cr	reation														
Pres	ervation														
HQ Pres	servation														
					BMP Elements										
El	ement	Loca	ition	Purpose	e/Function		No	tes							
BIMP Ele	<u>ements</u>														

BR = Bioretention Cell; SF = Sand Filter; SW = Stormwater Wetland; WDP = Wet Detention Pond; DDP = Dry Dentention Pond; FS = Filter Strip; S = Grassed Swale; LS = Level Spreader; NI = Natural Infiltration Area; FB = Forested Buffer.

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History Charles Williams Stream Wetland and Buffer Site / 80												
Activity or Report	Data Collection Complete	Completion or Delivery										
Mitigation Plan	September-08	Ma y-09										
Final Design - Construction Plans	November-09	April-12										
Construction		February-13										
Temporary S&E Mix Applied to Entire Project Area		January-13										
Permanent Seed Mix Applied to Entire Project Area		January-13										
Live Stake Plantings Applied		January-13										
Bare-rooted Planting Applied*		* see note below										
Baseline Monitoring Document	June-13	July-13										
Year 1 Monitoring												
Year 2 Monitoring												
Year 3 Monitoring												
Year 4 Monitoring												
Year 5 Monitoring												
Year 6 Monitoring (vegetation only)												

\* Note: Bare-root planting will occur between December 15, 2013 and March 15, 2014

Table 3. Project Contact Table									
Charles Williams Stream V	Vetland and Buffer Site / 80								
Designer	Firm Information/ Address								
Ecological Engineering, LLP	1151 SE Cary Parkway, Suite 101, Cary, NC 27518								
Jenny S. Fleming, PE	(919) 557-0929								
Construction Contractor	Firm Information/ Address								
Riverworks, Inc.	8000 Regency Parkway, Suite 800, Cary, NC 27518								
Bill Wright	(919) 459-9001								
Hauling Contractor	Firm Information/ Address								
Strader Fencing, Inc.	5434 Amick Road, Julian, NC 27283								
	(336) 697-7005								
Planting Contractor	Firm Information/ Address								
Riverworks, Inc.	8000 Regency Parkway, Suite 800, Cary, NC 27518								
George Morris	(919) 459-9001								
Seeding Contractor	Firm Information/ Address								
Strader Fencing, Inc.	5434 Amick Road, Julian, NC 27283								
Kenneth L. Strader	(336) 697-7005								
Seed Mix Sources	Green Resource, LLC (336) 855-6363								
Nursery Stock Suppliers (live stakes only)	Foggy Mountain Nursery (336) 384-5323								
	Mellow Marsh Farm (919) 742-1200								
Monitoring Performer	Firm Information/ Address								
Ecological Engineering, LLP	1151 SE Cary Parkway, Suite 101, Cary, NC 27518								
Lane Sauls (stream, vegetation & wetland)	(919) 557-0929								

Table 4. Project Baseline Information and Attributes											
Charles Williams Stream Wetland and Buffer Site / 80											
Project Information											
Project Name	Charles Williams Stream Wetland and Buffer Site										
County	Randolph										
Project Area	18 acres										
Project Coordinates (latitude and longitude)	35°49'31.95'' North/ 79°39'02.64" West										
Project Watersh	ed Summary Information										
Physiographic Province	Piedmont										
River Basin	Cape Fear										
USGS Hydrologic Unit 8-digit 03030003	USGS Hydrologic Unit 14-digit 03030003020010										
DWQ Subbasin	03-06-09										
Project Drainage Area	4.9 s q. mi.										
Project Drainage Area Percentage of Impervious Area	5 to 6%										
CGIA Land Use Classification	Agricultural Land										
Reach Sur	nmary Information										
Length of Reach	1,753 linear feet										
Valley Classification	Valley Type VIII										
Drainage Area	4.9 s q. mi.										
NCDWQ Stream ID Score	>50										
NCDWQ Water Quality Classification	WS-III										
Morphological Description (stream type)	C5										
Evolutionary Trend	C-G-F-E-C										
Underlying Mapped Soils	Chewacla loam										
Drainage Classification	Poorly drained										
Soil Hydric Status	Hydric B										
Slope	0 to 2%										
FEMA Classification	Zone AE										
Native Vegetation Community	Piedmont Alluvial Forest										
Percent Composition of Exotic Invasive Species	Less than 5%										
Wetland Su	ummary Information										
Size of Wetland	1.96 a cre s										
Wetland Type	Riverine										
Mapped Soil Series	Chewacla loam										
Drainage Classification	Somewhat poorly drained										
Soil Hydric Status	Hydric B										
Source of Hydrology	Overbank flooding										
Hydrologic Impairment	None										
Native Vegetation Community	Piedmont Alluvial Forest										
Percent Composition of Exotic Invasive Species	Less than 5%										
Regulato	bry Considerations										
Waters of the United States - Section 404	Resolved										
Waters of the United States - Section 401	Resolved										
Endangered Species Act	Resolved										
Historic Preservation Act	Resolved										
Coastal Zone/Area Management Acts (CZMA/CAMA)	Not Applicable										
FEMA Floodplain Compliance	Resolved										
Essential Fisheries Habitat	Not Applicable										

# Appendix B.

Cross Section and Profile Data



XSC #1 - U	IT to Sandy C	Creek - Riffl	e														
	As-built			Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4			Year 5	
Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF
0	555.63																
0	554.53																
4.1	554.33																
9.6	553.39																
13.1	552.79																
16.4	552.7	552.7															
19.1	552.06	552.7															
20.1	551.78	552.7															
21.3	551.03	552.7															
23.4	551.24	552.7															
25.6	551.27	552.7															
28.8	551.3	552.7															
31	551.4	552.7															
32.8	551.78	552.7															
34.8	552.11	552.7															
38.9	552.78																
54.2	553.3																
66.7	554.43																



XSC #2 - U	IT to Sandy 0	Creek															
	As-built		Year 1				Year 2			Year 3			Year 4			Year 5	
Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF
0	553.31																
0	553.02																
12.5	553.29																
18.3	552.97																
21.5	551.46	552.6															
21.9	551.02	552.6															
24.5	550.08	552.6															
25.9	550.25	552.6															
29.8	550.5	552.6															
31.6	550.28	552.6															
33.7	550.24	552.6															
35	551.1	552.6															
36.1	551.63	552.6															
38.7	552.6	552.6															
43.3	553.16																
57.3	554.17																



	(SC #3 - UT to Sandy Creek																
	As-built			Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4			Year 5	
Station I	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF
0	552.59																
0	551.76																
9.9	551.98																
17.8	551.95	551.95															
19.6	551.01	551.95															
21.3	550.17	551.95															
22.2	549.52	551.95															
23.4	549.36	551.95															
24.8	549.2	551.95															
25.7	549.18	551.95															
28.1	549.42	551.95															
29.4	550.08	551.95															
31.2	550.65	551.95															
37.4	550.65	551.95															
40.8	552.13																
48	552.56																
65.5	552.01																



XSC #4 - U	T to Sandy (	Creek - Riffl	е														
	As-built			Year 1			Year 2			Year 3			Year 4			Year 5	
Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF	Station	Elevation	BKF
0	552.38																
0	551.11																
13.7	551.68																
23.7	551.55																
26.1	550.6	551.42															
27.5	549.94	551.42															
29	549.03	551.42															
31	548.6	551.42															
32.7	548.73	551.42															
36.2	549.79	551.42															
43.3	550.31	551.42															
45.7	550.63	551.42															
48.9	551.42	551.42															
62.8	552.16																





	Easture																								
	Bankfull																								
Vear 5	WC.	<b>6</b>																							
	Elav																								
	c+J		ľ																						
	Eosturo																								
	Dank full																								
Vear 4	WC.	<b>C</b>																							
	Elav	LIEV	ľ																						
	cto	91d.																							
	ootino	anna																							
	a lliftant																								
Vear 3	Mc Inc.	2																							
	540	.piq.																							
	on time	ampa																							
	a lluit due																								
Vear 2	- mo	2																							
	Elev																								
	540	old.																							
	ant tra	ama																							
	ankfull																								
Vear 1	MC B	°	T																						
	c+0																								
	aOF	553.66	554.09	555.09	554.51	552.71	552.74	553.13	553.59	553.34	552.97	552.53	552.67	552	551.96	552.09	551.36	551.55	550.97						
Data	in the line		ľ	ľ	-	552.7		-/			552.6				551.95			551.42	Ľ						
Creek Raw	MC D	52.09 E	52.25	552.07	551.82	551.78	551.35	551.33	551.17	551.05	551.02	550.66	550.37	550.22	550.17 5	550.06	550.1	549.94	549.81		 				
- UT Sandy		50.13	50.99 E	550.34	1 60.03	551.03 5	148.32	549.35	148.93	149.66	550.5	149.88	549.35	549.47	549.2	547.6	549.01	148.73	48.31				_		
ofile Reach	C+0	<b>J</b> 1036 5	1119 5	1209 5	1331 5	1441 5	1570 5	1659 5	1728 5	1833 E	1936	2056 5	2175 5	2285 E	2349	2447	2517 E	2714 5	2753 E						_

# Appendix C.

Baseline Photographs

#### Baseline Photographs Taken July 2013



Vegetation Plot #1 – Facing southwest



Vegetation Plot #2 – Facing southwest



Vegetation Plot #3 – Facing southwest



Vegetation Plot #4 – Facing southwest



Vegetation Plot #5 – Facing southwest



Vegetation Plot #6 – Facing southwest



Vegetation Plot #7 – Facing southwest



Vegetation Plot #8 – Facing southwest



Vegetation Plot #9 – Facing southwest



Vegetation Plot #10 – Facing southwest



Vegetation Plot #11 – Facing southwest



Vegetation Plot #12 – Facing southwest



Cross Section #1 – Facing downstream



Cross Section #1 – Facing west



Cross Section #2 – Facing downstream



Cross Section #2 – Facing west



Cross Section #3 – Facing downstream



Cross Section #3 – Facing west



Cross Section #4 – Facing downstream



Cross Section #4 – Facing west

# Appendix D.

Record Drawings



# SANDY CREEK-CHARLES WILLIAMS STREAM, WETLAND AND BUFFER SITE RANDOLPH COUNTY, NC SCO PROJECT #070712501 EEP PROJECT #80

15' TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT TO MELANCHTON, NC START ENHANCEMENT STATION 10+00 LATITUDE: 035°49'45.62" LONGITUDE: 079°39'03.73" NCDOT "CW-2" N 757491.158 E 1808602.168 CONSERVATION EASEMENT UT TO SANDY CREEK 5.00 PERMANENT 20' ACCESS EASEMENT CONSERVATION EASEMENT END ENHANCEMENT STATION 27+48 SANDY CREEK TO RAMSEUR, NC

# **RECORD DRAWINGS**

		FROMECT ENGINEER	13
INDEX OF SHEETS	REVISIONS		
SHEET NUMBER SHEET   PSH-01 Tule Sheet   PSH-07 Structure Data   PSH-08 Grading Plans   b, c Plan and Profile   PSH-09.a Site Stabilization Plan	SANDY CREEK-CHARLES WILLIAMS STREAM. WETLAND AND BUFFER SITE	PREPARED FOR NC DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES	ECOSISIENTENTENTENTI I NORVAN
JENNY SUMMERLIN FLEMING, PE SENIOR PROJECT ENGINEER G. LANE SAULS PROJECT MANAGER (919) 557-0929	April 9. 2013 DATE	10227-010 project no.	
OFFICE PHONE NUMBER PREPARED FOR THE OFFICE OF: ECOSYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM EEP Project Manager: Melonie Allen EEP Review Coordinator: Wyatt Brown SCO# 070712501	PSH-01 sheet		
Ecosystem		ECOLOGICAL	1151–101 SE Cary Parkway• Cary, NC 27518•919.557.0929

# **STRUCTURE DATA**

			Structu	re Table			
	UT to Sand	y Creek (Desi	gn)		UT to S	andy Creek (Con	structed)
Structure	Chruchurg Turos	Station	Thalweg	Bankfull	Constructed	Constructed Arm	Constructed A
Number	Structure Type	Station	Elevation	Elevation	Invert Elevation	Angle	Slope
1	Cross Vane	14+40	551.39	553.99	551.62	20°	3.10%
2	Log Vane	14+90	551.25	553.85	550.94	30°	7.06%
3	Log Vane	15+17	550.68	553.28		Eliminated	
6	Log Vane	20+38	549.10	551.70	549.97	20°	2.00%
7	Log Vane w/ Rootwads	20+77	549.04	551.64		Eliminated	
8	Log Vane	21+25	548.96	551.56	550.17	24°	2.00%
9	Log Vane w/ Rootwads	21+65	548.90	551.50		Eliminated	
10	Log Vane w/ Rootwads	23+15	548.61	551.21	On	ly Root Wads Insta	alled
11	Log Vane w/ Rootwads	25+04	548.22	550.82		Eliminated	
12	Log Vane w/ Rootwads	25+29	548.17	550.77	549.73	30°	3.20%
13	Cross Vane	27+27	547.76	550.36	549.37	30°	5.30%

		Constr	ucted Riffle Ta	able		
	UT to Sand	dy Creek (Desig	n)		UT to Sandy Cre	ek (Constructed)
Structure Number	Туре	Station	Beginning Elevation	Ending Elevation	Beginning Elevation	Ending Elevation
5	At-grade stream crossing	19+87	549.18	549.15	550.88	550.79

		Strea	m Crossing Ta	ble		
	UT to Sand	ly Creek (Desig	n)		UT to Sandy Cre	ek (Constructed)
Structure Number	Туре	Station	Beginning Elevation	Ending Elevation	Beginning Elevation	Ending Elevation
4	2 @ 60" CSP	19+67	545.21	545.18	548.83	548.73







# SITE STABILIZATION PLAN

PERMANENT SEEDING (BY ZONE)

Ds3

			Acres	4.23
Strotum	Commo	Data: lbs/ac	Total lbs	
Herb	Red	12 (40%)	50.1	
Herb	Red	6 (20%)	25.4	
Herb	Little	4.5 (15%)	19.0	M ix applied
Herb	Virginia	3 (10%)	12.7	at rate of
Herb	Deer	1.5 (5%)	6.3	approx. 30 lbs/ acre
Herb	River	1.5 (5%)	6.3	1007 4010
Herb	Upland	1.5 (5%)	6.3	
	Subtotal	30 (100%)	96.1	
			Acres	4.71
Stratum	Commo	Rate: lbs/ac	Total lbs	
Herb	Red	9 (30%)	42.4	
Herb	Little	7.5 (25%)	35.3	Mix applied
Herb	Virginia	4.5 (15%)	21.2	at rate of
Herb	Deer	3 (10%)	14.1	approx. 30
Herb	River	3 (10%)	14.1	lbs/ acre
				- A CARLES AND A CAR
Herb	Upland	3 (10%)	14.1	

### **TEMPORARY SEEDING**

Temporary Seeding Thi	roughout Disturbed Areas			Acres	4.8
Year round	Secale cereale	Herb	Grain rye	130 lbs/ac	Single
May - September	Panicum ramosum	Herb	Brown top millet	40 lbs/ac	species to
May – September	Setaria italica	Herb	German millet	25 lbs/ac	be applied
September – March	Dactylis glomerata	Herb	Orchard grass	15 lbs/ac	

# SOIL PREPARATION AND AMENDMENTS

and the second second							
Zone 1 – Strea	amside Area				1	Acres	0.7
Mechanical Treatment	Approx. Date	Ground Cover Fabric	Mulch Type	Mulch Density / Thickness	Nutrient Amendments	Nutrient Total lbs <sup>1</sup>	
Disking	1/10 - 3/10	Coir	Wheat straw	75% cover	n/a	n/a	
	Sector Sector Sector	and the second		A State of the second	Subtotal	0	
Zone 2 – Ripa	rian Area					Acres	15.1
Mechanical Treatment	Approx. Date	Ground Cover Fabric	Mulch Type	Mulch Density / Thickness	Nutrient Amendments	Nutrient Total lbs	
Herbicide	1/10	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Disking	1/10 - 3/10	n/a	Wheat straw	75% cover	10/10/10 Pellet Fertilizer	3020	
n/a	1/10 - 3/10	n/a	n/a	n/a	Ground Limestone	3020	
					Subtotal	6040	
A second second		State State of State			Total	6040	15.8

## LIVE STAKING/TUBLING

Species	Common Name	Max Spacing	Unit Type	Size	Stratum	Indiv. Spacing	# of Stems
Salix nigra	Black Willow	2'	L	2' - 3'	Subcanopy	4'	1000
Cornus amomum	Silky Dogwood	2'	L	2' - 3'	Shrub	4'	3000
Alnus serrulata	Tag Alder	10'	Т	N/A	Shrub	20'	800
Sambucus canadensis	Elderberry	2'	L	2' - 3'	Shrub	4'	3000
Salix sericea	Silky Willow	2'	L	2'-3'	Subcanopy	4'	2000
					1	Total	9800

NOTE: UNIT TYPE CHOICES INCLUDE LIVE STAKE (L) AND TUBLING (T).

Species Name	Stratum	Commo	Rate: lbs/ac	Total lbs	
Festuca rubra	Herb	Red	12 (40%)	50.1	
Trifolium pratense	Herb	Red	6 (20%)	25.4	
Schizachrium scoparium	Herb	Little	4.5 (15%)	19.0	M ix applie
Elymus virginicus	Herb	Virginia	3 (10%)	12.7	at rate of
Panicum clandestinum	Herb	Deer	1.5 (5%)	6.3	lbs/ acre
Chasmanthium latifolium	Herb	River	1.5 (5%)	6.3	
Agrostis perennans	Herb	Upland	1.5 (5%)	6.3	
		Subtotal	30 (100%)	96.1	
one 2				Acres	4.71
S pecies Name	Stratum	Commo	Rate: lbs/ac	Total lbs	Mar State
Trifolum pratense	Herb	Red	9 (30%)	42.4	
Schizachyrium scoparium	Herb	Little	7.5 (25%)	35.3	Mix applie
Elymus virginicus	Herb	Virginia	4.5 (15%)	21.2	at rate of
Panicum clandestinum	Herb	Deer	3 (10%)	14.1	approx. 30
Chasmanthium latifolium	Herb	River	3 (10%)	14.1	lbs/ acre
Agrostis perennans	Herb	Upland	3 (10%)	14.1	
		Subtotal	30 (100%)	141.2	
ione 3				Acres	2.27
S pecies Name	Stratum	Commo	Rate: lbs/ac	Total lbs	
Trifolum pratense	Herb	Red	4.5 (30%)	10.2	
Schizachyrium scoparium	Herb	Little	3.75 (25%)	8.5	Mix applie
Elymus virginicus	Herb	Virginia	2.25 (15%)	5.1	at rate of
Panicum clandestinum	Herb	Deer	1.5 (10%)	3.4	approx. 15
Chasmanthium latifolium	Herb	River	1.5 (10%)	3.4	lbs/ acre
Agrostis perennans	Herb	Upland	1.5 (10%)	3.4	
		Subtotal	15 (100%)	34.0	
		Total (I	Permanent Seeding)	271.3	11.2

#### NOTE:

Zone 1

WETLANDS = 2 ACRES, SEEDED WITH TREATMENT 1 OR TREATMENT 2 SEED MIX.

PERMANENT SEEDING AND PELLETIZED SOIL AMENDMENTS APPLIED TO ALL DISTURBED AREAS, INCLUDING THOSE REQUIRING HERBICIDE TREATMENT. ALL FESCUE AND MICROSTEGIUM WITHIN EASEMENT TREATED VIA BACKPACK SPRAY APPLICATION OF HERBICIDE. PRIVET AND ROSE TREATED VIA BACKPACK SPRAY APPLICATION OF HERBICIDR OR BASAL BARKED AND PAINTED WITH HERBICIDE.

ſ	•	
ι	J	
1	-	

ROTELI ENGINEER SSAL F SSOL SSAL F SSOL SSAL F SSOL SSAL F SSOL SSAL F SSOL SSAL F SSOL SSAL F SSOL SSAL F SSOL SSAL F SSAL F SS		
REVISIONS	4/20/12-Revised Perm. Seeding Specs per EEP 5/30/12-Revised Soil Ammendments	
SITE STABILIZATION PLAN FOR THE SANDY CREEK-CHARLES WILLIAMS STREAM, WETLAND AND BUFFER SITE PREPARED FOR NC DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES ECOSYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM		
АртіІ 9, 2013 <sub>DATE</sub>	10227-010 project no.	
PSH-09.а <sup>внеет</sup>	NOT TO SCALE	
ECOLOGICAL ENGINEERING		

Ds2