Suther (Dutch Buffalo Creek) Stream and Wetland Restoration Project

EEP Project No. 370 2011 Monitoring Report: Year 2 of 5

Construction Completed: November 2009 Submission Date: May 2012



Submitted to: NCDENR-EEP 1652 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699







Table of Contents

SECTION 1 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 Goals and Objectives	. 1-1
1.2 Vegetation Assessment	. 1-2
1.3 Stream Assessment	. 1-2
1.4 Wetland Assessment	. 1-4
1.5 Annual Monitoring Summary	. 1-5

SECTION 2 – METHODOLOGY

2.1 Methodology	/2-	1

SECTION 3 – REFERENCES

SECTION 4 – APPENDICES

List of Appendices

Appendix A – Project Vicinity Map and Background Tables

Project Vicinity Map and Directions
Project Restoration Components
Project Activity and Reporting History
Project Contacts Table
Project Attribute Table

Appendix B – Visual Assessment Data

Figure 2	Current Condition Plan View (CPV)
Table 5	Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table
Table 6	Vegetation Condition Assessment Table
Photos	Stream Station Photos
Photos	Vegetation Plot Photos

Appendix C – Vegetation Plot Data

Table 7	Vegetation Plot Mitigation Success Summary Table
Table 8	CVS Vegetation Metadata Table

Table 9CVS Stem Count Total and Planted by Plat and Species

Appendix D – Stream Survey Data

Figure 3a-3d	Cross-sections with annual overlays
Figure 4	Longitudinal Profiles with Annual Overlays
Figure 5a-5d	Pebble Count Plots with Annual Overlays
Tables 10a,b	Baseline – Stream Data Summary Tables
Table 11a	Monitoring – Cross-Section Morphology Data Table
Table 11b	Monitoring – Stream Reach Morphology Data Table

Appendix E – Hydrologic Data

Table 12	Verification of Bankfull Events
Figure 6	Monthly Rainfall Data
Figure 7	Precipitation and Water Level Plots
Table 13	Wetland Hydrology Criteria Attainment



SECTION 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

SECTION 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Dutch Buffalo Creek (Site) is located in Cabarrus County, North Carolina, northeast of the City of Concord. The project is located in the Yadkin-Pee Dee River Basin, Catalog Unit 03040105, DWQ Subbasin 30712 with a watershed land use dominated by rural pasture land and forest. Dutch Buffalo Creek is a third order stream with an approximate drainage area of 23 square miles at the farthest downstream point of the project. The unnamed tributary (UT) to Dutch Buffalo Creek is a first order stream with an approximate drainage area of 0.3 square miles. Dutch Buffalo Creek drains into the Pee Dee River and is listed as WS-II class waters. Construction of the restoration project was completed in November 2009.

This report serves as year two of the five year monitoring plan for the Site.

1.1 Goals and Objectives

Historically, the Site had been disturbed through management required for cattle grazing and rearing. Past alterations to the Site include removal of riparian vegetation, dredging, ditching and conversion of wetlands, and straightening of drainage channels and tributaries to Dutch Buffalo Creek. The primary objectives of the project were to stabilize and protect degraded or vulnerable streambanks along an UT to Dutch Buffalo Creek and along the main channel of Dutch Buffalo Creek. Specifically, the goals for the project include:

- Stabilize and protect degraded or vulnerable streambanks along the main reach of Dutch Buffalo Creek.
- Enhance the upper project reach of Dutch Buffalo Creek through limiting livestock access and reestablishing vegetation along reaches of the main channel where necessary.
- Restore a natural, stable dimension, pattern, and profile along an unnamed tributary using natural channel design techniques.
- Improve riffle and pool habitats supportive of macrobenthos and fish communities.
- Restore and/or enhance the natural hydrology, vegetation, and soil characteristics in adjacent wetlands.
- Provide alternate cattle watering sources and road access across Dutch Buffalo Creek to supplement fencing exclusion efforts along the main channel.
- Improve the aesthetics of the stream.

To meet these goals, the following objectives have been established for the Dutch Buffalo Creek Stream and Wetland Restoration project:

• Enhancing approximately 3,004 linear feet in the main channel's upper reach.

- Preserving approximately 3,583 linear feet in the main channel's lower and upper reaches.
- Restoring 608 linear feet of an UT into a Rosgen C/E stream type.
- Preserving approximately 1.67 acres, enhancing approximately 4.26 acres, and restoring approximately 7.29 acres of riparian non-riverine¹ wetland area.
- Constructing access crossings across the main channel and the unnamed tributary of Dutch Buffalo Creek.
- Creating an alternative livestock watering source and install livestock exclusion fencing.

1.2 Vegetation Assessment

JJG conducted the 2011 (Year 2 of 5) vegetation assessment and vegetation plot analysis in August 2011. Vegetation assessments were conducted following the CVS-NCEEP Level 2 Protocol (Lee et al., 2008) to monitor and assess the planted woody vegetation in the wetland areas and along the UT stream reach. Seven vegetation plots were established in the design phase and situated randomly within the riparian buffer zone. The planted vegetation community goal for these plots is to establish a Piedmont floodplain forest. The following success criteria for vegetation were established for the Site:

- 320 stems per acre years 1 through 3
- 288 stems per acre year 4
- 260 stems per acre year 5

Vegetation problem areas are limited to the slower growth of planted woody vegetation within the riparian areas due to shading from adjacent mature trees and damage from wildlife grazing and rooting throughout the main preservation channel and enhancement floodplain areas. Japanese stiltgrass (*Microstegium vimineum*) has also been observed along the UT and is dominating the herbaceous layer in areas along Dutch Buffalo Creek. Growth of this invasive species; however, has not been observed to outcompete or stunt any planted or naturally recruited woody species within the vegetation plots. Typical on-site growth occurs as a uniform groundcover and is observed to dominate the herbaceous layer where limited woody canopy or native understory exists. Currently, the propagation and location of this species do not present any problem to the desired vegetation populations. Overall the streambanks are well vegetated. Herbaceous seeding along the restored streambanks and plugged wetland areas appears to provide adequate soil cover.

The 2011 vegetation monitoring results indicate that the Site appears to be meeting the vegetation success criteria in four of the seven established vegetation plots. Three plots (Plots 1, 3 and 4) were found to have limited planted species; however, all plots greatly

¹ The primary source hydrology appears to be groundwater and slope drainage, based on site observations. The incised state of Dutch Buffalo Creek precludes a frequent flooding interval due to overall floodplain disconnection.

exceeded the vegetation criteria when including naturally recruited specimens. Potential growth, vigor, and survival of the planted vegetation within Plot 1 have been limited by competition with surrounding herbaceous grasses. Low growth rates and survivability in Plots 3 and 4 are likely due to the abovementioned factors and have been reduced through wildlife grazing and competition with surrounding canopy. Overall, average survivability for planted species within the Site greatly exceeds the required threshold by 102 planted species per acre with a density of approximately 422 identified stems per acre (plot size = 0.0247 ac). Please refer to Appendix C, for detailed information regarding the 2011 vegetation current conditions and monitoring data results.

1.3 Stream Assessment

Assessments were conducted along the main channel of the Dutch Buffalo Creek enhancement reach (3,004 lf) and the restoration reach (608 lf) of the UT. Stream dimension, profile and substrate were also evaluated along the restored reach of the UT at four established cross-sections. Please refer to Appendix D for detailed geomorphologic information.

Main Channel

The main channel is exhibiting bare and undercutting banks along much of the project length. Attempts to stabilize and protect localized streambanks along the reach appear to be ineffective due to the lack of flood prone area and extensive flood flows within the confined channel. Reachwide disequilibrium does not appear to be a concern at this time. Debris jams within the creek are common and will be monitored to ensure they do not become problematic. Vegetation growth in the channel is also present at several locations throughout the reach. The installed stream crossings appear to be in stable condition. Cattle exclusion fencing and devices appear to be intact and are working as intended to keep cattle out of the conservation areas.

Unnamed Tributary

A total of four cross-sections and 608 lf of longitudinal profile were monitored within the restored reach of the UT to Dutch Buffalo. Stream pattern, profile, and dimension are maintaining vertical and lateral stability and development within the channel is transitioning as anticipated. Limited problem areas associated with aggradation and growth of in-stream vegetation and structural complications (one affected sill and associated riffle structure, mid-reach) were noted; however, complications observed during this assessment are not affecting intended function and are anticipated to stabilize as monitoring progresses.

In-stream vegetation does not appear to have affected channel flow at this time and is associated with a minor, aggraded mid-channel bar. Aggraded sections of the restored reach are likely a result of accumulated fine bed material that has not flushed from the system as the restored channel matures. These problem areas are not of immediate concern and will be monitored for an increase in negative trends during subsequent assessments. Overall, the streambanks and riparian areas are well vegetated and bed features are performing as intended with appropriate depths, lengths, and spacing. The log step-pools used to transition the restored reach to the main channel elevation are performing well and are in stable condition.

Restored parameters are closely consistent with as-built and MY1 Average bankfull width (8.59 ft) of the surveyed riffle cross-sections falls within the range of the as-built widths (8.34-11.01 ft), and the average surveyed mean bankfull depth of 1.03 ft is consistent with as-built conditions (1.02 ft). The surveyed bankfull widths and depths exhibit an average Width/Depth (W/D) ratio of 8.38 and an average cross-sectional area of 8.82, which are consistent with as-built values. At the time of the survey a majority of the restored channel was dry; however, the defining characteristics of the stream display typical dimensions of an E-type channel and are expected to narrow and deepen.

Visual inspection of the channel indicated a stable profile characterized by well-defined riffle and pool features. Step-pool structures transitioning the UT channel to Dutch Buffalo Creek are functioning appropriately and have maintained scour pools and zones of re-aeration, improving in-stream habitat while supporting grade. Particle size distribution has developed toward a larger and more evenly distributed substrate population with limited areas exhibiting increased siltation and embedding, but has declined since last monitoring period. This may be due to offsite, upstream erosion or the embedding and flushing of particles used during construction.

1.4 Wetland Assessment

The following general observations were noted regarding the riparian and wetland areas and associated vegetation.

- Herbaceous seeding appears to provide adequate soil cover along the restored streambanks and plugged wetland areas.
- Multiflora rose (*Rosa multiflora*) and Japanese stiltgrass is evident sporadically throughout the main channel preservation and enhancement floodplain, but does not appear to be a concern at this time.
- Visual assessment of planted woody vegetation suggests densities in riparian areas are adequate, but growth appears to be slower than expected due to shading from adjacent mature trees. Vegetation within Wetland Area C is being outcompeted by vigorous switchgrass growth.
- Log sills installed to stabilize filled ditches and increase hydrology in wetland enhancement areas are performing as expected, although water is piping under one sill. The piping is not a concern at this time as the grade is being maintained and there is no erosion resulting.

Currently, there are ten (10) groundwater gauges located on the site. The monitoring gauges are programmed to download groundwater levels daily and were downloaded monthly from March to November in order to capture hydrological data during the 2011

growing season. The target wetland hydrological success criterion is saturation or inundation for at least eight percent of the growing season in the lower landscape (floodplain) positions. To achieve the hydrologic success criterion, groundwater levels must be within 12-inches of the ground surface for 18 consecutive days, which equates to eight percent of the March 23 to November 7 (229 days) growing season.

Five of the ten gauges on-site achieved the wetland success criterion of soil saturation within the upper 12 inches for eight percent of the growing season. GW3, GW4, GW5, GW9 and GW10 did not meet the required duration of inundation/saturation, which is likely to do the proximity of the wells to Dutch Buffalo Creek. The incised creek is most likely creating a steep hydraulic gradient through drawdown of the groundwater table. The drawdown is reducing the groundwater table below the 12-inch threshold required for these wells to meet the success criterion. Determination of wetland limits and repositioning of the non-achieving gauges may be necessary to better characterize the site hydrology and wetland extents. The wells that did attain the success threshold exhibited improved hydrology compared to the MY1 monitoring period. This improvement may be due to increased precipitation and/or the maturation of the site. Further assessment and comparison throughout the monitoring phase will be necessary to confirm this trend.

Within the wetland zones, hydrophytic vegetation and hydrology indicators have developed. In some areas, the appropriate soil chroma has also developed. It is suspected that these areas may have already had hydric conditions present. Surface inundation to ground saturation was observed throughout the site; therefore, appropriate hydrological condition for the wetland zones appears to be present. Please refer to Appendix E for wetland plots and a summary of the wetland criteria attainment.

Log sills installed to stabilize filled ditches and increase hydrology in wetland enhancement areas are performing as expected, although water is piping under a majority of the sills. The piping is not a concern at this time as the grade is being maintained and there is no resulting erosion.

1.5 Annual Monitoring Summary

In summary, the Site has met the stream, vegetation, and a portion of the wetland mitigation goals for monitoring year 2. The 2011 vegetation plot monitoring results indicate that the planted vegetation is doing well at the Site, although competition with vigorous herbaceous species and mature canopy may be reducing growth rates. Recruit vegetation is compensating for reduced growth rates of planted specimens. Performance of vegetation has an opportunity to stabilize through additional growing seasons. The pattern, profile, and dimension of the restored UT channel appear to be maintaining vertical and lateral stability with stable structures and minimal bank erosion. A few problem areas were observed, such as mild aggradation and in-stream vegetation growth, and slight reduction in particle distribution. These areas of stream instability do not appear to have advanced from the previous monitoring years. For the 2011

monitoring year, half of the wetland gauges achieved the wetland success criterion of soil saturation within the upper 12 inches for eight percent of the growing season.

The conservation easement appears to be in a good condition. Exclusion fencing and cattle crossings are intact and appear to be functioning as intended. There was no evidence of cattle entry into the conservation easement. There was no evidence of human intervention such as mowing, harvesting, application of herbicides, or other mechanical or anthropogenic disturbance activities. Any natural resource issues outlined in this report are resulting from natural perturbations or circumstances.

The background information provided in this report is referenced from the restoration plan (JJG 2007) and previous monitoring reports (JJG 2011) and is available on EEP's website. All raw data supporting the tables and figures in the appendices is available from EEP upon request.



SECTION 2 METHODOLOGY

SECTION 2 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Methodology

Methods employed for the Site were a combination of those established by standard regulatory guidance and procedure documents as well as methods addressed in the Restoration Plan (JJG, 2007) and Baseline Monitoring Document and As-Built Baseline Report (JJG, 2011). Geomorphic and stream assessments were performed following guidelines outlined in the Stream Channel Reference Sites: An Illustrated Guide to Field Techniques (Harrelson et al., 1994) and in the Stream Restoration a Natural Channel Design Handbook (Doll et al, 2003). Vegetation assessments were performed following the Carolina Vegetation Survey-NCEEP Level 2 Protocol (Lee et al., 2006). JJG used the *Flora of the Carolinas, Virginia, Georgia, and surrounding areas* by Alan S. Weakley as the taxonomic standard for vegetation nomenclature for this report. Precipitation data for the hydrographs was obtained from an off-site resource in Concord, NC weather station (the nearest station offering daily precipitation data) through Weather Underground URL

(http://www.wunderground.com/history/airport/KJQF/2010/12/16/CustomHistory.html).



SECTION 3 REFERENCES

SECTION 3 REFERENCES

Doll, B.A., Grabow, G.L., Hall, K.A., Halley, J., Harman, W.A., Jennings, G.D., and Wise, D.E., 2003. Stream Restoration A Natural Channel Design Handbook.

Harrelson, Cheryl C; Rawlins, C.L.; Potyondy, John P. 1994. *Stream Channel Reference Sites: An Illustrated Guide to Field Technique.* Gen. Tech. Rep. RM-245. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 61 p.

Jordan, Jones, and Goulding. 2007. Restoration Plan, Dutch Buffalo Creek, Stream Restoration. Cabarrus County, North Carolina.

Jordan, Jones, and Goulding. 2011. Baseline Monitoring Document and As-built Baseline Report – Final, Suther (Dutch Buffalo Creek), Stream and Wetland Restoration Project. Cabarrus County, North Carolina.

Rosgen, D L. 1996. Applied River Morphology. Wildland Hydrology Books, Pagosa Springs, CO.

Weakley, A.S. 2008. *Flora of the Carolinas, Virginia, Georgia, Northern Florida, and Surrounding Areas* (Draft April 2008). University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: Chapel Hill, NC.



SECTION 4 APPENDICES

- Appendix A Project Vicinity Map and Background Tables
- Appendix B Visual Assessment Data
- Appendix C Vegetation Plot Data
- Appendix D Stream Survey Data
- Appendix E Hydrologic Data



APPENDIX A PROJECT VICINITY MAP AND BACKGROUND TABLES

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



Cabarrus County, NC February 2012

Directions from Charlotte, NC to Project Site:

From Interstate 85 North, take exit 63 (Lane Road) and turn east off the exit. Take Lane Road for approximately 0.8 miles to Old Salisbury-Concord Road and turn left. Take Old Salisbury-Concord Road for 0.5 miles and turn right onto Irish Potato Road (heading east). Follow Irish Potato Road for 5.0 miles, and where it intersects with Gold Hill Road, turn left (heading north-east). Take this to 6200 Gold Hill Road (approximately 2 miles), home of L. Suther.

The subject project site is an environmental restoration site of the NCDENR Ecosystem Enhancement Program (EEP) and is encompassed by a recorded conservation easement, but is bordered by land under private ownership. Therefore access by the general public is not permitted. Access by authorized personnel of state and federal agencies or their designees/contractors involved in the development, monitoring and stewardship of the restoration site is permitted within the terms and timeframes of their defined, pre-approved roles. Any intended site visitation or activity by any person outside of these previously sanctioned activities/roles requires prior coordination with EEP.



Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Credits Dutch Ruffele Creek Stream and Watland Restarction Project/FEP Project No. 370						
Mitigation Credits						
	Stream (SMU)	Riparian Wetland (WMU)	Non-riparian Wetland	Buffer	Nitrogen Nutrient Offset	Phosphorous Nutrient Offset
Туре	EII/P/R	P/E/R	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Totals	1,201.6/935.6/608	0.33/2.13/7.29	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
		Project (Components			
Project Component/Reach ID	Stationing (ft)	Existing Footage/ Acreage	Approach	Restoration or Restoration Equivalent	Restoration Footage or Acres	Mitigation Ratio
Dutch Buffalo Creek-	0+00-17+61	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Upper Reach	17+61 - 53+72	3,004 lf	N/A	RE	3,004 lf	2.5:1
Dutch Buffalo Creek- Lower Reach	53+72 - 100+50	4,678 lf	N/A	RE	4,678 lf	5:1
Unnamed Tributary	0+00-6+08	527 lf	P1, 2	R	608 lf	1:1
Wetland Area B-2	N/A	1.67 ac	N/A	RE	1.67 ac	5:1
Wetland Area B-1	N/A	4.44 ac	N/A	RE	2.47 ac	2:1
				R	1.97 ac	1:1
Wetland Area C	N/A	4.64 ac	N/A	RE	1.79 ac	2:1
				R	5.32 ac	1:1
		Componen	t Summations			
Restoration Level	Stream (linear feet)	Riparian Wetland (acres) Non-riparian Wetland (acres) Buffer (square feet) Upland (acres)			Upland (acres)	
		Riverine	Non-Riverine			
Restoration (R)	608	N/A	7.29	N/A	N/A	N/A
Enhancement (E)		N/A	4.26	N/A	N/A	N/A
Enahncement I (E)	N/A					
Enhancement II (E)	3,004					
Creation (C)		N/A	N/A	N/A		
Preservation (P)	4,678	N/A	1.67	N/A		N/A
HQ Preservation (P)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A
Totals	8,290	N/A	13.22	N/A	N/A	N/A
BMP Elements						

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History					
Dutch Buffalo Creek Stream and Wetland Restoration Project					
EEP Project No. 370					
Actual Completion or					
Activity or Report	Data Collection Completed	Delivery			
Restoration Plan	Jan-06	Sep-07			
Final Design-90%	Nov-08	Nov-08			
Construction	Nov-09	Dec-09			
Temporary S&E mix applied to entire	Nov 09	Nov 09			
project area*	1107-09	1107-09			
Permanent seed mix applied to reach	Nov-09	Nov-09			
Bare root and livestake plantings for reach	Dec-09	Dec-09			
Mitigation Plan/ As-Built (Year 0	Dec 09	Ian 00			
Monitoring)	Dec-09	Jan-03			
Year 1 Monitoring	Oct-10	Jun-11			
Year 2 Monitoring	Aug-11	May-12			
Year 3 Monitoring					
Year 4 Monitoring					
Year 5 Monitoring					

*Seed and mulch is added as each section of construction is completed.

Table 3 Project Contact Table			
Dutch Duffele Cucch Stream and Watland Destantion Duciest			
EED Durden Metallo Creek Stream and Wettaniu Kestoration Project			
EEP	Project No. 5/0		
	Jacobs Engineering Group		
Designer	6801 Governors Lake Parkway		
	Norcross, GA 30071		
Matthew Clabaugh, PE*	770-455-8555		
	River Works, Inc.		
Construction	8000 Regency Parkway, Suite 200		
	Cary, NC 27511		
Will Pedersen	919-459-9001		
Planting Contractor	River Works, Inc.		
Seeding Contractor	River Works, Inc.		
Monitoring Douformore.	Jacobs Engineering Group		
Nomtoring Performers:	6801 Governors Lake Parkway		
Baseline Year U	Norcross, GA 30071		
Stream Monitoring, POC			
Vegetation Monitoring, POC Alison Nichols, 704-247-9065			
Wetland Monitoring, POC			

*No longer employed by Jacobs Engineering Group

Table 4. Project Baseline Information and Attributes				
Project Information				
Project Name	Dutch Buffalo Creek Stream and Wetland Restoration Project			
County	Cabarrus County, North Carolina			
Project Area (acres)		66		
Project Coordinates (latitude and longitude)	35° 27'	05" N, 80° 29' 32" W	r	
Proje	ect Watershed Summary Information	l		
Physiographic Province		Piedmont		
River Basin		Yadkin PeeDee		
USGS Hydrologic Unit 8-digit 3040105	USGS Hydrologic Unit 14-digit	0304	40105020060	
DWQ Sub-basin		03-07-12		
Project Drainage Area (sq mi)		21.3		
Project Drainage Area Percentage of Impervious Area		3%		
CGIA Land Use Classification	Cultivated (3.00); N	Mixed Upland Hardwo	oods (10.00)	
	Reach Summary Information			
Parameters	Main Channel		UT	
Length of Reach (linear feet)	10,050		608	
Valley Classification		VIII		
Drainage Area (sq.mi.)	21.3		0.31	
NCDWQ stream identification score		13-17-11-(4.5)		
NCDWQ Water Quality Classification	W	/S-II; HQW,CA		
Morphological Description (stream type)	Perennial	I	ntermittent	
Evolutionary trend	$C \rightarrow G \rightarrow F \rightarrow C$	E→C	$Gc \rightarrow F \rightarrow C \rightarrow E$	
Underlying mapped soils	Altavista, Cecil, Chewaca	ala, Cullen, Enon, Paco	olet, Mecklenburg	
Drainage class**	MwD, wi	D, SPD, WD, WD, WD, WI)	
Soil Hydric status	Class B (Chewacla and Altavist	a)	
Stope FEMA Classification	0.0011	0.0093		
Native vegetation community	Piedmont/Mountain Bottomland	Forest: Piedmont/Low	Mountain Alluvial Forest	
Percent composition of exotic invasive vegetation	10 80			
	Wetland Summary Information			
Parameters	Main Channel		UT	
Size of Wetland (acres)	11.55		1.67	
Wetland Type (non-riparian, riparian riverine or riparian		ning	nion riverine	
non-riverine)	праная пуение	Tipa		
Mapped Soil Series		Chewacla		
Drainage class	SPD		SPD	
Soil Hydric Status	В		В	
Source of Hydrology	streamflow, groundwater	stream	low, stormwater	
Hydrologic Impairment	ditching		ditching	
	Piedmont/Mountain Bottomland Forest; Piedmont/Low Mountain Alluvial Forest;	Piedmont/Low Mountain Alluvial Forest		
Native vegetation community	Piedmont/Low Mountain Bottomland Forest			
Percent composition of exotic invasive vegetation	5	5		
Regulatory Considerations				
Regulation	Applicable?	Resolved?	Supporting Documentation	
Waters of the United States - Section 404	Yes	Yes	Approved JD, NWP 27	
Waters of the United States - Section 401	Yes	Yes	Approved 401 Certification	
Endangered Species Act	No	N/A	N/A	
Historic Preservation Act	No	N/A	N/A	
Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA)/Coastal Area	No	N/A	N/A	
IVIANA ELA LA LA CALVIA)	NT	NT / A	NT / A	
FEIVIA Floodplain Compliance	INO N	IN/A	IN/A	
Essential Fisheries Habitat	NO	IN/A	IN/A	

*Beaver activity was observed along the main channel of Dutch Buffalo Creek during the early stages of the design phase and has not impacted the UT. Beaver activity has not been observed in subsequent years.

"N/A": items do not apply / "-": items are unavailable / "U": items are unknown

SPD: Somewhat Poorly Drained; MWD: Moderately Well Drained; WD: Well Drained

**Drainage classes correspond to the underlying mapped soils listed.

Appendix A - Project Vicinity Map and Background Tables Dutch Buffalo Creek Monitoring Report Year 2 of 5



APPENDIX B VISUAL ASSESSMENT DATA

- Figure 2 Current Condition Plan View (CPV)
- Table 5
 Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table
- Table 6
 Vegetation Condition Assessment Table
- Photos Stream Station Photos
- Photos Vegetation Plot Photos





NOTES: 1. GENERAL SITE DATA ARE PROVIDED BY NCEEP. 2. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

PROJECT NO. 370 CABARRUS COUNTY NORTH CAROLINA **MONITORING YEAR 2 OF 5**



NC ECOSYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM DUTCH BUFFALO CREEK STREAM AND WETLAND RESTORATION

LEGEND

2-7

Wetland Restoration

Existing Wetland

Ditch Fill

Easement

Wetland Enhancement



- 2011 Poor Veg Cover
- Bankfull Trib
- Existing Top of Bank
- Constructed Riffle
- Log Cross Vane
- Step Pool
- --- Stream Centerline
- Stationing
- Stream Crossing
- ----- Fence
- Stock Trail
- Access Road
- --- Access Road Centerline

DATE: SCALE: JOB NO .:

MAY 2012 Not To Scale JJX31100

CURRENT CONDITION PLAN VIEW

FIGURE 2 INDEX





NOTES: 1. GENERAL SITE DATA ARE PROVIDED BY NCEEP. 2. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

PROJECT NO. 370 CABARRUS COUNTY NORTH CAROLINA MONITORING YEAR 2 OF 5



NC ECOSYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM DUTCH BUFFALO CREEK STREAM AND WETLAND RESTORATION

LEGEND Wetland Restoration - Wetland Enhancement Existing Wetland Ditch Fill X-Section 2011 VP Status Meets Did Not Meet Photo Point Gauge Type ⊕ Crest Gauge Groundwater Gauge --- Access Road Centerline Easement DATE: MAY 2012 SCALE: 1" = 100' JOB NO .: JJX31100 CURRENT CONDITION PLAN VIEW FIGURE 2-1

X-S



LEGEND



NOTES:

Enhancement

PROJECT NO. 370 CEEP. CABARRUS COUNTY

NORTH CAROLINA

MONITORING YEAR 2 OF 5

JJG

NC ECOSYSTEM ENHA DUTCH BUFFALO CREEK STREA

0

100

50

CURRENT CONDI

GENERAL SITE DATA ARE PROVIDED BY NCEEP.
 ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

PP10 CWG 4 PP 11		GWG 5 PP 12	
100 Feet			
HANCEMENT PROGRAM EAM AND WETLAND RESTORATION	DATE: SCALE: JOB NO.:	MAY 2012 1" = 100' JJX31100	
DITION PLAN VIEW	FIGURE 2-2		











NOTES: 1. GENERAL SITE DATA ARE PROVIDED BY NCEEP. 2. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE

PROJECT NO. 370 CABARRUS COUNTY NORTH CAROLINA **MONITORING YEAR 2 OF 5**



NC ECOSYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM DUTCH BUFFALO CREEK STREAM AND WETLAND RESTORATION

CURRENT CONDITION PLAN VIEW

LEGEND 2011 In-Stream Veg Wetland Restoration 2011 Poor Veg Cover Wetland Enhancement Bankfull - Trib Existing Wetland Existing Top of Bank Ditch Fill Constructed Riffle X-Section Log Cross Vane 2011 VP Status Step Pool Meets --- Stream Centerline Did Not Meet Stationing Photo Point Stream Crossing Gauge Type ----- Fence ⊕ Crest Gauge Stock Trail Groundwater Gauge ----- Access Road --- Access Road Centerline Easement DATE: MAY 2012 SCALE: 1" = 100' JOB NO .: JJX31100 FIGURE 2-4





NOTES: 1. GENERAL SITE DATA ARE PROVIDED BY NCEEP. 2. ALL LOCATIONS ARE APPROXIMATE PROJECT NO. 370 CABARRUS COUNTY NORTH CAROLINA MONITORING YEAR 2 OF 5



NC ECOSYSTEM ENHA DUTCH BUFFALO CREEK STREA

CURRENT CONDI

LEGI	END					and sold	
m Vea		Wetland	Restoration	17-1	Jan She		
g Cover		Wetland	Enhancemer	nt in the second s	. Alexandre		
•		Existing	Wetland	a con			
f Bank		Ditch Fill			2 - Come Di	E Contra Al	
iffle		X-Section	n	1			
ne	2011 V	P Status		. F.		and the	
	5660	Meets		Sale -		3 8 8 1 4	
rline		Did Not N	Veet			Sec. Mar	
	<u> </u>	Photo Po	pint			1125	
ng	Gauge	Type		S. The second			
	Æ	Crest Ga		14	Star Charles		
		Croundu	iuge				
Contorlino		Groundw	ater Gauge	Acres 1		18 1 1	
Centenine		Easemer	nt	- Head	Sector 1	151	
1.1.1		$z_{n} J_{l}$		Bar to	College In	1. 1.	
-Cort	1	A R	Server Server	ANAR.	11 - 5-11	1 States and	
State State	15	and the		1 Then 1	14-11	A Start	
have the			and the second		11/1	1 Stand	
		-72		a State I	N/ I	The second second	
	a de				11 19	1 322 225	
		and the	Hater A	2284	1 1015	and the second	
		Sector 1	1 Carlos			100000000000000000000000000000000000000	
11 Past	\mathbb{R}^{-1}	Part A		11/3		ATTE Transfer (
Real of			Are and	y Ed		14 A.	
Mar		1 Parts	Mar 1	1	Sale /	100000	
	1	an	The state				
I de la		ESA.	-	and the			
	a sila	1 1	1.10	1		- T - 10-7	
A CAR	the state	11	the Heller of the	125	林山北	and the second	
		151		e 🖌 🖓 🖓	13- 6 300	AN STREET	
	[second	2		real and	AND SO		
to-1	1	The second			1 - All		
		at a	the states		and and a		
	-1		Sec. Alter	1.1.1	Star Martin	TENSES	
10	1	11110			So it is		
	1 12	A al al	100 1/45.7		A SAN	AL REAL	
	a mar and	E	A A A			1 Autor	
	SUD.	the set	A.M.	and the second	ar and		
				"milting	1 Capi	14. A 1 2 - 1 1 1	
A				Augente in	To and	States and	
				the los	- ALST COM	and in	
			-	RIG.	10	A MARKED AND	
		-	100 5	<u>60</u> 0		100	
		Chill I				Feet	
C. C. C. C.	100				THE REAL	and the second second	
ANCEM	IFNT	PROG	RAM		DATE:	MAY 2012	
	WETI		ESTORAT	ION	SCALE:	1" = 100'	
	• • • · • • • •				JOB NO.:	JJX31100	
	. –	- -		_			
TION PLAN VIEW							
			FIGURE 2-5				













Appendix B. Visual Assessment Data Table 5. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table Main Channel Dutch Buffalo Creek (4,678 lf) Dutch Buffalo Creek Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5

Major Channel <u>Category</u> 1. Bed	Channel Sub- Category 1. Vertical Stability (Riffle and Run units)	Metric Aggradation Degradation	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments 0 0	Amount of Unstable Footage 0	% Stable, Performing as Intended 100%	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjust % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
	2. Riffle Condition	Texture/Substrate	-	-						
	3. Meander Pool	Depth Sufficient	-	-			-			
	Condition	Length Appropriate	-	-			-			
	4. Thalweg Position	Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	-	-			-			
		Thalweg centering at downstream of meander bend (Glide)	-	-			-			
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroded	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	10	100%	0	0	100%
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely Does NOT include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat			0	10	100%	0	0	100%
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse			0	10	100%	0	0	100%
				Totals	0	30	99%	0	0	100%
3. Engineered Structures	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs.	0	2			0%			
Sti uttui ts	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill	-	-			-			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms	-	-			-			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%	0	2			0%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~Max Pool Depth : Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at baseflow	-	-			N/A			

The channel is incised and eroding. No restoration was performed on this stream. Values are visual estimates of stream condition.

Appendix B. Visual Assessment Data Table 5. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table Unnamed Tributary to Dutch Buffalo Creek (608 lf) Dutch Buffalo Creek Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5

Major Channel <u>Category</u> 1. Bed	Channel Sub-Category 1. Vertical Stability (Riffle and Run units)	Metric Aggradation Degradation	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments 1 0	Amount of Unstable Footage 11 0	% Stable, Performing as Intended 98% 100%	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjust % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
	2. Riffle Condition	Texture/Substrate	7	7		I	100%	-		
	3. Meander Pool	Depth Sufficient	-	-			N/A			
	Condition*	Length Appropriate	8	8			100%	-		
	4. Thalweg Position	Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	7	7			100%	-		
		Thalweg centering at downstream of meander bend (Glide)	7	7			100%	-		
	-									
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroded	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	0	0	100%
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely Does NOT include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat				0	100%	0	0	100%
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse			0	0	100%	0	0	100%
				Totals	0	0	100%	0	0	100%
3. Engineered Structures	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs.	7	8			88%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill	8	8			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms	1	8			13%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%	8	8			100%			
	4. Habitat*	Pool forming structures maintaining \sim Max Pool Depth : Bankfull Depth \geq 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at baseflow	-	-			N/A			

* Survey performed during dry conditions in channel. Parameter unable to be assessed.

Appendix B Table 6: Vegetation Condition Assessment Table Dutch Buffalo Creek (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5

Planted Acreage

		Mapping Threshold	Number of	Combined	% of Planted
Vegetation Category	(acres)	Polygons	Acreage	Acreage	
Bare Areas	Very limited cover of both woody and herbaceous material	0.1	0	0	0%
Low Stem Density Areas Woody stem densities clearly below target levels based on MY3, 4, or 5 stem count criteria.		0.1	0	0	0%
		Total	0	0	0%
Areas of Poor Growth Rates or Vigor	Areas with woody stems of a size class that are obviously small given the monitoring year.				

Easement Acreage

Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold (SF)	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Planted Acreage
Invasive Areas of Concern*	Areas of points (if too small to render as polygons at map scale).	1000	0	0	0%
Easement Encroachment Areas	Areas of points (if too small to render as polygons at map scale).	none	0	0	0%

* Large portions of the site consist of invasive vegetation, but no areas are a concern at this time.



Photo Point 1: View Northwest (MY 1 – 10/2010)



Photo Point 1: View Northwest (MY 2 – 8/2011)



Photo Point 1: View Southeast (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 1: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)











Photo Point 2: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 2: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 2: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 2: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Appendix B – Visual Assessment Data Stream Station & Cross Section Photos Suther (Dutch Buffalo Creek) Stream and Wetland Restoration Project EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5 Submittal Date: February2012







Photo Point 3: View Upstream (MY 1 – 10/2010)

Photo Point 3: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)

Photo Point 3: No Available Downstream Photograph Photo Point 3: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)

Prepared For:

Appendix B – Visual Assessment Data Stream Station & Cross Section Photos Suther (Dutch Buffalo Creek) Stream and Wetland Restoration Project EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5 Submittal Date: February 2012



Photo Point 4: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 4: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 4: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 4: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)







Photo Point 5: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 5: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 5: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 5: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)











Photo Point 6: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 6: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 6: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 6: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)









Photo Point 7: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)

Photo Point 7: View Downstream

(MY 1 - 10/2011)



Photo Point 7: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 7: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)









Photo Point 8: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 8: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 8: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 8: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)









Photo Point 9: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 9: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 9: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 9: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)











Photo Point 10: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 10: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 10: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 10: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)











Photo Point 11: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 11: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 11: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 11: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)

Prepared For:









Photo Point 12: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 12: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 12: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 12: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)









Photo Point 13: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 13: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 13: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 13: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)









Photo Point 14: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 14: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 14: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Prepared For:







Photo Point 14: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 15: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 15: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 15: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 15: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)







Photo Point 17: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 17: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 17: No Available Downstream Photograph Photo Point 17: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)

Prepared For:









Photo Point 18: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 18: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 18: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 18: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)











Photo Point 19: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 19: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 19: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 19: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)









Photo Point 20: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 20: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 20: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 20: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)











Photo Point 21: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 21: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 21: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 21: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)











Photo Point 22: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 22: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 22: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 22: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)









Photo Point 23: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 23: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 23: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)

Photo Point 23: View Downstream (not available)



Prepared For:





Photo Point 24: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 24: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 24: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 24: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)









Photo Point 25: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)

Photo Point 25: View Downstream

(MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 25: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 25: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)









Photo Point 26: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 26: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 26: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 26: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)











Photo Point 27: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 27: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 27: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 27: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)









Photo Point 28: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 28: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 28: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 28: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)











Photo Point 29: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 29: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 29: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 29: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)









Photo Point 30: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 30: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 30: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 30: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)









Photo Point 31: View Upstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 31: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Photo Point 31: View Downstream (MY 1 - 10/2010)



Photo Point 31: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)











Cross Section 1: View Upstream (MY 1 - 1/2011)



Cross Section 1: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Cross Section 1: View Downstream (MY 1 - 1/2011)



Cross Section 2: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)











Cross Section 2: View Upstream (MY 1 - 1/2011)



Cross Section 2: View Downstream (MY 1 - 1/2011)



Cross Section 2: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Cross Section 2: View Downstream (MY 3 - 6/2011)











Cross Section 3: View Upstream (MY 1 - 1/2011)



Cross Section 3: View Downstream (MY 1 - 1/2011)



Cross Section 3: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Cross Section 3: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)









Cross Section 4: View Upstream (MY 1 - 1/2011)



Cross Section 4: View Upstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Cross Section 4: View Downstream (MY 1 - 1/2011)



Cross Section 4: View Downstream (MY 2 - 8/2011)













Vegetation Plot 1 (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Vegetation Plot 1 (MY 2 - 8/2011)

Prepared For:



Appendix B – Visual Assessment Data Vegetation Plot Photos Suther (Dutch Buffalo Creek) Stream and Wetland Restoration Project EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5 February 2012





Vegetation Plot 2 (MY 1 - 11/2010)



Vegetation Plot 2 (MY 1 - 11/2010)



Vegetation Plot 2 (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Vegetation Plot 2 (MY 2 - 8/2011)





Appendix B – Visual Assessment Data Vegetation Plot Photos Suther (Dutch Buffalo Creek) Stream and Wetland Restoration Project EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5 February 2012





Vegetation Plot 3 (MY 1 - 11/2010)



Vegetation Plot 3 (MY 1 - 11/2010)



Vegetation Plot 3 (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Vegetation Plot 3 (MY 2 - 8/2011)

Prepared For:



Appendix B – Visual Assessment Data Vegetation Plot Photos Suther (Dutch Buffalo Creek) Stream and Wetland Restoration Project EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5 February 2012





Vegetation Plot 4 (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Vegetation Plot 4 (MY 2 - 8/2011)

Prepared For:

Vegetation Plot 4 No available photograph (MY 1 - 11/2010)



Appendix B – Visual Assessment Data Vegetation Plot Photos Suther (Dutch Buffalo Creek) Stream and Wetland Restoration Project EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5 February 2012





Vegetation Plot 5 (MY 1 - 11/2010)



Vegetation Plot 5 (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Vegetation Plot 5 (MY 1 - 11/2010)



Vegetation Plot 5 (MY 2 - 8/2011)





Appendix B – Visual Assessment Data Vegetation Plot Photos Suther (Dutch Buffalo Creek) Stream and Wetland Restoration Project EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5 February 2012




Vegetation Plot 6 (MY 1 - 11/2010)



Vegetation Plot 6 (MY 1 - 11/2010)



Vegetation Plot 6 (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Vegetation Plot 6 (MY 2 - 8/2011)

Prepared For:



Appendix B – Visual Assessment Data Vegetation Plot Photos Suther (Dutch Buffalo Creek) Stream and Wetland Restoration Project EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5 February 2012



Prepared By:



Vegetation Plot 7 (MY 1 - 11/2010)



Vegetation Plot 7 (MY 1 - 11/2010)



Vegetation Plot 7 (MY 2 - 8/2011)



Vegetation Plot 7 (MY 2 - 8/2011)

Prepared For:



Appendix B – Visual Assessment Data Vegetation Plot Photos Suther (Dutch Buffalo Creek) Stream and Wetland Restoration Project EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5 February 2012



Prepared By:



APPENDIX C VEGETATION PLOT DATA

- Table 7
 Vegetation Plot Mitigation Success Summary Table
- Table 8
 CVS Vegetation Metadata Table
- Table 9
 CVS Stem Count Total and Planted by Plat and Species

Appendix C Table 7 Vegetation Plot Mitigation Success Dutch Buffalo Creek (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Projec Monitoring Year 2 of 5

Vegetation Plot ID	Vegetation Survival Threshold Met
Plot 1	Ν
Plot 2	Y
Plot 3	N
Plot 4	Ν
Plot 5	Y
Plot 6	Y
Plot 7	Y

Appendix C Table 8: CVS Vegetation Metadata Table Dutch Buffalo Creek (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5

Report Prepared By	Heath Caldwell
Date Prepared	9/13/2011 12:26
database name	DBC_2011.mdb
database location	J:\JJX31100\M5-Field Monitoring Data\MY 2011\VEGETATION\DBC (Suther)
DESCRIPTION OF WORKSHEETS IN	N THIS DOCUMENT
Metadata	Description of database file, the report worksheets, and a summary of project(s) and project data.
Plots	List of plots surveyed with location and summary data (live stems, dead stems, missing, etc.).
Vigor	Frequency distribution of vigor classes for stems for all plots.
Vigor by Spp	Frequency distribution of vigor classes listed by species.
Damage	List of most frequent damage classes with number of occurrences and percent of total stems impacted
Damage by Spp	Damage values tallied by type for each species.
Damage by Plot	Damage values tallied by type for each plot.
Stom Count by Dist and Spn	A matrix of the count of total living stems of each species (planted and natural volunteers combined) for
Stem Count by Plot and Spp	each plot; dead and missing stems are excluded.
PROJECT SUMMARY	
Project Code	6067501
project Name	Dutch Buffalo Creek
Description	Stream and Wetland Restoration and Enhancement Project
length(ft)	608
stream-to-edge width (ft)	33
area (sq m)	3727
Required Plots (calculated)	4
Sampled Plots	4

Appendix C
Table 9: CVS Stem Count Total and Planted by Plot and Species
Dutch Buffalo Creek (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370
Monitoring Year 2 of 5

				Current Data (MY2-8/2011)											Annual Means							
			Plo	ot 1	Plo	ot 2	Ple	ot 3	Plo	ot 4	Plo	ot 5	Plo	ot 6	Ple	ot 7	Curre	ent Mean	MY0 -	4/2010	MY1 -	11/2010
Species	Common Name	Туре	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т
Acer negundo	box elder	Т										1						1				
Alnus serrulata	hazel alder	S	2	4	4	5	2	2			1	1			1	2	1	2	4	4	4	4
Asimina triloba	pawpaw	Т			1	1		4			3	21		2			1	4	2	2	2	4
Betula nigra	river birch	Т	1	1									1	5			1	1	1	1	3	3
Callicarpa americana	American beautyberry	S															N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	1
Camellia	camellia	Т															N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Т	1	2													1	1	1	1	2	2
Celtis laevigata	sugarberry	Т															N/A	N/A	1	1	1	1
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Т	1	4	6	6							1	1			1	2	6	6	6	6
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Т		9				3	1	4	4	5	4	4			1	4	4	4	5	5
Lindera benzoin	northern spicebush	S		1	1	1	1	11							1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweet gum	Т		1		1		7				2		1			N/A	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	2
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Т			2	2					1	2		1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1
Nyssa sylvatica	blackgum	Т			1	1				2							1	1	1	1	2	2
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Т								1			8	11			1	2	7	7	7	4
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Т	1	1												1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Т													1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2
Ulmus americana	American elm	Т		2	3	4	2	3			4	7		1	6	6	2	3	3	3	3	3
Populus deltoides	eastern cottonwood	Т						1		1							N/A	1	N/A	N/A	2	2
Viburnum dentatum	southern arrowwood	S	1	1	5	5				1							1	1	3	3	3	3
	Plot Ar	ea (acres)								0.024	7		-						-		-	
	Spec	cies Count	6	10	8	9	3	7	1	5	5	6	4	8	5	6	5	7	6	6	7	8
	Stem Coun					26	5	31	1	9	13	39	14	26	10	12	10	24	16	16	18	22
T	Stellis	283	1053	931	1053	202	1255	40	304	520	15/9	50/	1055	405	480	422	9//	0//	0//	129	0/9	

Type=Shrub or Tree P = Planted T = Total



APPENDIX D STREAM SURVEY DATA

- Figure 3a-d Cross-sections with Annual Overlays
- Figure 4 Longitudinal Profiles with Annual Overlays
- Figure 5a-d Pebble Count Plots with Annual Overlays
- Tables 10a,b
 Baseline Stream Data Summary Tables
- Table 11a
 Monitoring Cross-Section Morphology Data Table
- Table 11bMonitoring Stream Reach Morphology Data Table

Appendix D. Stream Survey Data Figure 3a: Cross-Section Plots and Raw Data Tables Dutch Buffalo Creek (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Unnamed Tributary to Dutch Buffalo Creek Monitoring Year 2 of 5

Project Name	DBC (Suther)
EEP Project Number	370	
Cross-Section ID	XS-1, Riffle	
Survey Date	8/2011	
SUMMA	ARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation (ft)		648.52
Bankfull Cross-Section	8.77	
Bankfull Width (ft)		8.28
Flood Prone Area Elev	vation (ft)	650.16
Flood Prone Width (ft)	55.77
Bankfull Mean Depth	(ft)	1.06
Bankfull Max Depth (f	řt)	1.64
W/D Ratio		7.81
Entrenchment Ratio		6.74
Bank Height Ratio		1.00



XS-1: View Upstream



XS-1: View Downstream



Appendix D. Stream Survey Data Figure 3b: Cross-Section Plots and Raw Data Tables Dutch Buffalo Creek (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Unnamed Tributary to Dutch Buffalo Creek Monitoring Year 2 of 5



Appendix D. Stream Survey Data Figure 3c: Cross-Section Plots and Raw Data Tables Dutch Buffalo Creek (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Unnamed Tributary to Dutch Buffalo Creek Monitoring Year 2 of 5



Appendix D. Stream Survey Data Figure 3d: Cross-Section Plots and Raw Data Tables Dutch Buffalo Creek (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Unnamed Tributary to Dutch Buffalo Creek Monitoring Year 2 of 5



Appendix D Figure 4. Longitudinal Profile with Annual Overlays Dutch Buffalo Creek Stream and Wetland Restoration EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5



*No water in the channel during survey.

Appendix D. Stream Survey Data Figure 5a: Pebble Count Plots with Annual Overlays DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5

	F	eature: Riffle												
			MY2-8/2011 Size (mm) Total # Item % Cum %											
Description	Material	Size (mm)	Total #	Item %	Cum %									
Silt/Clay	silt/clay	0.062	0	0%	0%									
	very fine sand	0.125	1	1%	1%									
	fine sand	0.250	8	8%	9%									
Sand	medium sand	0.50	18	18%	27%									
	coarse sand	1.00	14	14%	41%									
	very coarse sand	2.0	10	10%	51%									
	very fine gravel	4.0	4	4%	55%									
	fine gravel	5.7	0	0%	55%									
	fine gravel	8.0	0	0%	55%									
	medium gravel	11.3	0	0%	55%									
Gravel	medium gravel	16.0	0	0%	55%									
	course gravel	22.3	3	3%	58%									
	course gravel	32.0	5	5%	63%									
	very coarse gravel	45	10	10%	73%									
	very coarse gravel	64	8	8%	81%									
	small cobble	90	12	12%	93%									
C 111	medium cobble	128	5	5%	98%									
Cobble	large cobble	180	1	1%	99%									
	very large cobble	256	1	1%	100%									
	small boulder	362	0	0%	100%									
B 11	small boulder	512	0	0%	100%									
Boulder	medium boulder	1024	0	0%	100%									
	large boulder	2048	0	0%	100%									
Bedrock	bedrock	40096	0	0%	100%									
TOTAL %	of whole count		100	100%	100%									
			1											
Sumn	nary Data													
D50	1.9													
D84	70.50													
D95	105.20													



250

522

2048

0.12 0.1 0.08 0.06 0.04 0.02 0

0.25

 $\mathbf{\hat{v}}$

6

MY0-4/2010 0 0 MY1-5/2011 0 0 MY2-8/2011

Ֆ ~\$0 zr

Particle Size (mm)

64

28

0.062

Appendix D. Stream Survey Data

Figure 5b: Pebble Count Plots with Annual Overlays DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5

	Det Name. Dutch D	oss-Section: 2	Imamed 1	ributary)	
	F	Teature: Pool			
		cuture. 1001	1	MY2-8/201	1
Description	Material	Size (mm)	Total #	Item %	Cum %
Silt/Clay	silt/clay	0.062	3	3%	3%
	very fine sand	0.125	1	1%	4%
	fine sand	0.250	3	3%	7%
Sand	medium sand	0.50	5	5%	12%
	coarse sand	1.00	3	3%	15%
	very coarse sand	2.0	1	1%	16%
	very fine gravel	4.0	0	0%	16%
	fine gravel	5.7	0	0%	16%
	fine gravel	8.0	3	3%	19%
	medium gravel	11.3	24	24%	43%
Gravel	medium gravel	16.0	27	27%	70%
	course gravel	22.3	23	23%	93%
	course gravel	32.0	4	4%	97%
	very coarse gravel	45	2	2%	99%
	very coarse gravel	64	0	0%	99%
	small cobble	90	0	0%	99%
Cabbla	medium cobble	128	0	0%	99%
Condie	large cobble	180	1	1%	100%
	very large cobble	256	0	0%	100%
	small boulder	362	0	0%	100%
Douldon	small boulder	512	0	0%	100%
Douider	medium boulder	1024	0	0%	100%
	large boulder	2048	0	0%	100%
Bedrock	bedrock	40096	0	0%	100%
TOTAL %	of whole count		100	100%	100%
			•		•
Sumn	ary Data				
D50	12.52				
D84	20.02				
D95	27.30				



Appendix D. Stream Survey Data Figure 5c: Pebble Count Plots with Annual Overlays DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5

	U	Fosture: Pool			
	-	eature. 1001	r –	MY2-8/201	1
Description	Material	Size (mm)	Total #	Item %	Cum %
Silt/Clay	silt/clay	0.062	100	100%	100%
	verv fine sand	0.125	0	0%	100%
	fine sand	0.250	0	0%	100%
Sand	medium sand	0.50	0	0%	100%
	coarse sand	1.00	0	0%	100%
	very coarse sand	2.0	0	0%	100%
	very fine gravel	4.0	0	0%	100%
	fine gravel	5.7	0	0%	100%
	fine gravel	8.0	0	0%	100%
	medium gravel	11.3	0	0%	100%
Gravel	medium gravel	16.0	0	0%	100%
	course gravel	22.3	0	0%	100%
	course gravel	32.0	0	0%	100%
	very coarse gravel	45	0	0%	100%
	very coarse gravel	64	0	0%	100%
	small cobble	90	0	0%	100%
Cabble	medium cobble	128	0	0%	100%
Cobble	large cobble	180	0	0%	100%
	very large cobble	256	0	0%	100%
	small boulder	362	0	0%	100%
Douldou	small boulder	512	0	0%	100%
Doulder	medium boulder	1024	0	0%	100%
	large boulder	2048	0	0%	100%
Bedrock	bedrock	40096	0	0%	100%
TOTAL %	of whole count		100	100%	100%
Sumn	nary Data				
D50	0.03				
D84	0.05				
D95	0.06				



Appendix D. Stream Survey Data Figure 5d: Pebble Count Plots with Annual Overlays DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5

Pro	ject Name: Dutch I	Buffalo Creek (U	Innamed	ributary)	
	Ci	ross-Section: 4			
	F	eature: Riffle	1	MV2 8/201	1
Description	Matarial	Size (mm)	Total #	Itom %	L Cum %
Silt/Clov	silt/clay	0.062	10tal #	2%	2%
Sill/Clay	silvelay	0.002	5	2 /0 50/	2/0 70/
	fine cond	0.123	3	370 10/	/ 70
Sand	madium cand	0.230	4	470 60/	1170
Sanu	medium sand	0.30	0	0%	1/%
	coarse sand	1.00	1	1 %	18%
	very coarse sand	2.0	0	0%	18%
	very fine gravel	4.0	0	0%	18%
	fine gravel	5.7	1	1%	19%
	tine gravel	8.0	2	2%	21%
a 1	medium gravel	11.3	17	17%	38%
Gravel	medium gravel	16.0	23	23%	61%
	course gravel	22.3	20	20%	81%
	course gravel	32.0	13	13%	94%
	very coarse gravel	45	2	2%	96%
	very coarse gravel	64	3	3%	99%
	small cobble	90	1	1%	100%
Cobble	medium cobble	128	0	0%	100%
CODDIC	large cobble	180	0	0%	100%
	very large cobble	256	0	0%	100%
	small boulder	362	0	0%	100%
Douldon	small boulder	512	0	0%	100%
Douider	medium boulder	1024	0	0%	100%
	large boulder	2048	0	0%	100%
Bedrock	bedrock	40096	0	0%	100%
TOTAL %	of whole count		100	100%	100%
Sumn	ary Data				
D50	13.75				
D84	24.77				
D95	38.50				



						Та	ble 10	a. Baseli	ne Stre	am Da	ata Sum	nary													
				Dutcl	h Buffal	o Creek	Stream	n and W	etland]	Restor	ation/E	EP Project	Numb	er 370											
Unnammed Tributary to Dutch Buffalo (608 linear feet)																									
Parameter	Gauge		Regional Curve			Pre-	Existin	g Conditi	on			Reference Reach Data Design									Monitorin	g Baseline	2		
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle	-	LL	UL	Eq.	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Med	Max	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n
Bankfull Width (ft)	-	6.83	7.55	7.19	-	8.68	-	-	-	10	-	8.3	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	8.34	8.60	8.60	8.85	-	2
Floodprone Width (ft)					-	9.8	-	-	-	10	-	130	-	-	-	-	-	150	-	52.52	54.05	54.05	55.57	-	2
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	-	0.98	1.08	1.03	-	1.17	-	-	-	10	-	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1.00	1.02	1.02	1.04	-	2
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	-				-	1.49	-	-	-	10	-	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	1.5	-	1.67	1.74	1.74	1.81	-	2
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area (ft ²)	-	9.18	10.14	9.66	-	10.17	-	-	-	10	-	10.95	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	8.30	8.77	8.77	9.24	-	2
Width/Depth Ratio	-				-	7.42	-	-	-	10	-	6.4	-	-	-	-	-	9	-	8.34	8.43	8.43	8.51	-	2
Entrenchment Ratio	-				-	1.13	-	-	-	10	-	15.66	-	-	-	-	-	16.67	-	6.28	6.29	6.29	6.30	-	2
Bank Height Ratio	-				-	2.53	-	-	-	10	-	1.2	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	-	2
Pattern			1	.		1			r - r			- 1									I				
Channel Beltwidth (ft)					2.5	-	-	19.4	-	46	33	51	-	69	-	2	33.3	57.15	81	33.3	57.15	57.15	81	-	-
Radius of Curvature (ft)			-		10.38	-	-	37.99	-	76	12	15.5	-	19	-	2	22.5	24.75	27	22.5	24.75	24.75	27	-	-
Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)			-		1.2	-	-	4.38	-	76	60	8.3	-	60	-	1	2.5	2.75	3	2.5	2.75	3	-	-	-
Meander Wavelength (ft)					43	-	-	109	-	50	60	64.5	-	69	-	2	57.6	91.80	126	57.6	91.8	91.8	126	-	-
Meander width Katio							-	2.24	-	46	4	6.15	-	8.3	-	2	3.1	6.35	9	3.7	6.35	6.35	9	-	-
Profile Diffle L angth (ft)			T	T	6.76	1	<u> </u>	41.57	r r	4	5.4			22	<u>г т</u>	C	14.4	22.40	52.4	12.76	1		10.26		
Piffle Slope (ft/ft)			1		0.70	-	-	41.37	-	4	0.016	-	-	0.024	-	2	0.014	0.02	0.024	0.00142	-	-	0.01113	-	-
Pool Length (ft)					5.80	-	-	37.56	-	7	7.8	-	-	35	-	2	54.12	64.72	75.32	10.32	-	-	31 /	-	-
Pool Max Depth (ft)					5.67	1 70		57.50		7	7.0	2.4	_		_	2	1	1.40	1.8	10.52			51.4		_
Pool Spacing (ft)					17.35	1.79	-	-	-	7	40.3	2.4	-	- 60	-	-	1	54.45	64.8	-	-	-	52.04	-	-
1 oor Spacing (it)					17.55	-	-	125.00	-	/	40.5	-	-	00	-	-	44.1	54.45	04.0	10.52	-	-	52.04	-	-
Transport Parameters																									
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/ft ²					-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankful			1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m ²					-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Additional Reach Parameters											T														
Rosgen Classification	-		1	1			G	5c					E4					C/E4				I	4		
Bankful Velocity (fps)	-	-	-	-			3	.8					3.5					3.65				3.	65		
Bankful Discharge (cfs)	-	-	-	-			39.	04*					38					39.04*				39.	04*		
Valley Length (ft)								-					-					-					-		
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)							6)8					608					608				6	08		
Sinuosity (ft)							1.	24					1.8					1.13				1.	16		
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	-						0.0	008					0.00	5				0.006				0.0	008		
BF slope (ft/ft)	-						0.0	008					0.00	5				0.006				0.0)08		
Bankful Floodplain Area (acres)							0.	14					1.81	l			2.09			0.75					
% of Reach with Eroding Banks								-					-					-					0		
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric								-					-					-					-		
Biological or Other								-					-					-					-		

*Calculated using Flowmaster

Table 10b. Baseline S	Table 10b. Baseline Stream Data Summary (Substrate, Bed, Bank and Hydrologic Containment Parameter Distributions)														
	Dutch Buffalo Creek Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370														
Unnammed Tributary to Dutch Buffalo (608 linear feet)															
Parameter	Pre-Existing Condition	Reference Reach Data	Design	As-built/Baseline											
Ri%/Ru%/P%/G%/S%	-	-	-	-											
SC% / Sa% / G% / C% / B% / Be%	-	-	-	24.5/35.75/36.75/3.25/0/0											
d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95 (mm)	0.12/0.83/2.36/11.03/22.6	-	-	1.45/5.85/8.29/25.06/47.52											
Entrenchment Class<1.5/1.5-1.99/2.0-4.9/5.0- 9.9/>10	100% <1.5 (1.13)	100% > 10 (15.66)	100% > 10 (16.67)	5.0 < 100% < 9.9 (5.35, 6.30)											
Incision Class <1.2/1.2-1.49/1.5-1.99/>2.0	(2.53) 100% > 2.0	1.2=(1.2) 100% <1.49	(1.0) 100%< 1.2	(1.0) 100%< 1.2											

		Table 1	1a: Morpho	ologic and H	ydraulic Mo	nitoring Sun	nmary								
	Dutcl	1 Buffalo Cr	eek Stream	and Wetland	l Restoration	n Project/SC	O #06-0675	2-01							
		Unn	ammed Trib	utary to Du	tch Buffalo (608 linear fe	et)								
PARAMETER			Cross	s-Section 1 (1	Riffle)		Cross-Section 2 (Riffle)								
	Baseline	MY1-2010	MY2-2011	MY3-2012	MY4-2013	MY5-2014	Baseline	MY1-2010	MY2-2011	MY3-2012	MY4-2013	MY5-2014			
DIMENSION															
Bankfull Width (ft)	8.9	8.7	8.3				9.6	9.7	9.4						
Floodprone Width (ft)	55.6	55.6	55.8				53.3	53.2	53.3						
Bankfull Mean Depth	1.0	1.1	1.1				1.1	1.0	1.0						
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	1.8	1.7	1.6				1.7	1.6	1.6						
Bankfull Cross-sectional Area (ft ²)	9.2	8.8	8.8				10.2	9.4	9.4						
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	8.5	8.6	7.8				9.1	10.0	9.3						
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	6.3	6.4	6.7				5.6	5.5	5.7						
Bankfull Bankheight Ratio	1.0	1.0	1.0				1.0	1.0	1.0						
Cross Sectional Area between end pins (ft ²)	75.0	69.6	75.5				12.0	9.8	19.1						
d50 (mm)	13.7	4.9	1.9				0.1	11.6	12.5						
PARAMETER			Cros	s-Section 3 (Pool)			Cross-Section 4 (Riffle)							
	Baseline	MY1-2010	MY2-2011	MY3-2012	MY4-2013	MY5-2014	Baseline	MY1-2010	MY2-2011	MY3-2012	MY4-2013	MY5-2014			
DIMENSION															
Bankfull Width (ft)	11.0	10.5	10.4				8.3	8.3	8.2						
Floodprone Width (ft)	59.0	58.0	55.3				52.5	52.5	55.1						
Bankfull Mean Depth	0.8	0.7	0.7				1.0	1.0	1.0						
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	8.9	8.7	1.6				8.9	8.7	1.7						
Bankfull Cross-sectional Area (ft ²)	9.3	7.5	7.6				8.3	8.4	8.3						
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	13.1	14.8	14.3				8.3	8.2	8.1						
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	5.4	5.5	5.3				6.3	6.3	6.8						
Bankfull Bankheight Ratio	1.0	1.0	1.0				1.0	1.0	1.0						
Cross Sectional Area between end pins (ft ²)	49.8	35.4	53.4				39.6	36.3	41.3						
d50 (mm)	0.1	0.2	0.03				11.1	17.5	13.8						

Table 11b. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary Dutch Buffalo Creek Stream and Wetland Restoration Project/SCO #06-06752-01 Unnammed Tributary to Dutch Buffalo (608 linear feet)																
Parameter	Baseline			MY 1 2010				MY 2 2011								
DIMENSION Min Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n
Bankfull Width (ft) 8.34 8.60	8.60	8.85	_	3	8.31	8.52	8.52	8.72	-	3	8.16	8.59	8.28	9.34	0.65	3
Floodprone Width (ft) 52.52 54.05	54.05	55.57	-	3	52.49	54.07	54.07	55.64	-	3	53.33	54.73	55.09	55.77	1.26	3
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft) 1.00 1.02	1.02	1.04	-	3	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01	-	3	1.01	1.03	1.01	1.06	0.03	3
Bankfull Max Depth (ft) 1.67 1.74	1.74	1.81	-	3	1.56	1.63	1.63	1.70	-	3	1.62	1.64	1.64	1.65	0.02	3
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft2) 8.30 8.77	8.77	9.24	-	3	8.42	8.62	8.62	8.82	-	3	8.27	8.82	8.77	9.42	0.58	3
Width/Depth Ratio8.348.43	8.43	8.51	-	3	8.23	8.43	8.43	8.63	-	3	7.81	8.38	8.08	9.25	0.77	3
Entrenchment Ratio 6.28 6.29	6.29	6.30	-	3	6.32	6.35	6.35	6.38	-	3	5.71	6.40	6.74	6.75	0.60	3
Bank Height Ratio 1.0 1.0	1.0	1.0	-	3	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	-	3	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.00	3
Bankfull Velocity (fps) 4.70 4.45	4.45	4.23	-	3	4.64	4.53	4.53	4.43	-	3	4.14	4.44	4.45	4.72	0.29	3
PROFILE Min Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n
Riffle Length (ft) 13.76 21.29	21.29	28.82	-	2	16.07	22.09	22.09	28.11	-	3	9.01	16.90	17.46	22.53	5.05	6
Riffle Slope (ft/ft) 0.00142 0.01	0.01	0.01856	-	2	0.00916	0.01006	0.01006	0.01096	-	3	0.0093	0.0203	0.0158	0.0472	0.0140	6
Pool Length (ft) 10.32 31.83	31.83	53.33	-	2	18.30	27.90	27.90	37.49	-	3	15.77	38.02	40.93	61.57	15.69	8
Pool Max depth 1.72 1.82	1.82	1.91	-	2	1.62	1.63	1.63	1.63	-	2	1.95	2.29	2.17	2.8	0.30	9
Pool Spacing (ft) 10.32 42.80	42.80	75.27	-	2	19.98	23.64	23.64	27.29	-	3	25.45	54.46	58.32	77.41	18.41	8
PATTERN Min Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n
Channel Beltwidth (ft) 33.30 57.15	57.15	81.00	-	5	33.30	57.15	57.15	81.00	-	5	33.30	57.15	57.15	81.00	-	5
Radius of Curvature (ft)22.5024.75	24.75	27.00	-	9	22.50	24.75	24.75	27.00	-	9	22.50	24.75	24.75	27.00	-	9
Meander Wavelength (ft) 57.60 91.80	91.80	126.00	-	7	57.60	91.80	91.80	126.00	-	7	57.60	91.80	91.80	126.00	-	7
Meander Width Ratio 3.70 6.35	6.35	9.00	-	-	3.70	6.35	6.35	9.00	-	-	3.70	6.35	6.35	9.00	-	-
ADDITIONAL REACH																
PARAMETERS																
Rosgen Classification	E4				E4				E4							
BF slope (ft/ft)	0.008				0.008				0.006							
Ri%/Ru%/P%/G%/S%	-	-	-		29.00	1.20	38.10	-	0.2		17.00	-	50.00	-	0.2	
SC%/Sa%/G%/C%/B%/Be%																
d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95																
% of reach with eroding banks	0			4				0								
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric	c				-				-							
Biological or Other																

*Insufficient water in channel to estimate an approximate value



APPENDIX E HYDROLOGIC DATA

- Table 12
 Verification of Bankfull Events
- Figure 6 Monthly Rainfall Data
- Figure 7 Precipitation and Water Level Plots
- Table 13Wetland Hydrology Criteria Attainment

Appendix E. Hydrologic Data Table 12. Verification of Bankfull Events Dutch Buffalo Creek Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5

	Date of		
Date of Collection	Occurrence	Method	Photo # (if available)
5/19/2011	Unknown	Crest Gauge	N/A
6/23/2011	Unknown	Crest Gauge	N/A
		Crest Gauge	N/A

Figure 6: Dutch Buffalo Creek 30-70 Percentile Graph for Rainfall in 2011, Concord NC DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5



*Historical rainfall data referenced from NC Cronos Database Divisonal Data for the Southern Piedmont of North Carloina - Data Period January 2011 through December 2011 monthly rainfall data from http://www.wunderground.com/history/airport/KJQF/2010/12/16/CustomHistory.html

Figure 7a: Precipitation and Water Level Plots for Gauges DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5



Figure 7b: Precipitation and Water Level Plots for Gauges DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5



Figure 7c: Precipitation and Water Level Plots for Gauges DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5



Figure 7d: Precipitation and Water Level Plots for Gauges DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5



Figure 7e: Precipitation and Water Level Plots for Gauges DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5



Figure 7f: Precipitation and Water Level Plots for Gauges DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5



Figure 7g: Precipitation and Water Level Plots for Gauges DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5



Figure 7h: Precipitation and Water Level Plots for Gauges DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5



Figure 7i: Precipitation and Water Level Plots for Gauges DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5



Figure 7j: Precipitation and Water Level Plots for Gauges DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5



Appendix E. Hydrologic Data Table 13: Wetland Hydrology Criteria Attainment DBC (Suther) Stream and Wetland Restoration/EEP Project No. 370 Monitoring Year 2 of 5

Summary of Groundwater Gauge Results for Years 1 through 5										
	Success Criteria Achieved/Max Consecutive Days During Growing Season (Percentage %)									
Gauge	Year 1 (2010)	Year 2 (2011)	Year 3 (2012)	Year 4 (2013)	Year 5 (2014)					
GW1	Yes/20 Days (9%)	Yes/63 Days (28%)								
GW2	Yes/52 Days (23%)	Yes/71 Days (31%)								
GW3	Yes/19 Days (8%)	No/12 Days (5%)								
GW4	No/4 Days (2%)	No/0 Days (0%)								
GW5	No/0 Days (0%)	No/3 Days (1%)								
GW6	Yes/46 Days (20%)	Yes/64 Days (28%)								
GW7	*N/A	Yes/41 Days (18%)								
GW8	*N/A	Yes/18 Days (8%)								
GW9	No/10 Days (4%)	No/3 Days (1%)								
GW10	Yes/53 Days (23%)	No/9 Days (4%)								