FINAL MITIGATION PLAN and AS-BUILT BASELINE REPORT UT to CANE CREEK RESTORATION SITE ALAMANCE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA (EEP Project No. 395)



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



November 2009

FINAL MITIGATION PLAN and AS-BUILT BASELINE REPORT UT to CANE CREEK RESTORATION SITE ALAMANCE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA (EEP Project No. 395)



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

Prepared by:
Axiom Environmental, Inc.
20 Enterprise Street
Suite 7
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607

Design Firm: URS Corporation 1600 Perimeter Park Drive, Suite 400 Morrisville, NC 27560





November 2009

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program (NCEEP) has completed restoration of streams and wetlands at the UT to Cane Creek Restoration Site (hereafter referred to as the "Site") to assist in fulfilling stream and wetland mitigation goals in the area. The Site is located in southwest Alamance County approximately 5 miles east of Liberty, North Carolina in United States Geological Survey Hydrologic Unit 03030002050050 (North Carolina Division of Water Quality Subbasin 03-06-04) of the Cape Fear River Basin. This Hydrologic Unit has been identified as a Targeted Local Watershed in NCEEP's Cape Fear River Basin Restoration Priorities 2009.

Prior to construction, the Site was characterized by pasture land utilized for livestock grazing. Land use practices including the maintenance and removal of riparian vegetation and hoof shear from livestock had resulted in degraded water quality, unstable channel characteristics (stream entrenchment, erosion, and bank collapse), and reduced storage capacity and floodwater attenuation. In addition, hydric soils were disturbed due to regular plowing and vegetation maintenance and hoof shear from livestock.

The goals and objectives of this project focus on improving local water quality, enhancing flood attenuation, and restoring aquatic and riparian habitat. These goals were accomplished by the following.

- 1. Reestablished stream stability and the capacity to transport watershed flows and sediment load by restoring stable channel morphology supported by natural instream habitat and grade/bank stabilization structures.
- 2. Reduced nonpoint source sedimentation and nutrient inputs into the Site by eliminating the acceleration of bank erosion as a result of land use activities, excluding livestock, and reestablishing a native riparian buffer greater than 50 feet in width.
- 3. Enhanced the capacity of the Site to mitigate flood flows by reconnecting the stream to the historic floodplain.

This project was constructed between March 17, 2008 and March 15, 2009. Final grading, stream structure installation, and site stabilization was completed by March 4, 2009, and planting of trees and shrubs was completed between March 11-15, 2009. As constructed, Site activities restored historic stream and wetland functions, which existed onsite prior to impacts from unrestricted livestock access, riparian and bank vegetation removal, and nutrient loading from surrounding pasture land. Stream construction of meandering, E-type stream channels resulted in 6783 linear feet of stream restoration. The removal of invasive species and subsequent planting with native riparian vegetation resulted in 1.3 acres of riparian riverine wetland enhancement and 2.0 acres of riparian riverine wetland preservation. Site activitites provided 6783 Stream Mitigation Units and 1.1 riparian riverine Wetland Mitigation Units. The Site will be protected by a 50.75 acre permanent conservation easement held by the State of North Carolina. Baseline measurements/evaluations indicate that Site streams, wetlands, and vegetation compare favorably to plans as set forth in the detailed restoration plan and construction plans.

The UT to Cane Creek Restoration Site monitoring plan will entail analysis of the stream channel and riparian vegetation. Monitoring of restoration efforts will be performed for a minimum of 5 years or until success criteria are fulfilled.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXEC	CUTIVE SUMMARY	i
1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.2	Project Goals and Objectives	1
1.3	Project Structure, Restoration Type, and Approach	. 1
2.0	MONITORING PLAN.	. 2
2.1		2
2.2	$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$	
3.0	SUCCESS CRITERIA	
3.1		
3.2		
4.0	MAINTENANCE AND CONTINGENCY	
5.0	REFERENCES	4
	APPENDICES	
	AFFENDICES	
Apper	ndix A. General Tables and Figures	
	Table 1. Site Restoration Structures and Objectives	
	Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History	
	Table 3. Project Contacts Table	
	Table 4. Project Attributes Table	
	Figure 1. Site Location Map	
	Figure 2. Monitoring Plan View	
Anner	ndix B. Baseline Morphology Tables	
търсі	Tables 5A-5D. Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary	
Annor	rables 3A-5D. Baseline Worphology and Trydraune Summary	
Appei		
	Table 6. Vegetation Plot Attribute Table	
	Table 7. Planted Woody and Herbaceous Species	
Apper	ndix D. As-built Construction Sheets	
	Sheets AB0-AB5. As-built Drawings	
	Sheets 1-11. As-built Survey	

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Location and Setting

The North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program (NCEEP) has completed restoration of streams and wetlands at the UT to Cane Creek Restoration Site (hereafter referred to as the "Site") to assist in fulfilling stream and wetland mitigation goals in the area. The Site is located in southwest Alamance County approximately 5 miles east of Liberty, North Carolina in United States Geological Survey (USGS) Hydrologic Unit 03030002050050 (North Carolina Division of Water Quality Subbasin 03-06-04) of the Cape Fear River Basin (Figure 1, Appendix A). This Hydrologic Unit has been identified as a Targeted Local Watershed in NCEEP's *Cape Fear River Basin Restoration Priorities 2009*.

Directions to the Site:

- From Raleigh, take US-64 West to exit 381 for NC-87 towards Spring Lake and Fayetteville
- > Turn right on NC-87/Graham Road
- Take a slight left onto Silk Hope Gum Springs Road/Silk Hope Road
- > Turn right on Snow Camp Road
- > Turn left on Old Dam Road
- > The Site is located at the stream crossing between Wild Rose Road and Cocoa Road
- Latitude, Longitude of Site: 35.8644°N, 79.4800°W (NAD83/WGS84)

1.2 Project Goals and Objectives

The goals and objectives of this project focus on improving local water quality, enhancing flood attenuation, and restoring aquatic and riparian habitat. These goals were accomplished by the following.

- 1. Reestablished stream stability and the capacity to transport watershed flows and sediment load by restoring stable channel morphology supported by natural instream habitat and grade/bank stabilization structures.
- 2. Reduced nonpoint source sedimentation and nutrient inputs into the Site by eliminating the acceleration of bank erosion as a result of land use activities, excluding livestock, and reestablishing a native riparian buffer greater than 50 feet in width.
- 3. Enhanced the capacity of the Site to mitigate flood flows by reconnecting the stream to the historic floodplain.

1.3 Project Structure, Restoration Type, and Approach

Prior to construction, the Site was characterized by pasture land utilized for livestock grazing. Land use practices including the maintenance and removal of riparian vegetation and hoof shear from livestock had resulted in degraded water quality, unstable channel characteristics (stream entrenchment, erosion, and bank collapse), and reduced storage capacity and floodwater attenuation. In addition, hydric soils were disturbed due to regular plowing and vegetation maintenance and hoof shear from livestock.

As constructed, Site activities restored historic stream and wetland functions, which existed onsite prior to impacts from unrestricted livestock access, riparian and bank vegetation removal, and nutrient loading from surrounding pasture land. Stream construction of meandering, E-type stream channels resulted in 6783 linear feet of stream restoration. The removal of invasive species and subsequent planting with native riparian vegetation resulted in 1.3 acres of riparian riverine wetland enhancement and 2.0 acres of riparian riverine wetland preservation (Table 1, Appendix A). Planting occurred within 41 acres of the conservation easement, including constructed streambanks, floodplain, wetland enhancement areas, and uplands. The target natural community within uplands of the Site is Mixed-Mesic Hardwood Forest and within the remainder of the Site is Piedmont/Mountain Bottomland Forest (Schafale and Weakley 1990). Table 7

Final Mitigation Plan
Page 1

(Appendix C) outlines woody and herbaceous species planted within the Site. Completed project activities, reporting history, completion dates, project contacts, and background information are summarized in Tables 2-4 (Appendix A).

2.0 MONITORING PLAN

The UT to Cane Creek Restoration Site monitoring plan will entail analysis of the stream channel and riparian vegetation. Monitoring of restoration efforts will be performed for a minimum of 5 years or until success criteria are fulfilled. Locations of stream cross-sections and vegetation monitoring plots are depicted on Figure 2 (Appendix A).

2.1 Stream

After completion of Site construction, five reaches approximately 600 linear feet in length were monitored for geometric activity along the restored channel. In addition, 12 stream cross-sections were established and permanently monumented throughout the Site.

Annual fall monitoring will include development of channel cross-sections on riffles and pools, pebble counts, and a water surface profile of the channel. The data will be presented in graphic and tabular format. Data to be presented will include 1) cross-sectional area, 2) bankfull width, 3) average depth, 4) maximum depth, 5) width-to-depth ratio, 6) water surface slope, and 7) stream substrate composition.

Baseline/as-built measurements, performed in September 2009, emulated the proposed channel morphology. Baseline data are included in Tables 5A-5D in Appendix B.

2.2 Vegetation

Following Site planting, 15 (10-meter by 10-meter) vegetation monitoring plots were established within the Site. During the first year, vegetation will receive a cursory, visual evaluation on a periodic basis to ascertain the degree of overtopping of planted elements by nuisance species. Subsequently, quantitative sampling of vegetation will be performed each year using the *CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation Level 1-2 Plot Sampling Only* (Version 4.0) (Lee et al. 2006) in September of the first monitoring year and between June 1 and September 30 for each subsequent year until the vegetation success criteria are achieved. A photographic record of plant growth will be included in each annual monitoring report. Attributes of the vegetation plots are included in Table 6 in Appendix C.

3.0 SUCCESS CRITERIA

3.1 Stream Success Criteria

Success criteria for stream restoration will include 1) successful classification of the reach as a functioning stream system (Rosgen 1996) and 2) channel variables indicative of a stable stream system. Annual monitoring will continue until success criteria are met and no less than two bankfull events have occurred, otherwise monitoring will continue until the second bankfull event has occurred.

Visual assessment of in-stream structures will be conducted to determine if failure has occurred. Failure of a structure may be indicated by collapse of the structure, undermining of the structure, abandonment of the channel around the structure, and/or stream flow beneath the structure.

3.2 Vegetation Success Criteria

Success criteria have been established to verify that the vegetation component supports community elements necessary for forest development. Success criteria are dependent upon the density and growth of

Final Mitigation Plan
Page 2

characteristic forest species. An average density of 320 stems per acre must be surviving at the end of the third monitoring year. Subsequently, 290 stems per acre must be surviving at the end of year 4 and 260 stems per acre at the end of year 5.

If vegetation success criteria are not achieved, based on average density calculations from combined plots over the entire restoration area, supplemental planting may be performed with tree species approved by regulatory agencies. Supplemental planting will be performed as needed until achievement of vegetation success criteria.

4.0 MAINTENANCE AND CONTINGENCY

In the event that success criteria are not fulfilled, a mechanism for contingency will be implemented.

Stream

In the event that stream success criteria are not fulfilled, a mechanism for contingency will be implemented. Stream contingency may include, but may not be limited to 1) structure installation; 2) repair of dimension, pattern, and/or profile variables; and 3) bank stabilization. The method of contingency is expected to be dependent upon stream variables that are not in compliance with success criteria. Primary concerns, which may jeopardize stream success include 1) headcut migration through the Site, and/or 2) bank erosion.

Headcut Migration Through the Site

In the event that a headcut occurs within the Site (identified visually or through onsite measurements [i.e. bank-height ratios exceeding 1.4]), provisions for impeding headcut migration and repairing damage caused by the headcut will be implemented. Headcut migration may be impeded through the installation of in-stream grade control structures (rip-rap sill and/or log cross-vane weir) and/or restoring stream geometry variables until channel stability is achieved. Channel repairs to stream geometry may include channel backfill with coarse material and stabilizing the material with erosion control matting, vegetative transplants, and/or willow stakes.

Bank Erosion

In the event that severe bank erosion occurs at the Site resulting in elevated width-to-depth ratios, contingency measures to reduce bank erosion and width-to-depth ratio will be implemented. Bank erosion contingency measures may include the installation of cross-vane weirs and/or other bank stabilization measures. If the resultant bank erosion induces shoot cutoffs or channel abandonment, a channel may be excavated which will reduce shear stress to stable values.

Vegetation

If vegetation success criteria are not achieved based on average density calculations from combined plots over the entire restoration area, supplemental planting may be performed with tree species approved by regulatory agencies. Supplemental planting will be performed as needed until achievement of vegetation success criteria.

Final Mitigation Plan Page 3

5.0 REFERENCES

- Lee, M.T., R.K. Peet, S.D. Roberts, and T.R. Wentworth. 2006. CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation. Version 4.0. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Ecosystem Enhancement Program. Raleigh, North Carolina.
- North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program. 2009. Cape Fear River Basin Restoration Priorities 2009 (online). Available: http://www.nceep.net/services/lwps/cape_fear/RBRP%20Cape%20Fear%202008.pdf [November 20, 2009].
- Rosgen D. 1996. Applied River Morphology. Wildland Hydrology. Pagosa Springs, Colorado.
- Schafale, M.P. and A.S. Weakley. 1990. Classification of the Natural Communities of North Carolina: Third Approximation. North Carolina Natural Heritage Program, Division of Parks and Recreation, North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources. Raleigh, North Carolina.
- United States Army Corps of Engineers, United States Environmental Protection Agency, North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission, North Carolina Division of Water Quality (USACE et al.). 2003. Stream Mitigation Guidelines.

Final Mitigation Plan Page 4

Appendix A. General Tables and Figures

Table 1. Site Restoration Structures and Objectives
Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History
Table 3. Project Contacts Table
Table 4. Project Attributes Table
Figure 1. Site Location Map
Figure 2. Monitoring Plan View

Final Mitigation Plan Appendices

Table 1. Site Restoration Structures and Objectives

Restoration Segment/ Reach ID*	Stati	ion Range	Mitigation Type	Priority Approach	Linear Footage/ Acreage	Comment
Reach A	10+0	0-28+10.76	Restoration	Priority 1	1738.76**	Restoration of dimension
Reach B	28+10.	76-49+29.45	Restoration	Priority 1	2118.69	and profile through a
Reach C	49+29.	45-61+24.03	Restoration	Priority 2	1194.58	combination of new
Reach D	100+0	0-113.57.31	Restoration	Priority 1	1357.31	location and in place
Reach E	200+0	0-203+73.25	Restoration	Priority 1	373.25	restoration.
Wetlands			Enhancement		1.3	Invasive species removal and planting with native forest vegetation.
Wetlands		Preservation		2.0		Invasive species removal.
		Componen		nt Summation		
Restoration I	evel	Stream (lin	near footage)	•	nrian Wetland eage)	Planted Riparian Buffer (acreage)
Restoration	n	678	32.59		.=	
Enhanceme	nt			1	.3	
Preservatio	n			2	.0	
Totals		6782.59	linear feet	3.3 a	icres	41 acres
Mitigation U	nits	6783	SMUs	1.1 V	VMUs	

^{*} Locations of each reach are depicted on the As-built Drawings in Appendix A

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History

	Data Collection	Completion
Activity or Report	Complete	or Delivery
Restoration Plan		February 2006
Construction Completion		March 2009
Site Planting		March 2009
As-built Drawings	July-October 2008	July 2009
Mitigation Plan		October 2009


Table 3. Project Contacts Table


Designer	URS Corporation
	1600 Perimeter Park Drive, Suite 400
	Morrisville, North Carolina 27560
	Kathleen McKeithan (919) 461-1597
Construction Contractor	River Works, Inc.
	8000 Regency Parkway, Suite 200
	Cary, North Carolina 27511
	Will Pederson (919) 459-9001
Conservation Easement Contractor	Landmark Surveying, Inc.
	109 E. Harden Street
	Graham, North Carolina 27253
	(336) 229-6275
As-built Surveying Contractor	Level Cross Surveying, PLLC
	668 Marsh County Lane
	Randleman, North Carolina 23717
	Sherri Willard (336) 495-1713

^{**} Constructed linear footage excludes the 72-foot corrugated metal pipe at Old Dam Road; therefore, the linear footage is shorter than stationing depicts.

Table 4. Project Attribute Table

Table 4. Project Attribute Table					
Projec	t County	Alam	nance County, N	North Carolina	a
Physiographi	c Region		Piedmo	nt	
Е	coregion		Carolina Sla	te Belt	
Project Riv			Cape Fe	ar	
USGS 14-d			0303000203	50050	
NCDWQ			03-06-0		
Within EEP Watershed Plan		Yes	s-Targeted Loca		
	RC Class		Warm		
% of project easeme			100 %	1	
Beaver activity observed during desi			No		
Restoration		Attribute Tab			I
	Reach A	Reach B	Reach C	Reach D	Reach E
Drainage area (acres)	390	1333	1640	892	282
Stream order	first	third	third	third	second
Restored length (linear feet)	1738.76	2118.69	1194.58	1357.31	373.25
Perennial or Intermittent	perennial	perennial	perennial	perennial	perennial
NCDWQ Index Number	16-28	16-28	16-28	16-28	16-28
NCDWQ Classification	C, NSW	C, NSW	C, NSW	C, NSW	C, NSW
303d list?	No	No	No	No	No
Upstream of a 303d listed segment?	No	No	No	No	No
Total acreage of easement	50.75	50.75	50.75	50.75	50.75
Total planted acreage of easement	41	41	41	41	41
Rosgen classification of preexisting	Degraded	Degraded E4	Degraded E4	Degraded	Degraded
	E4			E4	E4
Rosgen classification of asbuilt	E4	E4	E4	E4	E4
Valley type	VIII	VIII	VIII	VIII	VIII
Valley slope	0.0083	0.0041	0.0045	0.0046	0.0156
Cowardin classification	R3UB1	R3UB1	R3UB1	R3UB1	R3UB1
Trout waters designation?	No	No	No	No	No
Species of concern, T&E, etc?	No	No	No	No	No
Dominant Soil Series and Characteristics		ilt loam, George	eville silt loam.	Starr loam, C	Colfax silt
		am, Herndon si			
Wat	ershed Land		,		
Managed Herbaceous Coverage		()	49.8		
Mixed Upland Hardwoods			31.4		
Cultivated			9.9		
Southern Yellow Pine			4.6		
Deciduous Shrubland			2.0		
Mixed Hardwoods/Conifers			0.9		
Unmanaged Herbaceous Upland			0.9		
•					
Evergreen Shrubland			0.4		
Water Bodies			0.4		
Impervious Surfaces			<0.1		





Axiom Environmental, Inc. 20 Enterprise St. # 7 Raleigh, NC 27607 (919) 215-1693

MONITORING PLANVIEW
UT to CANE CREEK RESTORATION SITE
EEP Project # 395
Alamance County, North Carolina

Dwn. By: WGI	FIGURE
Date: Nov 2009	2
Project:	_
08-001	

Appendix B. **Baseline Morphological Tables**

Tables 5A-5D. Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary

Final Mitigation Plan UT to Cane Creek Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 395) Appendices

Table 5A. Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary Reach 1 UT to Cane Creek - EEP Project Number 395

Parameter	USGS Gage Data	Pr Cond	Pre-Existing Condition Reach 1	ing each 1	Proje.	Project Reference Stream #1	ence	Projec St	Project Reference Stream #2	ence	Desi	Design Reach 1	ch 1	As-b	As-built Reach 1	ch 1
					İ			!								
Dimension	Min Max Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med
BF Width (ft)	USGS gage data is			11.6			11.2			11			10			12.4
Floodprone Width (ft)	unavailable for this			92			100			105			65			150
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	project			14.3			10.1			16.2			11			6
BF Mean Depth (ft)				1.2			6.0			1.5			1.1			0.7
BF Max Depth (ft)				1.6			1.7			2			1.5			1.6
Width/Depth Ratio				9.4			12.4			7.5			9.1			17.1
Entrenchment Ratio				9.6			8.9			9.5			6.5			12.1
Bank Height Ratio				1.2			1.0			1.4			1.0			1.0
Wetted Perimeter(ft)				===			===			===			===			13.1
Hydraulic radius (ft)				===			#			===			===			0.7
Pattern																
Channel Beltwidth (ft)		20	20		15	20		20	22		35	20		24	64	46
Radius of Curvature (ft)		40	385		6	56		11	27		23	42		16	89	29
Meander Wavelength (ft)		80	460		29	22		59	96		40	140		74	198	121
Meander Width ratio		1.7	4.3		1.3	4.5		4.5	7.0		3.5	7.0		6.0	16.0	9.8
Profile																
Riffle length (ft)		===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	2	99	17
Riffle slope (ft/ft)				0.0080			0.0073			0.0112			0.0065	0.0014	0.0212	0.0066
Pool length (ft)		===	===	===	===	===	#	===	===	===	==	===	===	12	33	20
Pool spacing (ft)		100	240		15	87		2	92		13	99		39	113	70
Substrate																
d50 (mm)													 			20.9
d84 (mm)				===			===			===			===			63
Additional Reach Parameters																
Valley Length (ft)			1375			===			===			1379			1379	
Channel Length (ft)			1430			===			===			1737			1811	
Sinuosity			1.04			1.24			1.62			1.26			1.31	
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)			0.0080	(0.0046			0.0008			0.0043			0.0066	
BF slope (ft/ft)			===			#			===			===			===	
Rosgen Classification		Ŏ	Degraded E4	l E4		E4			E4			E4			C4	

Table 5B. Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary Reach 2 UT to Cane Creek - EEP Project Number 395

UT to Calle Creek - EEF Froject Number 333	C IDOIIIN	23															
Parameter			Ď	Pro_Fvieting	, bu	Project	Project Reference	out	Projec	Project Reference	ono						
	OSGS C	USGS Gage Data	Conc	r re-Existing Condition Reach 2	each 2	rroje S	Ject Neier Stream #1	 agua	rroje St	Stream #2	2 2	Desi	Design Reach 2	ch 2	As-b	As-built Reach 2	ch 2
Dimension	Min	Max Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med
BF Width (ft)	USGS g	USGS gage data is			13.8			11.2			7			41			9.8
Floodprone Width (ft)		unavailable for this			150			100			105			100			150
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)		project			27.4			10.1			16.2			24			6.1
BF Mean Depth (ft)					2.0			6.0			1.5			1.7			0.7
BF Max Depth (ft)					2.9			1.7			2			2.1			1.2
Width/Depth Ratio					7.0			12.4			7.5			8.2			12.1
Entrenchment Ratio					10.9			8.9			9.5			7.1			17.4
Bank Height Ratio					1.1			1.0			1.4			1.0			1.0
Wetted Perimeter(ft)					===			===			===			===			9.3
Hydraulic radius (ft)					===			===			===			===			9.0
Pattern																	
Channel Beltwidth (ft)			20	40		15	20		20	2.2		49	86		33	61	44
Radius of Curvature (ft)			22	20		6	56		11	27		32	28		19	45	36
Meander Wavelength (ft)			80	540		59	22		59	96		99	140		122	159	144
Meander Width ratio			1.4	2.9		1.3	4.5		4.5	7.0		3.5	7.0		14.0	19.0	17.0
Profile																	
Riffle length (ft)			===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	9	54	13
Riffle slope (ft/ft)					0.0044		1	0.0073			0.0112			0.0055	***	***	***
Pool length (ft)			===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	15	84	22
Pool spacing (ft)			31	295		15	87		2	92		19	93		64	109	82
Substrate					•					•							
d50 (mm)					===			===			===			===			4.0
d84 (mm)					===			===			===			===			11
Additional Reach Parameters																	
Valley Length (ft)				1986			===			===			1049			1121	
Channel Length (ft)				2065			===			===			1322			1357	
Sinuosity				1.04			1.24			1.62			1.26			1.21	
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)				0.0044			0.0046			0.0008			0.0037			* * *	
BF slope (ft/ft)				===			===			===			===			===	
Rosgen Classification			Ó	Degraded E4	E4		E4			E4			E4			E/C5	
1. 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	14	- 7															

^{***} No water in channel during as-built measurments

Table 5D. Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary Reach 5 UT to Cane Creek - EEP Project Number 395

Pre-Existing Project Reference Project R	,,,																
Nin Max Med Min Min Men Min	Parameter		<u>a</u>	re-Exist	ing	 Proje	ct Refe	rence	Proje	et Refer	ence.			1		:	1
Br. Width (t) Usos Sectional Acta (t) Usos Depth (t) Usos		USGS Gage Data	Conc	dition R	each 5	<u> </u>	tream #		<u> </u>	ream #	7	Des	ign Rea	ich 5	As-b	As-built Reach 5	ch 5
F. Cross Segre data is 10.3 11.2 11.	Dimension	Max	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med
Floodprone Width (ft)	BF Width (ft)	USGS gage data is			20.3			11.2			11			18	14.5	20.6	15.9
F. Cross Sectional Area (HZ)	Floodprone Width (ft)	unavailable for this			300			100			105			300	150.0	150.0	150.0
BF Mean Depth (ft)	BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	project			42.9			10.1			16.2			38	22.9	25.7	24.5
Hydraulic radius (ft) According Height Ratio According Height Rat	BF Mean Depth (ft)				2.1			6.0			1.5			2.1	1.2	1.6	1.6
Hydraulic radius (ft) Wetade Permeter (ft) Wetade Permeter (ft) Hydraulic radius (ft) Wetade Permeter (ft) Hydraulic radius (ft) Heander Wavelength (ft) Hoovel length (ft) Hoovel length (ft) Hydraulic radius (ft) Heander Wavelength (ft) Hoovel length (ft) Hoovel spacing (ft) Hoovel Spa	BF Max Depth (ft)				2.9			1.7			2			2.7	2.0	2.6	2.4
Entrenchment Ratio Bank Height Ratio Wetted Parameters (ft) Hydraulic radius (ft) Hydraulic radi	Width/Depth Ratio				9.6			12.4			7.5			8.5	9.5	17.3	8.6
Bank Height Ratio Wetted Perimeter(††)	Entrenchment Ratio				14.8			8.9			9.5			16.7	7.3	10.3	9.4
Wetted Perimeter (f) Hydraulic radius (f) === === === === 15 === === 15 <td>Bank Height Ratio</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1.6</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1.0</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1.4</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>1.0</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>1.0</td>	Bank Height Ratio				1.6			1.0			1.4			1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Hydraulic radius (ft)	Wetted Perimeter(ft)				===			=======================================			===			===	15.3	21.1	17.1
Chamel Beltwidth (ft)	Hydraulic radius (ft)				===			===			===			===	1.2	1.5	1.5
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	Pattern																
Radius of Curvature (ft)	Channel Beltwidth (ft)		23	91		15	50		20	77		63	126		34	104	82
Meander Wavelength (fth) Meander Wavelength (fth) 1.1 4.5 1.3 4.5 7.0 7.2 180 124 Riffle length (fth) === === === === === === === 1.3 4.5 7.0 3.5 7.0 7.8 7.8 Riffle length (fth) === === === === === === 1.2 1.2 1.2 7.0 7.0 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.0 7.8	Radius of Curvature (ft)		19	34		6	26		11	27		41	75		33	06	54
1.1 4.5 1.3 4.5 7.0 3.5 7.0 7.8	Meander Wavelength (ft)		66	150		29	22		59	96		72	180		124	303	156
Riffle length (ft)	Meander Width ratio		1.1	4.5		1.3	4.5		4.5	7.0		3.5	7.0		7.8	19.1	8.6
Riffle length (ft)	Profile																
Riffle slope (ft/ft)	Riffle length (ft)		===	===	===	=======================================	===	===	=======================================	===	===	===	===	===	12	82	33
Pool length (ft)	Riffle slope (ft/ft)				0.0029			0.0073			0.0112			0.0063	0.0000	0.0238	0.0036
Pool spacing (ft)	Pool length (ft)		===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	15	54	28
dS0 (mm) d84 (mm) === === === === === === === === === === ===	Pool spacing (ft)		74	220		15	87		2	92		24	119		28	201	83
(hmm) === === === === f (mm) === === === === gth (ft) 1112 === 1077 === gth (ft) 129 1.24 1.62 1.09 c (ft/ft) 0.0035 0.0046 0.0008 0.0041 c (ft/ft) === === === Degraded E4 E4 E4 E4	Substrate	,															
t (mm) === === === === gth (ft) 1112 === 1077 === gth (ft) 1435 === 1174 == unosity 0.0035 0.0046 0.0008 0.0041 === c (ft/ft) === === === === === c (ft/ft) === === === === c (ft/ft) === === === === c (ft/ft) === === === ===	d50 (mm)				#												16
gth (ft) 1112 === 1077 gth (ft) 1435 === 1174 nuosity 1.29 1.24 1.62 1.09 c (ft/ft) 0.0035 0.0046 0.0008 0.0041 === === === === c (ft/ft) E4 E4 E4	d84 (mm)				===			===			===			===			32
1112 === 1077 1435 === 1174 1.29 1.24 1.62 1.09 0.0035 0.0046 0.0008 0.0041 === === === Degraded E4 E4 E4 E4	Additional Reach Parameters																
1435 === 1174 174 174 174 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175 175	Valley Length (ft)			1112			===			===			1077			396	
1.29 1.24 1.62 1.09 1.09 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00	Channel Length (ft)			1435			===			===			1174			1194	
0.0035 0.0046 0.0008 0.0041 === === === Degraded E4 E4 E4 E4	Sinuosity			1.29			1.24			1.62			1.09			1.24	
=== === === === Degraded E4 E4 E4	Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	•		0.003£	2		0.0046			0.0008			0.0041			0.0023	
Degraded E4	BF slope (ft/ft)			#			===			===			==			===	
	Rosgen Classification			egradec	1 E4		E4			E4			E4			E/C4	

Table 5C. Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary
Reach 3 and 4
UT to Cane Creek - EEP Project Number 395
Parameter

395
Project Number
EEP
Creek -
Cane
T to

Darameter		6														
	USGS Gage Data	Conc	Fre-Existing indition Reacland 4	Fre-Existing Condition Reach 3 and 4	Proj.	Project Reference Stream #1	rence #1	Proje S	Project Reference Stream #2	rence	Design	Reach .	3 and 4	As-buil	Design Reach 3 and 4 As-built Reach 3 and 4	3 and 4
Dimension	Min Max Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med
BF Width (ft)	USGS gage data is			16			11.2			1			16	15.2	18.3	17.8
Floodprone Width (ft)	unavailable for this			300			100			105			200	150.0	150.0	150.0
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	project			34.2			10.1			16.2			32	22.2	26.3	24.4
BF Mean Depth (ft)				2.1			6.0			1.5			2.0	1.2	1.7	1.3
BF Max Depth (ft)				3.3			1.7			2			2.4	2.0	2.5	2.3
Width/Depth Ratio				2.2			12.4			7.5			8.0	8.8	14.3	13.7
Entrenchment Ratio				18.8			8.9			9.6			12.5	8.2	6.6	8.4
Bank Height Ratio				1.3			1.0			1.4			1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
Wetted Perimeter(ft)				===			===			===			===	9.91	19.3	18.6
Hydraulic radius (ft)				===			===			===			===	1.2	1.6	1.3
Pattern																
Channel Beltwidth (ft)		18	148		15	20		20	22		99	112		15	100	63
Radius of Curvature (ft)		23	32		6	56		11	27		28	99		23	72	45
Meander Wavelength (ft)		120	340		59	22		59	96		64	160		105	274	182
Meander Width ratio		1.1	9.2		1.3	4.5		4.5	7.0		3.5	7.0		6.3	15.4	10.2
Profile																
Riffle length (ft)					#			#					#	2	136	33
Riffle slope (ft/ft)				0.0070			0.0073			0.0112			0.0049	0.000	0.0108	0.0033
Pool length (ft)		===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	===	10	54	31
Pool spacing (ft)		29	395		15	87		2	92		21	106		28	180	113
Substrate																
d50 (mm)				===			===			===			===			9.0
d84 (mm)				===			===			===			===			16
Additional Reach Parameters																
Valley Length (ft)			1541			===			===			1562			1669	
Channel Length (ft)			2065			===			===			1984			2119	
Sinuosity			1.34			1.24			1.62			1.27			1.27	
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)			0.0031	1		0.0046			0.0008			0.0032			0.0031	
BF slope (ft/ft)			===			===			===			===			===	
Rosgen Classification			Degraded E4	d E4		E4			E4			E4			E/C5	

Appendix C. **Vegetation Data**

Table 6. Vegetation Plot Attribute Table Table 7. Planted Woody and Herbaceous Species

Final Mitigation Plan UT to Cane Creek Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 395) Appendices **Table 6. Vegetation Plot Attributes Data**

Plot	Community	Planting Zone ID	Reach ID	Associated	Method	CVS
ID	Type			Gauge		Level
1		streamside/floodplain	Reach A-Monitoring Profile 1	e	7	al.
2	est	streamside/floodplain	Reach A-Monitoring Profile 1	at the	ed	et
3	For	streamside/floodplain	Reach D-Monitoring Profile 2		tor 1, fo	ee
4	pu	streamside/floodplain	Reach D-Monitoring Profile 2	gauges	monitored stocol for	Ĺ Ĺ
5	าโลา	floodplain	Reach A	gaı	mc oto	6.
6	ton	floodplain	Reach B-Monitoring Profile 3	no	be Prc	4.
7	30t	streamside/floodplain	Reach B-Monitoring Profile 3	5	will SEP	
8	in F	streamside/floodplain	Reach B-Monitoring Profile 3	re a		Version 2006)
9	nta	floodplain	Reach B-Monitoring Profile 4	there	plots CVS-1	\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \
10	no	streamside/floodplain	Reach B-Monitoring Profile 4			$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{E}}$
11	$\mathbf{W}_{\mathbf{A}}$	streamside/floodplain	Reach B-Monitoring Profile 4	[ab]	ion the	O_{n}
12	ont	streamside/floodplain	Reach C-Monitoring Profile 5)lic	egetation using the	
13	dm	streamside/floodplain	Reach C-Monitoring Profile 5	apj	ge sin	ling
14	Piedmont/Mountain Bottomland Forest	streamside/floodplain	Reach C-Monitoring Profile 5	Not applicable,	Ve u	amp
15		streamside/floodplain	Reach C-Monitoring Profile 5			Sa

Final Mitigation Plan
UT to Cane Creek Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 395) Appendices

Table 7. Planted Woody and Herbaceous Vegetation

Planting Zone	Common Name	Scientific Name	Form	Number of Stem
Streamside	Black willow	Salix nigra	Live Stake	1800
	Elderberry	Sambucus Canadensis		2700
	Silky dogwood	Cornus amomum	Live Stake	2700
	Silky willow	Salix sericea		1800
Wetland Enhancement	Silky dogwood	Cornus amomum	Live Stakes	100
	Tag alder	Alnus serrulata	Containerized	100
	Buttonbush	Cephalanthus occidentalis	Bare Root	113
	Elderberry	Sambucus Canadensis	Bare Root	100
	Silky willow	Salix sericea	Live Stakes	75
	Swamp rose	Rosa palustris	Containerized	32
	Black gum	Nyssa sylvatica	Bare Root	300
	Sugarberry	Celtis laevigata	Bare Root	400
	Willow oak	Quercus phellos	Bare Root	1300
	Green ash	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	Bare Root	1400
	River birch	Betula nigra	Bare Root	500
	Silky dogwood	Cornus amomum	Live Stakes	175
	Tag alder	Alnus serrulata	Containerized	40
	Ironwood	Carpinus caroliniana	Bare Root	1000
	Sycamore	Platanus occidentalis	Bare Root	600
	Buttonbush	Cephalanthus occidentalis	Bare Root	437
Floodplain	Hazelnut	Corylus americana	Containerized	500
	Black walnut	Juglans nigra	Bare Root	1300
	Cherrybark oak	Quercus pagoda	Bare Root	300
	Swamp chestnut oak	Quercus michauxii	Bare Root	400
	Flowering dogwood	Cornus florida	Bare Root	80
	Red chokeberry	Aronia arbutifolia	Containerized	165
	Tulip poplar	Liriodendron tulipifera	Bare Root	1000
	Serviceberry	Amelanchier arbutifolia	Containerized	200
	Sweetbay magnolia	Magnolia virginiana	Bare Root	100
	Ninebark	Physocarpus sp.	Live Stakes	100
	Spicebush	Lindera benzoin	Containerized	106
	Blueberry	Vaccinium sp.	Containerized	15
	Coralberry	Symphoricarpos orbiculatus	Containerized	200
	Persimmon	Diospyros virginiana	Bare Root	600
	Southern red oak	Quercus falcate	Bare Root	500
Upland Slope	Black oak	Quercus velutina	Containerized	1300
opiana Stope	Flowering dogwood	Cornus florida	Bare Root	70
	Eastern red cedar	Juniperus virginiana	Bare Root	400
	Hackberry	Celtis occidentalis	Bare Root	1000
				Percent of Composition
	Swamp sunflower	Helianthus angustifolius		8
	Ironweed	Veronica noveboracensis	Permanent Seeding	5
	Swamp milkweed	Asclepias incarnate		2
	Joe-pye-weed	Eupatorium fistulosus		2
	Tearthumb	Polygonum sagittatum		5
Herbaceous	Bushy beard grass	Andropogon glomeratus		8
Seed Mixture	Deertongue	Panicum clandestinum		12
within	Switchgrass	Panicum virgatum		7
Streamside and	Soft rush	Juncus effusus	at a rate of 15	7
Floodplain Planting Zones	Showy tickseed sunflower	Bidens aristosa	lbs/acre	12
201143	Swamp rose	Rosa palustris	- 	5
	Fox sedge	Carex vulpinoidea	┥	12
	Leafy bullrush	Scirpus polyphyllus	-	5
	Sneezeweed	Helenium autumnale	⊣	5
	Virginia wild rye	Elymus virginicus	⊣ ⊦	5

Appendix D. As-built Construction Drawings

Sheets AB0-AB5. As-built Drawings Sheets 1-11. As-built Survey

Final Mitigation Plan Appendices

AS-BUILT DRAWINGS FOR

UNNAMED TRIBUTARY TO CANE CREEK STREAM DATA STREAM RESTORATION

PRA	JECT
1110	



EXISTING LENGTH (FT)	6330 LF
PROPOSED LENGTH (FT)	6440 LF
RESTORED LENGTH (FT)	6857 LF
PROPOSED STREAM CLASSIFICATION	E4


DISTURBED AREA - 41 ACRES

SHEET NO. DESCRIPTION


AB0 TITLE SHEET AB1 - AB5 PLAN SHEETS



ALAMANCE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA
DEACH A STA 10+00 LAT 75° 51, 76"N 70° 27, 79"W



1600 Perimeter Park Drive, Suite 400 Morrisville, North Carolina 27560 Phone (919)461-1100 Fax (919)461-1415 NC Lic.# C-2243 STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA



CLENT:
ECOSYSTEM ENHAN
PROGRAM
PROGRAM
FINING CONTROL
FINING CONTR

CREEK (PICKARD SITE) ESTORATION PROJECT MANCE COLINTY

UT TO CANE I



DATE: OCT 2009

CHECKED BY: KMM

URS PROJECT NO. 31823659

PROJ. NO.
SCO FILE "020594101
SHEET NO.
ABO

SITE DATA

ECOSYSTEM ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM 1652 MAIL SERVICE CENTER RALEIGH, NC 27699-1652 CONTACT: PERRY SUGG PHONE: 919-715-1359

URS CORPORATION - NORTH CAROLINA
1600 PERIMETER PARK DRIVE
SUITE 400
MORRISVILLE, NC 27560
CONTACT: KATHLEEN MCKEITHAN PHONE: 919-461-1597

EXISTING SURVEY PREPARED BY:

KCI TECHNOLOGIES
4601 SIX FORKS ROAD, RALEIGH, NC 27609
CONTACT: JAMES M. GELLENTHIN (L-3860) PHONE: 919-783-9214
SEALED L-3860


CONSERVATION EASEMENT PREPARED BY:

LANDMARK SURVEYING, INC. PHONE: 336-229-6275

AS-BUILT SURVEY PREPARED BY

LEVEL CROSS SURVEYING, PLLC 668 MARSH COUNTY LANE RANDLEMAN, NC 23717 CONTACT: SHERI WILLARD, PLS PHONE: 336-495-1713 SEALED L-3385 7-22-09

RECORD DRAWING



RECORD DRAWING STATEMENT

THIS RECORD DRAWING HAS BEEN PREPARED, IN PART, BASED UPON INFORMATION FURNISHED BY OTHERS. WHILE THIS INFORMATION IS BELIEVED TO BE RELIABLE, URS ASSUMES NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACCURACY OF THIS RECORD DRAWING OR FOR ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS THAT MAY HAVE BEEN INCORPORATED INTO IT AS A RESULT OF INCORRECT INFORMATION PROVIDED TO URS. THOSE RELYING ON THIS RECORD DOCUMENT BE ADVISED TO OBTAIN INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION OF ITS ACCURACY.







UT TO CANE CREEK (PICKARD SITE)
STREAM RESTORATION PROJECT
ALAMANCE COUNTY
THE

ECOSYSTEM ENHANCEMENT
PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM

FOR PROGRAM




DATE: OCT 2009
TECHNICIAN: EHJ

TECHNICIAN: EHJ


URS PROJECT NO. 31823659

PROJ. NO.
SCO FILE #020594101
SHEET NO.
ABI



RECORD DRAWING STATEMENT

THIS RECORD DRAWING HAS BEEN PREPARED, IN PART, BASED UPON INFORMATION FURNISHED BY OTHERS. WHILE THIS INFORMATION IS BELIEVED TO BE RELIABLE, URS ASSUMES NO RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACCURACY OF THIS RECORD DRAWING OR FOR ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS THAT MAY HAVE BEEN INCORPORATED INTO IT AS A RESULT OF INCORRECT INFORMATION PROVIDED TO URS. THOSE RELYING ON THIS RECORD DOCUMENT BE ADVISED TO OBTAIN INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION OF ITS ACCURACY.



RECORD DRAWING

Suite 400 827560 919)481-1415

1600 Perimeter Park Drive, Sults A Morrisville, North Carolina 27568 Phone (919/461-1100 Fax (919)491.

TO CANE CREEK (PICKARD S TREAM RESTORATION PROJE ALAMANCE COUNTY

ECOSYSTEM ENHANCEMENT
PROGRAM
FECOSYSTEM
FECOSYSTEM




DATE: 0CT 2009


TECHNICIAN: EI

CHECKED BY: KM

URS PROJECT NO. 31823659

PROJ. NO.
SCO FILE "020594101
SHEET NO.
AB2









DATE: OCT 2009 TECHNICIAN: EHJ


CHECKED BY: KM URS PROJECT NO.


31823659


SCO FILE *020594101


































PROFILE VERTICLE SCALE: I" = 5' HORIZONTAL SCALE: I" = 40'



Note:

Shaded background portion of drawing is for information only and has not been verified as As-Built.

Shaded base drawing for this survey was provided by URS Corporation, Inc.



SHEET 11 OF 11

AS-BUILT SURVEY FOR

CANE CREEK RESTORATION

PROJECT NO. 13080017CC

ALAMANCE COUNTY NORTH CAROLINA

SURVEY DATES:

JULY - OCTOBER 2008