UT to Lilliput Creek (Hog Branch Ponds) Stream and Wetland Restoration Project

SCO No. 07-07155-01 DENR Contract No. D08049S EEP Project No. 290 Brunswick County North Carolina

Year 5 of 5 Monitoring Report Data Collection: January through December 2014 Submission Date: March 6, 2015



Prepared for:



North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources Ecosystem Enhancement Program 217 West Jones St., Suite 3000A, Raleigh, N.C. 27603 (This page intentionally left blank)

UT to Lilliput Creek (Hog Branch Ponds) Stream and Wetland Restoration Project

SCO No. 07-07155-01 DENR Contract No. D08049S EEP Project No. 290 Brunswick County, North Carolina

Year 5 of 5 Monitoring Report Data Collection: January through December 2014 Submission Date: March 6, 2015

Prepared by:



Land Management Group, Inc. 3805 Wrightsville Avenue; Suite 15 Wilmington, NC 28403 (910) 452-0001 (This page intentionally left blank)

2.0 TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	TITLE PAGE	i
2.0	TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
3.0	PROJECT SUMMARY	1
	3.1 Goals and Objectives	1
	3.2 Project Success Criteria	
	3.3 Site Location and History	1
	3.4 Project Components	
	3.5 Project Design/Approach	
	3.6 Project Performance	2
	3.6.1 <u>Vegetation Monitoring Results</u>	
	3.6.2 <u>Stream Monitoring Results</u>	
	3.6.3 <u>Hydrology Monitoring Results</u>	
	3.6.4 Verification of Component Boundaries	4

- 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

3.0 PROJECT SUMMARY

3.1 <u>Goals and Objectives</u>

The goal for the UT to Lilliput Creek (Hog Branch Ponds) Stream and Wetland Restoration Site is to restore ecological function, improve overall water quality, and enhance native wildlife habitat. This goal has been accomplished by implementing two main objectives. The first objective is restoration of channelized tributaries to the headwater outer coastal plain stream type, as described in the "Information Regarding Stream Restoration in the Outer Coastal Plain of North Carolina" guidance document (COE 2005). The second objective is to restore and enhance the altered wetlands.

3.2 <u>Project Success Criteria</u>

The wetland vegetative success criterion is the survival of 260 5-year old planted woody stems per acre at the end of the year 5 monitoring period, which is based on the US Army Corps of Engineers Stream Mitigation Guidelines (COE 2003). The wetland hydrological success criterion is a groundwater level within 12 inches of the soil surface for a minimum of 12% of the growing season. The stream morphology success criteria are based on overall performance of the designed zero to first order stream restoration so that no substantial aggradation, degradation, down-cutting, or erosion occurs. Surface water monitoring gauges must exhibit similar conditions to the on-site reference gauge and clearly show fluctuation in flow.

3.3 Site Location and History

The 516.73-acre site is located in Boiling Spring Lakes, Brunswick County (Figures 1a and 1b). It was previously owned by International Paper and used in rotation as a pine plantation. Two major site alterations that occurred within the project site included channelization of natural stream channels and bedding.

3.4 Project Components

Project components consist of stream restoration, stream preservation, non-riparian wetland preservation, restoration, enhancement, and riparian preservation (See Table 1 for Project Components and Figure 2 for Component Location). A total of **3,238 linear feet** of stream restoration was provided in accordance with the mitigation plan. Stream preservation areas consist of **5,332 linear feet**. The non-riparian wetland preservation areas total **87.74 acres** and riparian wetland preservation areas total **20.45 acres**. Non-riparian wetland enhancement totaling **96.46 acres** makes up the bulk of the project effort. Non-riparian wetland restoration totals **7.83 acres**.

3.5 <u>Project Design/Approach</u>

In order to meet the project goals, stream restoration re-established the riparian vegetation zone, re-connected flood plain areas, and enhanced wildlife habitat. These ecological functions had been non-existent for decades due to the previous ditch and drainage regime. The restoration and enhancement of wetlands onsite will likely improve water quality given increased flow dissipation and residence time of site hydrology. Restoring the natural hydrologic characteristics has also restored the conditions that are beneficial for the long-leaf

pine community type that previously dominated the site before human intervention.

3.6 <u>Project Performance</u>

3.6.1 <u>Vegetation Monitoring Results</u>

Sixteen (16) permanent vegetation plots were established and used in annual vegetation monitoring. Of these, fifteen (15) were set up and monitored using the Carolina Vegetation Survey (CVS) – EEP protocol Level 2 (version 4.2). The remaining plot was located at Site 6 and consisted of a total stem count because this restoration area was so small. Areas of slow vegetative growth identified within the stream valleys during previous monitoring events were replanted by the EEP in March of 2014 (Figure 3). These areas represented approximately 11 acres, or 10% of the entire site. Any supplemental plantings that were located within vegetative plots were identified and documented during Year 5 monitoring efforts.

During the MY5 monitoring event, the site exhibited a mean planted density of 504 stems per acre with a range of 161 to 971 stems per acre. When subtracting the supplemental stems recently planted, the mean stem density was 377 stems per acre with a range of 161 to 688 stems per acre. This was lower than the 421 stems per acre observed in 2013, but still surpassed the vegetative success criterion. When volunteers are included in the totals, the mean stem density was 4,840 stems per acre with a range of 1,457 to 9,672 stems per acre. Vegetation plot locations are identified in Figure 3. Of the individual plots, VP 3 and VP 13 did not meet the success criterion. Four stems in VP 3 died since the MY4 monitoring event and four additional stems continue to be missing. Currently, there are four original stems and one supplemental Nyssa biflora stem that was planted in the spring of 2014. As in MY4, only four of the eighteen originally planted longleaf pine trees remain in VP 13. This equates to 161.8 planted stems per acre. As in previous years, the health of the remaining trees in this plot is good (all rated 3 for vigor); however, volunteer vegetation is quite dense in this area and shading may be contributing to increased mortality of the longleaf stems.

Planted stem growth of vegetation within the plots located in the stream valleys (VP 1-4 & 6-9) continues to be slow (average of less than 2.5 feet in height for nonsupplemental stems). However, the height of most stems has been slowly increasing each year. As noted above, supplemental planting occurred within the zero-order stream valleys in March of 2014 and the number of planted stems observed within the plots located in these areas increased.

As in previous years, a large number of volunteer shrubs was identified in most of the plots. Plots located within the stream valleys (VP 1-4 & 6-9) supported mostly volunteer loblolly pine trees. Other plots outside of the channels (VP 5; 10-15) contained high numbers of a variety of characteristic trees and shrubs including loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*), huckleberry (*Gaylussacia frondosa*), and gallberry (*Ilex glabra*). The number of volunteers within the site steadily increased between MY1

and MY4, but then decreased between MY4 and MY5 as the plants have grown in size. Overall the diversity of native woody vegetation is excellent with between 4 and 12 native woody species noted per plot and 26 native woody species noted site wide.

The site's mean stem density surpassed the vegetative success criterion during all five years of monitoring (Table 9). Individually, VP 13 did not meet the planted criterion in Years 3 - 5 and VP 3 failed to meet it in Year 5. But as indicated above, together with the volunteer population the site is dense and diverse.

3.6.2 <u>Stream Monitoring Results</u>

Stream monitoring consisted of both visual and morphological (i.e. survey) assessment of the channels. Both channels exhibited evidence of the "braided" stream type characteristic of the Zero to First Order outer coastal plain stream morphology. The channels appear to be stable and no areas of significant degradation or rill erosion were noted. Based on survey data collected from longitudinal profiles and eight fixed cross sections, the channel dimension and pattern are similar to asbuilt conditions (Appendix D; Figure 4). No significant trends are seen when comparing cross section and longitudinal data between the monitoring years.

3.6.3 <u>Hydrology Monitoring Results</u>

The site is currently being monitored for hydrology using forty-three (43) water level monitoring gauges (28 groundwater monitoring gauges, 8 surface flow monitoring gauges, and 7 reference gauges (Figure 3).

During MY5 (2014), two gauges were replaced. Well #16 was destroyed by an ATV or wildlife and Gauge #4S was rendered inoperable due to equipment malfunction. Both gauges were replaced in February of 2014.

Groundwater Hydrology

In MY 5, all 28 groundwater monitoring gauges located within the mitigation site exhibited groundwater within 12 inches of the soil surface for a duration in excess of the 12% hydrologic success criterion (Table 10). The hydrographs of the gauges show groundwater levels were within 12 inches of the soil surface for much of the 2014 growing season (Appendix E). Please see Figure 3 for gauge locations.

A comparison between pre-construction monitoring data and postconstruction monitoring data demonstrated an increase in hydroperiod within the enhancement areas. In MY5, Gauge 11 exhibited 69 consecutive days (26% of the growing season) of groundwater within 12 inches of the soil surface. By comparison, the pre-construction monitoring (2005) gauge located in this area exhibited 14 consecutive days (6% of the growing season). Gauge 17 exhibited 72 consecutive days (27% of the growing season) in MY5 while 2005 pre-construction monitoring data exhibited 11 consecutive days (5% of the growing season) in the same location. Throughout the five years of monitoring, the hydrology success criterion has largely been met on this site (Table 10). In MY2 (2011), six gauges did not meet the criteria. Rainfall was below normal during several months of the growing season in 2011 and likely attributed to this lack of wetland hydrology.

Stream Hydrology

All surface water monitoring gauges exhibited fluctuations in water levels and extended periods of above-ground flow during MY5. As in previous years, the reference stream gauge documented a lower level of water in the channel and less variable flow than the on-site stream gauges (Appendix E). The reference stream is located in a more densely vegetated area than the on-site streams. The vegetation and surface roughness adjacent to the reference channel is likely reducing peak discharge events.

3.6.4 Verification of Component Boundaries

Verification of stream and wetland boundaries was conducted in the fall of 2013 to ensure that on-the-ground mitigation acreages match mapped boundaries as depicted in the mitigation plan. NC DWQ Stream Identification Forms (Ver. 4.11) and USACE Stream Assessment Worksheets were completed in several locations to determine the limits of streams on site. Based upon this assessment, the stream limits appear to be consistent with those depicted in the mitigation plan. The wetlands assessment was performed using the three parameter methodology outlined in the 1987 COE Wetland Delineation Manual and the Atlantic and Gulf Coastal Plain Regional Supplement to the COE Wetland Delineation Manual (USACE 2010). Several areas identified as wetland enhancement (6.1 acres total) and one area identified as wetland restoration (0.16 ac) in the mitigation plan did not meet hydric soil and/or wetland hydrology parameters (Figure 3).

4.0 PROJECT CONDITION AND MONITORING DATA APPENDICES

Appendix A. Project Vicinity Map and Background Tables



Source: USGS 7.5 Minute Quadrangle, Funston, NC

(This page intentionally left blank)



FIGURE 2.

Project Components U.T. to Lilliput Creek (Hog Branch Ponds) Stream and Wetland Restoration Site Project No: D05053S EEP No. 290

Brunswick County

Legend

Restoration Plan Component

Property Boundary

Stream Restoration (7.23 Ac., 3238 LF.)

Wetland Restoration (7.83 Ac.)

Wetland Enhancement (96.46 Ac.)

Wetland Preservation (87.74 Ac.)

Riverine Wetland Preservation (20.45 Ac.)

Wetland in Powerline ROW (4.54 Ac.)

Stream Preservation (100' buffer, 8.67 Ac., 5332 LF)







March 2015

(This page intentionally left blank for double-sided printing)

				-			tigation Credits		
		UT Lil	liput Stre	am and W	letland R	estoration	Project, EEP No	. 290	
	Stre	eam	Riparian			Credits liparian land	Buffer	Nitrogen Nutrient Offset	Phosphorus Nutrient Offset
Туре	R	RE	R	RE	R	RE			
Totals	3,238	1,026		4.09	7.83 (7.67 ¹)	65.78 (62.73 ¹)			
				Pr	oject Con	nponents			
Project Stationing/ Component Location		Existing Acre	Footage/ eage	Appr	roach	Restoration or Restoration Equivalent	Restoration Footage or Acreage	Mitigation Ratio	
0 to 1st Order Stream Restoration	Northern	Tributary	1,53	5 LF	Stre	t Order eam pration	Restoration	1,535 LF	1:1
0 to 1st Order Stream Restoration	to 1st Order tream Southern Tributary		1,70	3 LF	Stre	t Order eam pration	Restoration	1,703 LF	1:1
Stream Preservation	See Figure 1a		4,93	4,932 LF Prese		rvation	Preservation (RE)	4,932 LF	5:1
Stream Preservation	(area closest to		400 LF Pres		Prese	ervation Preservation (RE)		400 LF	10:1
Non-Riparian Wetland Restoration	Vetland See Figure 1a		7.83 (7.67 ¹) ac		Resto	oration	Restoration	7.83 (7.67 ¹) ac	1:1
Non-Riparian Wetland Enhancement	See Fig	gure 1a	96.46 (9	0.36¹) ac	Enhan	cement	Enhancement (RE)	96.46 (90.36 ¹) ac	2:1
Non-Riparian Wetland Preservation	See Fig	gure 1a	87.7	4 ac	Prese	rvation	Preservation (RE)	87.74 ac	5:1
Riparian Wetland Preservation	See Fig	gure 1a	20.4	5 ac	Prese	rvation	Preservation (RE)	20.45 ac	5:1
				Con	nponent S	Summatio	n		
Restoration Level	Strea	ım (lf)	Ripari	an Wetlan	ıd (ac)	Non-Ripa	rian Wetland (ac)	Buffer (sq ft)	Upland (ac)
Restoration	3 23	8 LF				7.8	3 (7.67 ¹) ac		
Enhancement	0,20						6 (90.36 ¹) ac		
Enhancement I									
Enhancement II Creation									
Preservation	5.33	2 LF		20.45 ac			87.74 ac		
HQ Preservation	0,00			_0.40 du					
					BMP Elei	ments*			
Element	Loca	ation	Pur	oose/Fund				Notes	
n/a	n	/a		n/a				n/a	

*BMP Elements are not part of the UT Lilliput Project

¹ Asset verification performed in 2013 determined that acreage of wetland restoration and enhancement decreased.

Activity or Report	Data Collection Complete	Actual Completion or Delivery
Restoration Plan	NA	Oct-06
Final Design – Construction Plans	NA	Apr-08
Construction	NA	Feb-10
Temporary S&E mix applied to entire project area	NA	Mar-09
Permanent seed mix applied to entire project area	NA	Mar-09
Containerized and B&B plantings	NA	Feb-10
Baseline Monitoring Document (Year 0 Monitoring -baseline)	December-10	December-10
Year 1 Monitoring	December-10	January-11
Year 2 Monitoring	December-11	December-11
Year 3 Monitoring	December-12	December-12
Year 4 Monitoring	December-13	December-13
Year 5 Monitoring	December-14	March-15

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History UT Lilliput Stream and Wetland Restoration Project -EEP Project No. 290

Table 3. Project Contacts Table UT Lilliput Stream and Wetland Restoration Project				
EEP Project No. 290				
Designer	Rummel, Klepper, and Kahl Engineers			
Designer	900 Ridgefield Drive Suite 350; Raleigh, NC 27609			
Primary project design POC	Pete Stafford (919) 878-9560			
Construction Contractor	River Works Inc. 8000 Regency Parkway Cary, NC 27518			
Construction contractor POC	Mike Pedersen (919) 459-9001			
Planting Contractor	River Works Inc. 8000 Regency Parkway Cary, NC 27518			
Planting Contractor POC	Mike Pedersen (919) 459-9001			
Seeding Contractor	River Works Inc. 8000 Regency Parkway Cary, NC 27518			
Seeding Contractor POC	Mike Pedersen (919) 459-9001			
Seed Mix Sources	Contact River Works Inc.			
Nursery Stock Suppliers	Contact River Works Inc.			
Maniforing Darformous (MV1)	Rummel, Klepper, and Kahl, LLP			
Monitoring Performers (MY1)	900 Ridgefield Drive Suite 250; Raleigh, NC 27609			
Stream Monitoring POC	Pete Stafford (919) 878-9560			
Vegetation Monitoring POC	Pete Stafford (919) 878-9560			
Wetland Monitoring POC	Pete Stafford (919) 878-9560			
	Land Management Group, Inc.			
Monitoring Performers (MY2 - MY5)	3805 Wrightsville Avenue, Suite 15; Wilmington, NC 28403			
Vegetation Monitoring POC	Kim Williams (910) 452-0001			
Wetland Monitoring POC	Kim Williams (910) 452-0001			

Г

٦

Table 4. Project Baseline Ir				
UT Lilliput Stream and W	, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i			
EEP Proje				
Project Inf	formation			
Project Name	UT Lilliput Stream and Wetland Restoration Project			
Project County	Brun	swick		
Project Area	600	acres		
Project Coordinates (Lat and Long)	34.078043	,-78.026662		
Project Watershed Su	immary Information			
Physiographic Region	Coast	al Plain		
River Basin	Cape	e Fear		
USGS HUC 8 Digit 03020103	USGS HUC 14 Dig	git 03030005070010		
NCDWQ Subbasin	03-0	06-17		
Project Drainage Area	N	I/A		
Project Drainage impervious cover estimate (%)	<	5%		
CGIA Land Use Classification				
Reach Summar	y Information			
Parameters	North Tributary	South Tributary		
Length of Reach	1,535 LF	1,703 LF		
Valley Classification	0 to 1st order	0 to 1st order		
Drainage Area	52.49 acres	66.94 acres		
NCDWQ Stream Identification Score	N/A	N/A		
NCDWQ Water Quality Classification	CNSW	CNSW		
Morphological Description (stream type)	0 to 1st order	0 to 1st order		
Evolutionary Trend	N/A	N/A		
Underlying Mapped Soils	Leon	Murville		
Drainage Class	Poorly Drained	Poorly Drained		
Soil Hydric Status	Hydric A	Hydric A		
Slope	0.001	0.001		
FEMA Classification	Zone X	Zone X		
Native Vegetation Community	N/A	N/A		
Percent Composition Exotic Invasive Vegetation	< 1%	< 1%		
Wetland Summa	ry Information			
Parameter	Wetland 1	Wetland 2		
Size (acres)	87.74	22.45		
Wetland Type	Non-Riparian	Riparian		
Mapped Soils Series	Murville and Leon	Muckalee		
Drainage Class	Very poorly drained, poorly drained	Very poorly drained		
Soil Hydric Status	А	А		
Source of Hydrology	Groundwater	Groundwater		
Hydrologic Impairment	N/A	N/A		
Native Vegetation Community	Long Leaf Pine	Coastal Plain Blackwater Small Stream		
Percent of Exotic/Invasive Veg	<1%	<1%		

Table 4. Contd. Regulatory Considerations						
Regulation	Applicable?	Resolved?	Supporting Documentation			
Waters of the US – Section 404	Yes	Yes	Upon Request			
Waters of the US – Section 401	Yes	Yes	Upon Request			
Endangered Species Act	Yes	Yes	Upon Request			
Historic Preservation Act	Yes	Yes	Upon Request			
Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) Coastal Area Management Act (CAMA)	Yes	Yes	Upon Request			
FEMA Floodplain Compliance	Yes	Yes	Upon Request			
Essential Fisheries Habitat	No					

Appendix B. Visual Assessment Data (This page intentionally left blank)



FIGURE 3.

Current Conditions Plan View U.T. to Lilliput Creek (Hog Branch Ponds) Stream and Wetland Restoration Site Project No: D08049S EEP No. 290 Brunswick County

Legend

Vegetation Monitoring Counts

- Less Than 320 Planted Stems per Acre
- More Than 320 Planted Stems per Acre Areas of slow stem growth that received
- Areas of slow stem growth that received supplemental planting in March of 2014.

Gauge Success Criteria



Restoration Plan Component

March 2015

FIGURE 4.

Monitoring Plan Features

Project No: 290 Project No: D05053S U.T. Lilliput Stream and Wetland Restoration Site

Brunswick County



Photo Point and Direction	

Surface Gauges 2010 Monitoring Gauges

Restoration Plan Component Eros vaunde in belleteni epuse wev 🔶 🕂 Groundwater Gauges 2010/2011

Riverine Wetland Preservation (11.78 Ac.) Wetland Preservation (57.74 Ac.) Wetland Restoration (7.83 Ac.) Stream Restoration (7.23 Ac., 3238 LF.)









Major Channel Category	Channel Sub- Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjusted % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
	1. Vertical Stability	1. Aggradation			N/A	N/A	N/A			
		2. Degradation		ľ	N/A	N/A	N/A			
	2. Riffle Condition	1. Texture/Substrate	N/A	N/A			N/A			
	3. Meander Pool	1. Depth	N/A	N/A			N/A			
1. Bed	Condition	2. Length	N/A	N/A			N/A			
	4. Thalweg Condition	1. Thalweg at upstream of meander bend	N/A	N/A			N/A			
	4. Thatweg Condition	2. Thalweg centering at downstream of meander	N/A	N/A			N/A			
	1. Scoured/Eroding	Bank lacking vegetative cover from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	N/A	N/A	100%
2. Bank	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, caving, or collapse			0	0	100%	N/A	N/A	100%
				TOTALS	0	0	100%	N/A	N/A	100%
	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs	9	9			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill	1	1			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms	N/A	N/A			N/A			
3. Engineered Structures	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%	N/A	N/A			N/A			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining- Max Pool Depth: Mean Bankfull Depth Ratio >= 1.6 Rootwads/logs providng some cover at base flow	N/A	N/A			N/A			

Major Channel Category	Channel Sub- Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjusted % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
	1. Vertical Stability	1. Aggradation			N/A	N/A	N/A			
	(Riffle and Run Units)	2. Degradation		Ī	N/A	N/A	N/A			
	2. Riffle Condition	1. Texture/Substrate	N/A	N/A			N/A			
1. Bed	3. Meander Pool	1. Depth	N/A	N/A			N/A			
1. Deu	Condition	2. Length	N/A	N/A			N/A			
	4. Thalweg Condition	1. Thalweg at upstream of meander bend	N/A	N/A			N/A			
	, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	2. Thalweg centering at downstream of meander	N/A	N/A			N/A			
		Bank lacking vegetative cover from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	N/A	N/A	100%
2. Bank	2 Indercut	Banks undercut/overhanging			N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, caving, or collapse			0	0	100%	N/A	N/A	100%
				TOTALS	0	0	100%	N/A	N/A	100%
	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs	9	9			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill	1	1			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms	N/A	N/A			N/A			
3. Engineered Structures	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%	N/A	N/A			N/A			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining- Max Pool Depth: Mean Bankfull Depth Ratio >= 1.6 Rootwads/logs providng some cover at base flow	N/A	N/A			N/A			

Table 6. Vegetation Condition Assessment Table

Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold	CCPV Depiction	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Planted Acreage
1. Bare Areas	Very limited cover of both woody and herbaceous material	No bare areas located onsite for MY5 2014	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2. Low Stem Density Areas	Woody stem densities clearly below target levels based on MY3, 4, or 5 stem count criteria	VP 3 & 13 did not meet vegetative success criterion in MY5.	Red Square	2	0.04 ac	< .1%
3. Areas of Poor Growth Rates	Areas with woody stems of a size class that are obviously small given the monitoring year	Many stems in plots within stream valleys exhibited slow growth; supplemental planting occurred in 2014	Red dotted line	2	~ 11 ac	~ 10%

Stream Problem Areas UT to Lilliput Stream and Wetland Restoration Site EEP Project No. 290								
Feature Issue	Feature Issue Station Number Suspected Cause Photo Number							
No issues identified	N/A	N/A	N/A					

Vegetation Problem Areas UT to Lilliput Stream and Wetland Restoration Site EEP Project No. 290			
Feature Issue	Station Number	Suspected Cause	Photo Number
No issues identified	N/A	N/A	N/A



Photo Station 2: Vegetation Plot 3 in Southern Tributary (photo taken 9/16/14)



Photo Station 4: Southern Tributary (photo taken 9/16/14)



Photo Station 7: Vegetation Plot 8 in Northern Tributary (photo taken 9/16/14)



Photo Station 10: Northern Tributary (photo taken 3/7/14)



Photo Station 20: Upper Reach of Northern Tributary (photo taken 3/7/14)



Photo Station 21: Upper Reach of Southern Tributary (photo taken 9/16/14)

Picture 17 Picture 18 Picture 18

Pre-Restoration Photos Taken near VP 5



Vegetation Plot 5 (photo taken 9/16/14)



Pre-Restoration Photos Taken near VP 9



Vegetation Plot 9 (photo taken 9/16/14)



Pre-Restoration Photos Taken near VP 13



Vegetation Plot 13 (photo taken 9/16/14)


Pre-Restoration Photos Taken near VP 14



Vegetation Plot 14 (photo taken 9/16/14)



Pre-Restoration Photos taken near VP 15



Vegetation Plot 15 (photo taken 9/16/14)

Appendix C. Vegetation Plot Data

Table	e 7. Vegetation Plot Crit	teria Attainment	
Tract	Vegetation Plot ID	Vegetation Survival Threshold Met?	Tract Mean
Southern Tributary	VP1	Y	
Southern Tributary	VP2	Y	
Southern Tributary	VP3	Ν	
Southern Headwater Wetland	VP4	Y	
Site 2	VP5	Y	
Northern Tributary	VP6	Y	
Northern Tributary	VP7	Y	
Northern Tributary	VP8	Y	880/
Northern Headwater Wetland	VP9	Y	88%
Wetland Enhancement	VP10	Y	
Wetland Enhancement	VP11	Y	
Site 1	VP12	Y	
Wetland Enhancement	VP13	Ν	
Wetland Enhancement	VP14	Y	
Wetland Enhancement	VP15	Y	
Site 6	Site 6 (Total Count)	Y	

	Table 8. CVS Vegetation Plot Metadata
	UT to Lilliput Creek EEP No. 290
Report Prepared By	Kim Williams
Date Prepared	3/6/2015 10:00
Database Name	UTLilliput_290_MY5_2014.mdb
Database Location	L:\Wetlands\2008\UT to Lilliput\Annual Monitoring Report\Year 5
Computer Name	KWILLIAMS
	Description Worksheets in This Document
Metadata	Description of database file, the report worksheets, and a summary of project and project data.
Proj Planted	Each project is listed with its PLANTED stems per acre, for each year. This includes live stakes, all planted stems, and all natural/volunteer stems.
Proj Total Stems	Each project is listed with its TOTAL stems per acre, for each year. This includes live stakes, all planted stems, and all natural/volunteer stems.
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 by each.
Damage by Spp	Damage values tallied by type for each species.
Damage by Plot	Damage values tallied by type for each plot.
Planted Stems by Plot and Spp	A matrix of the count of PLANTED living stems of each species for each plot; dead and missing stems are excluded.
	Project Summary
Project Code	290
Project Name	UT Lilliput
Description	Stream and Wetland Restoration Project
River Basin	Cape Fear
Length (ft)	3238
Stream-to-Edge Width (ft)	
Area (sq m)	
Required Plots (calculated)	16

Table 9. Planted and total stem counts (species by plot with annual means)

		Current Plot Data (MY5 2014)	
E290-LMG-0002 E290-L	MG-0003 E290-LMG-0004	E290-LMG-0005 E290-LMG-0	0006 E290-LMG-0007 E290-LMG-0008 E290-LMG-0009
PnoLS P-all T PnoLS P-	III T PnoLS P-all T	PnoLS P-all T PnoLS P-all	T PnoLS P-all T PnoLS P-all T PnoLS P-all T
8	10		
1		1	
3		9	
1 1 1	6 6	6	
4		6	13
10 2 2 2	1 1	3	5 5 6 3 3 3 1 1
3 7		1 1	
9 4 4 4 1	1 1 6 6	6	
			4
		6 6 6 4 4	4
4 8 8 8 4	4 4 2 2	2 6 6 6 11 11	
72 82	40	73 30	39 24 34
	1 1	1	
	1 1	1	
2	6 6	6	
	1 1	1	5 5 5 3 3
00 15 15 120 5	5 55 24 24 ⁻	107 12 12 52 15 15	80 11 11 36 18 18 52 15 15 ⁻
1	1 1		
0.02 0	.02 0.02	0.02 0.02	0.02 0.02 0.02
6 4 4 10 2	2 4 8 8		
6.9 607.03 607.03 4856 2 202 34 20	2.34 2225.8 971 25 971 25 43?		3237.5 445.15 445.15 1456.9 728.43 728.43 2104 4 607.03 607.03 416
6 6.9 607	4 4 10 2 7.03 607.03 4856.2 202.34 202		4 10 2 2 4 8 8 12 2 2 5 2 2 7.03 607.03 4856.2 202.34 202.34 225.8 971.25 971.25 4330.1 485.62 485.62 2104.4 607.03 607.03

Site	Species	Planted	MY5 Total
Site 6	Taxodium distichum	40	27

Color for Density Exceeds requirements by 10% Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10%

Fails to meet requirements

UT to Lilliput Creek (Hog Branch Ponds) Stream and Wetland Restoration Project (EEP #290) March 6, 2015 Year 5 of 5 Monitoring Report

Opposite Supposite Supposite <th< th=""><th>969</th><th>969</th><th>695.3</th><th>1549</th><th>461.3</th><th>461.3</th><th>1688</th><th>420.9</th><th>420.9</th><th>4840</th><th>5.405</th><th>5.402</th><th>8236</th><th>7.626</th><th>323.7</th><th>0187</th><th>323.7</th><th>7.626</th><th>9199</th><th>6.181</th><th>6.181</th><th>4492</th><th>889</th><th>889</th><th>2789</th><th>364.2</th><th>364.2</th><th>7042</th><th>485.6</th><th>482.6</th><th>er ACRE</th><th>g smət2</th><th></th></th<>	969	969	695.3	1549	461.3	461.3	1688	420.9	420.9	4840	5.405	5.402	8236	7.626	323.7	0187	323.7	7.626	9199	6.181	6.181	4492	889	889	2789	364.2	364.2	7042	485.6	482.6	er ACRE	g smət2	
	2	L	L	91	L	L	58	L	L	97	6	6	6	٢	٢	8	٢	٢	11	١	١	6	2	2	6	٢	L	6	٢	٢	anoo sə	i ɔəq 2	
		72.0			76.0			76.0			75.0			20.0			20.0			20.02			20.02			20.0			20.0		(ACRES)	əzis	
		11			91			91			91			ŀ			L			ŀ			٢			ŀ			ŀ		ze (ares)	is	
	186	681	681	493	171	171	5498	120	120	₽671	781	781	511	8	8	163	8	8	191	4	4	111	21	L٢	536	6	6	774	15	15	ຸງunoວ ພະ	Ste	
	ľ									52									13						6						Shrub	honeycup	sidon9Z
							54																								Shrub	Elliott's blueberry	Vaccinium elliottii
(ivi) : (ivi)							132			121									12						100			90			Shrub	highbush blueberry	πυεοάπγιος πυίπιςςεν
Construction				72			6																								Shrub		muinicoeV
										6	6	6																			Tree	psld cypress	mudoiteib muiboxeT
							9			9												9									shrub	flameleaf sumac	munilleqoo sudЯ
	55	55	52	50	50	50	S۱	9L	S٢	15	21	15																			Tree	overcup oak	Quercus lyrata
	9	9	9	G	G	G	١	١	L	١	١	٢																			Tree	laurel oak	Quercus laurifolia
Markaneria Markanerintetet Markanerine	9	9	9	L	L	L	3	3	3	4	4	4																			Tree		Quercus
Scale of the state State <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>82</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>455</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>199</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>53</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>S۱</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>4</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>48</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>91</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>L</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Тгее</td> <td>loblolly pine</td> <td>ebaet zuni9</td>				82			455			199			53			S۱			4			48			91			L			Тгее	loblolly pine	ebaet zuni9
See shore by the serve by the ser	9לי	7 9	4 9	82	63	63	115	88	88	54	5 4	54										6	6	6							Tree	əniq bnoq	Pinus serotina
Scientific Anno Common Name Special T Nucl S rank Nu	17	۱L	17	69	69	69	4 9	63	63	69	69	69	8	8	8	8	8	8	4	4	4	8	8	8	6	6	6	15	15	15	Тгее	longleaf pine	eintsuliad suni9
Speciality (Marked)				92																											eent	yed qmews	Persea palustris
See allower							164			102			9			01			43			9			15			52			eent	гедрау	Persea borbonia
Scale Scale <t< td=""><td>-</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>50</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>ЭэтТ</td><td>plackgum</td><td>esitevlys essyN</td></t<>	-						50																								ЭэтТ	plackgum	esitevlys essyN
Specific trans Specif	٢	١	١	2	2	2	2	2	2	50	52	53																			ЭэтТ	swamp tupelo	Nyssa biflora
iganonic information Specific Annow Specific Annonnonnow Specific Annononnow							G																								ЭэлТ	oləqut	essyN
Construction				6٤			105			٥٥٢						30			01			21			9			9L			sprub	wax myrtle	Morella cerifera
Consistentic Name Specifie Specifie <td>91</td> <td>9٤</td> <td>9l</td> <td>G٢</td> <td>9L</td> <td>9L</td> <td>100</td> <td>14</td> <td>14</td> <td>31</td> <td>21</td> <td>21</td> <td>١</td> <td></td> <td>Tree</td> <td>sweetbay</td> <td>Magnolia virginiana</td>	91	9٤	9l	G٢	9L	9L	100	14	14	31	21	21	١																		Tree	sweetbay	Magnolia virginiana
Scientification Specification Speci							100			01			01																		Shrub	pt staggerbush	εneinem einoγλ
Solution				12			120			40												13			4						Shrub	fetterbush lyonia	εbiɔul εinoγλ
3< 2 2 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3										8	8	8																			Shrub	comn winterberry	llex verticillata
Scatter <				<u>9</u> 9			524			201			99			945			12			3			33			21			Shrub	inkberry	llex glabra
Common Name Specific Name </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>99l</td> <td></td> <td>Shrub</td> <td>large gallberry</td> <td>llex coriacea</td>							99l																								Shrub	large gallberry	llex coriacea
Splitzability Splitzability<							3			S			٢			4															Shrub	uooyep	enisses xell
Species E290-LMG control E290-LMG contro E290-LMG control E290-LMG							3			4									7												tree	loblolly bay	Sordonia lasianthus
Multiple Specific Name Specific Nam Specific Name Specific Name							203			140			90												90			30			Shrub	pine huckleberry	esobnort eisessulyee
Second field (since) Specifie (since)	ľ				1		152			100						08			50				1				1		1	1	Shrub	dwarf huckleberry	esomub eisessulyeð
Consist (1) Common Name				945			138			611			29						51	ſ								21			Shrub	itit qmsws	Cyrilla racemiflora
Nonicitie Specifie Specifie <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>G</td><td></td><td></td><td>15</td><td></td><td></td><td>01</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>l</td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td><td>01</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td><td>Ī</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Shrub</td><td>sweet pepperbush</td><td>clethra alnifolia</td></t<>				G			15			01					l		1		01				1		Ī						Shrub	sweet pepperbush	clethra alnifolia
Cell fullition Cell					1					٢				1			1			1		L			Ī		1		1	1	Shrub	red chokeberry	Aronia arbutitudia sinoiA
Cell fullition Cell	ľ				1		38L							1			1			1					Ī		1		1	1	Shrub		sinorA
2becies E290-FWG-0010 E250-FWG-0011 E250-FWG-0013 E250-FWG-0014 E250-FWG-0012 MA2 (2014) MA2 (2013) MA2 (2013)				9			2			2						٢												١			Тгее	red maple	Acer rubrum
2 ^{becies} E230-FWG-0010 E230-FWG-0011 E230-FWG-0013 E230-FWG-0014 E230-FWG-0014 E230-FWG-0019 WA2 (2014) WA2 (2013) WA2 (2013)	T	ll6-q	PnoL	L	P-all	Slong	L	lle-	A SJong	T	P-all	SJong	T	P-all	SJong	L	ll6-q	Slong		T ll6-c	PnoLS	T	ll6-q	PnoLS F	I .	T II6-9	Slong	L	ll6-q	Slong			Scientific Name
	۱)	102) 201	W	(7							۲5 (201 [,]	W	012							-гме-о	E290	015			_	00-9М1-0	E290	010			Species		

March 6, 2015 Year 5 of 5 Monitoring Report UT to Lilliput Creek (Hog Branch Ponds) Stream and Wetland Restoration Project (EEP #290)

Fails to meet requirements

Color for Density Exceeds requirements by 10% Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10%

Table 9 contd.Planted and total stem counts (species by plot with annual means)

Appendix D. Stream Survey Data

Project Na	ame		UT to Lil	liput]													
Watershe	d		Lilliput, N	/IY5														
Cross Se	ction		1S															
Drainage	Area		66.94 ac															
Date			12/15/20	14														
Crew			Paramou	unte														State of the second
	uilt Surv			10 Surve			11 Surve			12 Surve			3 Surve			14 Survey		The Part of the Pa
Station	Elev	Notes		Elev	Notes	Station	Elev	Notes		Elev	Notes	Station	Elev	Notes		Elev	Notes	
0 5.13	48.83 48.35		0 0.09	48.89 48.53		N/A			0 1.83	48.89 48.13		0 24.2	48.89 48.4		0.00 3.99	48.89 48.27		
10.36	48.28		2.48	48.37					22.17	47.92		50.48	47.77		8.31	48.00		
20.86	48.11		7.88	48.05					39.42	48.2		66.97	47.66		15.78	48.24		
21.1	48.12		13.38	48.19					57.06	48.01		81.76	47.92		23.30	48.20		
32.36	48.01		19.37	48.18					76.66	48.24		95.15	47.52		31.09	48.19		Southern Tributary Station 29+00 - SCX1
56.25	48.16		19.65	48.02					89.37	48.94		114.18	47.87		39.26	48.27		Looking downstream
59.59 61.65	48.68 48.52		24.16 25.16	48.13 48.27								138.24	48.84		48.35 57.44	48.26 48.36		
62.67	48.89		30.04	48.3											65.56	48.30 48.21		
63.92	48.96		35.14	48.33											74.00	48.48		
64.23	48.96		39.71	48.1											78.76	48.83		
			44.64	48.11											85.88	48.61		
			45.56	47.97											89.60	48.94		
			47.38 51.71	47.92 48.19														
			56.59	48.19														
			57.23	48.47														
			64	48.77														
			64.52	49.12														<u> </u>
									C			ut 2014 N - Souther		tarv				
52	2									1033 00		- Souther		tai y				
5																		
50																		
Elevation (ft)																		
										×		¥ –		N A			;	* * *
48 ex	8 +*		-											<u> </u>		×		× ×
ū 47	7 🕂																	~
46	<u>a</u>																	
4										I				1				1
	0				2	0				40				60)			80 100
											[Distance (ft)					
						[- -	s-Built	—∎— Ye	ear 201	0 📥	Year 20	12 →	Yea	r 2013 -	- 	ar 201	4
						l								-				

Project N Watershe Cross Se Drainage Date Crew	ed ection		UT to Lill Lilliput, M 2S 66.94 ac 12/15/20 Paramou	1Y 5 14																	
	ouilt Surv			10 Survey	,	20	1 Survey	,	20	12 Surve	v	201	13 Surve	v	20	14 Survey		A REAL PROPERTY OF LAND	APAC SUCCES	和45.45月1日,194	
Station	Elev	Notes		Elev	Notes	Station	Elev	Notes	Station	Elev	Notes	Station	Elev	y Notes	Station		Notes	THE STATE OF THE STATE	The state	The second second	the state of the
0 16.25 16.73 16.75	52.28 52.13 52.13 52.12		0 0.14 13.46 19.73	52.68 52.48 52.61 52.4		N/A			0 15.68 29.88 48.66	52.68 52.51 51.85 50.39		0 30.63 43.6 60.46	52.68 52.55 51.66 50.29		0.00 6.79 15.78 25.69 34.00	52.68 52.81 52.58 52.18 51.33					
16.75 17.26 20 22.07 53.26	52.12 52.46 52.32 52.18 49.8		29.04 38.91 47 53.77 58.97	51.8 51.04 50.55 50.19 49.96					73.52 93.16 105.09 125.19 139.15	50.25 50.24 50.21 49.98 50.22		92 115.47 154.32 171.03 185.26	50.52 49.91 50.02 51.42 52.54		42.44 50.81 61.29 71.79	50.76 50.16 50.45 50.51					19-14/2010 J.
53.29 53.99 54.12 72.82	49.79 49.8 49.8 49.66		63.53 68.72 76.4 77.52	49.95 49.86 49.7 49.7					156.49 181.4 197.68	51.1 52.68 52.99		223.2	52.03		82.78 94.27 103.18 113.36	50.51 50.22 50.29 50.27		Southern Tributar Looking downstre		+00 - SCX2	
96.93 121.79 124.01 149.28	49.81 49.9 49.92 49.87		77.81 79.02 82.05 88.99	49.7 49.82 49.89 49.83											121.78 130.25 141.96 152.21	50.01 50.45 50.64 51.26					
149.91 150.07 150.16 172.65 172.69	49.85 49.85 49.86 51.89 51.9		91.67 96.79 101.16 103.95 106.66	49.93 50.05 50.05 49.91 50											162.79 174.39 185.64 194.22 198.50	51.83 52.71 53.21 53.13 53.4					
172.91 197.64	51.9 52.26		107.92 116.14 123.16 137.55 144.13	50 50 50 50.1 49.98																	
			151.32 158.29	50.21 50.77					Cro			ut 2014 I - Southe		utary							
54	3	K		*													*	* ***			
52 51 50 49	1 <u></u>				*			K	*	*		<u>*~</u> *(1	*	*	*	*				X	
₩ 48 47 46	3		1		1					1		1				1					
	0		20	4	0	60)	80)	100		120 Distance (ft)	140		160		180 20	0	220	240
						-	As-Bi	uilt 🚽	- 2010	Survey		2012 Surv	/ey →	2013	Survey	— Ж — 20	14 Su	vey			

Project Name Watershed Cross Section Drainage Area Date Crew Station Elev 0 52.17 14.6 51.94 16.72 51.93 31.45 52.07 37.34 52.05 61.46 51.27 64.43 51.42 65.32 51.1 65.95 51.97 70.21 51.99 102.27 51.5 117.25 51.23 130.06 51.43 146.95 51.56 148.06 51.12 160.4 52.6 180.84 53.84		MY 5 c 014 unte	10 Survey Elev Note 51.9 51.63 51.71 51.73 51.38 51.56 51.63 51.7 51.52 51.65 51.87 51.55 51.61 51.67 51.48 51.44 51.57 51.61 51.65 51.82 51.65 51.82 51.65 51.82 51.67 51.67 51.67 51.82 51.67 51.82 51.78 51.67 51.82 51.78 51.67 51.9 52.37 52.37		11 Survey Elev Notes	2012 Survey Station Elev Notes 0 51.9 57.68 51.13 57.68 51.13 81.06 51.42 105.87 51.23 119.46 51.26 139.7 51.46 158.69 51.49 170.14 52.45 184.01 53.11 188.8 53.27	2013 Survey Station Elev Notes 0 51.90 26.74 51.74 37.57 51.29 68.47 51.31 95.17 51.44 120.22 51.19 147.84 51.67 163.07 52.74 179.56 53.40 53.40	2014 Survey Station Elev Notes 0 51.9 6.69 51.45 15.48 51.33 27.6 51.53 41.31 51.74 46.94 51.38 57.95 51.42 73.23 51.51 96.85 51.26 109.91 51.45 109.91 51.45 121.16 51.48 134.1 51.63 144.38 51.59 152.71 51.65 159.15 52.06 166.88 52.33 176.72 53.19 183.87 53.16 190.07 53.25	Southern Tributary Station 2 Looking upstream	23+00 - SCX3
		157.97 166.56 179.84	52.69 53.26 53.37				put 2014 MY5 3 - Southern Tributary			
55 54 53 53 52 52 51 51 50 49 48	*	*				*	─ ★		***	***
48 +		20		40	60 → As-Built		100 12 Distance (ft) - 2012 Survey ————————————————————————————————————	20 140 3 Survey — X —2014 Sur	160 vey	180 200

Project N Watershe Cross Se Drainage Date Crew	ed ction	UT to I Lilliput 4S 66.94 a 12/15/2 Param	, MY 5 ac 2014 ounte	10 Survey		2011 Survey		20	12 Survey	<i>.</i>	201	3 Surve		20	14 Survey			- Contraction of the second		Alas et	
As-b Station 0 8.78 15.36 17.37 19.1 19.91 35.85 36.47 38.08 69.9 72.79 74.41 76.19 98.88 119.88 120 139.03 139.26 145.55 169.51 187.17	Elev 54.74 54.73 54.69 54.68 54.61 55.16 53.8 53.79 53.88 53.79 53.88 53.79 53.73 53.73 53.73 53.64 53.16 53.33 54.39 54.41 54.6 55.24 55.22	Notes	20 Station 0 0.15 17.5 21.43 28.11 32.8 36.68 41.24 44.17 50.87 59.07 67.83 72.61 79.17 87.63 94.53 96.31 104.06 111.12 116.5 125.49 132.75 135.77 145.16 158.45 168.6 183.97 184.25		otes Statio N/A		Notes	20 Station 0 6.33 36.15 53.37 69.3 90.73 115.5 135.78 156.2 173.52 187.72	12 Survey Elev 55.16 54.68 54.56 54.32 53.36 53.85 54 54.12 54.82 55	y Notes	Station 0 27.46 38.37 55.37 74.51 110.95 135.98 163.09 173.84 186.1 211.71	3 Surve Elev 54.74 55.17 54.84 54.57 53.94 54.04 54.2 54.29 54.57 55.32 55.44	y Notes	20 Station 0.00 0.14 8.87 16.69 25.95 31.64 38.13 45.49 52.15 59.49 64.10 69.46 75.54 82.13 90.36 97.33 106.81 114.84 123.23 133.98 146.27 158.93 167.81 180.02 189.07	,		Southern T Looking do		ation 15+0	0 - SCX4	
								Cro			out 2014 - South		butary	,							
56 55 54 52 53 52	5	*	***	* * *		***		**	×	*	***			*	*	*	*	*	*	×	
ш 32 5 ⁷ 50	1		20	2	40	60		80		100	Distance	120 (ft)		140		160		180	20	00	220
						As	-Built -	- 201	0 Survey	/	2012 Sur	vey →	(2013	Survey	—————————————————— 2014	4 Surv	ey				

Cross Section N Drainage Area 52 Date 12	illiput, MY5 I1 2.49 2/15/2014 Paramounte															
As-built Survey		2010 Survey	1	201	11 Surve	y	20	12 Survey	/	201	13 Surve	y	20	14 Surve	/	
Station Elev N 0 55.56 0.07 55.39 0.44 55.37 12.86 54.82 13.14 54.81 13.25 54.79 13.25 54.79 13.25 54.79 13.25 54.79 13.25 54.79 13.25 54.79 26.79 53.49 26.8 53.48 46.12 53.15 48.76 53.13 51.88 53.31 72.8 53.31 72.8 53.31 73.23 53.38 91.32 54.6 94.69 54.84 99.22 55 109.11 55.28 55.28	Notes Statio 0 0.02 10.28 15.58 23.87 31.33 31.33 36.96 40.17 44.95 48.35 52.86 59.18 67.07 71.5 78.4 86.66 97.03 108.6 108.3	55.49 55.37 55 54.61 53.95 53.41 53.42 53.42 53.42 53.42 53.13 53.29 52.91 53.26 53.28 53.39 53.29 53.29 53.28 53.39 53.99 54.78 55.2 2 55.1	Notes	Station N/A	Elev	Notes	Station 0 5.42 19.6 38.05 53.38 65.41 79.37 90.2 95.19 102.26 108.67	Elev 55.49 55.09 55.07 53.42 53.26 53.03 53.59 54.4 54.66 55.3 55.65	Notes	Station 0 21.74 32.14 52.59 74.14 89.88	Elev 55.49 53.71 53.34 53.44 53.73 55.15	Notes	Station 0.00 5.54 12.87 21.31 27.27 32.01 35.75 42.94 49.50 59.07 65.86 73.78 80.25 85.71 92.48 100.31 104.09 110.03	Elev 55.49 55.06 55.33 54.93 54.7 54.1 53.37 53.37 53.39 53.4 53.32 54.01 53.32 54.01 54.7 55.66		Northern Tributary Station 28+25 - NCX1 Looking downstream



UT to Lilliput Creek (Hog Branch Ponds) Stream and Wetland Restoration Project - EEP No. 290 March 6, 2015 - Monitoring Year 5 of 5

As-built Survey 2010 Survey 2011 Survey 2012 Survey 2013 Survey 2014 Station Elev Notes Station														, MY5 2014	UT to I Lilliput N2 52.49 12/15/2 Param	ied ection	Project I Watersh Cross S Drainage Date Crew
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	2014 Survey	20	у	13 Surve	20	у	12 Surve	20	ey	11 Surve	20	у	10 Surve			built Sur	
148.67 55.15 189.88 55.83 144.48 153.42 164.18 174.51	n Elev Notes 56.24 56.05 3 56.03 3 55.88 9 55.92 0 55.56 3 55.92 1 55.10 3 55.22 1 55.10 3 53.84 5 53.97 4 53.70 4 53.70 4 53.70 4 53.70 4 53.99 9 54.16 9 53.92 2 53.93 5 54.10 8 54.63 2 55.32 8 55.32 8 55.32 8 55.38 1 56.44	Station 0.00 6.72 14.83 22.88 30.69 38.10 45.93 52.31 59.68 64.93 70.25 74.84 83.34 93.15 102.59 112.24 118.39 125.89 134.12 140.55 144.48 153.42 164.18 174.51	-	Elev 56.24 56.08 54.17 54.07 53.98 54.06	Station 0 24.17 52.41 68.69 93.47 117.51		Elev 56.24 56.06 55.51 54.89 53.97 54 53.92 53.98 54.13 55.52 56.45	Station 0 19.65 39.64 56.16 65.04 87.21 108.58 117.63 139.66 157.3 170.66	-		Station		Elev 56.24 55.95 56.26 55.43 55 54.29 53.88 53.74 53.74 53.74 53.74 53.72 53.69 53.59 53.59 53.51 53.88 54.73 55.15	Station 0 0.1 12.95 24.5 32.94 40.64 48.75 52.86 59.07 67.53 75.47 83.29 94.51 108.93 117.04 120.29 125.76 136.35 148.67		Elev 56.28 55.61 55.64 53.79 53.48 53.37 53.48 53.52 53.59 53.32 53.25 53.25 54.63 54.82	Station 0 0.4 24.51 47.03 53.04 56.82 77.6 84.09 96.35 109.63 109.63 117.34 120.85 144.04 147.08



Northern Tributary Station 21+00 - NCX2 Looking downstream



Project N Watershe Cross Se Drainage Date Crew	ed ection	UT to Lilliput N3 52.49 12/15/ Param	, MY 5 2014																	
As-b	ouilt Surv	vey	20	10 Survey		2011 Surv			12 Surve			3 Surve			14 Survey		a starting			中國科
Station 0 24.05 24.89 38.04 38.91 42.7 50.97 69.64 73.57 101.27 106.16 130.28 159.93	Elev 55.98 55.25 55.21 54.48 54.52 54.43 54.17 53.88 53.79 53.92 54.5 55.84 55.89	Notes		Elev N 55.88 55.89 55.68 55.15 54.08 54.1 54.15 54.28 54.12 54.28 54.22 54.22 54.20 54.2 54.2 54.2 54.2 54.2 54.45 54.52 55.14 55.54 56.09	otes Sta N		Notes	Station 0 5.22 24.55 37.87 53 74.84 97.72 115.63 137.54 148.2 160.55	Elev 55.88 55.45 55.54 55.54 54.05 54.05 53.75 54.26 55.4 55.59 56.03	Notes	Station 0 27.48 40.08 58.27 78.15 103.85 122.88 146.11 172.04	Elev 55.88 55.6 55.25 54.14 53.86 54.48 55.44 55.29	Notes	Station 0.00 6.72 14.15 23.54 30.05 38.13 46.25 53.06 57.20 62.94 69.65 76.51 84.30 93.84 101.58 109.10 120.25 126.61 133.47 143.84 154.49 160.36	Elev Not 55.88 55.36 55.62 55.66 55.40 55.09 54.79 54.08 53.84 53.92 54.02 54.02 54.02 54.04 53.88 53.86 53.81 54.17 54.47 54.93 55.24 55.48 55.65 55.98	Northe	ern Tributary St og upstream	ation 21+00 - N	NCX3	
								Cros		-	ut 2014 - North		ibutar	у						
Elevation (ft) C C C C C	67 66 55 64 63 62 61	*	**	***		*	**		K<u>∲</u>—— ∦		* *	**			*			*		
5	io — 0		20		40		60		80		100 Distance	(ft)	12	20	140		160	180	20	00
						<i>F</i>	s-Built	 201	0 Surve	y —	2012 Sur	vey →	(2013	Survey ·	———————————————— 2014 S	urvey				

Project Name Watershed Cross Section Drainage Area Date Crew		UT to Lilliput Lilliput, MY 5 N4 52.49 12/15/2014 Paramounte																Kans		
As-te Station 0 0.18 35.09 37.17 37.2 37.3 57.19 60.55 60.72 63.06 100.42 101.05 101.29 105.71 107.01 126.47 132.17 136 152.86 154.15 176.01 176.22 176.36 191.03	Juilt Sur Elev 56.02 55.59 55.59 55.59 55.59 54.25 54.09 54.12 54.08 54.03 54.03 54.03 54.04 54.05 54.07 54.08 54.09 54.28 53.98 54.04 55.13 55.13 55.58	vey Notes		10 Surve; Elev 56.16 55.97 55.63 55.34 55.14 54.77 54.61 54.62 54.41 54.62 54.43 54.64 54.65 54.43 54.64 54.43 54.54 54.32 54.33 54.52 54.97 55.64 56.11 56.14	V Notes	20 Station N/A	11 Surve Elev	y Notes	20 Station 0 9.34 19.18 34.04 46.13 64.29 84.27 103.46 119.05 136.67 157.47 174.57 189.8 199.27	12 Surve Elev 56.16 55.57 55.08 54.6 54.58 54.5 54.47 54.49 54.53 55.91 56.07 55.86 56.13	y Notes	207 Station 0 22.64 52.36 73.03 105.57 120.37 137.68 152.11 168.49 197.97	3 Survey Elev 56.02 55.27 54.81 54.78 54.97 55.66 56.13 56.22 55.85	, Notes	20 Station 0.00 5.55 15.77 23.79 33.46 45.60 47.94 55.71 63.04 71.36 80.48 89.46 99.91 110.32 120.38 130.33 139.96 147.21 154.95 161.24 169.66 179.08 185.96 193.90 199.39	14 Survey Elev 56.02 55.88 55.53 54.76 54.38 54.03 54.2 54.38 54.4 54.38 54.4 54.38 54.4 54.38 54.4 54.33 54.22 54.4 54.35 54.4 53.98 54.4 55.52 55.81 55.87 55.5 55.81	Notes	Northern Tributary Station Looking downstream	14+00 - NCX4	
									Cros		-	ut 2014 - North		butar	у					
Elevation (Ft) 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	7 -	*-	*	*	*	***	×	**	**		*				*	×		***	*	* *
5	1 +		20		4	0		60		80		100 Distance ((ft)	12	0	14	0	160	180	200
						-	- As	-Built –	▲ 201	0 Survey	/ 	2012 Surv	vey -×	-2013	Survey -	* 201	4 Surv	ey		

UT to Lilliput Stream and Wetland Restoration Project Longitudinal Profile Northern Tributary



UT to Lilliput Stream and Wetland Restoration Project Longitudinal Profile Southern Tributary



Appendix E. Hydrologic Data



UT to Lilliput Stream and Wetland Restoration Project 30 & 70 Percentile Graph for Rainfall in 2014



Gauge 1 (B6518F6) Groundwater Levels 2014



Gauge 2 (14E1825C) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #2 (14E1825C) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge #3 (B652289) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 4 (B6523B9) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #4 (B6523B9) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 5 (B6B4FA5) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #5 (B6B4FA5) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge

Elevation (in)



Gauge 6 (B651839) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #6 (B651839) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 7 (B651949) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #7 (B651949) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 8 (B652394) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #8 (B652394) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 9 (B6B86AA) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #9 (B6B86AA) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 10 (11312C28) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #10 (11312C28) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge

Elevation (in)



Gauge 11 (B6522DB) Groundwater Levels 2014



Gauge 12 (14E195A9) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #12 (14E195A9) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 13 (B65180A) Groundwater Levels 2014

Elevation (in)


Gauge 14 (B65170F) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #14 (B65170F) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 15 (B6B7D86) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #15 (B6B7D86) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 16 (B651747) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #16 (B651747) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 17 (B65188E) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #17 (B65188E) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 18 (B6B4FE1) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #18 (B6B4FE1) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 19 (10FADD7F) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #19 (10FADD7F) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 20 (136AF38D) Groundwater Levels 2014



Gauge 21 (AB372F9) Groundwater Levels 2014

 KSUT Raingauge Gauge #21 (AB372F9) 12in Below Surface



Gauge 22 (B65191F) Groundwater Levels 2014

KSUT Raingauge Gauge #22 (B65191F) 12in Below Surface



Gauge 23 (136B1B1A) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #23 (136B1B1A) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 24 (EBD7242) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #24 (EBD7242) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 25 (1130EE20) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #25 (1130EE20) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 26 (A27A7B0) Groundwater Levels 2014



Gauge 27 (EBD3F40) Groundwater Levels 2014

Elevation (in)

Gauge #27 (EBD3F40) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Gauge 28 (113137D2) Groundwater Levels 2014

Gauge #28 (113137D2) KSUT Raingauge 12in Below Surface

Reference Gauge G1 (B65180F) Groundwater Levels 2014





Reference Gauge G2 (B652305) Groundwater Levels 2014

Ref Gauge GND #2 (B652305) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge



Reference Gauge G3 (B6522EB) Groundwater Levels 2014

Ref Gauge GND #3 (B6522EB) 12in Below Surface KSUT Raingauge

Reference Gauge G4 (131528E9) Groundwater Levels 2014



Reference Gauge G5 (11313D1E) Groundwater Levels 2014



Reference Gauge G6 (11313D00) Groundwater Levels 2014



Reference Stream Gauge (B65233C) Water Levels 2014



Elevation (in)

Stream Gauge 1 (B65181E) Water Levels 2014



-Ground Surface _____Gauge #1_S (B65181E) _____KSUT Raingauge

Stream Gauge 2 (B6B8038) Water Levels 2014



Elevation (in)

Ground Surface Gauge #2_S (B6B8038) KSUT Raingauge

Stream Gauge 3 (B6B5189D) Water Levels 2014



Stream Gauge 4 (13D4BB96) Water Levels 2014



Ground Surface Gauge #4_S (13D4BB96) KSUT Raingauge

Stream Gauge 5 (1130DB70) Water Levels 2014



Stream Gauge 6 (B651794) Water Levels 2014



Stream Gauge 7 (B6516eB) Water Levels 2014



Ground Surface Gauge #7_S (B6516EB) KSUT Raingauge

Stream Gauge 8 (B6518D8) Water Levels 2014



C	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)
1	Yes/43 days	Yes/108 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/93 days	Yes/148 days
1	(16%)	(40%)	(45%)	(35%)	(55%)
2	Yes/68 days	Yes/126 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/268 days	Yes/161 days
	(25%)	(47%)	(45%)	100%)	(60%)
3	Yes/44 days	Yes/127 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/107 days	Yes/157 days
	(16%)	(47%)	(45%)	(40%)	(58%)
4	Yes/43 days	Yes/126 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/104 days	Yes/148 days
	(16%)	(47%)	(45%)	(39%)	(55%)
5 6	Yes/43 days	Yes/126 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/197 days	Yes/161 days
	-	(47%)	(45%)	(73%)	(60%)
	(16%) Vas/62 dava	Yes/126 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/198 days	Yes/161 days
	Yes/63 days	•	-	-	-
	(24%)	(47%) Vac/126 dama	(45%)	(74%)	(60%)
7	Yes/42 days	Yes/126 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/194 days	Yes/161 days
	(16%)	(47%)	(45%)	725%)	(60%)
8	Yes/42 days	Yes/125 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/104 days	Yes/148 days
	(16%)	(47%)	(45%)	(39%)	(55%)
9	Yes/58 days	Yes/125 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/101 days	Yes/116 days
	(22%)	(47%)	(45%)	(37%)	(43%)
10	Yes/36 days	Yes/33 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/72 days	Yes/64 days
	(14%)	(12%)	(45%)	(27%)	(24%)
11	Yes/57 days	Yes/106 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/97 days	Yes/69 days
	(22%)	(40%)	(45%)	(36%)	(26%)
12	Yes/33 days	No/23 days	Yes/31 days	Yes/69 days	Yes/62 days
	(13%)	(9%)	(12%)	(26%)	(23%)
13	Yes/36 days	No/23 days	Yes/31 days	Yes/69 days	Yes/61 days
	(13%)	(9%)	(12%)	(26%)	(23%)
	Yes/40 days	Yes/116 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/84 days	Yes/116 days
14	(16%)	(43%)	(45%)	(31%)	(42%)
	Yes/41 days	Yes/126 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/102 days	Yes/148 days
15	•	(47%)	(45%)	(37%)	(55%)
16	(16%)		Yes/121 days	Yes/104 days	Yes/148 days
	Yes/57 days	Yes/99 days		(39%)	-
	(22%)	(37%)	(45%)		(55%)
17	Yes/43 days	Yes/99 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/73 days	Yes/72 days
	(16%)	(37%)	(45%)	(27%)	(27%)
18	Yes/126 days	Yes/126 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/167 days
	(47%)	(47%)	(45%)	(45%)	(62%)
19	Yes/63 days	Yes/126 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/178 days	Yes/161 days
	(24%)	(47%)	(45%)	(66%)	(60%)
20	Yes/32 days	Yes/116 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/196 days	Yes/116 days
	(13%)	(43%)	(45%)	(73%)	(42%)
21	Installed 12/10	No/19 days	Yes/31 days	Yes/68 days	Yes/59 days
	Instaneu 12/10	(7%)	(12%)	(25%)	(22%)
22	In stalls 1 12/10	No/19 days	Yes/34 days	Yes/67 days	Yes/54 days
	Installed 12/10	(7%)	(13%)	(25%)	(20%)
23		Yes/116 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/74 days	Yes/67 days
	Installed 12/10	(43%)	(45%)	(28%)	(25%)
24		Yes/109 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/73 days	Yes/65 days
	Installed 12/10	(41%)	(45%)	(28%)	(24%)
25 26	l	Yes/74 days	(43%) Yes/121 days	Yes/84 days	Yes/68 days
	Installed 12/10	-	(45%)	(31%)	(25%)
		(28%)			
	Installed 12/10	No/25 days	No/22 days	Yes/62 days	Yes/35 days
	ļ	(9%)	(8%)	(23%)	(13%)
27	Installed 12/10	No/25 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/70 days	Yes/63 days
		(9%)	(45%)	(26%)	(23%)
28	Installed 12/10	Yes/40 days	Yes/121 days	Yes/72 days	Yes/64 days
-0	mouneu 12/10	(15%)	(45%)	(27%)	(24%)

Table 10. Wetland gauge attainment data