YEAR 4 ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT FINAL Year 5 Post Planting UT to Falls Lake (McDaniel Farm) Riparian Buffer and Nutrient Offset Mitigation Project Durham County, North Carolina NC Division of Mitigation Services Project #: 95389

#### Neuse River Basin 03020201

DWR #: 2015-0634





Mitigation Services

Prepared for and by: NC Department of Environmental Quality Division of Mitigation Services 1652 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1652

December 2020

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Project Summary	.1
2.0	Performance Standards	.1
	Monitoring Plan.	
	3.1 Reporting	
	3.2 Vegetation Monitoring	
4.0	Maintenance & Contingency Plan	2
5.0	Year 3 Annual Monitoring	2

### Appendices

Appendix A. Background Tables

Table 1 Project Components

Table 2 Project Activity & Reporting

- Table 3 Project Contacts
- Table 4 Project Attributes

#### Appendix B. Visual Assessment Data

Figure 1 Vicinity Map

Figure 2 Asset Map

Figure 3 Current Condition Plan View

Site Photos

Table 5 Vegetation Condition Assessment

Appendix C. Vegetation Plot Data

Table 6 Planted Tree Species

Table 7 Planted and Total Stems

### **1.0 PROJECT SUMMARY**

NC Division of Mitigation Services (DMS) implemented the **UT to Falls Lake (McDaniel Farm) Project** (Project) to fulfill riparian buffer mitigation needs in the Neuse 03020201 Catalog Unit and nutrient offset mitigation needs in the Upper Falls Lake Watershed in accordance with the NC Division of Water Resources (DWR) Temporary Buffer Mitigation Rule (15A NCAC 02B .0295) effective October 24, 2014.

This project site is located off Benny Ross Road in Durham County approximately 7.5 miles east of the City of Durham and is within the Upper Falls Lake Watershed (Appendix B, Figure 1). The site is within the Lick Creek watershed (HU 3020201050030) which is comprised of sub-watersheds draining to Lick Creek, its tributary Rocky Branch, Laurel Creek, and unnamed tributaries to Falls Lake. Falls Lake is a drinking water supply watershed with additional nutrient restrictions regulated by the North Carolina Division of Water Resources. The site is in NC DWR's 03-04-01 sub-basin.

Riparian buffer mitigation activities occur along the Project from top of bank and extending out to 200 feet, resulting in a maximum of 9.67 acres (421,385 ft<sup>2</sup>) of riparian buffer and/or nutrient offset mitigation through planting and preservation of 10.86 acres of forested buffer easement along the main unnamed tributary to Falls Lake and several water conveyances that flow to UT to Falls Lake. Refer to Appendix A, Table 1 for project mitigation components and Appendix B, Figure 2 for the project component/asset map. Due to the site's location within the Upper Falls Lake Watershed, nutrient offset mitigation from this site can only be provided to offset impacts from development within the Falls Lake Watershed. In addition, riparian buffer mitigation from this site can be used to offset permitted impacts according to the Temporary Rule (15A NCAC 02B .0295) effective October 24, 2014.

The following goals of this riparian buffer/nutrient offset mitigation project are to address stressors identified in the Project watershed through the restoration of riparian buffers along the UT and its conveyances.

- Removing nonpoint sources of pollution associated with agricultural activities
- Reducing sedimentation onsite and downstream

The success of these goals are based on the following objectives;

- Removal of horses and goats from riparian areas;
- Reducing the application of agricultural materials into and adjacent to streams;
- Establishing a vegetative buffer adjacent to streams to treat surface runoff, which may contain pollutants such as sediment and/or agricultural pollutants from the adjacent landscape;
- Reducing bank erosion associated with a lack of vegetative cover; and
- Planting a diverse hardwood vegetative buffer adjacent to Site tributaries.

Project restoration activities were completed in March 2016. Refer to Appendix A, Tables 2, 3 and 4 for detailed project activity, reporting history, project contact information and project baseline information and attributes.

**Directions to the Project from Raleigh:** Take US 70 West/Glenwood Avenue toward Durham. Turn Right on NC 50 North/Creedmoor Road. Exit onto NC 98 West. Turn Right onto Southview Road and follow to T intersection. Turn Right onto Baptist Road. Turn right onto Benny Ross Road Site. Travel approximately 0.3 mile to gate on the left. Access is by foot through the gate and 50 ft. access easement See Appendix D, As-Built Sheets). Coordinates: 35.998142, -78.742794

### 2.0 PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

Performance standards were established for native forest development and diffuse flow through the riparian buffer in accordance with DWR's Administrative Code 15A NCAC 02B.0295 (Mitigation Program Requirements for Protection and Maintenance of Riparian Buffers) (NCDWR 2014 Temporary Rule). Performance standards are dependent upon the density and survival of characteristic forest species. After five years of monitoring, an average density of 260 woody stems per acre must be surviving and diffuse flow maintained.

### 3.0 MONITORING PLAN

### 3.1 Reporting

Annual monitoring data will be reported following DMS's Riparian Buffer and Nutrient Offset Buffer Annual Monitoring Report Template (ver. 1.0) dated Feb. 2, 2014. The monitoring report shall provide a project data chronology and assist in decision making regarding project close-out. The following table outlines monitoring requirements and parameters for this project.

Required	Parameter	Quantity	Frequency	Notes
Yes	Vegetation	Quantity and location of vegetation plots will be determined by Division of Mitigation Services	Annual	Vegetation will be monitored for a period of five years or until success criteria are met. During years 2, 3 and 5 random plots will be used. Visual monitoring of the site will be done all five years
Yes	Project boundary		Annual	Locations of fence damage, vegetation damage, boundary encroachments, etc. will be mapped

### 3.2 Vegetation Monitoring

To monitor the vegetation at this site, the NC Division of Mitigation Services will use a combination of visual monitoring and random vegetation plots. Visual monitoring will be conducted during all five years of monitoring to assess vegetative cover, diffuse flow and easement integrity. DMS will monitor ten (10) rotating, random 1,500 square foot vegetation plots in years 2, 3, and 5 to assess vegetative success representative of the entire mitigation area from top of bank to 200 feet from each tributary/conveyance. These ten (10) plots will provide coverage of 3% of the site each year used. In each sample plot, monitoring parameters will include species composition and density. As it was done for the baseline data collection, the vegetation plots will be randomly selected using a grid and random number generator or similar method for each of the monitoring years 2, 3 and 5. Visual observations of the percent cover of shrub and herbaceous species, diffuse flow and easement integrity will be documented by photograph and site visits.

Monitoring of site restoration efforts will be performed for five years or until performance standards are met. The first annual monitoring assessment (MY1) was completed in the fall of 2016. The vegetation will be monitored for a total of five years, with the final monitoring activities concluding in 2021. The close-out for the Project will be conducted in 2022 given that the performance criteria has been met.

### 4.0 MAINTENANCE AND CONTINGENCY PLAN

DMS shall monitor the site and conduct a physical inspection of the site a minimum of once per year throughout the postconstruction monitoring period until performance standards are met. These site inspections may identify site components and features that require routine maintenance. Routine maintenance should be expected most often in the first two years following site construction and may include the following:

Component/Feature Maintenance through project close-out		Remedial Measures
Vegetation	Vegetation shall be maintained to ensure survival. Routine vegetation maintenance and repair activities may include supplemental planting. The site will also be evaluated to ensure diffuse flow is still occurring.	Any remedial activities performed will be documented in the annual monitoring reports.
Site Boundary	Site boundaries shall be identified in the field to ensure clear distinction between the mitigation site and adjacent properties. Boundaries may be identified by fence, marker, bollard, post, tree-blazing, or other means as allowed by site conditions and/or conservation easement. Boundary markers disturbed, damaged, or destroyed will be repaired and/or replaced on an as needed basis.	Any remedial activities performed will be documented in the annual monitoring reports.

### 5.0 YEAR 4 MONITORING

Based on the results of Year 2 annual monitoring, and DMS's efforts to contract with a new planting contractor to replant the Project and treat invasive vegetation, DMS did not conduct annual monitoring in 2018. The replanting of the site was completed in late February 2019. A list of species planted during the replant of the site is provided in Appendix C. Invasive treatments were last completed in June 2019. Species treated included Tree of Heaven, Lespedeza and dog fennel. Additional treatment of will be done as needed.

Year 4 annual monitoring (MY4) was conducted in August 2020. While quantitative vegetation monitoring was not proposed for MY4, due to the history of planted stems struggling at this site, and observations of low stem density and vigor, MY4 monitoring activities included stem counts using ten (10) rotating, random 1,500 square foot vegetation plots. Other monitoring activities included visual monitoring of the project verifying the presence or absence of invasive species; checking the integrity of the easement and fencing; and taking photographs at the established photo points.

Five (5) of the ten (10) transects did not meet success criteria of 260 stems per acre for planted stems. Visual monitoring and random vegetation transects conducted by DMS staff revealed most planted stems are concealed by herbaceous vegetation and areas with low stem density are likely due to low soil fertility, and to a lesser extent, competition from a dense

herbaceous layer. Furthermore, in plots that met success criteria, the vigor of many stems was poor (See Appendix B for representative photos). The fence installed along the easement boundary is functioning as intended and all installed signage is still in place.

DMS secured a new planting contractor, Terravista Landscape Management (Terravista), to treat invasive vegetation and replant approximately 3.27 acres of low stem density area within the easement. Terravista began the supplemental planting on December 16, 2020 and completed the work on January 4, 2021. To maximize survivability of stems in the poor site soils, Terravista dug 10" deep holes by hand with shovels and backfilled with 50/50 mix. Planted stems were at least 24" in height and 0.5" in caliper size. Planted species included Persimmon (*Diospyros virginiana*) and Sycamore (*Platanus occidentalis*). Terravista has been contracted to conduct independent, random vegetation transect monitoring to ensure survival of at least 300 stems per acre in the supplemental planting zones. The results of Terravista's monitoring will be included in future monitoring reports in addition to the normal yearly vegetation monitoring.

APPENDIX A

### **BACKGROUND TABLES**

# Table 1: Project Mitigation ComponentsUT to Falls Lake (McDaniel Farm) DMS Project #95389

				М	itigation C	Componen	ts*			
Project Component	Existing Buffer SF	Restored Buffer SF	Creditable Buffer SF	Restortion Level	Mitigation Ratio (X:1)	Riparian Buffer Mitigation Credits (SF)		Nutrient Offset Credits Nitrogen (Ibs)	Nutrient Offset Credits Phosphous (Ibs)	Notes/Comments
Buffer										
Riparian Buffer TOB-50' (Reaches A1, A2 & B) Subject Rural	0	49,393	49,393	R	1	49,393	OR	2,577.48	166.00	Restored riparian buffer for buffer or Nutrient Offset credit
Riparian Buffer 51-100' (Reaches A1, A2 & B) Subject Rural	0	82,083	82,083	R	1	82,083	OR	4,283.35	275.87	Restored riparian buffer for buffer or Nutrient Offset credit
Riparian Buffer 101-200' (Reaches A1, A2 & B) Subject Rural	0	149,557	149,557	R	1			7,804.36	502.64	Restored riparian buffer for Nutrient Offset credit only
Riparian Buffer TOB-200' Non-Subject Rural	0	72,392	72,392	R	1			3,777.65	243.30	Restored riparian buffer for Nutrient Offset credit only
Riparian Buffer TOB-100' (Reaches A1, A2 & B) Subject Rural	64,826	0	64,826	Ρ	10	6,483				Preserved Riparain Buffer for Buffer Credit only
Riparian Buffer 101-200' (Reach A2) Subject Rural	3,134	0	3,134	Ρ	20	157				Preserv ed Riparian Buffer for Buffer Credit only. Area in this zone is less than 10% of total Buffer Mitigation area. 20:1 ratio = 10:1 factoring in 50% reduction for preservation on a Subject Non-Urban stream.
		Totals	421,385			138,115		18,442.85	1,187.82	

\*All assets and credits generated in accordance with DWR Temporary Buffer Mitigation Rule (15A NCAC 02B .0295) effective October 24, 2014.

Length and	Area Sun	nmations I	oy Mitigatio	n Category	
	Stream	Riparian Wetland		Non-riparian Wetland	Creditable Buffer
	(linear				(square
Restoration Level	feet)	(ac	res)	(acres)	feet)
		Riverine	Non- Riverine		
Restoration					353,425
Enhancement					
Enhancement I					
Enhancement II					
Creation					
Preserv ation					67,960
High Quality Pres					

Overall Assets Summary						
Asset Category	Overall Credits					
Buffer <sup>1</sup>	138,115					
Nutrient Offset Nitrogen (Ibs/ac/30 yr)	18,442.85					
Nutrient Offset Phosphorus (Ibs/ac/30 yr)	1,187.82					

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to 15A NCAC 02B .0295(n)(1) (2014 Temporary Rule), buffer mitigation credit used for buffer credit will not be used for nutrient offset credit

## Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History

UT to Falls Lake (McDaniel Farm) DMS Project #95389	
---	--

Activity or Deliverable	Data Collection Complete	Completion or Delivery
Institution Date	NA	Jun-13
404 permit date	NA	NA
Restoration Plan	Jul-15	Sep-15
Final Design – Construction Plans	Jul-15	Sep-15
Construction	NA	Mar-16
Planting	Mar-16	Mar-16
Mitigation Plan / As-built (Year 0 Monitoring – baseline)	May-16	Jun-16
Year 1 Monitoring	Oct-16	Oct-16
Year 2 Monitoring	Oct-17	Oct-17
Invasive Treatment	NA	Oct-19
Site Replant	NA	Feb-19
Invasive Treatment	NA	Jun-19
Year 3 Monitoring	Sep-19	Sep-19
Year 4 Monitoring	Aug-20	Aug-20
Year 5 Monitoring		

### Table 3. Project Contacts Table

#### UT to Falls Lake (McDaniel Farm) DMS Project #95389

Designer	NC Division of Mitigation Services
	217 W Jones Street, Raleigh, NC 27603
Jeff Schaffer, DMS	(919) 707-8308
Construction Contractor	Wright Contracting, LLC
	PO Box 545, Siler City, NC 27344
Andrew Dimmette	(704) 219-0486
Initial Planting Contractor	Bruton Natural Systems, Inc.
	PO Box 1197, Fremont, NC 27830
Charlie Bruton	(919) 242-6555
Supplemental Planting &	Terravista Landscape Management
Invasive Contractor	7213 Becky Cir., Raleigh, NC 27615
Jennifer Barnhill	(919) 791-7840
Monitoring Performers	NC Division of Mitigation Services
	217 W Jones Street, Raleigh, NC 27603
Jeremiah Dow, DMS	(919) 707-8308

#### Table 4: Project Attributes Table

UT to Falls Lake (McDaniel Farm) DMS Project #95389

	Project Info	rmation					
Project Name		UT to Falls Lake (McDaniel Farm)					
County			Durham				
Project Area (acres)			10.86				
Project Coordinates (latitude and lo	ngitude)		35.998142, -78.7427	94			
Planted Acreage (Acres of Woody	Stems Planted)		10.86				
	Project Watershed Sur	nmary Information					
Phy siographic Province							
River Basin		Neuse					
USGS Hydrologic Unit 8-digit	3020201	USGS Hy drologic Unit 14	4-digit	03020201050030			
DWR Sub-basin	•		03-04-01				
Project Drainage Area (acres)		21.5					
Project Drainage Area Percentage	of Impervious Area		< 5%	< 5%			
CGIA Land Use Classification		Majority Forested, some pasture					
	Regulatory Cor	siderations					
	Parameters	Applicable?	Resolved?	Supporting Docs?			
Water of the United States - Section	1 404	No					
Water of the United States - Section	ו 401	No					
Endangered Species Act		No					
Historic Preservation Act	No						
Coastal Zone Management Act (C	ZMA or CAMA)	No					
FEMA Floodplain Compliance	No						
Essential Fisheries Habitat		No					

APPENDIX B

VISUAL ASSESSMENT DATA



### FIGURE 1 Project Location Map UT TO FALLS LAKE (McDANIEL FARM) Durham County, NC









UT to Falls Lake (McDaniel Farm) Year 4 Annual Monitoring Report

11

### Site Photos



Photo Point 1



Photo Point 2B-NE



Photo Point 3B-NW



Photo Point 5



Photo Point 2A-NW



Photo Point 3A-SW



Photo Point 4



Photo Point 6



Photo Point 7A-SE



Photo Point 8A-NW



Photo Point 9



View of Veg Transect 2



Photo Point 7B-E



Photo Point 8B-SE



Photo Point 10



View of Veg Transect 2

#### Table 5: Vegetation Condition Assessment

UT to Falls Lake (McDaniel Farm) DMS Project #95389

Planted Acreage	10.86					
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.	0.1 acres	Pattern and Color	0	0.00	0.0%
2. Low Stem Density Areas	Woody stem densities clearly below target levels based on MY3, 4, or 5 stem count criteria.	0.1 acres	Transparent Pink Polygons	5	3.27	30.1%
			Total	5	0.00	0.0%
3. Areas of Poor Growth Rates or Vigor	Areas with woody stems of a size class that are obviously small given the monitoring year.	0.25 acres	Pattern and Color	0	0.00	0.0%
			Cumulative Total	5	3.27	30.1%

Easement Acreage	10.86					
Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold	CCPV Depiction	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Easement Acreage
4. Invasive Areas of Concern	Areas or points (if too small to render as polygons at map scale).	1000 SF	Pattern and Color	0	0.00	0.0%
5. Easement Encroachment Areas	Areas or points (if too small to render as polygons at map scale).	none	Pattern and Color	0	0.00	0.0%

### APPENDIX C

Vegetation Plot Data

### Table 6a: Planted Tree Species

UT to Falls Lake (McDan	iel Farm) DMS Proje	ct #95389	
Scientific Name	Common Name	Number Planted	% of Total
Acer rubrum	Red Maple	1,000	17.5%
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	Green Ash	1,000	17.5%
Platanus occidentalis	Sycamore	1,000	17.5%
Betula nigra	River birch	1,000	17.5%
Ulmus americana	American Elm	1,000	17.5%
Hamamelis virginiana	Witch hazel	700	12.3%
Tota		5,700	100%

#### Table 6b: Supplemental Planted Tree Species (2018)

Scientific Name	Common Name	Number Planted	% of Total
Liriodendron tulipefera	Tulip poplar	700	15.6%
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	Green Ash	700	15.6%
Platanus occidentalis	Sycamore	600	13.3%
Betula nigra	River birch	600	13.3%
Diosypros virginiana	Persimmon	600	13.3%
Nyssa sylvatica	Black gum	600	13.3%
Cercis Canadensis	Red bud	700	15.6%
Total	4,500	100.0%	

### Table 7: Planted and Total Stems - MY4

UT to Falls Lake (McDaniel Farm) DMS Project #95389

				Current Year (MY4) Annual Means																												
			V	VT1 VT2		VT3		VT4		VT5		VT6		VT7		VT8		VT9		VT10		MY4 (2020)		MY3 (2019)		MY2 (2017)		MY1 (2016)		MY0 (2	2016)	
Scientific Name	Common Name	Туре	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т	Р	Т
Acer rubrum	Red Maple	Tree																									2	2	3	3	26	26
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	Green Ash	Tree			1	1							2	2									3	3	13	13	7	7	3	3	24	24
Platanus occidentalis	Sycamore	Tree			2	2	7	7	4	4			1	1			3	3	3	3			20	20	18	18	12	12	25	25	26	26
Betula nigra	River birch	Tree																							13	13	5	5	24	24	32	32
Ulmus americana	American Elm	Tree	1	1	3	3					1	1	1	1			2	2			1	1	9	9	9	9	6	6	17	17	35	35
Hamamelis virginiana	Witch hazel	Tree																							43	43	9	9	19	19	28	28
Liriodendron tulipefera	Tulip poplar	Tree																												ı		
Diosypros virginiana	Persimmon	Tree			2	2	4	4	3	3	4	4	2	2	1	1	1	1	8	8	3	3	28	28	14	18				I L		
Nyssa sylvatica	Black gum	Tree					1	1			2	2	4	4	6	6	5	5	23	23	6	6	47	47								
Cercis Canadensis	Red bud	Tree																														
Pinus taeda	Loblolly pine	Tree		10		57		26		4		2		6		15		67		21		9		217		165		81		46		29
Liquidambar styraciflua	Sweet gum	Tree						5		2		3		8		9		9						36		62		85		64		38
Salix nigra	Black Willow	Tree																												2		
Chamaecyparis thyoides	Atlantic White Cedar	Tree				1		2		1														4		2		2		1		
Quercus spp.	Oak	Tree														1								1				1		1		
	Unknown	Tree																										4		8		1
	Ster	m count	1	11	8	66	12	45	7	14	7	12	10	24	7	32	11	87	34	55	10	19	107	365	110	343	41	214	91	213	171	239
	Plot size	e (acres)	0.0	)34	0.0	34	0.0	34	0.0	34	0.0	34	0.0	34	0.0	)34	0.0	)34	0.0	)34	0.0	)34	0.3	344	0.3	344	0.3	44	0.3	,44	0.34	44
	Specie	s Count	1	2	4	6	3	6	2	5	3	5	5	7	2	5	4	6	3	4	3	4	5	9	6	9	6	11	6	12	6	9
	Stems pe		29	319	232	1,916	348	1,307	203	407	203	348	290	697	203	929	319	2,526	987	1,597	290	552	311	1,060	319	996	119	621	264	618	581	1016

### Type = Tree, Shrub, Livestake

P = Planted

T = Total

#### Color for Density

Exceeds requirements by 10%
Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements, by less than 10%

Fails to meet requirements by more than 10%