LWP Name	Basin	HUC8	LWP Area	Key driver for LWP	Year complete	Stressors	Objectives	Recommended Status
Catheys Creek LWP	Broad	03050105	45 square miles	Both Catheys Creek and a major tributary, Hollands Creek, are on North Carolina 303(d) List of Impaired Waters due to biological impairment. Incised and eroding streams, excessive sedimentation, stormwater impacts and fecal coliform are were common.	2005	(1) - Excess Sedimentation; (2) - Stormwater runoff; (3) - Fecal coliform bacteria; (4) - Point source pollution	A - Cropland, livestock, and forestry BMPs; B - Road/driveway BMPs; C - Stream restoration; D - Stormwater BMPs	Deprecate
Cove Creek LWP	Broad	03050105	80 square miles	Developed as fast-track watershed characterization and restoration strategy for Cove Creek watershed (abbreviated effort - mostly desktop analysis)	2007	(1) - Stream incision; (2) - Inadequate riparian buffers; (3) - Sedimentation; (4) - Stream bank erosion; (5) Livestock access; and (6) - Possible nutrient enrichment	A - Agricultural and forestry BMPs, incl. livestock exclusion; B - Stream restoration; C - Buffer planting and preservation; D - Residential stormwater BMPs; E - Floodplain wetland restoration; F - Stream crossing stabilization	Deprecate
Cranes Creek	Cape Fear	03030004	101 square miles	All of Crane's Creek and its tributaries were on the state's 303d list of impaired streams from their source to their confluence with Wood Lake (also known as Lake Surf). Crane's Creek was listed because historic sampling indicated habitat degradation and fish populations that were in low in number and diversity	2005	1) Excess sedimentation, 2) stormwater runoff, 3) inadequate buffer, 4) streambank erosion, 5) nutrients	A. Agricultural BMPs, B. Stream restoration, C. Buffer restoration/preservation, D. Stormwater BMPs, E. Livestock exclusion, F. Wetland restoration, G. Stream crossing stabilization	Non-Mitigation
Great Coharie	Cape Fear	03030006	53 square miles	Headwater system draining to an existing DMS High Quality Preservation site, projected mitigation needs	2014	1) Loss of buffer, 2) invasive aquatic vegetation, 3) loss if in-stream habitat, 4) erosion/sedimentation, 5) loss of floodplain connection, 6) restricted aquatic species movement, 7) flow alterations, 8) elevated N and total P, 9) elevated pathogen loads, 10) Low DO, 11) loss of high value forest and wetlands.	A. Reduce runoff and erosion by slowing and filtering water, nutrients and sediment at their source in the fields. This could be accomplished through agricultural best management practices (BMPs), installing vegetated buffers along ditches and waterways, and allowing ditches to become naturally vegetated with plants. B. Protect the riparian floodplains. These seasonally flooded mainstem riparian zones are the most important feature of the Great Coharie Creek and provide tremendous ecological functions. They help sustain the rich natural heritage in the Great Coharie Creek and the Black River.	Keep
Middle Cape Fear	Cape Fear	03030004	180 square miles	Water quality and aquatic habitat degradation and increasing growth and development pressures.	2006	1) Sedimentation, 2) Stream bank and upland erosion, 3) Lack of adequate forested buffer, 4) Nutrients, 5) Agricultural and sivicultural land use impacts, 6) Imperviousness	A. Stream restoration and preservation, B. Riparian buffer restoration and preservation, C. Agricultural BMPs, D. Stormwater BMPs	Keep
Morgan and Little	Cape Fear	03030002	75 square miles	WQ/Habitat degradation, partnership opportunities and ongoing watershed threats.	2004	1) Stream erosion and instability, 2) development, 3) riparian buffer disturbance, 4) floodplain alteration, 5) Jordan and University eutrophication, 6) fecal coliform.	A.Address eutrophication in University Lake, B.Improve in-stream WQ conditions and reduce toxicity, C.Improve hydrological function, D.Improve headwater stream stability and reduce sediment loading, E.Improve terrestrial and aquatic habitat.	Keep
New Hanover	Cape Fear	03030007	79 square miles	Develop and support recommendations for improving and protecting water quality, habitat, floodwater prevention, and watershed issues related to growth and development.	2002	1) Streambank erosion, 2) Sedimentation, 3) Riparian buffer impacts, 4) Stream alterations, 5) Stormwater, 6) Nutrients, 7) Fecal coliform, 8) Loss of habitat	A. Stream restoration, enhancement and preservation, B. Buffer restoration, enhancement and preservaiton C. Stormwater BMPs, D. Wetland restoration, enhancement and preservation	Deprecate
Travis, Tickle and Little Alamance	Cape Fear	03030002	51 square miles	Poor water quality, degraded biology, loss of riparian vegetation, bank erosion and urban runoff, poor riparian habitat, impacts from suburban development, and agricultural runoff.	2008	1) Stream bank erosion, 2) lack of forested buffer, 3) stormwater runoff, 4) livestock access to streams, 5) floodplain development,6) urban toxicants, 7) nutrients, 8) fecal coliform	A. Stream restoration, B. Riparian buffer restoration, C. Livestock exclusion, D. Stormwater BMPs, E. Agricultural BMPs	Keep
Troublesome, Little Troublesome	Cape Fear	03030002	69 square miles	NCDOT mitigation projected needs, WQ/Habitat degradation, partnership opportunities and ongoing watershed threats.	2004	1) Highly erodible soils and land disturbance, 2) development, 3) riparian buffer disturbance, 4) nutrient inupts to Lake Reidsville, 5) Impervious cover, 6) floodplain development, 7) stormwater, 8) fecal coliform, 9) channelization.	A. Agricultural BMPs, B. Stream restoration and enhancement, C. Stormwater BMPs, D. Riparian buffer restoration	Keep
Upper and Middle Rocky River	Cape Fear	03030003	177 square miles	Continuing high needs for compensatory mitigation in this Cataloging Unit and a screening for promising restoration sites	2005	1) Streambank erosion, 2) Lack of adequate buffer, 3) Stormwater, 4) Livestock access, 5) Floodplain development, 6) Nutrients, 7) Fecal Coliform, 8) Herbicides/pesticides	A. Stream restoration, B. Riparian buffer, C. Livestock exclusion, D. Wetland restoration, E. Stormwater BMPs, F. Agricultural BMPs	Keep
Cape Fear Regional Watershed Plan	Cape Fear	03030002/03030003	620 square miles	Satisfy compensatory mitigation requirements in a region with frequent mitigation needs through watershed planning, and develop a forward thinking planning approach in a region with high development potential	In Progress			TBD
Charlotte LWP	Catawba	03050301, 03050103	275 square miles	To develop a watershed management plan that can be used as a tool to enhance existing programs	2003	(1) - Stream bank erosion; (2) - Channel modification; (3) - Excess sediment inputs; (4) - Excess nutrient inputs: (5) - Excess heavy metals; (6) - Stormwater; (7) - Impervious cover	A - Stormwater BMPs; B - stream restoration; C - Wetland restoration; D - Riparian buffer restoration	Deprecate
Hunting Creek LWP	Catawba	03050101	26 square miles	Water quality impairment and habitat degradation	2011	(1) - Stream bank erosion; (2) - Lack of adequate forested buffer; (3) - Impervious cover & increased stormwater flows; (4) - Nutrients; (5) - Fecal coliform bacteria	A - Stream restoration; B - Riparian buffer restoration/enhancement; C - Protection of intact forests; D - Stormwater BMPs and retrofits; E - Agricultural BMPs	Keep
Indian and Howards Creek LWP	Catawba	03050102	114 square miles (total)	Drinking water protection, stormwater runoff, habitat degradation and rural preservation; impaired biology on Lower Indian Creek	2010	(1) - Hydrologic modification (Channelization and dredging); (2) - Incised channels with unstable stream banks; (3) - Degraded/deforested riparian buffers; (4) - Degraded wetlands; (5) - Livestock access to riparian buffers and streams; (6) - Fecal coliform; (7) - Nutrients; (8) - Impervious cover and stormwater runoff	A - Stream and riparian buffer restoration/enhancement projects; B - Preservation of upstream reaches, high-quality reaches, and intact wetlands; C - Stormwater BMPs; D - Agricultural BMPs; E - Wetland restoration/enhancement	Keep
Lower Creek LWP	Catawba	03050101	99 square miles	Lower Creek/major tribs/Lake Rhodhiss on 2006 303(d) list for biological integrity and turbidity	2006	(1) - Stream bank erosion; (2) - Lack of adequate forested buffer; (3) - Stream channelization; (4) - Impervious cover; (5) - Upland erosion; (6) - Livestock access to streams; (7) - Floodplain development; (8) - Urban toxicants; (9) - Nutrients; (10) - Fecal coliform bacteria	A - Stream restoration; B - Riparian buffers; C - Livestock exclusion; D - Stormwater BMPs; E - Agriculture & forestry BMPs	Keep
Muddy Creek LWP	Catawba	03050101	111 square miles	The Muddy Creek Restoration Partnership formed in 1998 to address severe sedimentation issues in the Muddy Creek watershed and its impacts on the Catawba River.	2003, 2011	(1) - Stream bank erosion; (2) - Lack of adequate forested buffer; (3) - Stream channelization; (4) - Impervious cover; (5) - Upland erosion; (6) - Livestock access to streams; (7) - Urban toxicants; (8) - Nutrients; (19) - Fecal coliform bacteria	A - Stream restoration; B - Riparian buffers; C - livestock exclusion; D - Stormwater BMPs; E - Agriculture & forestry BMPs	Keep
Bald Creek LWP	French Broad	06010108	Originally 18 square miles; plus 59 square miles (Phase IV) = 77 square miles	NCDOT projected needs	2006	(1) Fecal coliform, (2) Sedimentation, (3) Channelization, (4) Degraded riparian buffers, (5) Livestock in streams, (6) Nutrients (nitrates), (7) Channel bank instability/bed incision, (8) Inadequate septic/sewage systems	A - Restoration or enhancement of selected stream reaches and riparian areas; B - Preservation of key intact headwater forests; C - Straight-pipe elimination and upgrades to faulty septic systems; D - Fencing to exclude livestock from streams	Deprecate
Mud Creek LWP	French Broad	06010105	113 square miles	COG-led effort to address WQ degradation - sections of Mud Creek, Bat Fork, and Clear Creek were 303(d) listed	2003	(1) Volume, velocity and quality of post-construction French Broad River Basin runoff from existing and new development (stormwater); (2) Pesticides, nutrients, sediment and bacteria and other agricultural on-point source pollution; (3) Habitat degradation due to sedimentation, bank erosion, channelization, lack of riparian vegetation, loss of riffles or pools, loss of woody habitat and streambed scour; and (4) Sediment from construction activities, unpaved road/driveways, forestry, mining and development (upland sources of sedimentation).	A - Implement stormwater BMPs; B - Implement agricultural BMPs and reduce use of agricultural pesticides; C - Stream restoration; D - Riparian buffer restoration; E - Stabilize eroding roadside banks and ditches	Non-Mitigation
South Hominy LWP	French Broad	06010105	38 square miles	2000 303(d) listing of South Hominy Creek (has since been delisted)	2006	(1) Channelization; (2) Excess sedimentation from unpaved roads and driveways, stream bank erosion, and eroding uplands; (3) Localized nutrient and fecal coliform bacteria pollution; and (4) Lack of adequate riparian vegetation.	A - Implementation of priority stream and wetland restoration projects; B - encouraging low impact development (LID) techniques for future development; C - implementing agricultural, forestry, and residental best management practices; D - Riparian buffer restoration; and E - preservation of high-priority forested headwater areas.	Keep
Peachtree-Martins Creek LWP	Hiwassee	06020002	39 square miles	Expanded on watershed restoration work performed by the Hiwassee River Watershed Coalition and natural resource agencies	2007	(1) Lack of riparian vegetation; (2) - Channel modification; (3) - Excess nutrients; (4) - Excess sediment; (5) - Fecal bacterial contamination; (6) - Urban stormwater; (7) - Commercial and residential development	A - Revegetation of riparian areas; B - Stream channel restoration; C - Agricultural and forestry BMPs; D - Stabilization and revegetation of eroding upland areas and stream banks; E - Education for property owners and contractors; F - Removal of straight pipes and repair/replacement of faulty septic systems; G - Stormwater BMPs; H- Preservation of priority areas hrough conservation easements	Deprecate
Franklin to Fontana LWP	Little Tennessee	06010202	154 square miles	Local interest and conservation of aquatic community (much of the watershed was found to be functioning)	2011	(1) lack of woody riparian vegetation, (2) channel modification, (3) excess sediment and nutrient inputs, (4) fecal bacterial contamination, (5) stormwater runoff, (6) tomato pesticides, and (7) barriers to fish passage.	A. stream restoration, B. farmland and wildland preservation, C. agricultural and stormwater best management practices,	Keep
Bear Swamp LWP	Lumber	03040203	52 square miles	Water quality and aquatic degradation related to unbuffered stream segments, proximtiy to projected DOT impacts and important habitat values identified with in the area.	2006	1) Sedimentation, 2) Lack of forested riparian buffers, 3) Nutrients, 4) Imperviousness, 5) Stormwater and 6) Channelization	A. Stream restoration and preservation, B. Riparian buffer restoration and preservation, C. Agricultural BMPs, D. Stormwater BMPs , E. Wetland restoration	Keep

Lockwoods Folly	Lumber	03040207	153 square miles	The Lockwoods Folly River is listed on the 303(d) list of impaired waters for shellfish closures due to fecal coliform bacteria, rapid growth was anticipated.	2007	1) Channelized streams on ag/siviculture lands, 2) cleared and drained wet flats, 3) land use change/development, 4) impervious surfaces, 5) poor riparian habitat, 6) sediment load, 7) nutrients/eutorophication, 8) fecal coliform	A. Stabilize streams, B.protect and improve existing buffer, C. stream restoration and enhancement, D. Wetland restoration,E. Preserve strategic sites to protect WQ, F. Stormwater BMPs, G.Coastal Marsh restoration	**Keep**
Ellerbe Creek	Neuse	03020201	37 square miles	Water quality within water supply reservoirs	2010	1) Stream bank erosion, 2) lack of forested buffer, 3) stream channelization, 4) impervious cover, 5) upland erosion, 6) urban toxicants, 7) nutrients, 8) fecal coliform	A. Stream restoration, B. Riparian buffer restoration and enhancement, C. Stormwater BMPs, D. Agricultural/forestry BMPs	**Keep**
Hominy Swamp Creek	Neuse	03020203	16 square miles	Local resource professionals identified it as a high priority for restoration efforts due to heavy erosion and routine flooding concerns. It has since been designated by DWQ as biologically impaired based on poor ratings of benthic invertebrate communities identified during basin-wide sampling efforts.	2004	1) Sedimentation, 2) Nutrients, 3) Loss of floodplain connection, 4) Stormwater, 5) Loss of riparian buffer, 6) Impacted wetlands	A. Water Quality/Stormwater BMPs, B. Riparian buffer restoration, C. Wetland Restoration, D. Improve floodplain connection, E. Permanently protect threatened streams	**Deprecate**
Lake Rogers	Neuse	03020201	47 square miles	Most at risk water supply reservoir in the Upper Neuse River Basin (UNRBA)	2008	1) Sedimenation (lake), 2) Stormwater runoff, 3) Nutrient loading, 4) Sediment loading, 5) Streambank erosion	A. Protect critcal wetland areas, B. Agricultural BMPs, C. Stream restoration	**Deprecate**
Lick Creek	Neuse	03020201	23 square miles	Lick Creek is on the NC Section 303(d) list of impaired water bodies, due primarily to the Creek's poor aquatic life ratings. The Creek is also a tributary of Falls Lake, for which the State of NC has developed a nutrient management strategy.	2009	1) Sedimentation and erosion, 2) Degraded buffer, 3) Non-point source pollutants, 4) Degraded instream habitat, 5) Degraded wetland habitat, 6) Development impacts	A. Timber harvesting BMPs, B. Stormwater BMPs, C. Agricultural BMPs, D. Stream restoration, E. Wetland restoration, F. Riparian buffer restoration	**Keep**
Little Lick Creek	Neuse	03020201	21 square miles	Little Lick Creek is on the NC Section 303(d) list of impaired water bodies, due primarily to the Creek's poor aquatic life ratings and to low levels of dissolved oxygen. The Creek is also a tributary of Falls Lake, for which the State of NC developed a nutrient management strategy.	2009	1) Sedimentation, 2) Streambank erosion, 3) Stormwater, 4) Forest conversion, 5) Development impacts	A. Stream restoration, B. Buffer restoration, C. Stormwater BMPs, D. Protection of critical lands	**Keep**
Stoney Creek LWP	Neuse	03020202	30 square miles	It is considered impaired for its entire length due to poor biological communities and is cited on North Carolina's 303(d) list due to nonpoint source pollution issues. Because it flows into the Neuse River which has well-documented nitrogen and phosphorus problems, it is classified as C-NSW by the NC Division of Water Quality (DWQ) meaning that these are nutrient sensitive waters. Stoney Creek was also one of 11 watersheds in the state chosen in 2001 for DWQ's Watershed Assessment and Restoration Project (WARP), a detailed stressor study intended to identify specific causes of impairment.	2005	1) Stormwater, 2) Agricultural impacts, 3) Nutrients, 4) Development	A. Stream restoration, B. Wetland restoration, C. Buffer restoration, D. Stormwater BMPs	**Non-Mitigation**
Upper Swift Creek	Neuse	03020201	66 square miles	It is on the state's 303d list due to biological impairment with nonpoint source pollution issues cited as the probable cause. It was designated as a high priority watershed for restoration efforts in the Wake County Watershed Management Plan, and was a focus area of the DWQ Watershed Restoration Program's analyses of causes of biological impairment in selected impaired stream systems. Upper Swift Creek is a designated Water Supply Watershed, and has the support of numerous local resource professionals in protecting and improving water quality and aquatic habitat.	2005	1) Habitat degrdation, 2) Scour, 3) Sedimentation, 4) Nutrients, 5) Toxicants, 6) Fecal coliform	A. Stream restoration, B. Riparian buffer restoration, C. Stormwater BMPs, D. Agricultural BMPs	**Keep**
Wake- Johnston	Neuse	03020201	144 square miles	Within these watersheds lie portions of several municipalities including Clayton, Knightdale, Wendell (entirely within), and Zebulon. Residential and commercial development continues to expand from these centers. Much of Buffalo Creek and a segment of the Neuse are designated as impaired waters by the NC Division of Water Quality due to poor biological communities	Phase I	See Neuse 01 RWP for findings	See Neuse 01 RWP for findings	**Non-Mitigation**
Neuse 01 RWP	Neuse	03020201	580 square miles	Population growth and the associated rapid development create a significant need for restoration projects in the Neuse 01 CU. The I-540 corridor runs through portions of the planning area and future completion of this interstate highway loop is a major driver for mitigation in the Upper Neuse. DMS developed the Neuse 01 RWP in order to identify and prioritize potential mitigation projects to offset ecological impacts related to highway development and construction throughout the Neuse 01 CU.	2015	1) Nutrients, 2) Sediment, 3) Stormwater, 4) Barriers	A. Stream restoration, B. Regenerative stormwater conveyances, C.Stormwater BMPs, D. Riparian buffer restoration, E. Agricultural BMPs, F. Aquatic organism passage. G. Wetland restoration, H. Targeted habitat protection/improvement opportunities	**Keep**
Little River & Brush Creek LWP	New	05050001	~111 square miles	Initially focused on Bledsoe Creek watershed (6.5 square miles)	2007	(for Bledsoe Ck focus area): (1) - Deforested riparian buffers; (2) - Livestock access to streams; (3) - Unstable stream banks, incised channels, channel straightening, degraded riparian habitat; (4) - elevated nutrient & sediment loading; (5) - Degraded (drained, cleared) wetlands; (6) - Urban stormwater runoff, excessive impervious cover; (7) - elevated fecal loading; (8) - Elevated metals and sediments in stormflow	A - Buffer protection ordinance/buffer restoration projects; B - Agricultural BMPs related to fertilizers and livestock access; C - Stream restoration/enhancement projects; D - Wetland restoration and preservation projects; E - Stormwater BMP projects, stormwater management	**Keep**
Pasquotank River LWP	Pasquotank	03010205	370 square miles	Due to water quality and growth and development concerns including sedimentation, urban and agricultural nonpoint source pollution, observed stream instability and proximity to future Department of Transportation impacts. The watershed area has also been impacted by stormwater runoff, flooding, sedimentation and habitat degradation issues.	2003	1) Upstream ditiching, 2) Agricultural/Forestry impacts, 3) Fecal coliform, 4) Loss of riparian vegetation	A. Stormwater BMPs, B. Agricultural BMPs. C. Riparian buffer restoration and protection	**Keep**
Eden Area LWP	Roanoke	03010103	225 square miles	A major coal ash spill discharged into the Dan River from Duke Energy ponds in Eden, the mitigation may include stream restoration within priority subwatersheds of the Eden Area LWP.	2014	1) Erosion and sedimentation, 2) Fecal coliform, 3) Nutrient inputs, 4) Stormwater runoff, 5) Agricultural ponds	A)Agricultural and forestry BMPs; B)stream restoration/enhancement; C)buffer restoration/enhancement; D) livestock exclusion/fencing; improved pasture management; E) protection of headwater streams and buffers; F)stormwater management; G) riparian wetland restoration	**Keep**
Fishing Creek LWP	Tar-Pamlico	03020101	70 square miles	Projected development around Oxford, Fishing Creek is the major tributary of the Tar River running through the study area and is considered impaired due to its poor aquatic insect community and the Oxford wastewater treatment plant is situated just south of the city in the headwaters of Fishing Creek.		1) Stream bank erosion, 2) Lack of adequate forested buffer, 3) Stream channelization, 4) Impervious cover, 5) Upland Erosion, 6) Livestock access to streams, 7) Floodplain development, 8) Urban toxins, 9) Nutrients, 10) Fecal coliform.	A. Stream restoration, B. Riparian buffers, C. Livestock exclusion, D. Sand dredging BMPs, E. Stormwater BMPs, F. Agricultural/Forestry BMPs	**Keep**
Middle Tar-Pamlico	Tar-Pamlico	03020103	61 square miles	This area was chosen because of existing water quality and aquatic habitat degradation issues, as well as important habitat values which are present. All waterbodies within this area are designated as Nutrient Sensitive Waters, while Hendricks Creek and Green Mill Run are 303(d) listed as impaired waters.	2005	1) Contaminated runoff, 2) Poor in-stream habitat, 3) Low DO/Turbitiy/Toxicity, 4) Loss of habitat, 5) Flooding/reduced baseflow, 6) Wetland loss	A. Buffer restoration, B. Stream restoration, C. BMPs, D. Wetland restoration, E. Preservation	**Deprecate**
Ararat River & Upper Yadkin LWP	Yadkin	03040101	2008 Initial Area ~235 square miles; 2011 Focus Area: Toms Creek & Pilot Creek (~50 sq. miles)	Initially a one-year "fast track" to help deliver projected mitigation needs in 2008	2013	(1) - Erosion and sedimentation; (2) - Missing or degraded riparian buffers; (3) - Stormwater runoff; and (4) - Nutrient and fecal coliform "hot spots"	A - Stream, buffer and wetland restoration/enhancement projects, including agriculture/forestry BMPs (e.g., livestock exclusion); B - Urban/suburban stormwater BMPs; C - Stream, buffer and wetland preservation (esp. in headwater tributaries); D - Illicit discharge monitoring/detection and remediation (leaks, spills, overflows from sewer lines and septic systems)	**Keep**
Goose and Crooked	Yadkin	03040105	95 Square Miles	Local interest, large mitigation needs projected and Endangered Carolina heelsplitter mussel presence	2013	1) Increased peak flows and runoff volumes, 2) Sediment, 3) Bacteria, 4) Nutrients and Oxygen-demanding substances and 5) Toxicity-related pollutants	A. Stream enhancement/restoration, B. Riparian wetland enhancement/ restoration, C. Stream buffer restoration, D. Urban stormwater retrofit, E. Non-riparian wetland enhancement/ restoration, F. Urban stormwater retrofit, G. Agricultural BMPs, H. LIvestock exclusion from streams, I. Point source Management, J. Pesticide and nutrient management	**Keep**

Mountain, Little Mountain	Yadkin	03040104	68 square miles	The entire length of Little Mountain Creek is 303(d)-listed as an impaired water body by the Division of Water Quality (DWQ). Livestock access to streams is noted as another issue in portions of these watersheds. There are three major NCDOT TIPs planned within these watersheds. In terms of their resource assets, these HUs include water supply watershed areas and habitat for rare or threatened species.	Phase I	N/A	N/A	**Non-Mitigation**
Upper Rocky River	Yadkin	03040105	200 square miles	The watersheds include a mix of urban and rural land uses, stream reaches considered "impaired" by DWQ and several planned N.C. Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Transportation Improvement Projects (TIPs).	2004	1) Streambank erosion, 2) Lack of adequate buffer, 3) Stream channelization, 4)Agricultural impacts, 5) Land use changes, 6) Nutrients, 7) Fecal Coliform, 8) Sedimentation, 9) Point source in-stream impacts	A. Stream restoration, B. Wetland restoration, C. Livestock exclusion, D. Agricultural BMPs, E. Riparian buffer restoration, F. Stormwater BMPs	**Keep**
Upper Uwharrie LWP	Yadkin	03040103	130 square miles	Chosen because of existing water quality and aquatic habitat degradation issues, as well as important habitat values	On Hold	N/A	N/A	**Non-Mitigation**
Upper Yadkin/Kerr Scott Reservoir LWP	Yadkin	03040101	137 square miles	Wilkes County SWCD WQ study funded under 319 grant; W. Kerr Scott Reservoir is municipal drinking water source for Wilkesboro	2004	(1) - Erosion and sedimentation, especially from poor cropland & pasture management, clearing of hillslopes; (2) - Degraded riparian buffers; livestock access to streams; (3) - Stream bank erosion and channel instability; (4) - Excess nutrient inputs; and (5) Fecal coliform inputs	A - Stream, buffer and wetland restoration/enhancement projects; B - Agriculture/forestry BMPs, especially addressing land application of manure and livestock access to streams; C - Stream, buffer and wetland preservation	**Non-Mitigation**
White Oak	White Oak	03030001/03020106	35.5 square miles	Traditional mitigation opportunities are limited in these coastal watersheds, this plan attempts to address this issue by proposing a mechanism to assign sufficient credits that would offset impacts due to coastal development and habitat degradation.	2009	1) Agricultural and forestry impacts, 2) Ditching, 3) Runoff, 4) Lack of riparian buffer	A) Stormwater management, B) Delay or cease ditch management, C) Pollution Management, D) SAV plantings, E) Oyster sanctuaries	**Non-Mitigation**