Mitigation Project Name	Abbey Lamm Stream and Wetland	County	Alamance	USACE Action ID	2014-01710
DMS ID	96311	Date Project Instituted	2/21/2014	NCDWR Permit No	2014-0336
River Basin	Cape Fear	Date Prepared	5/22/2018		
Cataloging Unit	03030002				

Credit Release Milestone	Stream Credits						Wetland Credits							
	Scheduled Releases (Stream)	Warm	Cool	Cold	Anticipated Release Year (Stream)	Actual Release Date (Stream)	Scheduled Releases (Forested)	Riparian Riverine	Riparian Non-riverine	Non-riparian	Scheduled Releases (Coastal)	Coastal	Anticipated Release Year (Wetland)	Actual Release Year (Wetland)
Potential Credits (Mitigation Plan)		4,731.600						1.000						
Potential Credits (As-Built Survey)		4,731.600						1.000						
1 (Site Establishment)	N/A				N/A	N/A	N/A				N/A		N/A	
2 (Year 0 / As-Built)	30%	1,419.480			2015	7/16/2015	30%	0.300			30%		2015	7/16/2015
3 (Year 1 Monitoring)	10%	473.160			2016	4/25/2016	10%	0.100			10%		2016	4/25/2016
4 (Year 2 Monitoring)	10%	473.160			2017	8/8/2017	10%	0.100			15%		2017	8/8/2017
5 (Year 3 Monitoring)	10%	473.160			2018	4/25/2018	15%	0.150			20%		2018	4/25/2018
6 (Year 4 Monitoring)	5%				2019		5%				10%		2019	
7 (Year 5 Monitoring)	10%				2020		15%				15%		2020	
8 (Year 6 Monitoring)	5%				2021		5%				N/A		2021	
9 (Year 7 Monitoring)	10%				2022		10%				N/A		2022	
Stream Bankfull Standard	10%	473.160			2017	8/8/2017	N/A				N/A			
Total Credits Released to Date		3,312.120						0.650						

DEBITS (released credits only)

		Ratios	1	1.5	2.5	5	1	3	2	5	1	3	2	5	1	3	2	5
			Stream Restoration	Stream Enhancement II	Stream Enhancement III	Stream Preservation	Riparian Restoration	Riparian Creation	Riparian Enhancement	Riparian Preservation	Nonriparian Restoration	Nonriparian Creation	Nonriparian Enhancement	Nonriparian Preservation	Coastal Marsh Restoration	Coastal Marsh Creation	Coastal Marsh Enhancement	Coastal Marsh Preservation
As-Built Amounts (feet and acres)			4,400.000		829.000		1.000											
As-Built Amounts (mitigation credits)			4,400.000		331.600		1.000											
Percentage Released			70%		70%		65%											
Released Amounts (feet / acres)			3,080.000		580.300		0.650											
Released Amounts (credits)			3,080.000		232.120		0.650											
NCDWR Permit	USACE Action ID	Project Name																
2013-0517	2013-00557	NCDOT TIP R-2413A/B - NC 68 Connector, Guilford County	1,320.000		248.700													
2013-0517	2013-00557	NCDOT TIP R-2413A/B - NC 68 Connector, Guilford County	440.000		82.900													
2013-0918	2005-21386	NCDOT TIP U-2525B/C - Greensboro Eastern Loop, Guilford County	880.000		165.800		0.327											
	2016-00402	SR 2022 - Bridge 108 - Division 7, Guilford County					0.173											
2013-0918	2005-21386	NCDOT TIP U-2525B/C - Greensboro Eastern Loop, Guilford County	430.000		82.900													
2013-0918	2005-21386	NCDOT TIP U-2525B/C - Greensboro Eastern Loop, Guilford County					0.150											
2013-0223	2001-21125	NCDOT TIP U-2524C/D - Greensboro Outer Loop	10.000															
Remaining Amounts (feet / acres)			0.000		0.000		0.000											
Remaining Amounts (credits)			0.000		0.000		0.000											

Contingencies (if any): None

Signature of Wilmington District Official Approving Credit Release

9/6/18
Date

1 - For DMS, no credits are released during the first milestone
2 - For DMS projects, the second credit release milestone occurs automatically when the as-built report (baseline monitoring report) has been made available to the NCIRT by posting it to the DMS (NCEEP) Portal, provided the following criteria have been met:
1) Approval of the final Mitigation Plan
2) Recordation of the preservation mechanism, as well as a title opinion acceptable to the USACE covering the property
3) Completion of all physical and biological improvements to the mitigation site pursuant to the mitigation plan
4) Reciept of necessary DA permit authorization or written DA approval for porjects where DA permit issuance is not required
3 - A 10% reserve of credits is to be held back until the bankfull event performance standard has been met

Information from DMS Debit Ledger dated 03/02/2016

YEAR 4 (2018) MONITORING REPORT
ABBEY LAMM
STREAM AND WETLAND MITIGATION SITE

ALAMANCE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA
FULL DELIVERY CONTRACT NO. 5790
DMS PROJECT NUMBER 96311

CAPE FEAR RIVER BASIN
CATALOGING UNIT 03030002

Data Collection – March-October 2018

PREPARED FOR:

N.C. DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
DIVISION OF MITIGATION SERVICES
1601 MAIL SERVICE CENTER
RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27699-1601

January 2019

YEAR 4 (2018) MONITORING REPORT
ABBEY LAMM
STREAM AND WETLAND MITIGATION SITE

ALAMANCE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA
FULL DELIVERY CONTRACT NO. 5790
DMS PROJECT NUMBER 96311

CAPE FEAR RIVER BASIN
CATALOGING UNIT 03030002

Data Collection – March-October 2018

PREPARED BY:

RESTORATION SYSTEMS, LLC
1101 HAYNES STREET, SUITE 211
RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27604

AND

AXIOM ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.
218 SNOW AVENUE
RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27603

January 2019

Table of Contents

1.0 PROJECT SUMMARY 1
2.0 METHODOLOGY 5
2.1 Streams 5
2.2 Vegetation 6
2.3 Wetland Hydrology 7
2.4 Biotic Community Change 8
3.0 REFERENCES 9

Appendices

APPENDIX A. PROJECT BACKGROUND DATA AND MAPS
Figure 1. Vicinity Map
Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Credits
Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History
Table 3. Project Contacts Table
Table 4. Project Baseline Information and Attributes
APPENDIX B. VISUAL ASSESSMENT DATA
Figures 2. Current Conditions Plan View
Tables 5A-5E. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment
Table 6. Vegetation Condition Assessment
Stream Fixed-Station Photographs
APPENDIX C. VEGETATION PLOT DATA
Tables 7. Supplemental Vegetation Transect Data
Remedial Planting Plan Figure
2016 Replant Photos
APPENDIX D. STREAM SURVEY DATA
Table 8a-8e. Baseline Stream Data Summary
Table 9a-9l. Years 1-3 Monitoring Data
APPENDIX E. HYDROLOGY DATA
Tables 10a-10b. UT1 and UT3 Channel Evidence
Stream Gauge Graphs
Table 11. Verification of Bankfull Events
Groundwater Gauge Graphs
Table 12. Groundwater Hydrology Data
APPENDIX F. BENTHIC DATA
Results
Habitat Assessment Data Sheets
APPENDIX G. MISCELLANOUS
Figure-2015 Fescue Treatment
Herbicide Application Forms

1.0 PROJECT SUMMARY

The Abbey Lamm Stream and Wetland Mitigation Site (Site) encompasses approximately 17.3 acres located approximately 2.0 miles east of Snow Camp in southern Alamance County within 14-digit Cataloging Unit and Targeted Local Watershed 03030002050050 of the Cape Fear River Basin (Figure 1, Appendix B and Table 4, Appendix A). Prior to Site construction, the Site consisted of agricultural land used for livestock grazing and hay production. Streams had been cleared of vegetation, dredged of cobble substrate, trampled by livestock, eroded vertically and laterally, and received extensive sediment and nutrient inputs from livestock. In addition, streamside wetlands had been drained by channel incision, soils were compacted, cleared of forest vegetation, and altered by existing land uses. Completed project activities, reporting history, completion dates, project contacts, and project attributes are summarized in Tables 1-4 (Appendix A).

Positive aspects supporting mitigation activities at the Site included the following.

- Streams have a Best Usage Classification of WS-V, NSW (Nutrient Sensitive Waters)
- Located in a Targeted Local Watershed (TLW)
- According to the *Cape Fear River Basin Restoration Priorities 2009*, benthic ratings in the TLW vary from "Fair" to "Good-Fair" indicating a need for improvement of aquatic conditions in the watershed (NCDMS 2009)
- A Significant Natural Heritage Area is located immediately east of the Site

The Site is not included in a Local Watershed Plan; however, this project meets overall goals of the Local Watershed Plans including 1) reduce sediment loading, 2) reduce nutrient loading, 3) manage stormwater runoff, 4) reduce toxic inputs, 5) provide and improve instream habitat, 6) provide and improve terrestrial habitat, 7) improve stream stability, and 8) improve hydrologic function. The following table summarizes the project goals/objectives and proposed functional uplift based on Site restoration activities and observations of two reference areas located in the vicinity of the Site.

Project Goals and Objectives

Project Goal/Objective	**How Goal/Objective will be Accomplished**
Improve Hydrology	
Restore Floodplain Access	Building a new channel at the historic floodplain elevation to restore overbank flows
Restore Wooded Riparian Buffer	Planting a woody riparian buffer
Improve Microtopography	Scarifying soils to reduce compaction and hoof shear due to cattle
Restore Stream Stability	Building a new channel, planting a woody riparian buffer, and removing cattle
Increase Sediment Transport	
Improve Stream Geomorphology	
Increase Surface Storage and Retention	Building a new channel at the historic floodplain elevation restoring overbank flows, removing cattle, scarifying compacted soils, and planting woody vegetation
Restore Appropriate Inundation/Duration	
Increase Subsurface Storage and Retention	Raising the stream bed elevation

Project Goals and Objectives (continued)

Improve Water Quality	
Increase Upland Pollutant Filtration	Planting a native, woody riparian buffer and installing 8 marsh treatment areas
Increase Thermoregulation	Planting a native, woody riparian buffer
Reduce Stressors and Sources of Pollution	Removing cattle and installing 8 marsh treatment areas
Increase Removal and Retention of Pathogens, Particulates (Sediments), Dissolved Materials (Nutrients), and Toxins from the Water Column	Raising the stream bed elevation, restoring overbank flows, planting with woody vegetation, removing cattle, increasing surface storage and retention, restoring appropriate inundation/duration, and installing 8 marsh treatment areas
Increase Energy Dissipation of Overbank/Overland Flows/Stormwater Runoff	Raising the stream bed elevation, restoring overbank flows, planting with woody vegetation, and installing 8 marsh treatment areas
Restore Habitat	
Restore In-stream Habitat	Building a stable channel with a cobble/gravel bed and planting a woody riparian buffer
Restore Stream-side Habitat	Planting a woody riparian buffer
Improve Vegetation Composition and Structure	

Project construction occurred between January and April 2015. Planting was completed in April 2015. Site activities include the restoration of perennial and intermittent stream channels, enhancement (level II) of perennial and intermittent stream channels, and restoration of riparian wetlands. A total of **4731.6 Stream Mitigation Units (SMUs) and 1.0 Riparian Wetland Mitigation Units (WMUs)** are being offered as depicted in the following tables.

Stream Mitigation Type	**Perennial Stream Counting Towards Mitigation Credits (linear feet)**	**Intermittent Stream Counting Towards Mitigation Credits (linear feet)**	**Ratio**	**Stream Mitigation Units**
Restoration	2629	1771	1:1	4400
Enhancement (Level II)	403	426	2.5:1	331.6
Totals	**3032**	**2197**		**4731.6**

Wetland Mitigation Type	**Acreage**	**Ratio**	**Riparian Wetland Mitigation Units**
Riparian Restoration	1.0	1:1	1.0
Riparian Enhancement*	0.4	--	--
Totals	**1.4**		**1.0**

***Wetland enhancement acreage is not included in mitigation credit calculations as per RFP 16-005568 requirements.**

Stream Success Criteria

Monitoring and success criteria for stream restoration should relate to project goals and objectives. From a mitigation perspective, several of the goals and objectives are assumed to be functionally elevated by restoration activities without direct measurement. Other goals and objectives will be considered successful upon achieving vegetation success criteria. The following summarizes stream success criteria related to goals and objectives.

Project Goal/Objective	Stream Success Criteria
Improve Hydrology	
Restore Floodplain Access	Two overbank events will be documented, in separate years, during the monitoring period.
Restore Wooded Riparian Buffer	Attaining Vegetation Success Criteria.
Improve Microtopography	Removal of cattle and scarification of soils during construction.
Restore Stream Stability	Cross-sections, monitored annually, will be compared to as-built measurements to determine channel stability and maintenance of channel geomorphology.
Improve Stream Geomorphology	
Increase Surface Storage and Retention	Removal of cattle, installation of 8 marsh treatment areas, scarification of soils during construction, documentation of two overbank events in separate monitoring years, and attaining Wetland and Vegetation Success Criteria.
Restore Appropriate Inundation/Duration	
Increase Subsurface Storage and Retention	Two overbank events will be documented, in separate years, during the monitoring period and attaining Wetland Success Criteria.
Increase Sediment Transport	Pebble counts documenting coarsening of bed material from pre-existing conditions.
Improve Water Quality	
Increase Upland Pollutant Filtration	Installation of 8 marsh treatment areas and attaining Wetland and Vegetation Success Criteria
Increase Thermoregulation	Attaining Vegetation Success Criteria
Reduce Stressors and Sources of Pollution	Removal of cattle and installation of 8 marsh treatment areas
Increase Removal and Retention of Pathogens, Particulates (Sediments), Dissolved Materials (Nutrients), and Toxins from the Water Column	Removal of cattle, installation of 8 marsh treatment areas, documentation of two overbank events in separate monitoring years, and attaining Vegetation Success Criteria
Increase Energy Dissipation of Overbank/Overland Flows/Stormwater Runoff	Installation of 8 marsh treatment areas, documentation of two overbank events in separate monitoring years, and attaining Vegetation Success Criteria
Restore Habitat	
Restore In-stream Habitat	Reincorporating natural substrate removed from existing Site streams and stockpiled onsite into proposed stream beds, pebble counts documenting coarsening of bed material from pre-existing conditions, and attaining Vegetation Success Criteria (Section 8.3.1)
Restore Stream-side Habitat	Attaining Vegetation Success Criteria
Improve Vegetation Composition and Structure	Attaining Vegetation Success Criteria

Intermittent channels (UT 1 and UT 3) were questioned by IRT members with respect to jurisdictional status. Success criteria in these reaches require surface water flow within the stream channels during years with normal climactic conditions for at least 30 consecutive days. Furthermore, IRT members require these systems to have a discernible ordinary high water mark, which will be evaluated and considered towards project success. Iron-oxidizing bacteria and hydric soils within these reaches will be documented by photograph throughout the monitoring period, and will be considered signs of intermittent channels by IRT members.

Vegetation Success Criteria

An average density of 320 planted stems per acre must be surviving in the first three monitoring years. Subsequently, 290 planted stems per acre must be surviving in year 4, 260 planted stems per acre in year 5, and 210 planted stems per acre in year 7. In addition, planted vegetation must average 10 feet in height in each plot at year 7 since this Site is located in the Piedmont. Volunteer stems may be considered on a case-by-case basis in determining overall vegetation success; however, volunteer stems should be counted separately from planted stems.

Wetland Success Criteria

Monitoring and success criteria for wetland restoration should relate to project goals and objectives. From a mitigation perspective, several of the goals and objectives are assumed to be functionally elevated by restoration activities without direct measurement. Other goals and objectives will be considered successful upon achieving vegetation success criteria. The following summarizes wetland success criteria related to goals and objectives.

Project Goal/Objective	Wetland Success Criteria
Improve Hydrology	
Restore Wooded Riparian Buffer	Attaining Vegetation Success Criteria.
Improve Microtopography	Removal of cattle and scarification of soils during construction.
Increase Surface Storage and Retention	Removal of cattle, scarification of soils during construction, documentation of two overbank events in separate monitoring years, attaining Vegetation Success Criteria, and documentation of an elevated groundwater table (within 12 inches of the soil surface) for greater than 10 percent of the growing season during average climatic conditions.
Restore Appropriate Inundation/Duration	
Increase Subsurface Storage and Retention	
Improve Water Quality	
Increase Upland Pollutant Filtration	Installation of 8 marsh treatment areas and attaining Wetland and Vegetation Success Criteria.
Reduce Stressors and Sources of Pollution	Removal of cattle and installation of 8 marsh treatment areas.
Increase Removal and Retention of Pathogens, Particulates (Sediments), Dissolved Materials (Nutrients), and Toxins from the Water Column	Removal of cattle, installation of 8 marsh treatment areas, documentation of two overbank events in separate monitoring years, and attaining Vegetation Success Criteria.
Increase Energy Dissipation of Overbank/Overland Flows/Stormwater Runoff	Installation of 8 marsh treatment areas, documentation of two overbank events in separate monitoring years, and attaining Vegetation Success Criteria.
Restore Habitat	
Restore Stream-side Habitat	Attaining Vegetation Success Criteria.
Improve Vegetation Composition and Structure	

According to the *Soil Survey of Alamance County*, the growing season for Alamance County is from April 17 – October 22 (USDA 1960). However, the start date for the growing season is not typical for the Piedmont region; therefore, for purposes of this project, gauge hydrologic success will be determined using data from February 1 - October 22 to more accurately represent the period of biological activity. Based on growing season information outlined in the Interim Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Eastern Mountains and Piedmont Region (Environmental Laboratory 2012), this will be confirmed annually by soil temperatures exceeding 41 degrees Fahrenheit at 12 inches depth and/or bud burst.

Target hydrological characteristics include saturation or inundation for 10 percent of the monitored period (February 1-October 22), during average climatic conditions. During years with atypical climatic conditions, groundwater gauges in reference wetlands may dictate threshold hydrology success criteria (75 percent of reference). These areas are expected to support hydrophytic vegetation. If wetland parameters are marginal as indicated by vegetation and/or hydrology monitoring, a jurisdictional determination will be performed. The jurisdictional determination will not supersede monitoring data, or overturn a failure in meeting success criteria; however, this information may be used by the IRT, at the discretion of the IRT, to make a final determination on Site wetland re-establishment success.

Summary of Monitoring Period/Hydrology Success Criteria by Year

Year	Soil Temperatures/Date Bud Burst Documented	Monitoring Period Used for Determining Success	10 Percent of Monitoring Period
2015 (Year 1)	--	April 8*-October 22 (198 days)	20 days
2016 (Year 2)	Bud burst and soil temperatures documented on March 30, 2016	March 30-October 22 (207 days)	21 days
2017 (Year 3)	Bud burst and soil temperatures documented on February 28, 2017	February 28-October 22 (237 days)	24 days
2018 (Year 4)	Bud burst and soil temperatures documented on March 6, 2018	March 6-October 22 (231 days)	23 days
2019 (Year 5)			

*Gauges were installed on April 8 during year 1 (2015), so this date was used as the start of the growing season.

Summary information/data related to the occurrence of items such as beaver or encroachment and statistics related to performance of various project and monitoring elements can be found in tables and figures within this report's appendices. Narrative background and supporting information formerly found in these reports can be found in the Baseline Monitoring Report (formerly Mitigation Plan) and in the Mitigation Plan (formerly the Restoration Plan) documents available on the NC Division of Mitigation Services (NCDMS) website. All raw data supporting the tables and figures in the appendices are available from NCDMS upon request.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

Monitoring requirements and success criteria outlined in the latest guidance by NCDMS dated November 7, 2011 (*Monitoring Requirements and Reporting Standards for Stream and/or Wetland Mitigation*) will be followed and are briefly outlined below. Monitoring data collected at the Site should include reference photos, plant survival analysis, channel stability analysis, and biological data, if specifically required by permit conditions.

Wetland hydrology is proposed to be monitored for a period of seven years (years 1-7). Riparian vegetation and stream morphology is proposed to be monitored for a period of seven years with measurements completed in years 1-3, year 5, and year 7. If monitoring demonstrates the Site is successful by year 5 and no concerns have been identified, Restoration Systems may propose to terminate monitoring at the Site and forego monitoring requirements for years 6 and 7. Early closure will only be provided through written approval from the USACE in consultation with the Interagency Review Team. Monitoring will be conducted by Axiom Environmental, Inc. Annual monitoring reports of the data collected will be submitted to the NCDMS by Restoration Systems no later than December 31 of each monitoring year data is collected.

2.1 Streams

Annual monitoring will include development of channel cross-sections and substrate on riffles and pools. Data to be presented in graphic and tabular format will include 1) cross-sectional area, 2) bankfull width, 3) average depth, 4) maximum depth, and 5) width-to-depth ratio. Post construction, permanently-monumented cross-sections were installed throughout the Site, at approximately 50 foot intervals. Sixty monitoring cross-sections will be measured annually. Cross-section locations are depicted on Figure 2 (Appendix B); data is included in Appendix D. Longitudinal profiles will not be measured routinely unless monitoring demonstrates channel bank or bed instability, in which case, longitudinal profiles may be required by the USACE along reaches of concern to track changes and demonstrate stability.

Visual assessment of in-stream structures will be conducted to determine if failure has occurred. Failure of a structure may be indicated by collapse of the structure, undermining of the structure, abandonment of the channel around the structure, and/or stream flow beneath the structure. In addition, visual assessments of the entire channel will be conducted in each of the seven years of monitoring as outlined in NCDMS *Monitoring Requirements and Reporting Standards for Stream and/or Wetland Mitigation*. Areas of concern will be depicted on a plan view figure identifying the location of concern along with a written assessment and photograph of the area.

Based on the monitoring schedule, stream morphology measurements were not taken during year 4 (2018) monitoring. Additional stream monitoring will occur in Years 5 (2019) and 7 (2021). Morphology data from years 1-3 can be found in Tables 8A-E and 9A-L (Appendix D).

Intermittent stream reaches, including UT 1 and UT 3, will receive priority 1 stream restoration to restore adjacent wetlands and elevate stream function. Priority 1 stream restoration along intermittent stream reaches was discussed by IRT members with regard to adequate base flow once stream restoration is complete. Therefore, stream flow gauges were installed in the upper and lower reaches of UT 1 and UT 3 to catalog flow for 30 consecutive days. Channel formation was evident in both UT 1 and UT 3 in years 1-4 (2015-2018) (Tables 10a-10b, Appendix E). The approximate location of stream flow gauges are depicted on Figure 2 (Appendix B); gauge data is included in Appendix E.

2.2 Vegetation

After planting was completed in April 2015, an initial evaluation was performed to verify planting methods and to determine initial species composition and density. Supplemental planting and additional Site modifications will be implemented, if necessary.

During quantitative vegetation sampling, 14 sample plots (10-meter by 10-meter) were installed within the Site as per guidelines established in *CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.2* (Lee et al. 2008). In each sample plot, vegetation parameters to be monitored include species composition and species density. Visual observations of the percent cover of shrub and herbaceous species will also be documented by photograph.

In accordance with the monitoring schedule, stem count measurements were not taken during Year 4 (2018) monitoring. Vegetation monitoring will occur during years 5 (2019) and 7 (2021). Visual observations indicate that planted stems are doing well across the site. Additionally, three temporary 25-meter by 4-meter transects were established and measured in the spring of 2018. Stem counts in these plots ranged from 404-810 stems per acre; results are summarized in Table 7 (Appendix C) and plot transect locations are depicted on Figure 2 (Appendix B).

Heavy herbaceous competition in the first year (2015) growing season had effected planted stems; therefore, on March 10, 2016 open areas in the upper 2/3 of the Site were treated with a pre-emergent and grass specific herbicide (Appendix G). The treatment was successful in knocking back herbaceous growth; however, by the end of the growing season the amount of new herbaceous growth was similar to the density observed in 2015. RS does not plan to continue this form of treatment.

Working with Carolina Silvics, RS planted 1250 1-gallon pots during the week of December 20th, 2016, which included the following species: *Betula nigra, Fraxinus pennsylvanica, Platanus occiendentalis, Quercus falcata, Quercus nigra, Quercus palustris, Quercus phellos,* and *Quercus rubra*. A remedial planting plan figure detailing location of planting and density, in addition to photographs, are provided in Appendix C. Of note, no remedial planting was performed within forested areas, i.e vegetation plot 12. This is an enhancement area within an existing hardwood forest. Given planted species surviving within

vegetation plot 12 and surrounding density of the existing forest, RS did not feel it was necessary to replant this area although vegetation plot 12 was not meeting year 3 success criteria.

2.3 Wetland Hydrology

Six groundwater monitoring gauges were installed to take measurements after hydrological modifications were performed at the Site. Groundwater gauges were installed in larger wetland sections along UT 1, UT 2, and the main stem channel. Gauges were installed at various elevations within the floodplain to accurately determine hydrology of wetland re-establishment areas. Approximate locations of wetland groundwater monitoring gauges are depicted on Figure 2 (Appendix A) and Asbuilt Plan Sheets (Appendix D). Hydrological sampling will continue throughout the growing season at intervals necessary to satisfy jurisdictional hydrology success criteria (USEPA 1990). In addition, an on-site rain gauge will document rainfall data for comparison of groundwater conditions with extended drought conditions and floodplain crest gauges will confirm overbank flooding events.

Gauge	Success Criteria Achieved/Max Consecutive Days During Growing Season (Percentage)						
	Year 1 (2015) February 1 Growing Season Start	**Year 2 (2016) March 30 Growing Season Start**	**Year 3 (2017) February 28 Growing Season Start**	**Year 4 (2018) March 6 Growing Season Start**	**Year 5 (2019)**	**Year 6 (2020)**	**Year 7 (2021)**
1	No*/10 days (3.8 percent)	Yes/75 days (36 percent)	No/12 days (5.1 percent)	Yes/68 days (29 percent)			
1B+				Yes/60 days (26 percent)			
2	Yes/35 days (13.3 percent)	Yes/122 days (59 percent)	Yes/82 days (35 percent)	Yes/30 days (13 percent)			
3	No*/14 days (5.3 percent)	Yes/48 days (23 percent)	Yes/135 days (57 percent)	Yes/66 days (29 percent)			
4	No*/14 days (5.3 percent)	Yes/100 days (48 percent)	Yes/78 days (33 percent)	Yes/28 days (12 percent)			
5	Yes/32 days (12.1 percent)	Yes/75 days (36 percent)	Yes/48 days (20 percent)	Yes/60 days (26 percent)			
6	No*/9 days (3.4 percent)	No/7 days (3.4 percent)	No/5 days (2.1 percent)	Yes/25 days (11 percent)			
6B+				Yes/28 days (12 percent)			
7**	--	Yes/116 days (56 percent)	Yes/153 days (65 percent)	Yes/103 days (45 percent)			
8**	--	Yes/206 days (100 percent)	Yes/211 days (89 percent)	Yes/231 days (100 percent)			
9**	--	Yes/54 days (26 percent)	No^/12 days (5.1 percent)	Yes/132 days (57 percent)			

*Due to Site construction activities, groundwater gauges were not installed until April 8, 2015. It is expected that all gauges would meet success criteria at the beginning of the growing season.

**These gauges were installed on March 8, 2016 to show wetland establishment within the old pond bed.

^This gauge malfunctioned through the majority of the growing season due to continuous inundation. It is expected that this gauge would have met success criteria had it functioned properly.

+These gauges were installed during Year 4 (2018) in close proximity with two gauges that had not met success criteria in previous monitoring years in order to verify the groundwater data at these locations.

2.4 Biotic Community Change

Changes in the biotic community are anticipated from a shift in habitat opportunities as tributaries are restored. In-stream, biological monitoring is proposed to track the changes during the monitoring period. The benthic macroinvertebrate community will be sampled using NCDWQ protocols found in the *Standard Operating Procedures for Benthic Macroinvertebrates* (NCDWQ 2006) and *Benthic Macroinvertebrate Protocols for Compensatory Stream Restoration Projects* (NCDWQ 2001). Biological sampling of benthic macroinvertebrates will be used to compare preconstruction baseline data with postconstruction restored conditions.

Two benthic macroinvertebrate monitoring locations will be established within restoration reaches. Postrestoration collections will occur in the approximate location of the prerestoration sampling. Benthic macroinvertebrate samples will be collected from individual reaches using the Qual-4 collection method. Sampling techniques of the Qual-4 collection method consist of kick nets, sweep nets, leaf packs, and visual searches. Preproject biological sampling occurred on June 26, 2014; postproject monitoring will occur in June of monitoring years 2-5.

Identification of collected organisms will be performed by personnel with North Carolina Division of Water Resources (NCDWR) or by a NCDWR certified laboratory. Other data collected will include D50 values/NCDWR habitat assessment forms. Biological sampling for year 4 (2018) occurred on June 12, 2018. The samples were sent to Pennington and Associates, a NCDWQ certified laboratory, for identification and analysis. The results and Habitat Assessment Dataforms are included in Appendix F.

3.0 REFERENCES

Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. Technical Report Y-87-1. United States Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Environmental Laboratory. 2012. Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Eastern Mountains and Piedmont Region (Version 2.0). United States Army Engineer Research and Development Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Lee, M.T., R.K. Peet, S.D. Roberts, and T.R. Wentworth. 2008. CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation. Version 4.2. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Ecosystem Enhancement Program. Raleigh, North Carolina.

North Carolina Division of Water Quality (NCDWQ). 2001. Benthic Macroinvertebrate Monitoring Protocols for Compensatory Mitigation. 401/Wetlands Unit, Department of Environment and Natural Resources. Raleigh, North Carolina.

North Carolina Division of Water Quality (NCDWQ). 2006. Standard Operating Procedures for Benthic Macroinvertebrates. Biological Assessment Unit, North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources. Raleigh, North Carolina.

North Carolina Division of Mitigation Services (NCDMS 2009). Cape Fear River Basin Restoration Priorities 2009 (online). Available: http://portal.ncdenr.org/c/document_library/get_file?uuid=864e82e8-725c-415e-8ed9-c72dfcb55012&groupId=60329

Schafale, M.P. and A.S. Weakley. 1990. Classification of the Natural Communities of North Carolina: Third Approximation. North Carolina Natural Heritage Program, Division of Parks and Recreation, North Ccarolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources. Raleigh, North Carolina.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). 1960. Soil Survey of Alamance County, North Carolina. Soil Conservation Service.

United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). 1990. Mitigation Site Type Classification (MiST). EPA Workshop, August 13-15, 1989. EPA Region IV and Hardwood Research Cooperative, NCSU, Raleigh, North Carolina.

APPENDIX A

PROJECT BACKGROUND DATA AND MAPS

Figure 1. Vicinity Map

Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Credits

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History

Table 3. Project Contacts Table

Table 4. Project Baseline Information and Attributes



Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Prepared for:

RESTORATION SYSTEMS | LLC

Project:

ABBEY LAMM STREAM AND WETLAND MITIGATION SITE

Alamance County, NC

Title:

Site Location

Notes:

Background Imagery sources (provided by ESRI Data and Maps):
1. Physical Map of the United States (2009) created by the U.S. Park Service (upper inset).
2. Delorme World Basemap digital mapping (2010, lower inset).
3. Snow Camp, NC (1978), Crutchfield Crossroads, NC (1974), Saxapahaw, NC (1977), and Silk Hope, NC (1974) 7.5-minute topographic quadrangles provided by the U.S. Geological Survey.

Drawn by:	KRJ
Date:	NOV 2015
Scale:	1:42000
Project No.:	14-005

FIGURE

1

Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Credits
Abbey Lamm Restoration Site

Mitigation Credits			
Stream Restoration	**Stream Enhancement**	**Riparian Wetland Restoration**	**Nonriparian Wetland Restoration**
4400	**331.6**	**1.0**	**--**

Projects Components

Station Range	Existing Linear Footage/ Acreage	Priority Approach	Restoration/ Restoration Equivalent	Restoration Linear Footage/ Acreage	Mitigation Ratio	Mitigation Credits	Comment
UT 1 Station 00+21 to 05+62	531	PI	Restoration	541	1:1	541	
UT 1a Station 00+00 to 01+54	154	PI	Restoration	154-8=146	1:1	146	8 lf of UT1a located outside of easement is not credit generating
UT 2 Station 00+22 to 04+77	502	PI	Restoration	455	1:1	455	
UT 3a Station 00+00 to 00+93	93		EII	93	2.5:1	37.2	
UT 3b Station 00+00 to 01+43	143		EII	143	2.5:1	57.2	
UT 3c Station 00+00 to 01+90	190		EII	190	2.5:1	76	
UT 3 Station 00+93 to 11+77	1021	PI	Restoration	1084	1:1	1084	
Mainstem Channel Station 04+77 to 16+31	1098	PI	Restoration	1154-61-63= 1030	1:1	1030	61 lf and 63 lf of Mainstem located outside of easement at two crossings are not credit generating
Mainstem Channel Station 16+31 to 20+59	428		EII	428-25=403	2.5:1	161.2	25 lf of Mainstem located outside of easement are not credit generating
Mainstem Channel Station 20+59 to 32+58	NA	PI	Restoration	1199-55=1144	1:1	1144	55 lf of Mainstem located outside of easement are not credit generating

Component Summation

Restoration Level	Stream (linear footage)	Riparian Wetland (acreage)	Nonriparian Wetland (acreage)
Restoration	4400*	1.0	--
Enhancement (Level 1)	--	--	--
Enhancement (Level II)	829**	--	
Enhancement	--	0.4***	
Totals	**5229**	**--**	**--**
Mitigation Units	**4731.6 SMUs**	**1.0 Riparian WMUs**	**0.00 Nonriparian WMUs**

*An additional 187 linear feet of stream restoration is proposed outside of the easement and is therefore not included in this total or in mitigation credit calculations.
**An additional 25 linear feet of stream enhancement (level II) is proposed outside of the easement and is therefore not included in this total or in mitigation credit calculations.
***Wetland enhancement acreage is not included in mitigation credit calculations as per RFP 16-005568 requirements.

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History
Abbey Lamm Restoration Site

Activity or Deliverable	Stream Monitoring Complete	Vegetation Monitoring Complete	Data Collection Complete	Completion or Delivery
Technical Proposal (RFP No. 16-005568)	--	--	--	October 2013
EEP Contract No. 5790	--	--	--	February 2014
Mitigation Plan	--	--	--	September 2014
Construction Plans	--	--	--	September 2014
Construction Earthwork	--	--	--	April 3, 2015
Planting	--	--	--	April 7, 2015
As-Built Documentation	April 14, 2015	April 9, 2015	May 2015	July 2015
Year 1 Monitoring	October 20, 2015	September 23, 2015	October 2015	November 2015
Fescue Treatment	--	--	--	March, 2016
Year 2 Monitoring	April 7, 2016	July 6, 2016	October 2016	December 2016
Remedial Planting	--	--	--	December 8, 2016
Year 3 Monitoring	March 27, 2017	July 19, 2017	October 2017	November 2017
Year 4 Monitoring	April 15, 2018	--	October 2018	October 2018

Table 3. Project Contacts Table

Full Delivery Provider	Restoration Systems 1101 Haynes Street, Suite 211 Raleigh, North Carolina 27604 Worth Creech 919-755-9490
Designer	Axiom Environmental, Inc. 218 Snow Avenue Raleigh, NC 27603 Grant Lewis 919-215-1693
Construction Plans and Sediment and Erosion Control Plans	Sungate Design Group, PA 915 Jones Franklin Road Raleigh, NC 27606 Joshua G. Dalton, PE 919-859-2243
Construction Contractor	Land Mechanic Designs 780 Landmark Road Willow Spring, NC 27592 Lloyd Glover 919-639-6132
Planting Contractor	Carolina Silvics, Inc. 908 Indian Trail Road Edenton, NC 27932 Mary-Margaret McKinney 252-482-8491
As-built Surveyor	K2 Design Group 5688 US Highway 70 East Goldsboro, NC 27534 John Rudolph 919-751-0075
Baseline Data Collection	Axiom Environmental, Inc. 218 Snow Avenue Raleigh, NC 27603 Grant Lewis 919-215-1693

Table 4. Project Attribute Table
Abbey Lamm Restoration Site

Project Information				
Project Name	Abbey Lamm Restoration Site			
Project County	Alamance County, North Carolina			
Project Area (acres)	17.3			
Project Coordinates (latitude & latitude)	35.885584ºN, 79.394638ºW			
Project Watershed Summary Information				
Physiographic Province	Piedmont			
Project River Basin	Cape Fear			
USGS HUC for Project (14-digit)	03030002050050			
NCDWR Sub-basin for Project	03-06-04			
Project Drainage Area (acres)	257			
Percentage of Project Drainage Area that is Impervious	<2%			
Reach Summary Information				
Parameters	**Main**	**UT 1**	**UT 2**	**UT 3**
Length of reach (linear feet)	3258	695	455	1510
Valley Classification	alluvial			
Drainage Area (acres)	257	49	56	32
NCDWR Stream ID Score	--	29	35.25	28
NCDWR Water Quality Classification	WS-V, NSW			
Existing Morphological Description (Rosgen 1996)	Eg5/Fc5	E/G 5	C/G 5	Eg5
Existing Evolutionary Stage (Simon and Hupp 1986)	III/IV	II/III	IV/III	III
Underlying Mapped Soils	Efland silt loam, Goldston slaty silt loam, Herndon silt loam, Moderately gullied land, Orange silt loam			
Drainage Class	Well-drained, well-drained, well-drained, poorly to well-drained, moderately well-drained			
Hydric Soil Status	Nonhydric			
Slope	0.0179	0.0256-0.0362		
FEMA Classification	NA			
Native Vegetation Community	Piedmont Alluvial Forest/Dry-Mesic Oak-Hickory Forest			
Watershed Land Use/Land Cover (Site)	40% forest, 58% agricultural land, <2% low density residential/impervious surface			
Watershed Land Use/Land Cover (Cedarock Reference Channel)	65% forest, 30% agricultural land, <5% low density residential/impervious surface			
Percent Composition of Exotic Invasive Vegetation	<5%			

APPENDIX B

VISUAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Figure 2. Current Conditions Plan View (CCPV)

Tables 5A-5E. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment

Table 6. Vegetation Condition Assessment

Stream Station Photographs



Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Prepared for:

RESTORATION SYSTEMS | LLC

Project:

ABBEY LAMM STREAM AND WETLAND MITIGATION SITE

Alamance County, NC

Title:

Current Conditions Plan View

Notes:

Background Imagery source: 2014 aerial photogarphy provided by the NC OneMap program (online, provided by the NC Geographic Information Coordination Council)

Drawn by:	KRJ
Date:	NOV 2017
Scale:	1:3000
Project No.:	14-005

FIGURE

2



Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Prepared for:

RESTORATION SYSTEMS | LLC

Project:

ABBEY LAMM STREAM AND WETLAND MITIGATION SITE

Alamance County, NC

Title:

Current Conditions Plan View

Notes:

Background Imagery source: 2014 aerial photogarphy provided by the NC OneMap program (online, provided by the NC Geographic Information Coordination Council)

Drawn by:	KRJ
Date:	OCT 2018
Scale:	1:3000
Project No.:	14-005

FIGURE

2

Table 5A **Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment**
Reach ID **Lamm Mainstem**
Assessed Length **2781**

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	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjusted % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed	1. **Vertical Stability** (Riffle and Run units)	1. Aggradation - Bar formation/growth sufficient to significantly deflect flow laterally (not to include point bars)			0	0	100%			
		2. Degradation - Evidence of downcutting			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	1. Texture/Substrate - Riffle maintains coarser substrate	56	56			100%			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	1. Depth Sufficient (Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6)	55	55			100%			
		2. Length appropriate (>30% of centerline distance between tail of upstream riffle and head of downstrem riffle)	55	55			100%			
	4.**Thalweg Position**	1. Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	55	55			100%			
		2. Thalweg centering at downstream of meander (Glide)	55	55			100%			
2. Bank	**1. Scoured/Eroding**	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%			100%
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely. Does NOT include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat.			0	0	100%			100%
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse			0	0	100%			100%
				Totals	0	0	100%	0	0	100%
3. Engineered Structures	**1. Overall Integrity**	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs.	14	14			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill.	14	14			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms.	14	14			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%. (See guidance for this table in EEP monitoring guidance document)	14	14			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~ Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth ratio ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at base-flow.	14	14			100%			

Table 5B **Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment**
Reach ID **Lamm UT1-A**
Assessed Length **154**

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	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjusted % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed	1. **Vertical Stability** (Riffle and Run units)	1. Aggradation - Bar formation/growth sufficient to significantly deflect flow laterally (not to include point bars)			0	0	100%			
		2. Degradation - Evidence of downcutting			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	1. Texture/Substrate - Riffle maintains coarser substrate	6	6			100%			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	1. Depth Sufficient (Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6)	5	5			100%			
		2. Length appropriate (>30% of centerline distance between tail of upstream riffle and head of downstrem riffle)	5	5			100%			
	4.**Thalweg Position**	1. Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	5	5			100%			
		2. Thalweg centering at downstream of meander (Glide)	5	5			100%			
2. Bank	**1. Scoured/Eroding**	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%			100%
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely. Does NOT include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat.			0	0	100%			100%
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse			0	0	100%			100%
				Totals	0	0	100%	0	0	100%
3. Engineered Structures	**1. Overall Integrity**	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs.	4	4			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill.	4	4			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms.	4	4			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%. (See guidance for this table in EEP monitoring guidance document)	4	4			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~ Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth ratio ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at base-flow.	4	4			100%			

Table 5C **Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment**
Reach ID **Lamm UT1**
Assessed Length **541**

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	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjusted % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed	1. **Vertical Stability** (Riffle and Run units)	1. Aggradation - Bar formation/growth sufficient to significantly deflect flow laterally (not to include point bars)			0	0	100%			
		2. Degradation - Evidence of downcutting			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	1. Texture/Substrate - Riffle maintains coarser substrate	25	25			100%			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	1. Depth Sufficient (Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6)	24	24			100%			
		2. Length appropriate (>30% of centerline distance between tail of upstream riffle and head of downstrem riffle)	24	24			100%			
	4.**Thalweg Position**	1. Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	24	24			100%			
		2. Thalweg centering at downstream of meander (Glide)	24	24			100%			
2. Bank	**1. Scoured/Eroding**	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%			100%
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely. Does NOT include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat.			0	0	100%			100%
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse			0	0	100%			100%
				Totals	0	0	100%	0	0	100%
3. Engineered Structures	**1. Overall Integrity**	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs.	10	10			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill.	10	10			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms.	10	10			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%. (See guidance for this table in EEP monitoring guidance document)	10	10			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~ Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth ratio ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at base-flow.	10	10			100%			

Table 5D **Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment**
Reach ID **Lamm UT2**
Assessed Length **455**

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	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjusted % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed	1. **Vertical Stability** (Riffle and Run units)	1. Aggradation - Bar formation/growth sufficient to significantly deflect flow laterally (not to include point bars)			0	0	100%			
		2. Degradation - Evidence of downcutting			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	1. Texture/Substrate - Riffle maintains coarser substrate	23	23			100%			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	1. Depth Sufficient (Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6)	22	22			100%			
		2. Length appropriate (>30% of centerline distance between tail of upstream riffle and head of downstrem riffle)	22	22			100%			
	4.**Thalweg Position**	1. Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	22	22			100%			
		2. Thalweg centering at downstream of meander (Glide)	22	22			100%			
2. Bank	**1. Scoured/Eroding**	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%			100%
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely. Does NOT include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat.			0	0	100%			100%
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse			0	0	100%			100%
				Totals	0	0	100%	0	0	100%
3. Engineered Structures	**1. Overall Integrity**	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs.	12	12			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill.	12	12			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms.	12	12			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%. (See guidance for this table in EEP monitoring guidance document)	12	12			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~ Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth ratio ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at base-flow.	12	12			100%			

Table 5E **Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment**
Reach ID **UT3**
Assessed Length **1084**

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	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjusted % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed	1. **Vertical Stability** (Riffle and Run units)	1. Aggradation - Bar formation/growth sufficient to significantly deflect flow laterally (not to include point bars)			0	0	100%			
		2. Degradation - Evidence of downcutting			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	1. Texture/Substrate - Riffle maintains coarser substrate	38	38			100%			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	1. Depth Sufficient (Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6)	37	37			100%			
		2. Length appropriate (>30% of centerline distance between tail of upstream riffle and head of downstrem riffle)	37	37			100%			
	4.**Thalweg Position**	1. Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	37	37			100%			
		2. Thalweg centering at downstream of meander (Glide)	37	37			100%			
2. Bank	**1. Scoured/Eroding**	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%			100%
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely. Does NOT include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat.			0	0	100%			100%
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse			0	0	100%			100%
				Totals	0	0	100%	0	0	100%
3. Engineered Structures	**1. Overall Integrity**	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs.	23	23			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill.	23	23			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms.	23	23			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%. (See guidance for this table in EEP monitoring guidance document)	23	23			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~ Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth ratio ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at base-flow.	23	23			100%			

Table 6 — Vegetation Condition Assessment

Abbey Lamm

Planted Acreage[1] 16.4

Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold	CCPV Depiction	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Planted Acreage
1. Bare Areas	None	0.1 acres	none	0	0.00	0.0%
2. Low Stem Density Areas	None	0.1 acres	none	0	0.00	0.0%
2B. Low Planted Stem Density Areas	None	0.1 acres	none	0	0.00	0.0%
			Total	0	0.00	0.0%
3. Areas of Poor Growth Rates or Vigor	None	0.25 acres	none	0	0.00	0.0%
			Cumulative Total	0	0.00	0.0%

Easement Acreage[2] 17.3

Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold	CCPV Depiction	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Easement Acreage
4. Invasive Areas of Concern[4]	None	1000 SF	none	0	0.00	0.0%
5. Easement Encroachment Areas[3]	None	none	none	0	0.00	0.0%

1 = Enter the planted acreage within the easement. This number is calculated as the easement acreage minus any existing mature tree stands that were not subject to supplemental planting of the understory, the channel acreage, crossings or any other elements not directly planted as part of the project effort.

2 = The acreage within the easement boundaries.

3 = Encroachment may occur within or outside of planted areas and will therefore be calculated against the overall easement acreage. In the event a polygon is cataloged into items 1, 2 or 3 in the table and is the result of encroachment, the associated acreage should be tallied in the relevant item (i.e., item 1,2 or 3) as well as a parallel tally in item 5.

4 = Invasives may occur in or out of planted areas, but still within the easement and will therefore be calculated against the overall easement acreage. Invasives of concern/interest are listed below. The list of high concern spcies are those with the potential to directly outcompete native, young, woody stems in the short-term (e.g. monitoring period or shortly thereafter) or affect the community structure for existing, more established tree/shrub stands over timeframes that are slightly longer (e.g. 1-2 decades). The low/moderate concern group are those species that generally do not have this capacity over the timeframes discussed and therefore are not expected to be mapped with regularity, but can be mapped, if in the judgement of the observer their coverage, density or distribution is suppressing the viability, density, or growth of planted woody stems. Decisions as to whether remediation will be needed are based on the integration of risk factors by DMS such as species present, their coverage, distribution relative to native biomass, and the practicality of treatment. For example, even modest amounts of Kudzu or Japanese Knotweed early in the projects history will warrant control, but potentially large coverages of Microstegium in the herb layer will not likley trigger control because of the limited capacities to impact tree/shrub layers within the timeframes discussed and the potential impacts of treating extensive amounts of ground cover. Those species with the "watch list" designator in gray shade are of interest as well, but have yet to be observed across the state with any frequency. Those in *red italics* are of particular interest given their extreme risk/threat level for mapping as points where isolated specimens are found, particularly ealry in a projects monitoring history. However, areas of discreet, dense patches will of course be mapped as polygons. The symbology scheme below was one that was found to be helpful for symbolzing invasives polygons, particulalry for situations where the conditon for an area is somewhere between isolated specimens and dense, discreet patches. In any case, the point or polygon/area feature can be symbolized to describe things like high or low concern and species can be listed as a map inset, in legend items if the number of species are limited or in the narrative section of the executive summary.

Abbey Lamm
Year 4 Fixed Station Photographs
Taken October 2018

Photo Point 1a



Photo Point 1b

Photo Point 2

Photo Point 3

Photo Point 4a

Photo Point 4b



Abbey Lamm
Year 4 Fixed Station Photographs (continued)
Taken October 2018

Photo Point 5a



Photo Point 5b



Photo Point 6



Photo Point 7

Photo Point 8

APPENDIX C

VEGETATION PLOT DATA

Table 7. Supplemental Vegetation Transect Data

Remedial Planting Plan Figure

2016 Replant Photos

Table 10a. Supplemental Vegetation Transect Data – April 2017

Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	Temporary Plot 1 2m x 50m	Temporary Plot 2 2m x 50m	Temporary Plot 3 2m x 50m	Temporary Plot 4 2m x 50m	Temporary Plot 5 2m x 50m
Betula nigra	River birch	Tree		3		1	
Cornus amomum	Silky dogwood	Tree			1		2
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	Green ash	Tree				2	5
Liriodendron tulipifera	Tulip poplar	Tree	1	2	11		2
Nyssa sp.	Gum	Tree		2		2	1
Platanus occidentalis	Sycamore	Tree	1	4		2	
Quercus falcata	Southern red oak	Tree				1	
Quercus nigra	Water oak	Tree	1				
Quercus phellos	Willow oak	Tree	4	4		2	
Quercus rubra	Northern red oak	Tree	2	2	5	1	1
Ulmus americana	American elm	Tree	1		2		
		Stem Count	**10**	**17**	**19**	**11**	**11**
		Size (Ares)	1	1	1	1	1
		Size (Acres)	0.0247	0.0247	0.0247	0.0247	0.0247
		Species count	6	6	4	7	5
		Stems per acre	**404.9**	**688.3**	**769.2**	**445.3**	**445.3**

Table 10b. Supplemental Vegetation Transect Data – October 2017

Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	Temporary Plot 1 2m x 50m	Temporary Plot 2 2m x 50m	Temporary Plot 3 2m x 50m	Temporary Plot 4 2m x 50m	Temporary Plot 5 2m x 50m	Temporary Plot 6 2m x 50m	Temporary Plot 7 2m x 50m	Temporary Plot 8 2m x 50m	Temporary Plot 9 2m x 50m	Temporary Plot 10 2m x 50m
Betula nigra	River birch	Tree		3		1		2			1	3
Cornus amomum	Silky dogwood	Tree			1		2	1			1	
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	Green ash	Tree	2			3	5		3	52	1	
Liriodendron tulipifera	Tulip poplar	Tree	1	2	11		2		2		1	3
Nyssa sp.	Gum	Tree		2		1	1	1	2			5
Platanus occidentalis	Sycamore	Tree	1	4		2		1	3	3	3	3
Quercus sp.	Oak	Tree						1	1	2		1
Quercus alba	White oak	Tree									2	3
Quercus falcata	Southern red oak	Tree				1						
Quercus nigra	Water oak	Tree	1	1				3	1	1		
Quercus phellos	Willow oak	Tree	4	4		2		2	2	4	1	1
Quercus rubra	Northern red oak	Tree	2	1	5	1	1	2		2		2
Ulmus americana	American elm	Tree	1		2			1				
Carya sp.	Hickory	Tree					1					
		Stem Count	**12**	**19**	**19**	**11**	**12**	**14**	**14**	**64**	**10**	**21**
		Size (Ares)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
		Size (Acres)	0.0247	0.0247	0.0247	0.0247	0.0247	0.0247	0.0247	0.0247	0.0247	0.0247
		Species count	7	7	4	7	6	9	7	6	7	8
		Stems per acre	**485.8**	**769.2**	**769.2**	**445.3**	**485.8**	**566.8**	**566.8**	**2591.1**	**404.9**	**850.2**

Table 7. Supplemental Vegetation Transect Data – March 2018

Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	Temporary Plot 1 4m x 25m	Temporary Plot 2 4m x 25m	Temporary Plot 3 4m x 25m
Betula nigra	River birch	Tree			2
Cornus amomum	Silky dogwood	Tree		1	7
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	Green ash	Tree		10	7
Liriodendron tulipifera	Tulip poplar	Tree	4		
Nyssa sp.	Gum	Tree	5		2
Platanus occidentalis	Sycamore	Tree		4	
Quercus nigra	Water oak	Tree		3	
Quercus rubra	Northern red oak	Tree	1	2	
Ulmus americana	American elm	Tree			
		Stem Count	**10**	**20**	**18**
		Size (Ares)	1	1	1
		Size (Acres)	0.0247	0.0247	0.0247
		Species count	3	5	4
		Stems per acre	**404.9**	**809.7**	**728.7**


RESTORATION SYSTEMS, LLC
1101 HAYNES ST, SUITE 211
RALEIGH, NC 27604
PHONE : 919.755.9490
FAX : 919.755.9492
This map and all data contained within are supplied as is with no warranty. Restoration Systems, LLC expressly disclaims responsibility for damages or liability from any claims that may arise out of the use or misuse of this map. It is the sole responsibility of the user to determine if the data on this map is compatible with the user's needs. This map was not created as survey data, nor should it be used as such. It is the user's responsibility to obt ain proper survey data, prepared by a licensed surveyor, where required by law.
SCALE: 1 in = 213 ft
DATE: 5 - 2016
SITE: Abbey Lamm
Abbey Lamm Mitigation Site
2016 Remedial Planting Plan
Aerial Imagery: (c) ESRI
Coordinate System:
NAD_1983_SP_NC_FIPS_3200_Ft.
Feet
0 50 100 200 300 400
Replant Area 1:
Density: 145 trees in 0.41 ac ~ 350 Trees / Ac.
3 new planted stems added to veg plots 12 & 14
0.41
14
0.88
Replant Area 2:
Density: 320 trees in 0.88 ac ~ 360 Trees / Ac.
9 new planted stems added to veg plot 14
0.21
13
Replant Area 3:
Density: 30 trees in 0.21 ac ~ 140 Trees / Ac.
3 new planted stems added to veg plot 13
12
11
10
Replant Area 4:
Density: 25 trees in 0.15 ac ~ 160 Trees / Ac.
0.15
Replant Area 5:
Density: 190 trees in 0.62 ac ~ 300 Trees / Ac.
7 new planted stems added to veg plot 7
0.62
7
0.56
6
5
0.2
9
8
Replant Area 6:
Density: 60 trees in 0.20 ac ~ 300 Trees / Ac.
6 new planted stems added to veg plot 9
Replant Area 7:
Density: 115 trees in 0.56 ac ~ 200 Trees / Ac.
4 new planted stems added to veg plot 6
0.43
4
3
Replant Area 8:
Density: 150 trees in 0.43 ac ~ 300 Trees / Ac.
7 new planted stems added to veg plot 4
0.13
1
0.42
2
Replant Area 9:
Density: 40 trees in 0.13 ac ~ 300 Trees / Ac.
7 new planted stems added to veg plot 1
Replant Area 10:
Density: 150 trees in 0.42 ac ~ 350 Trees / Ac.

ABBEY LAMM
STREAM AND WETLAND MITIGATION SITE
ALAMANCE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA
FULL DELIVERY CONTRACT NO. 5790

Photographs taken January 13th, 2017

Abbey Lamm– Remedial Action Plan for Vegetation - Update

Photo 1: Looking S. along Replant Area -1 **Photo Date: 1-13-2017**

Photo 2: Looking N. in Replant Area 2, just N. of veg. plot 14 Photo Date: 1-13-2017

Abbey Lamm– Remedial Action Plan for Vegetation - Update

Photo 3: Looking W. in Replant Area 3, near veg. plot 13 Photo Date: 1-13-2017

Photo 4: Looking NE. in Replant Area 5, near veg. plot 7 Photo Date: 1-13-2017

Abbey Lamm– Remedial Action Plan for Vegetation - Update

Photo 5: Looking N. in Replant Area 6. Photo Date: 1-13-2017

Photo 6: Looking N. in Replant Area 6, towards veg. plot 9. Photo Date: 1-13-2017

Abbey Lamm– Remedial Action Plan for Vegetation - Update

Photo 7: Looking SW. in Replant Area 8. Photo Date: 1-13-2017

Photo 8: Looking NW. in Replant Area 10. Photo Date: 1-13-2017

Abbey Lamm– Remedial Action Plan for Vegetation - Update

Photo 9: Surviving bear roots outside of replant area Photo Date: 1-13-2017

Photo 10: Surviving bear root outside of replant area

Photo Date: 1-13-2017

APPENDIX D

STREAM SURVEY DATA

Tables 8a-e. Baseline Stream Data Summary

Tables 9a-l. Years 1-3 Monitoring Data

Table 8A. Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary
Lamm UT 1

Parameter	USGS Gage Data			Pre-Existing Condition			Project Reference Cedarock Park			Project Reference Causey Farm			Design			As-built		
Dimension	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**
BF Width (ft)	USGS gage data is unavailable for this project			4	12	6.5	8	12.1	8.1	10.7	11.3	11	6.5	7.5	7	6	9.1	8.6
Floodprone Width (ft)				6	27	17	15	25	18	122	140	131	30	90	50			50
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)						3.5			8			14.7			3.5	3.6	6.7	4.0
BF Mean Depth (ft)				0.3	0.9	0.6	0.8	1	0.8	1.3	1.4	1.4	0.46	0.55	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.6
BF Max Depth (ft)				0.7	1.3	1	1.1	1.4	1.4	1.9	2	2	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.7	1.2	0.9
Width/Depth Ratio				4.4	40	13.8	8	15.1	10.1	8	9	9	12	16	14	10	19	13
Entrenchment Ratio				1	6.8	2.9	1.9	2.2	2.1	11	13	12	4.3	12.9	7.1	6	8	5.8
Bank Height Ratio				1.3	2.6	1.7	1	1.8	1			1.4	1	1.3	1			1
Wetted Perimeter(ft)						===			===			===			===	6.3	9.6	8.9
Hydraulic radius (ft)						===			===			===			===	0.4	0.7	0.6
Pattern																		
Channel Beltwidth (ft)				No pattern of riffles and pools due to straightening activties			20	38	22.8	17	36	29.8	21	42	28	21	42	28
Radius of Curvature (ft)							11	27	16.5	9	113	30.6	14	70	21	14	70	21
Meander Wavelength (ft)							44	116	68.4	10	91	62.9	42	84	60	42	84	60
Meander Width ratio							2.4	4.7	2.8	1.5	3.5	2.7	3	6	4	3	6	4
Profile																		
Riffle length (ft)				No pattern of riffles and pools due to straightening activties					===			===			===	5	44	15
Riffle slope (ft/ft)							1.00%	5.76%	3.16%	0.20%	1.20%	0.98%	3.71%	7.73%	4.94%	1.10%	9.83%	2.98%
Pool length (ft)									===			===			===	5	12	8
Pool spacing (ft)							25	69	37.2	2	7.4	4	21	56	28	21	56	28
Substrate																		
d50 (mm)						===			===			===			===			===
d84 (mm)						===			===			===			===			===
Additional Reach Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)						===			===			===			===			466
Channel Length (ft)						===			===			===			===			559
Sinuosity						1.02			1.2			1.46			1.2			1.2
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)						2.84%			2.58%			0.53%			2.56% - 3.62%			2.56%
BF slope (ft/ft)						===			===			===			===			===
Rosgen Classification						E/G 5			E 4/5			E 4/5			E/C 3/4			E/C 3/4

Table 8B. Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary
Lamm UT 2

Parameter	USGS Gage Data			Pre-Existing Condition			Project Reference Cedarock Park			Project Reference Causey Farm			Design			As-built^		
Dimension	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**
BF Width (ft)	USGS gage data is unavailable for this project			7.1	15.6	9.7	8	12.1	8.1	10.7	11.3	11	6.5	7.5	7	5.9	9.7	7.6
Floodprone Width (ft)				15	40	27	15	25	18	122	140	131	30	90	50			50
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)						3.8			8			14.7			3.5	2.3	5.5	3.2
BF Mean Depth (ft)				0.2	0.5	0.4	0.8	1	0.8	1.3	1.4	1.4	0.46	0.55	0.5	0.4	0.6	0.4
BF Max Depth (ft)				0.5	1.3	0.8	1.1	1.4	1.4	1.9	2	2	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.5	1	0.7
Width/Depth Ratio				14.2	78	28.8	8	15.1	10.1	8	9	9	12	16	14	15	21	17
Entrenchment Ratio				1	5.6	3	1.9	2.2	2.1	11	13	12	4.3	12.9	7.1	5	9	6.6
Bank Height Ratio				1	3	1.6	1	1.8	1			1.4	1	1.3	1			1
Wetted Perimeter(ft)						===			===			===			===	6.1	10.1	7.7
Hydraulic radius (ft)						===			===			===			===	0.3	0.5	0.4
Pattern																		
Channel Beltwidth (ft)				No pattern of riffles and pools due to straightening activties			20	38	22.8	17	36	29.8	21	42	28	21	42	28
Radius of Curvature (ft)							11	27	16.5	9	113	30.6	14	70	21	14	70	21
Meander Wavelength (ft)							44	116	68.4	10	91	62.9	42	84	60	42	84	60
Meander Width ratio							2.4	4.7	2.8	1.5	3.5	2.7	3	6	4	3	8	4
Profile																		
Riffle length (ft)				No pattern of riffles and pools due to straightening activties					===			===			===	5	26	12
Riffle slope (ft/ft)							1.00%	5.76%	3.16%	0.20%	1.20%	0.98%	3.71%	7.73%	4.94%	0.84%	4.64%	2.94%
Pool length (ft)									===			===			===	4	14	8
Pool spacing (ft)							25	69	37.2	2	7.4	4	21	56	28	21	56	28
Substrate																		
d50 (mm)						===			===			===			===			===
d84 (mm)						===			===			===			===			===
Additional Reach Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)						===			===			===			===			387
Channel Length (ft)						===			===			===			===			464
Sinuosity						1.03			1.2			1.46			1.2			1.2
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)						3.07% - 4.31%			2.58%			0.53%			2.56% - 3.62%			3.01%
BF slope (ft/ft)						===			===			===			===			===
Rosgen Classification						C/G 5			E 4/5			E 4/5			E/C 3/4			E/C 3/4

^Measured as-built numbers do not include D-type reach.

Table 8C. Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary
Lamm UT 3

Parameter	USGS Gage Data			Pre-Existing Condition			Project Reference Cedarock Park			Project Reference Causey Farm			Design			As-built		
Dimension	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**
BF Width (ft)	USGS gage data is unavailable for this project			3.4	12.3	7.2	8	12.1	8.1	10.7	11.3	11	6.5	7.5	7	6.3	8.6	7.3
Floodprone Width (ft)				18	40	26	15	25	18	122	140	131	30	90	50			250
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)						2.6			8			14.7			3.5	2	3.1	2.5
BF Mean Depth (ft)				0.2	0.8	0.4	0.8	1	0.8	1.3	1.4	1.4	0.46	0.55	0.5	0.3	0.5	0.3
BF Max Depth (ft)				0.5	1.3	0.8	1.1	1.4	1.4	1.9	2	2	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.4	0.8	0.6
Width/Depth Ratio				4.3	61.5	24	8	15.1	10.1	8	9	9	12	16	14	15	27	23
Entrenchment Ratio				2.4	7	4.1	1.9	2.2	2.1	11	13	12	4.3	12.9	7.1	6	8	6.8
Bank Height Ratio				1	2	1.4	1	1.8	1			1.4	1	1.3	1			1
Wetted Perimeter(ft)						===			===			===			===	6.4	8.8	7.4
Hydraulic radius (ft)						===			===			===			===	0.3	0.4	0.3
Pattern																		
Channel Beltwidth (ft)				No pattern of riffles and pools due to straightening activties			20	38	22.8	17	36	29.8	21	42	28	21	42	28
Radius of Curvature (ft)							11	27	16.5	9	113	30.6	14	70	21	14	70	21
Meander Wavelength (ft)							44	116	68.4	10	91	62.9	42	84	60	42	84	60
Meander Width ratio							2.4	4.7	2.8	1.5	3.5	2.7	3	6	4	3	8	4
Profile																		
Riffle length (ft)				No pattern of riffles and pools due to straightening activties					===			===			===	6	66	21
Riffle slope (ft/ft)							1.00%	5.76%	3.16%	0.20%	1.20%	0.98%	3.71%	7.73%	4.94%	0.82%	6.50%	3.13%
Pool length (ft)									===			===			===	4	14	7
Pool spacing (ft)							25	69	37.2	2	7.4	4	21	56	28	21	56	28
Substrate																		
d50 (mm)						===			===			===			===			===
d84 (mm)						===			===			===			===			===
Additional Reach Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)						===			===			===			===			846
Channel Length (ft)						===			===			===			===			1015
Sinuosity						1.05			1.2			1.46			1.2			1.2
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)						3.34%			2.58%			0.53%			2.56% - 3.62%			3.19%
BF slope (ft/ft)						===			===			===			===			===
Rosgen Classification						Fc 5/6			Eg 5			E 4/5			E/C 3/4			C 3/4

Table 8D. Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary
Lamm Main Upstream

Parameter	USGS Gage Data			Pre-Existing Condition			Project Reference Cedarock Park			Project Reference Causey Farm			Design			As-built		
Dimension	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**
BF Width (ft)	USGS gage data is unavailable for this project			11.7	26.5	18.5	8	12.1	8.1	10.7	11.3	11	11.2	12.9	12.1	12.3	13.3	12.7
Floodprone Width (ft)				29	75	56	15	25	18	122	140	131	20	90	40			250
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)						10.4			8			14.7			10.4	8.8	12.5	10.4
BF Mean Depth (ft)				0.4	0.9	0.6	0.8	1	0.8	1.3	1.4	1.4	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.7	1	0.85
BF Max Depth (ft)				1.1	1.7	1.3	1.1	1.4	1.4	1.9	2	2	1.1	1.4	1.3	1	12.6	1.3
Width/Depth Ratio				11.7	66.3	31.5	8	15.1	10.1	8	9	9	12	16	14	13	17	15
Entrenchment Ratio				1.9	24	6.2	1.9	2.2	2.1	11	13	12	1.7	7.4	3.3	7	7	7.05
Bank Height Ratio				1	1.9	1.2	1	1.8	1			1.4	1	1.3	1			1
Wetted Perimeter(ft)						===			===			===			===	13	13.9	13.2
Hydraulic radius (ft)						===			===			===			===	0.7	0.9	0.8
Pattern																		
Channel Beltwidth (ft)				No pattern of riffles and pools due to straightening activties			20	38	22.8	17	36	29.8	36	73	48	36	73	48
Radius of Curvature (ft)							11	27	16.5	9	113	30.6	24	121	36	24	121	36
Meander Wavelength (ft)							44	116	68.4	10	91	62.9	73	145	103	73	145	103
Meander Width ratio							2.4	4.7	2.8	1.5	3.5	2.7	3	6	4	3	6	4
Profile																		
Riffle length (ft)				No pattern of riffles and pools due to straightening activties					===			===			===	9	66	26
Riffle slope (ft/ft)							1.00%	5.76%	3.16%	0.20%	1.20%	0.98%	2.15%	4.48%	2.86%	0.00%	3.87%	1.86%
Pool length (ft)									===			===			===	5	34	12
Pool spacing (ft)							25	69	37.2	2	7.4	4	36	97	48	36	97	48
Substrate																		
d50 (mm)						===			===			===			===			===
d84 (mm)						===			===			===			===			===
Additional Reach Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)						===			===			===			===			949
Channel Length (ft)						===			===			===			===			1139
Sinuosity						1.05			1.2			1.46			1.2			1.2
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)						1.76%			2.58%			0.53%			1.79%			1.57%
BF slope (ft/ft)						===			===			===			===			===
Rosgen Classification						Eg5/Fc			E 4/5			E 4/5			E/C 3/4			E/C 3/4

Table 8E. Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary
Lamm Main Downstream

Parameter	USGS Gage Data			Pre-Existing Condition			Project Reference Cedarock Park			Project Reference Causey Farm			Design			As-built		
Dimension	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**	**Min**	**Max**	**Med**
BF Width (ft)	USGS gage data is unavailable for this project			8.7	17	13	8	12.1	8.1	10.7	11.3	11	11.2	12.9	12.1	12.8	13.4	13.0
Floodprone Width (ft)				17	24	22	15	25	18	122	140	131	20	90	40			250
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)						10.4			8			14.7			10.4	9.7	11.8	11.3
BF Mean Depth (ft)				0.6	1.2	0.9	0.8	1	0.8	1.3	1.4	1.4	0.8	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.9	0.8
BF Max Depth (ft)				0.9	1.9	1.4	1.1	1.4	1.4	1.9	2	2	1.1	1.4	1.3	1.1	1.3	1.3
Width/Depth Ratio				7.3	28.3	17.4	8	15.1	10.1	8	9	9	12	16	14	15	17	16
Entrenchment Ratio				1.2	2.6	1.8	1.9	2.2	2.1	11	13	12	1.7	7.4	3.3	7	7	6.9
Bank Height Ratio				1.3	2.7	2	1	1.8	1			1.4	1	1.3	1			1
Wetted Perimeter(ft)						===			===			===			===	13.2	14.1	13.6
Hydraulic radius (ft)						===			===			===			===	0.7	0.9	0.8
Pattern																		
Channel Beltwidth (ft)				No pattern of riffles and pools due to straightening activties			20	38	22.8	17	36	29.8	36	73	48	36	73	48
Radius of Curvature (ft)							11	27	16.5	9	113	30.6	24	121	36	24	121	36
Meander Wavelength (ft)							44	116	68.4	10	91	62.9	73	145	103	73	145	103
Meander Width ratio							2.4	4.7	2.8	1.5	3.5	2.7	3	6	4	3	6	4
Profile																		
Riffle length (ft)				No pattern of riffles and pools due to straightening activties					===			===			===	15	142	59
Riffle slope (ft/ft)							1.00%	5.76%	3.16%	0.20%	1.20%	0.98%	2.15%	4.48%	2.86%	0.71%	3.22%	1.93%
Pool length (ft)									===			===			===	7	40	18
Pool spacing (ft)							25	69	37.2	2	7.4	4	36	97	48	36	97	48
Substrate																		
d50 (mm)						===			===			===			===			===
d84 (mm)						===			===			===			===			===
Additional Reach Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)						===			===			===			===			961
Channel Length (ft)						===			===			===			===			1153
Sinuosity						NA			1.2			1.46			1.2			1.2
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)						NA			2.58%			0.53%			1.79%			1.72%
BF slope (ft/ft)						===			===			===			===			===
Rosgen Classification						Eg5/Fc			E 4/5			E 4/5			E/C 3/4			E/C 3/4

Table 9A. Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary
Lamm UT-Main (Downstream) - Stream and Wetland Restoration Site

Parameter	XS 1 Pool (Main Down)						XS 2 Riffle (Main Down)						XS 3 Riffle (Main Down)						XS 4 Riffle (Main Down)						XS 5 Pool (Main Down)					
Dimension	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
BF Width (ft)	13	12.2	12.5	11.8			12.8	14.4	12.6	13.2			13.1	*	12.9	14.3			13	12.7	12.1	12.6			14.1	14.8	15.7	17.2		
Floodprone Width (ft)	----	----	----	----			90	90	90	90			90	*	90	90			90	90	90	90			----	----	----	----		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	11.2	12.2	9.7	9.4			9.7	11.1	12.6	9.5			11.8	*	9.1	8.1			11.3	10.5	10.3	9.4			11.8	6.6	7.7	7.6		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.9	1.0	0.8	0.8			0.8	0.8	1.0	0.7			0.9	*	0.7	0.6			0.9	0.8	0.9	0.7			0.8	0.4	0.5	0.4		
BF Max Depth (ft)	1.7	1.5	1.6	1.4			1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2			1.3	*	1.3	1.2			1.3	1.4	1.4	1.2			1.7	0.8	0.8	0.8		
Width/Depth Ratio	----	----	----	----			16.9	18.7	12.6	18.3			14.5	*	18.3	25.2			15.0	15.4	14.2	16.9			----	----	----	----		
Entrenchment Ratio	----	----	----	----			7.0	6.3	7.1	6.8			6.9	*	7.0	6.3			6.9	7.1	7.4	7.1			----	----	----	----		
Bank Height Ratio	----	----	----	----			1	1	1.09	1.09			1	*	1	1			1	1.08	1.08	1.00			----	----	----	----		
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	13.6	12.7	13.2	12.3			13.2	14.7	13	13.6			13.7	*	13.4	14.7			13.6	13.2	12.8	13			15	15.1	15.9	17.3		
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.8			0.7	0.8	1.0	0.7			0.9	*	0.7	0.6			0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7			0.8	0.4	0.5	0.4		

Parameter	XS 6 Riffle (Main Down)						XS 7 Riffle (Main Down)						XS 8 Riffle (Main Down)						XS 9 Riffle (Main Down)						XS 10 Riffle (Main Down)					
Dimension	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
BF Width (ft)	13.4	13.3	13	12.7			12.8	11.2	12.2	11.9			13.6	13.5	14	14.7			12.3	14	12.5	12.1			16.1	17.2	17.3	16.9		
Floodprone Width (ft)	90	90	90	90			90	90	90	90			90	90	90	90			90	90	90	90			90	90	90	90		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	11.3	11	13.4	12.1			8.7	8.9	9.1	8.8			11.6	8.2	7.6	6.8			9.8	9.8	8.9	7.3			12.4	11.8	12.1	10.1		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.0			0.7	0.8	0.7	0.7			0.9	0.6	0.5	0.5			0.8	0.7	0.7	0.6			0.8	0.7	0.7	0.6		
BF Max Depth (ft)	1.3	1.6	1.8	1.7			1.2	1.2	1.3	1.2			1.5	0.9	0.8	0.8			1.2	1.3	1.2	1.3			1.3	1.1	1.2	1.2		
Width/Depth Ratio	15.9	16.1	12.6	13.3			18.8	14.1	16.4	16.1			15.9	22.2	25.8	31.8			15.4	20.0	17.6	20.1			20.9	25.1	24.7	28.3		
Entrenchment Ratio	6.7	6.8	6.9	7.1			7.0	8.0	7.4	7.6			6.6	6.7	6.4	6.1			7.3	6.4	7.2	7.4			5.6	5.2	5.2	5.3		
Bank Height Ratio	1	1.23	1.38	1.31			1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1			1	1.08	1	1.08			1	1	1	1		
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	14.1	13.9	13.9	13.4			13.2	11.6	12.8	12.4			14.3	13.8	14.4	14.9			12.9	14.5	12.8	15.2			16.6	17.5	17.6	17.2		
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.8	0.8	1.0	0.9			0.7	0.8	0.7	0.7			0.8	0.6	0.5	0.5			0.8	0.7	0.7	0.5			0.7	0.7	0.7	0.6		

* Note: Cross Section 3 was not measured due to yellow jacket nest at cross section.

Table 9B. Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary
Lamm UT-Main (Downstream) - Stream and Wetland Restoration Site

Parameter	MY-00 (2015)			MY-01 (2015)			MY-02 (2016)			MY-03 (2017)			MY-04 (2018)			MY-05 (2019)		
	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med
Pattern																		
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	36	73	48															
Radius of Curvature (ft)	24	121	36															
Meander Wavelength (ft)	73	145	103															
Meander Width Ratio	3	6	4															
Profile																		
Riffle Length (ft)	15	142	59															
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.71%	3.22%	1.93%															
Pool Length (ft)	7	40	18															
Pool Spacing (ft)	36	97	48															
Additonal Reach Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)	961			961			961			961								
Channel Length (ft)	1,153			1,153			1,153			1153								
Sinuosity	1.2																	
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	0.0172																	
BF Slope (ft/ft)	------			------			------			------								
D50	16.2			13.6			42.1			40.8								
D84	60			67			97			99								
Rosgen Classification	C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4								

Table 9C. Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary Lamm
UT-Main (Downstream) - Stream and Wetland Restoration Site

Parameter	XS 11 Pool (Main Down)						XS 12 Riffle (Main Down)						XS 13 Riffle (Main Down)						XS 14 Riffle (Main Down)						XS 15 Pool (Main Down)					
Dimension	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
BF Width (ft)	13.4	10.5	10.7	11			11.9	11.5	11.8	12.5			15.4	16	17	15.8			13	13.3	12.9	13			16.1	13.8	12.6	12.6		
Floodprone Width (ft)	----	----	----	----			90	90	90	90			90	90	90	90			90	90	90	90			----	----	----	----		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	9.8	11.3	11.2	11.6			7.2	5.1	5.2	5.5			8.6	9.2	8.4	7.2			12.9	15.6	16	14.2			12.7	10.4	10.1	9.1		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.7	1.1	1.0	1.1			0.6	0.4	0.4	0.4			0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5			1.0	1.2	1.2	1.1			0.8	0.8	0.8	0.7		
BF Max Depth (ft)	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.6			1	1	0.8	0.6			0.9	1.5	1.1	1.3			1.4	2.2	1.9	1.9			1.8	1.6	1.5	1.4		
Width/Depth Ratio	----	----	----	----			19.7	25.9	26.8	28.4			27.6	27.8	34.4	34.7			13.1	11.3	10.4	11.9			----	----	----	----		
Entrenchment Ratio	----	----	----	----			7.6	7.8	7.6	7.2			5.8	5.6	5.3	5.7			6.9	6.8	7.0	6.9			----	----	----	----		
Bank Height Ratio	----	----	----	----			1	1	1	1			1	1.67	1.22	1.44			1	1.57	1.36	1.36			----	----	----	----		
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	13.9	11.3	11.5	11.9			12.2	11.7	11.7	12.9			15.6	16.6	17.5	16.5			13.6	14.5	14.4	14.3			16.7	14.4	13.4	13.4		
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.7	1	1.0	1.0			0.6	0.4	0.4	0.4			0.6	0.6	0.5	0.4			1	1.1	1.1	1.0			0.8	0.7	0.8	0.7		

Parameter	XS 16 Riffle (Main Down)*						XS 17 Riffle (Main Down)*						XS 18 Riffle (Main Down)*						XS 19 Pool (Main Down)*					
Dimension	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
BF Width (ft)	16.2	16.0	16.2	16.0			14.3	14	13.9	14.4			13.2	13.1	13.3	13.5			12	12.1	11.8	11.7		
Floodprone Width (ft)	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0			19	19	19	19			31	31	31	31			----	----	----	----		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	10.1	9.6	9.8	8.6			11.2	12.6	11.5	13.2			10.1	11.6	11.9	11.8			13.1	14.6	14.6	13.4		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5			0.8	0.9	0.8	0.9			0.8	0.9	0.9	0.9			1.1	1.2	1.2	1.1		
BF Max Depth (ft)	0.8	0.9	1.0	0.9			1.3	1.4	1.1	1.2			1.2	1.4	1.5	1.4			1.4	1.9	1.7	1.5		
Width/Depth Ratio	26.0	26.7	26.8	29.8			18.3	15.6	16.8	15.7			17.3	14.8	14.9	15.4			----	----	----	----		
Entrenchment Ratio	1.2	1.3	1.2	1.3			1.3	1.4	1.4	1.3			2.3	2.4	2.3	2.3			----	----	----	----		
Bank Height Ratio	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.2			1.6	1.6	1.7	1.7			1.6	1.5	1.4	1.5			----	----	----	----		
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	16.4	16.2	16.5	16.2			15.3	14.9	14.9	15.7			14	14.1	14.7	14.8			12.9	13	12.8	12.6		
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5			0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8			0.7	0.8	0.8	0.8			1	1.1	1.1	1.1		

* Enhancement (Level II) Reach

Table 9D. Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary Lamm
UT-Main (Downstream) - Stream and Wetland Restoration Site

Parameter	MY-00 (2015)			MY-01 (2015)			MY-02 (2016)			MY-03 (2017)			MY-04 (2018)			MY-05 (2019)		
	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med
Pattern																		
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	36	73	48															
Radius of Curvature (ft)	24	121	36															
Meander Wavelength (ft)	73	145	103															
Meander Width Ratio	3	6	4															
Profile																		
Riffle Length (ft)	15	142	59															
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.71%	3.22%	1.93%															
Pool Length (ft)	7	40	18															
Pool Spacing (ft)	36	97	48															
Additonal Reach Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)	961			961			961			961								
Channel Length (ft)	1,153			1,153			1,153			1153								
Sinuosity	1.2																	
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	0.0172																	
BF Slope (ft/ft)	------			------			------			------								
D50	16.2			13.6			42.1			40.8								
D84	60			67			97			99								
Rosgen Classification	C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4								

Table 9E. Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary
Lamm Main (Upstream) - Stream and Wetland Restoration Site

Parameter	XS 20 Pool (Main Up)						XS 21 Riffle (Main Up)						XS 22 Riffle (Main Up)						XS 23 Riffle (Main Up)						XS 24 Pool (Main Up)					
Dimension	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
BF Width (ft)	7.1	8.1	11.8	11.7			13.3	13	12	13			12.6	13.4	13	13.3			12.3	13.3	11.9	12.8			12.8	13.1	12.1	12.9		
Floodprone Width (ft)	----	----	----	----			90	90	90	90			90	90	90	90			90	90	90	90			----	----	----	----		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	6.7	4.9	5.6	5.6			12.5	10	9.9	9.1			12.5	11.3	11.2	11.5			8.8	9.5	9.1	8.8			13.1	12.9	13.1	12.9		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.9	0.6	0.5	0.5			0.9	0.8	0.8	0.7			1.0	0.8	0.9	0.9			0.7	0.7	0.8	0.7			1.0	1.0	1.1	1.0		
BF Max Depth (ft)	1.3	1	1	1			1.4	1.5	1.6	1.6			1.4	1.9	1.9	2.2			1	1.3	1.5	1.4			1.8	1.6	1.7	1.6		
Width/Depth Ratio	----	----	----	----			14.2	16.9	14.5	18.6			12.7	15.9	15.1	15.4			17.2	18.6	15.6	18.6			----	----	----	----		
Entrenchment Ratio	----	----	----	----			6.8	6.9	7.5	6.9			7.1	6.7	6.9	6.8			7.3	6.8	7.6	7.0			----	----	----	----		
Bank Height Ratio	----	----	----	----			1	1.07	1.14	1.14			1	1.36	1.36	1.57			1	1.30	1.50	1.40			----	----	----	----		
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	8.4	8.6	12.2	12.2			13.9	13.4	12.4	13.7			13.3	14.4	13.9	14.7			13	13.9	12.6	13.3			13.6	13.9	12.9	13.7		
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.8	0.6	0.5	0.5			0.9	0.7	0.8	0.7			0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8			0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7			1	0.9	1.0	0.9		

Parameter	XS 25 Riffle (Main Up)						XS 26 Pool (Main Up)						XS 27 Riffle (Main Up)						XS 28 Pool (Main Up)						XS 29 Riffle (Main Up)					
Dimension	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
BF Width (ft)	13.0	15.4	15.2	15.2			13.3	13.4	13.9	13.5			12.0	12.8	12.3	12.4			11.4	11.0	10.3	10.4			12.8	12.7	12.5	12.3		
Floodprone Width (ft)	90.0	90.0	90.0	90.0			----	----	----	----			90.0	90.0	90.0	90.0			----	----	----	----			90.0	90.0	90.0	90.0		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	11.3	11.4	10.8	10.6			12.1	11.8	11.6	10.8			9.5	9.7	10.8	9.8			8.4	8.9	7.6	8.3			12.1	12.1	12.0	11.6		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.9	0.7	0.7	0.7			0.9	0.9	0.8	0.8			0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8			0.7	0.8	0.7	0.8			0.9	1.0	1.0	0.9		
BF Max Depth (ft)	1.4	1.2	1.3	1.3			1.8	1.6	1.7	1.6			1.2	1.2	1.4	1.2			1.3	1.5	1.4	1.4			1.4	1.5	1.4	1.4		
Width/Depth Ratio	15.0	20.8	21.4	21.8			----	----	----	----			15.2	16.9	14.0	15.7			----	----	----	----			13.5	13.3	13.0	13.0		
Entrenchment Ratio	6.9	5.8	5.9	5.9			----	----	----	----			7.5	7.0	7.3	7.3			----	----	----	----			7.0	7.1	7.2	7.3		
Bank Height Ratio	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0			----	----	----	----			1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0			----	----	----	----			1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	13.5	15.8	15.7	15.6			14.0	14.0	14.4	14.0			12.4	13.1	12.8	12.8			11.8	11.7	10.9	11.0			13.5	13.4	13.3	12.9		
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.7			0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8			0.8	0.7	0.8	0.8			0.7	0.8	0.7	0.8			0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9		

Parameter	XS 30 Pool (Main Up)						XS 31 Riffle (Main Up)						XS 32 Riffle (Main Up)					
Dimension	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
BF Width (ft)	12.3	12.6	11.7	12.4			11.6	11.4	11.6	11.7			12.7	13.2	13.9	14.1		
Floodprone Width (ft)	----	----	----	----			90	90	90	90			25	25	25	25		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	11.5	11	10	11.1			8.6	8.3	8.1	8.6			9	8.7	8.8	8.2		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9			0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7			0.7	0.7	0.6	0.6		
BF Max Depth (ft)	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.8			1	1.2	1.2	1.2			1	0.9	1	0.8		
Width/Depth Ratio	----	----	----	----			15.6	15.7	16.6	15.9			17.9	20.0	22.0	24.2		
Entrenchment Ratio	----	----	----	----			7.8	7.9	7.8	7.7			2.0	1.9	1.8	1.8		
Bank Height Ratio	----	----	----	----			1	1.20	1.20	1.20			1	1	1	1		
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	12.9	13.2	12.5	13			12	11.9	12.3	12.1			13	13.6	14.2	14.3		
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.9			0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7			0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6		

Table 9F. Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary
Lamm Main (Upstream) - Stream and Wetland Restoration Site

Parameter	MY-00 (2015)			MY-01 (2015)			MY-02 (2016)			MY-03 (2017)			MY-04 (2018)			MY-05 (2019)		
	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med
Pattern																		
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	36	73	48															
Radius of Curvature (ft)	24	121	36															
Meander Wavelength (ft)	73	145	103															
Meander Width Ratio	3	6	4															
Profile																		
Riffle Length (ft)	10	66	26															
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.00%	3.87%	1.86%															
Pool Length (ft)	5	34	12															
Pool Spacing (ft)	36	97	48															
Additonal Reach Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)	949			949			949			949								
Channel Length (ft)	1,139			1,139			1,139			1139								
Sinuosity	1.2																	
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	0.0157																	
BF Slope (ft/ft)	------			------			------			------								
D50	16.2			13.6			42.1			40.8								
D84	60			67			97			99								
Rosgen Classification	C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4								

Table 9G. Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary
Lamm UT-1 - Stream and Wetland Restoration Site

Parameter	XS 1 Pool (UT 1)						XS 2 Riffle (UT 1)						XS 3 Riffle (UT 1)						XS 4 Riffle (UT 1)						XS 5 Riffle (UT 1)					
Dimension	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
BF Width (ft)	8.1	8.2	8	8.3			8	7.9	8	8.2			9.1	8.7	8.8	8.4			6	7.9	7	8.8			8.7	8.4	9	7.9		
Floodprone Width (ft)	----	----	----	----			50	50	50	50			50	50	50	50			50	50	50	50			50	50	50	50		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	6.4	5.4	5.4	4.5			5	4.5	4.3	4.6			6.7	6.5	6.5	6.4			3.6	3.6	3.5	4.1			4	4	3.7	3.5		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.8	0.7	0.7	0.5			0.6	0.6	0.5	0.6			0.7	0.7	0.7	0.8			0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5			0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4		
BF Max Depth (ft)	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.1			1	0.9	1	1			1.2	1.3	1.6	2			0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9			0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8		
Width/Depth Ratio	----	----	----	----			12.8	13.9	14.9	14.6			12.4	11.6	11.9	11.0			10.0	17.3	14.0	18.9			18.9	17.6	21.9	17.8		
Entrenchment Ratio	----	----	----	----			6.3	6.3	6.3	6.1			5.5	5.7	5.7	6.0			8.3	6.3	7.1	5.7			5.7	6.0	5.6	6.3		
Bank Height Ratio	----	----	----	----			1	1	1	1			1	1.08	1.33	1.67			1	1	1	1			1	1	1	1		
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	8.6	8.7	8.4	8.8			8.4	8.3	8.4	8.5			9.6	9.4	10.2	10.2			6.3	8.3	7.6	9.1			9	8.7	9.4	8.1		
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.5			0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5			0.7	0.7	0.6	0.6			0.6	0.4	0.5	0.5			0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4		

Parameter	XS 6 Riffle (UT 1)						XS 1 Riffle (UT 1-a)						XS 2 Riffle (UT 1-a)					
Dimension	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
BF Width (ft)	8.6	8.9	8.3	8.3			7.4	8	6.8	7.7			7.8	8.4	8	7.9		
Floodprone Width (ft)	17	18	17	17			50	50	50	14			50	50	50	50		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	4	3.8	4.2	3.9			2.5	2.7	1.9	2.1			3.4	3.7	3	3.5		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.5	0.4	0.5	0.5			0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3			0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4		
BF Max Depth (ft)	0.7	0.8	0.9	0.9			0.5	0.7	0.7	0.6			0.6	0.8	0.6	0.8		
Width/Depth Ratio	18.5	20.8	16.4	17.7			21.3	23.7	24.3	28.2			17.6	19.1	21.3	17.8		
Entrenchment Ratio	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0			6.8	6.3	7.4	1.8			6.4	6.0	6.3	6.3		
Bank Height Ratio	1	1.14	1.29	1.29			1	1.40	1.40	1.20			1	1.33	1.00	1.33		
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	8.9	9.2	8.9	9			7.5	8.2	7.2	7.9			8	8.6	8.1	8.1		
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.4			0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3			0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4		

Table 9H. Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary
Lamm UT-1 - Stream and Wetland Restoration Site

Parameter	MY-00 (2015)			MY-01 (2015)			MY-02 (2016)			MY-03 (2017)			MY-04 (2018)			MY-05 (2019)		
	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med
Pattern																		
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	21	42	28															
Radius of Curvature (ft)	14	70	21															
Meander Wavelength (ft)	42	84	60															
Meander Width Ratio	3	6	4															
Profile																		
Riffle Length (ft)	5	44	15															
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	1.10%	9.83%	2.98%															
Pool Length (ft)	5	12	8															
Pool Spacing (ft)	21	56	28															
Additonal Reach Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)	466			466			466			466								
Channel Length (ft)	559			559			559			559								
Sinuosity	1.2																	
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	0.0256																	
BF Slope (ft/ft)	------			------			------			------								
D50	15.2			13.4			11			13.3								
D84	67			58			73			77								
Rosgen Classification	C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4								

Table 9I. Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary
Lamm UT-2 - Stream and Wetland Restoration Site

Parameter	XS 1 Riffle (UT 2)						XS 2 Riffle (UT 2)						XS 3 Pool (UT 2)						XS 4 Riffle (UT 2)						XS 5 Riffle (UT 2)					
Dimension	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
BF Width (ft)	7.4	7.8	7.3	7.7			7.6	6.5	6.5	7.0			7.5	7.3	7.2	7.5			7.6	8.6	8.1	8.8			9.7	7.8	7.9	7.3		
Floodprone Width (ft)	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0			50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0			----	----	----	----			50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0			50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	3.2	3.8	3.4	3.1			2.7	2.6	2.0	2.9			7.2	6.3	5.9	6.1			3.6	3.4	3.4	3.4			5.5	5.6	5.6	5.6		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.4			0.4	0.4	0.3	0.4			1.0	0.9	0.8	0.8			0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4			0.6	0.7	0.7	0.8		
BF Max Depth (ft)	0.7	0.9	0.8	0.8			0.5	0.7	0.6	0.6			1.4	1.3	1.3	1.3			0.7	0.8	0.7	0.7			1.0	1.4	1.5	1.3		
Width/Depth Ratio	17.1	16.0	15.7	19.1			21.4	16.3	21.1	16.9			----	----	----	----			16.0	21.8	19.3	22.8			17.1	10.9	11.1	9.5		
Entrenchment Ratio	6.8	6.4	6.8	6.5			6.6	7.7	7.7	7.1			----	----	----	----			6.6	5.8	6.2	5.7			5.2	6.4	6.3	6.8		
Bank Height Ratio	1.0	1.29	1.14	1.14			1.0	1.40	1.20	1.20			----	----	----	----			1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0			1.0	1.40	1.50	1.30		
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	7.6	8.1	7.6	7.9			7.7	6.9	7.3	7.2			8.3	8.1	8.0	8.3			7.9	8.9	8.4	9.0			10.1	8.4	9.5	8.2		
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4			0.3	0.4	0.3	0.4			0.9	0.8	0.7	0.7			0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4			0.5	0.7	0.6	0.7		

Parameter	XS 6 Riffle (UT 2)					
Dimension	**MY 0**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
BF Width (ft)	5.9	5.9	6.3	5.3		
Floodprone Width (ft)	50	50	50	50		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	2.3	2.7	2.2	2		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.4	0.5	0.3	0.4		
BF Max Depth (ft)	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.7		
Width/Depth Ratio	15.1	12.9	18.0	14.0		
Entrenchment Ratio	8.5	8.5	7.9	9.4		
Bank Height Ratio	1	1.33	1	1.17		
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	6.1	6.3	6.7	5.5		
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.4		

Table 9J. Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary
Lamm UT-2 - Stream and Wetland Restoration Site

Parameter	MY-00 (2015)			MY-01 (2015)			MY-02 (2016)			MY-03 (2017)			MY-04 (2018)			MY-05 (2019)		
	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med
Pattern																		
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	21	42	28															
Radius of Curvature (ft)	14	70	21															
Meander Wavelength (ft)	42	84	60															
Meander Width Ratio	3	6	4															
Profile																		
Riffle Length (ft)	5	26	12															
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.84%	4.64%	2.94%															
Pool Length (ft)	4	14	8															
Pool Spacing (ft)	21	56	28															
Additonal Reach Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)	387			387			387			387								
Channel Length (ft)	464			464			464			464								
Sinuosity	1.2																	
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	0.0301																	
BF Slope (ft/ft)	------			------			------			------								
D50	16.3			16			45.6			43.9								
D84	110			93			109			103								
Rosgen Classification	C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4								

Table 9K. Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary
Lamm UT-3 - Stream and Wetland Restoration Site

Parameter	XS 1 Riffle (UT 3)						XS 2 Pool (UT 3)						XS 3 Riffle (UT 3)						XS 4 Pool (UT 3)						XS 5 Riffle (UT 3)					
Dimension	MY 0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY 0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY 0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY 0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY 0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5
BF Width (ft)	7.3	7.1	7.2	7.2			9.7	11.6	10.7	10.2			7.6	7.6	7.1	6.5			10.4	11.2	10.8	11.1			6.9	6.0	6.0	5.8		
Floodprone Width (ft)	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0			----	----	----	----			50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0			----	----	----	----			50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	2.4	2.4	2.6	2.6			5.9	5.6	5.5	4.8			2.5	2.9	2.6	2.0			7.5	7.1	6.6	6.2			3.1	4.2	4.1	4.0		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4			0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5			0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3			0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6			0.4	0.7	0.7	0.7		
BF Max Depth (ft)	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.5			1.0	1.0	1.1	0.9			0.5	0.8	0.7	0.6			1.2	1.3	1.4	1.4			0.8	1.2	1.2	1.1		
Width/Depth Ratio	22.2	21.0	19.9	19.9			----	----	----	----			23.1	19.9	19.4	21.1			----	----	----	----			15.4	8.6	8.8	8.4		
Entrenchment Ratio	6.8	7.0	6.9	6.9			----	----	----	----			6.6	6.6	7.0	7.7			----	----	----	----			7.2	8.3	8.3	8.6		
Bank Height Ratio	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0			----	----	----	----			1.0	1.60	1.40	1.20			----	----	----	----			1.0	1.50	1.50	1.38		
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	7.4	7.3	7.4	7.5			10.0	11.9	11.2	10.5			7.7	7.8	7.6	7.4			10.8	12.1	11.6	11.8			7.1	6.9	7.6	6.8		
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.3	0.3	0.4	0.3			0.6	0.5	0.5	0.5			0.3	0.4	0.3	0.3			0.7	0.6	0.6	0.5			0.4	0.6	0.5	0.6		

Parameter	XS 6 Riffle (UT 3)						XS 7 Pool (UT 3)						XS 8 Riffle (UT 3)						XS 9 Riffle (UT 3)						XS 10 Pool (UT 3)					
Dimension	MY 0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY 0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY 0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY 0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY 0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5
BF Width (ft)	6.9	6.8	6.3	6.6			6.8	6.7	7.0	6.9			6.3	6.0	5.9	7.0			7.9	7.3	7.0	4.1			7.8	8.4	6.8	5.7		
Floodprone Width (ft)	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0			----	----	----	----			50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0			50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0			----	----	----	----		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	2.8	3.0	2.6	2.3			7.1	8.7	8.9	9.9			2.0	2.3	2.3	2.5			2.5	2.6	3.1	1.8			5.0	3.7	3.3	3.4		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3			1.0	1.3	1.3	1.4			0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4			0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4			0.6	0.4	0.5	0.6		
BF Max Depth (ft)	0.6	0.8	0.7	0.5			1.7	2.1	2.4	2.3			0.4	0.6	0.7	0.6			0.5	0.7	0.9	0.8			1.0	0.9	0.9	1.0		
Width/Depth Ratio	17.0	15.4	15.3	18.9			----	----	----	----			19.8	15.7	15.1	19.6			25.0	20.5	15.8	9.3			----	----	----	----		
Entrenchment Ratio	7.2	7.4	7.9	7.6			----	----	----	----			7.9	8.3	8.5	7.1			6.3	6.8	7.1	12.2			----	----	----	----		
Bank Height Ratio	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0			----	----	----	----			1.0	1.50	1.75	1.50			1.0	1.40	1.80	1.60			----	----	----	----		
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	7.2	7.1	6.7	6.8			7.8	8.4	9.4	8.8			6.4	6.2	6.5	7.4			8.1	7.5	7.6	4.4			8.3	8.7	7.2	6.2		
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3			0.9	1.0	0.9	1.1			0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3			0.3	0.3	0.4	0.4			0.6	0.4	0.5	0.5		

Parameter	XS 11 Riffle (UT 3)						XS 12 Riffle (UT 3)						XS 13 Pool (UT 3)						XS 14 Riffle (UT 3)					
Dimension	MY 0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY 0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY 0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY 0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5
BF Width (ft)	6.3	7.2	7.0	4.6			7.9	6.6	6.7	4.2			7.0	5.5	5.4	5.1			8.6	8.7	8.0	8.3		
Floodprone Width (ft)	50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0			50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0			----	----	----	----			50.0	50.0	50.0	50.0		
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	2.5	3.8	3.7	2.3			2.6	3.0	2.9	2.7			4.1	3.4	2.9	2.6			2.8	3.4	3.4	3.0		
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5			0.3	0.5	0.4	0.6			0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5			0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4		
BF Max Depth (ft)	0.6	1.2	1.1	0.9			0.6	0.9	1.1	1.2			1.2	0.9	0.8	0.8			0.7	0.9	0.9	0.8		
Width/Depth Ratio	15.9	13.6	13.2	9.2			24.0	14.5	15.5	6.5			----	----	----	----			26.4	22.3	18.8	23.0		
Entrenchment Ratio	7.9	6.9	7.1	10.9			6.3	7.6	7.5	11.9			----	----	----	----			5.8	5.7	6.3	6.0		
Bank Height Ratio	1.0	2.00	1.83	1.50			1.0	1.50	1.83	2.00			----	----	----	----			1.0	1.29	1.29	1.14		
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	6.5	7.7	7.7	5.2			8.1	6.9	7.6	5.1			8.2	5.9	5.8	5.7			8.8	9.3	8.3	8.5		
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.4	0.5	0.5	0.4			0.3	0.4	0.4	0.5			0.5	0.6	0.5	0.5			0.3	0.4	0.4	0.4		

Table 9L. Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary
Lamm UT-3 - Stream and Wetland Restoration Site

Parameter	MY-00 (2015)			MY-01 (2015)			MY-02 (2016)			MY-03 (2017)			MY-04 (2018)			MY-05 (2019)		
	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med
Pattern																		
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	21	42	28															
Radius of Curvature (ft)	14	70	21															
Meander Wavelength (ft)	42	84	60															
Meander Width Ratio	3	6	4															
Profile																		
Riffle Length (ft)	6	66	21															
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.82%	6.50%	3.13%															
Pool Length (ft)	4	14	8															
Pool Spacing (ft)	21	56	28															
Additonal Reach Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)	846			846			846			846								
Channel Length (ft)	1,015			1,015			1,015			1,015								
Sinuosity	1.2																	
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	0.0319																	
BF Slope (ft/ft)	------			------			------			------								
D50	8.7			17.4			6.9			12.2								
D84	87			95			29			54								
Rosgen Classification	C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4			C/E 3/4								

APPENDIX E

HYDROLOGY DATA

Tables 10A-B. UT1 and UT3 Channel Evidence

Stream Gauge Graphs

Table 11. Verification of Bankfull Events

Groundwater Gauge Graphs

Table 12. Groundwater Hydrology Data

Table 10A. UT1 Channel Evidence

UT1 Channel Evidence	Year 1 (2015)	Year 2 (2016)	Year 3 (2017)	Year 4 (2018)
Max consecutive days channel flow	64	101	118	119
Presence of litter and debris (wracking)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Leaf litter disturbed or washed away	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Matted, bent, or absence of vegetation (herbaceous or otherwise)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sediment deposition and/or scour indicating sediment transport	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Water staining due to continual presence of water	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Formation of channel bed and banks	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sediment sorting within the primary path of flow	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sediment shelving or a natural line impressed on the banks	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Change in plant community (absence or destruction of terrestrial vegetation and/or transition to species adapted for flow or inundation for a long duration, including hydrophytes)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Development of channel pattern (meander bends and/or channel braiding) at natural topographic breaks, woody debris piles, or plant root systems	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Exposure of woody plant roots within the primary path of flow	No	No	No	No
Other:				

Channel formation and sorting on UT-1




Lamm Surface Gauge UT-1 Upstream
Year 4 (2018 Data)
Surface Water Level (in)
Rainfall Amounts (in)
78 Days
24
22
20
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
5.0
4.5
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
2/1/18
2/9/18
2/17/18
2/25/18
3/5/18
3/13/18
3/21/18
3/29/18
4/6/18
4/14/18
4/22/18
4/30/18
5/8/18
5/16/18
5/24/18
6/1/18
6/9/18
6/17/18
6/25/18
7/3/18
7/11/18
7/19/18
7/27/18
8/4/18
8/12/18
8/20/18
8/28/18
9/5/18
9/13/18
9/21/18
9/29/18
10/7/18
10/15/18
10/23/18
10/31/18


Lamm Surface Gauge UT-1 Downstream
Year 4 (2018 Data)
Surface Water Level (in)
Rainfall Amounts (in)
24
22
20
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
5.0
4.5
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
119 Days
94 Days
2/1/18
2/9/18
2/17/18
2/25/18
3/5/18
3/13/18
3/21/18
3/29/18
4/6/18
4/14/18
4/22/18
4/30/18
5/8/18
5/16/18
5/24/18
6/1/18
6/9/18
6/17/18
6/25/18
7/3/18
7/11/18
7/19/18
7/27/18
8/4/18
8/12/18
8/20/18
8/28/18
9/5/18
9/13/18
9/21/18
9/29/18
10/7/18
10/15/18
10/23/18
10/31/18

Table 10B. UT3 Channel Evidence

UT3 Channel Evidence	Year 1 (2015)	Year 2 (2016)	Year 3 (2017)	Year 4 (2018)
Max consecutive days channel flow	51	100	160	104
Presence of litter and debris (wracking)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Leaf litter disturbed or washed away	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Matted, bent, or absence of vegetation (herbaceous or otherwise)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sediment deposition and/or scour indicating sediment transport	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Water staining due to continual presence of water	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Formation of channel bed and banks	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sediment sorting within the primary path of flow	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Sediment shelving or a natural line impressed on the banks	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Change in plant community (absence or destruction of terrestrial vegetation and/or transition to species adapted for flow or inundation for a long duration, including hydrophytes)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Development of channel pattern (meander bends and/or channel braiding) at natural topographic breaks, woody debris piles, or plant root systems	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Exposure of woody plant roots within the primary path of flow	No	No	No	No
Other:				

Wrack on the UT-3 upstream gauge


Lamm Surface Gauge UT-3 Upstream
Year 4 (2018 Data)
Surface Water Level (in)
Rainfall Amounts (in)
Gauge damaged by fallen tree during hurricane. Data was not recoverable.
67 Days
24
22
20
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
5.0
4.5
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
2/1/18
2/9/18
2/17/18
2/25/18
3/5/18
3/13/18
3/21/18
3/29/18
4/6/18
4/14/18
4/22/18
4/30/18
5/8/18
5/16/18
5/24/18
6/1/18
6/9/18
6/17/18
6/25/18
7/3/18
7/11/18
7/19/18
7/27/18
8/4/18
8/12/18
8/20/18
8/28/18
9/5/18
9/13/18
9/21/18
9/29/18
10/7/18
10/15/18
10/23/18
10/31/18


Lamm Surface Gauge UT-3 Downstream
Year 4 (2018 Data)
Surface Water Level (in)
Rainfall Amounts (in)
104 Days
24
22
20
18
16
14
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
5.0
4.5
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
2/1/18
2/9/18
2/17/18
2/25/18
3/5/18
3/13/18
3/21/18
3/29/18
4/6/18
4/14/18
4/22/18
4/30/18
5/8/18
5/16/18
5/24/18
6/1/18
6/9/18
6/17/18
6/25/18
7/3/18
7/11/18
7/19/18
7/27/18
8/4/18
8/12/18
8/20/18
8/28/18
9/5/18
9/13/18
9/21/18
9/29/18
10/7/18
10/15/18
10/23/18
10/31/18

Table 11. Verification of Bankfull Events

Date of Data Collection	Date of Occurrence	Method	Photo (if available)
May 27, 2015	April 30, 2015	1.66 inches of rain documented in one day at an onsite rain gauge.	--
June 28, 2015	June 19, 2015	Wrack, sediment, and laid-back vegetation observed in the floodplain after 2.28 inches of rain was recorded in one day at an onsite rain gauge.	1-3
October 10, 2016	October 8, 2016	A trail camera installed on the right bank of UT3 documented a bankfull flow after 3.41 inches of rain was recorded in one day at an onsite rain gauge.	4
April 28, 2017	April 24, 2017	Wrack and laid-back vegetation observed in the floodplain after 3.41 inches of rain was recorded over two days at an onsite rain gauge.	5
July 19, 2017	June 19, 2017	2.24 inches of rain documented in one day at an onsite rain gauge.	--
June 11, 2018	April 24, 2018	Wrack observed in the floodplain after 2.66 inches of rain documented* between April 23-24, 2018 at an onsite rain gauge.	6
October 23, 2018	August 21, 2018	Stream gauge data indicates a bankfull event occurred after 2.60 inches of rain documented* between August 20-21, 2018 at an onsite rain gauge.	--
October 23, 2018	September 17, 2018	Stream gauge data indicates a bankfull event occurred after 5.33 inches of rain was recorded between September 15 and 17, 2018 at an onsite rain gauge.	--
October 23, 2018	October 11, 2018	Wrack and laid-back vegetation observed in the floodplain after 2.47 inches of rain was recorded on October 11, 2018 at an onsite rain gauge.	7-8

Bankfull Photo 1: Wrack and sediment in the floodplain of the mainstem

Bankfull Photo 2: Wrack in the floodplain of the mainstem

Bankfull Photo 3: Wrack and laid back vegetation in the floodplain of UT-3

Bankfull Photo 4: Trail Cam photo of UT-3 during rain event October 08, 2016



Bankfull Photo 5: Wrack and laid back vegetation in the floodplain of UT-2



Bankfull Photo 6: Wrack in streamside vegetation along the mainstem

Bankfull Photo 7: Large wrack and laid back vegetation in the floodplain just upstream of a piped crossing on the mainstem

Bankfull Photo 8: Wrack and laid back vegetation in the floodplain of the mainstem


Lamm Groundwater Gauge 1
Year 4 (2018 Data)
March 6
Growing Season
Start
October 22
Growing Season
End
68 days
Groundwater Level (in)
Rainfall Amounts (in)
8
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
-12
-14
-16
-18
-20
-22
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
2/25/18
3/4/18
3/11/18
3/18/18
3/25/18
4/1/18
4/8/18
4/15/18
4/22/18
4/29/18
5/6/18
5/13/18
5/20/18
5/27/18
6/3/18
6/10/18
6/17/18
6/24/18
7/1/18
7/8/18
7/15/18
7/22/18
7/29/18
8/5/18
8/12/18
8/19/18
8/26/18
9/2/18
9/9/18
9/16/18
9/23/18
9/30/18
10/7/18
10/14/18
10/21/18


Lamm Groundwater Gauge 1B
Year 4 (2018 Data)
March 6
Growing Season
Start
October 22
Growing Season
End
60 Days
Groundwater Level (in)
Rainfall Amounts (in)
8
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
-12
-14
-16
-18
-20
-22
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
2/25/18
3/4/18
3/11/18
3/18/18
3/25/18
4/1/18
4/8/18
4/15/18
4/22/18
4/29/18
5/6/18
5/13/18
5/20/18
5/27/18
6/3/18
6/10/18
6/17/18
6/24/18
7/1/18
7/8/18
7/15/18
7/22/18
7/29/18
8/5/18
8/12/18
8/19/18
8/26/18
9/2/18
9/9/18
9/16/18
9/23/18
9/30/18
10/7/18
10/14/18
10/21/18


Lamm Groundwater Gauge 2
Year 4 (2018 Data)
March 6
Growing Season
Start
October 22
Growing Season
End
30 days
53 days
Groundwater Level (in)
Rainfall Amounts (in)
10
8
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
-12
-14
-16
-18
-20
-22
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
2/25/18
3/4/18
3/11/18
3/18/18
3/25/18
4/1/18
4/8/18
4/15/18
4/22/18
4/29/18
5/6/18
5/13/18
5/20/18
5/27/18
6/3/18
6/10/18
6/17/18
6/24/18
7/1/18
7/8/18
7/15/18
7/22/18
7/29/18
8/5/18
8/12/18
8/19/18
8/26/18
9/2/18
9/9/18
9/16/18
9/23/18
9/30/18
10/7/18
10/14/18
10/21/18


Lamm Groundwater Gauge 3
Year 4 (2018 Data)
March 6
Growing Season
Start
October 22
Growing Season
66 Days
Groundwater Level (in)
Rainfall Amounts (in)
8
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
-12
-14
-16
-18
-20
-22
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
2/25/18
3/4/18
3/11/18
3/18/18
3/25/18
4/1/18
4/8/18
4/15/18
4/22/18
4/29/18
5/6/18
5/13/18
5/20/18
5/27/18
6/3/18
6/10/18
6/17/18
6/24/18
7/1/18
7/8/18
7/15/18
7/22/18
7/29/18
8/5/18
8/12/18
8/19/18
8/26/18
9/2/18
9/9/18
9/16/18
9/23/18
9/30/18
10/7/18
10/14/18
10/21/18


Lamm Groundwater Gauge 4
Year 4 (2018 Data)
March 6
Growing Season
Start
October 22
Growing Season
End
28 days
Groundwater Level (in)
Rainfall Amounts (in)
8
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
-12
-14
-16
-18
-20
-22
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
2/25/18
3/4/18
3/11/18
3/18/18
3/25/18
4/1/18
4/8/18
4/15/18
4/22/18
4/29/18
5/6/18
5/13/18
5/20/18
5/27/18
6/3/18
6/10/18
6/17/18
6/24/18
7/1/18
7/8/18
7/15/18
7/22/18
7/29/18
8/5/18
8/12/18
8/19/18
8/26/18
9/2/18
9/9/18
9/16/18
9/23/18
9/30/18
10/7/18
10/14/18
10/21/18


Lamm Groundwater Gauge 5
Year 4 (2018 Data)
March 6
Growing Season
Start
October 22
Growing Season
End
60 days
Groundwater Level (in)
Rainfall Amounts (in)
8
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
-12
-14
-16
-18
-20
-22
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
2/25/18
3/4/18
3/11/18
3/18/18
3/25/18
4/1/18
4/8/18
4/15/18
4/22/18
4/29/18
5/6/18
5/13/18
5/20/18
5/27/18
6/3/18
6/10/18
6/17/18
6/24/18
7/1/18
7/8/18
7/15/18
7/22/18
7/29/18
8/5/18
8/12/18
8/19/18
8/26/18
9/2/18
9/9/18
9/16/18
9/23/18
9/30/18
10/7/18
10/14/18
10/21/18


Lamm Groundwater Gauge 6
Year 4 (2018 Data)
March 6
Growing Season
Start
October 22
Growing Season
End
25 days
Groundwater Level (in)
Rainfall Amounts (in)
8
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
-12
-14
-16
-18
-20
-22
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
2/25/18
3/4/18
3/11/18
3/18/18
3/25/18
4/1/18
4/8/18
4/15/18
4/22/18
4/29/18
5/6/18
5/13/18
5/20/18
5/27/18
6/3/18
6/10/18
6/17/18
6/24/18
7/1/18
7/8/18
7/15/18
7/22/18
7/29/18
8/5/18
8/12/18
8/19/18
8/26/18
9/2/18
9/9/18
9/16/18
9/23/18
9/30/18
10/7/18
10/14/18
10/21/18


Lamm Groundwater Gauge 6B
Year 4 (2018 Data)
March 6
Growing Season
Start
October 22
Growing Season
End
28 days
Groundwater Level (in)
Rainfall Amounts (in)
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
-12
-14
-16
-18
-20
-22
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
2/25/18
3/4/18
3/11/18
3/18/18
3/25/18
4/1/18
4/8/18
4/15/18
4/22/18
4/29/18
5/6/18
5/13/18
5/20/18
5/27/18
6/3/18
6/10/18
6/17/18
6/24/18
7/1/18
7/8/18
7/15/18
7/22/18
7/29/18
8/5/18
8/12/18
8/19/18
8/26/18
9/2/18
9/9/18
9/16/18
9/23/18
9/30/18
10/7/18
10/14/18
10/21/18


Lamm Groundwater Gauge 7
Year 4 (2018 Data)
March 6
Growing Season
Start
October 22
Growing Season
End
Gauge
Malfunction
103 days
Groundwater Level (in)
Rainfall Amounts (in)
10
8
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
-12
-14
-16
-18
-20
-22
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
2/25/18
3/4/18
3/11/18
3/18/18
3/25/18
4/1/18
4/8/18
4/15/18
4/22/18
4/29/18
5/6/18
5/13/18
5/20/18
5/27/18
6/3/18
6/10/18
6/17/18
6/24/18
7/1/18
7/8/18
7/15/18
7/22/18
7/29/18
8/5/18
8/12/18
8/19/18
8/26/18
9/2/18
9/9/18
9/16/18
9/23/18
9/30/18
10/7/18
10/14/18
10/21/18


Lamm Groundwater Gauge 8
Year 4 (2018 Data)
March 6
Growing Season
Start
October 22
Growing Season
End
231 days
Groundwater Level (in)
Rainfall Amounts (in)
12
10
8
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
-12
-14
-16
-18
-20
-22
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
2/25/18
3/4/18
3/11/18
3/18/18
3/25/18
4/1/18
4/8/18
4/15/18
4/22/18
4/29/18
5/6/18
5/13/18
5/20/18
5/27/18
6/3/18
6/10/18
6/17/18
6/24/18
7/1/18
7/8/18
7/15/18
7/22/18
7/29/18
8/5/18
8/12/18
8/19/18
8/26/18
9/2/18
9/9/18
9/16/18
9/23/18
9/30/18
10/7/18
10/14/18
10/21/18


Lamm Groundwater Gauge 9
Year 4 (2018 Data)
March 6
Growing Season
Start
October 22
Growing Season
End
Gauge Malfunction
132 days
Groundwater Level (in)
Rainfall Amounts (in)
10
8
6
4
2
0
-2
-4
-6
-8
-10
-12
-14
-16
-18
-20
-22
-24
-26
4.0
3.5
3.0
2.5
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
0.0
2/25/18
3/4/18
3/11/18
3/18/18
3/25/18
4/1/18
4/8/18
4/15/18
4/22/18
4/29/18
5/6/18
5/13/18
5/20/18
5/27/18
6/3/18
6/10/18
6/17/18
6/24/18
7/1/18
7/8/18
7/15/18
7/22/18
7/29/18
8/5/18
8/12/18
8/19/18
8/26/18
9/2/18
9/9/18
9/16/18
9/23/18
9/30/18
10/7/18
10/14/18
10/21/18

Table 12. Groundwater Hydrology Data

Gauge	Success Criteria Achieved/Max Consecutive Days During Growing Season (Percentage)						
	Year 1 (2015) February 1 Growing Season Start	**Year 2 (2016) March 30 Growing Season Start**	**Year 3 (2017) February 28 Growing Season Start**	**Year 4 (2018) March 6 Growing Season Start**	**Year 5 (2019)**	**Year 6 (2020)**	**Year 7 (2021)**
1	No*/10 days (3.8 percent)	Yes/75 days (36 percent)	No/12 days (5.1 percent)	Yes/68 days (29 percent)			
1B+	--	--	--	Yes/60 days (26 percent)			
2	Yes/35 days (13.3 percent)	Yes/122 days (59 percent)	Yes/82 days (35 percent)	Yes/30 days (13 percent)			
3	No*/14 days (5.3 percent)	Yes/48 days (23 percent)	Yes/135 days (57 percent)	Yes/66 days (29 percent)			
4	No*/14 days (5.3 percent)	Yes/100 days (48 percent)	Yes/78 days (33 percent)	Yes/28 days (12 percent)			
5	Yes/32 days (12.1 percent)	Yes/75 days (36 percent)	Yes/48 days (20 percent)	Yes/60 days (26 percent)			
6	No*/9 days (3.4 percent)	No/7 days (3.4 percent)	No/5 days (2.1 percent)	Yes/25 days (11 percent)			
6B+	--	--	--	Yes/28 days (12 percent)			
7**	--	Yes/116 days (56 percent)	Yes/153 days (65 percent)	Yes/103 days (45 percent)			
8**	--	Yes/206 days (100 percent)	Yes/211 days (89 percent)	Yes/231 days (100 percent)			
9**	--	Yes/54 days (26 percent)	No^/12 days (5.1 percent)	Yes/132 days (57 percent)			

*Due to Site construction activities, groundwater gauges were not installed until April 8, 2015. It is expected that all gauges would meet success criteria at the beginning of the growing season.

**These gauges were installed on March 8, 2016 to show wetland establishment within the old pond bed.

^This gauge malfunctioned through the majority of the growing season due to continuous inundation. It is expected that this gauge would have met success criteria had it functioned properly.

+These gauges were installed during Year 4 (2018) in close proximity with two gauges that had not met success criteria in previous monitoring years in order to verify the groundwater data at these locations.

APPENDIX F
BENTHIC DATA

Results

Habitat Assessment Data Sheets

PAI ID NO			51446	51447	51448
STATION			Mainstream	UT-1	UT-2
DATE			6/13/2018	6/13/2018	6/13/2018
STATION	Functional Feeding Group	Tolerance Value			
MOLLUSCA					
Bivalvia					
Veneroida					
Sphaeriidae		FC			
Pisidium sp.	6.6	FC		1	
Gastropoda					
Basommatophora					
Lymnaeidae		SC			
Pseudosuccinea columella	7.7	CG	4		
Physidae					
Physella sp.	8.7	CG	1	1	
Planorbidae		SC			
Menetus dilatatus	7.6	SC			2
ANNELIDA					
Clitellata					
Oligochaeta		CG			
Naididae					
Naidinae		CG			
Dero digita	9.8	CG		2	
Tubificida					
Lumbriculida					
Lumbriculidae		CG	1		
ARTHROPODA					
Crustacea					
Isopoda					
Asellidae		SH			
Caecidotea sp.	8.4	CG	1		
Amphipoda		CG			
Crangonyctidae					
Crangonyx sp.	7.2	CG	6		11
Insecta					
Collembola					
Isotomidae			1		6
Ephemeroptera					
Baetidae		CG			
Callibaetis sp.	9.2	CG	1		
Neocloeon triangulifer			7		
Neocloeon sp.					2
Caenidae		CG			
Caenis sp.	6.8	CG	2	1	
Heptageniidae		SC			
Stenonema femoratum	6.9	SC	1		

PAI ID NO			51446	51447	51448
STATION			Mainstream	UT-1	UT-2
DATE			6/13/2018	6/13/2018	6/13/2018
STATION	Functional Feeding Group	Tolerance Value			
Odonata					
Aeshnidae		P			
Aeshna umbrosa		P	1		2
Coenagrionidae		P			
Enallagma sp.	8.5	P		4	
Gomphidae		P			
Dromogomphus spinosus	5.6	P	1		
Corduliidae					
Neurocordulia sp.	5.3		10	10	12
Somatochlora linearis	8.9	P	1		
Hemiptera					
Corixidae		PI	1		
Coleoptera					
Dytiscidae		P			
Neoporus sp.	5			1	
Haliplidae					
Peltodytes sp.	8.4	SH	5		1
Diptera					
Chironomidae					
Ablabesmyia mallochi	7.4	P	1		
Dicrotendipes neomodestus	7.9	CG	2	1	
Chironomus sp.	9.3	CG		2	
Limnophyes sp.		CG		1	
Natarsia sp.	9.6	P		1	
Paramerina sp.	4.1	P	1		
Paratanytarsus sp.	8	CG	1		
Paratendipes albimanus/duplicatus	5.6				2
Phaenopsectra obediens gp.	6.6	SC	1		
Polypedilum illinoense gp.	8.7	SH	1		
Psectrocladius sp.		SH		1	
Zavrelimyia sp.	8.6	P	1	6	5
Culicidae		FC			
Anopheles sp.	8.6	FC	4	3	
Dixidae		CG			
Dixella sp.		CG			1
Tabanidae		PI			
Chrysops sp.	6.7	PI		1	1
TOTAL NO. OF ORGANISMS			**56**	**36**	**45**
TOTAL NO. OF TAXA			**24**	**15**	**11**
EPT TAXA			**4**	**1**	**1**
BIOTIC INDEX Assigned Values			**7.07**	**7.16**	**6.63**

180612

3/06 Revision 6

Habitat Assessment Field Data Sheet
Mountain/ Piedmont Streams

Lamm - Main

Biological Assessment Unit, DWQ

TOTAL SCORE 93

Directions for use: The observer is to survey a **minimum of 100 meters with 200 meters preferred** of stream, preferably in an **upstream** direction starting above the bridge pool and the road right-of-way. The segment which is assessed should represent average stream conditions. To perform a proper habitat evaluation the observer needs to get into the stream. To complete the form, select the description which best fits the observed habitats and then circle the score. If the observed habitat falls in between two descriptions, select an intermediate score. A final habitat score is determined by adding the results from the different metrics.

Stream Lamm Mainstem Location/road: Major Hill Rd. (Road Name Major Hill) County Alamance

Date ~~[illegible]~~ 180612 **CC#** 03030002 Basin Cape Fear Subbasin 03-06-04

Observer(s) DM KJ Type of Study: ☐ Fish ☒ Benthos ☐ Basinwide ☐ Special Study (Describe) _____

Latitude 36.885875 Longitude -79.395705 Ecoregion: ☐ MT ☒ P ☐ Slate Belt ☐ Triassic Basin

Water Quality: Temperature _____ °C DO _____ mg/l Conductivity (corr.) _____ µS/cm pH _____

Physical Characterization: Visible land use refers to immediate area that you can see from sampling location - include what you estimate driving thru the watershed in watershed land use.

Visible Land Use: 20 %Forest ____ %Residential 30 %Active Pasture ____ % Active Crops
____ %Fallow Fields ____ % Commercial ____ %Industrial 50 %Other - Describe: 4 yr. old stream/wetland restoration site, early successional hardwood forest

Watershed land use : ☐ Forest ☐ Agriculture ☐ Urban ☐ Animal operations upstream

Width: (meters) Stream 2m Channel (at top of bank) 1m **Stream Depth:** (m) Avg .2 Max .5
☐ Width variable ☐ Large river >25m wide

Bank Height (from deepest part of riffle to top of bank-first flat surface you stand on): (m) 0.5

Bank Angle: 60 ° or ☐ NA (Vertical is 90°, horizontal is 0°. Angles > 90° indicate slope is towards mid-channel, < 90° indicate slope is away from channel. NA if bank is too low for bank angle to matter.)

☐ Channelized Ditch
☐ Deeply incised-steep, straight banks ☐ Both banks undercut at bend ☐ Channel filled in with sediment
☐ Recent overbank deposits ☐ Bar development ☐ Buried structures ☐ Exposed bedrock
☐ Excessive periphyton growth ☐ Heavy filamentous algae growth ☐ Green tinge ☐ Sewage smell
Manmade Stabilization: ☒ N ☐ Y: ☐ Rip-rap, cement, gabions ☐ Sediment/grade-control structure ☐ Berm/levee
Flow conditions : ☐ High ☒ Normal ☐ Low
Turbidity: ☒ Clear ☐ Slightly Turbid ☐ Turbid ☐ Tannic ☐ Milky ☐ Colored (from dyes)
Good potential for Wetlands Restoration Project?? ☒ **YES** ☐ **NO Details** Stream restored - Streams also

Channel Flow Status

Useful especially under abnormal or low flow conditions.

A. Water reaches base of both lower banks, minimal channel substrate exposed ..... ☐
B. Water fills >75% of available channel, or <25% of channel substrate is exposed..... ☐
C. Water fills 25-75% of available channel, many logs/snags exposed..... ☒
D. Root mats out of water..... ☐
E. Very little water in channel, mostly present as standing pools..... ☐

Weather Conditions: Cloudy - humid overall **Photos:** ☐ N ☒ Y ☐ Digital ☐ 35mm

Remarks: Restored Channel

Cool, wet spring above average rainfall, unsuitable for

I. Channel Modification

	Score
A. channel natural, frequent bends	5
B. channel natural, infrequent bends (channelization could be old)	4
C. some channelization present	3
D. more extensive channelization, >40% of stream disrupted	2
E. no bends, completely channelized or rip rapped or gabioned, etc	0

☐ Evidence of dredging ☐Evidence of desnagging=no large woody debris in stream ☒Banks of uniform shape/height

Subtotal 5

Remarks restoration recent

II. Instream Habitat: Consider the percentage of the reach that is favorable for benthos colonization or fish cover. If >70% of the reach is rocks, 1 type is present, circle the score of 17. Definition: leafpacks consist of older leaves that are packed together and have begun to decay (not piles of leaves in pool areas). Mark as Rare, Common, or Abundant.

A **Rocks** C **Macrophytes** R **Sticks and leafpacks** R **Snags and logs** C **Undercut banks or root mats**

AMOUNT OF REACH FAVORABLE FOR COLONIZATION OR COVER

	>70% Score	40-70% Score	20-40% Score	<20% Score
4 or 5 types present	20	16	12	8
3 types present	19	15	11	7
2 types present	18	14	10	6
1 type present	17	13	9	5
No types present	0			

☐ No woody vegetation in riparian zone Remarks stream developing well since restoration

Subtotal 19

III. Bottom Substrate (silt, sand, detritus, gravel, cobble, boulder) Look at entire reach for substrate scoring, but only look at riffle for embeddedness, and use rocks from all parts of riffle-look for "mud line" or difficulty extracting rocks.

	Score
A. substrate with good mix of gravel, cobble and boulders	
1. embeddedness <20% (very little sand, usually only behind large boulders)	15
2. embeddedness 20-40%	12
3. embeddedness 40-80%	8
4. embeddedness >80%	3
B. substrate gravel and cobble	
1. embeddedness <20%	14
2. embeddedness 20-40%	11
3. embeddedness 40-80%	6
4. embeddedness >80%	2
C. substrate mostly gravel	
1. embeddedness <50%	8
2. embeddedness >50%	4
D. substrate homogeneous	
1. substrate nearly all bedrock	3
2. substrate nearly all sand	3
3. substrate nearly all detritus	2
4. substrate nearly all silt/ clay	1

Remarks stable riffle w/ good vegetation

Subtotal 12

IV. Pool Variety Pools are areas of deeper than average maximum depths with little or no surface turbulence. Water velocities associated with pools are always slow. Pools may take the form of "pocket water", small pools behind boulders or obstructions, in large high gradient streams, or side eddies.

	Score
A. Pools present	
1. Pools Frequent (>30% of 200m area surveyed)	
a. variety of pool sizes	10
b. pools about the same size (indicates pools filling in)	8
2. Pools Infrequent (<30% of the 200m area surveyed)	
a. variety of pool sizes	6
b. pools about the same size	4
B. Pools absent	0

Subtotal 10

☒ Pool bottom boulder-cobble=hard ☐ Bottom sandy-sink as you walk ☐ Silt bottom ☐ Some pools over wader depth

Remarks mix of cobble and silt

Page Total 46 ✓

Lamm Main

V. Riffle Habitats

Definition: Riffle is area of reaeration-can be debris dam, or narrow channel area.

	Riffles **Frequent** Score	Riffles **Infrequent** Score
A. well defined riffle and run, riffle as wide as stream and extends 2X width of stream....	16	12
B. riffle as wide as stream but riffle length is not 2X stream width	14	7
C. riffle not as wide as stream and riffle length is not 2X stream width	10	3
D. riffles absent.....	0	

Channel Slope: ☐Typical for area ☒Steep=fast flow ☐Low=like a coastal stream

Subtotal 16

VI. Bank Stability and Vegetation

FACE UPSTREAM

	Left Bank Score	Rt. Bank Score
A. Banks stable		
1. little evidence of erosion or bank failure(except outside of bends), little potential for erosion.	7	7
B. Erosion areas present		
1. diverse **trees**, shrubs, grass; plants healthy with good root systems.....	6	6
2. few trees or small trees and **shrubs**; vegetation appears generally healthy.....	5	5
3. sparse **mixed** vegetation; plant types and conditions suggest poorer soil binding.....	3	3
4. mostly **grasses**, few if any trees and shrubs, high erosion and failure potential at high flow..	2	2
5. little or no bank vegetation, mass erosion and bank failure evident.....	0	0

Total 14

Remarks

VII. Light Penetration Canopy is defined as tree or vegetative cover directly above the stream's surface. Canopy would block out sunlight when the sun is directly overhead. Note shading from mountains, but not use to score this metric.

	Score
A. Stream with **good** canopy with some breaks for light penetration	10
B. Stream with **full canopy** - breaks for light penetration absent.....	8
C. Stream with **partial** canopy - sunlight and shading are essentially equal.....	7
D. Stream with **minimal** canopy - full sun in all but a few areas.....	2
E. **No canopy** and no shading.....	0

Remarks some open areas but better shading, good trees taller

Subtotal 7

VIII. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width

Definition: Riparian zone for this form is area of natural vegetation adjacent to stream (can go beyond floodplain). Definition: A break in the riparian zone is any place on the stream banks which allows sediment or pollutants to directly enter the stream, such as paths down to stream, storm drains, uprooted trees, otter slides, etc.

FACE UPSTREAM

Dominant vegetation: ☐ Trees ☒ Shrubs ☒ Grasses ☒ Weeds/old field ☐Exotics (kudzu, etc)

	Lft. Bank Score	Rt. Bank Score
A. Riparian zone **intact** (no breaks)		
1. width > 18 meters.....	5	5
2. width 12-18 meters.....	4	4
3. width 6-12 meters.....	3	3
4. width < 6 meters.....	2	2
B. Riparian zone **not intact** (breaks)		
1. breaks rare		
a. width > 18 meters.....	4	4
b. width 12-18 meters.....	3	3
c. width 6-12 meters.....	2	2
d. width < 6 meters.....	1	1
2. breaks common		
a. width > 18 meters.....	3	3
b. width 12-18 meters.....	2	2
c. width 6-12 meters.....	1	1
d. width < 6 meters.....	0	0

Remarks

Total 10

☐ Disclaimer-form filled out, but score doesn't match subjective opinion-atypical stream.

Page Total 47

TOTAL SCORE 93

Supplement for Habitat Assessment Field Data Sheet

Diagram to determine bank angle:





This side is 45° bank angle.

Site Sketch:

Other comments: Several salamanders found not included in tally
Northern Sunfish

180612

3/06 Revision 6

Habitat Assessment Field Data Sheet
Mountain/ Piedmont Streams

Lamm UT-1

Biological Assessment Unit, DWQ

TOTAL SCORE 96

Directions for use: The observer is to survey a **minimum of 100 meters with 200 meters preferred** of stream, preferably in an **upstream** direction starting above the bridge pool and the road right-of-way. The segment which is assessed should represent average stream conditions. To perform a proper habitat evaluation the observer needs to get into the stream. To complete the form, select the description which best fits the observed habitats and then circle the score. If the observed habitat falls in between two descriptions, select an intermediate score. A final habitat score is determined by adding the results from the different metrics.

Stream Lamm UT-2 Location/road: Major Hill Rd. (Road Name Major Hill) County Alamance

Date 140612 **CC#** 03030002 Basin Cape Fear Subbasin 03-06-04

Observer(s)_____ Type of Study: ☐ Fish ☒ Benthos ☐ Basinwide ☐ Special Study (Describe) _____

Latitude 35.884037 Longitude -79.392666 Ecoregion: ☐ MT ☒ P ☐ Slate Belt ☐ Triassic Basin

Water Quality: Temperature_____ °C DO _____ mg/l Conductivity (corr.) _____ µS/cm pH _____

Physical Characterization: Visible land use refers to immediate area that you can see from sampling location - include what you estimate driving thru the watershed in watershed land use.

Visible Land Use: ____%Forest ____%Residential 50 %Active Pasture ____% Active Crops
____%Fallow Fields ____% Commercial ____%Industrial 50 %Other - Describe: 3yr. old Stream/wetland restoration site, early successional hardwood forest

Watershed land use : ☐Forest ☐Agriculture ☐Urban ☐ Animal operations upstream

Width: (meters) Stream 1.5 Channel (at top of bank) 0.5 **Stream Depth**: (m) Avg 0.1 Max 0.3
☐ Width variable ☐ Large river >25m wide

Bank Height (from deepest part of riffle to top of bank-first flat surface you stand on): (m) 0.4

Bank Angle: 40 ° or ☐ NA (Vertical is 90°, horizontal is 0°. Angles > 90° indicate slope is towards mid-channel, < 90° indicate slope is away from channel. NA if bank is too low for bank angle to matter.)

☐ Channelized Ditch
☐Deeply incised-steep, straight banks ☐Both banks undercut at bend ☐Channel filled in with sediment
☐ Recent overbank deposits ☐Bar development ☐Buried structures ☐Exposed bedrock
☐ Excessive periphyton growth ☐ Heavy filamentous algae growth ☐Green tinge ☐ Sewage smell
Manmade Stabilization: ☐N ☒Y: ☐Rip-rap, cement, gabions ☒ Sediment/grade-control structure ☐Berm/levee
Flow conditions : ☐High ☒Normal ☒Low Normal
Turbidity: ☒Clear ☐ Slightly Turbid ☐Turbid ☐Tannic ☐Milky ☐Colored (from dyes)
Good potential for Wetlands Restoration Project?? ☐ **YES** ☒**NO Details** Channel restored 2014/2015

Channel Flow Status

Useful especially under abnormal or low flow conditions.
A. Water reaches base of both lower banks, minimal channel substrate exposed ..... ☐
B. Water fills >75% of available channel, or <25% of channel substrate is exposed..... ☒
C. Water fills 25-75% of available channel, many logs/snags exposed..... ☐
D. Root mats out of water..... ☐
E. Very little water in channel, mostly present as standing pools..... ☐

Weather Conditions: Warm, Cloudy, Humid **Photos:** ☒N ☐Y ☐ Digital ☐35mm

Remarks: Restored Channel

tadpoles abundant

I. Channel Modification

	Score
A. channel natural, frequent bends	(5)
B. channel natural, infrequent bends (channelization could be old)	4
C. some channelization present	3
D. more extensive channelization, >40% of stream disrupted	2
E. no bends, completely channelized or rip rapped or gabioned, etc	0

☐ Evidence of dredging ☐Evidence of desnagging=no large woody debris in stream ☐Banks of uniform shape/height

Remarks_____ Subtotal 5

II. Instream Habitat: Consider the percentage of the reach that is favorable for benthos colonization or fish cover. If >70% of the reach is rocks, 1 type is present, circle the score of 17. Definition: leafpacks consist of older leaves that are packed together and have begun to decay (not piles of leaves in pool areas). Mark as Rare, Common, or Abundant.

A **Rocks** C **Macrophytes** R **Sticks and leafpacks** R **Snags and logs** C **Undercut banks or root mats**

AMOUNT OF REACH FAVORABLE FOR COLONIZATION OR COVER

	>70% Score	40-70% Score	20-40% Score	<20% Score
4 or 5 types present	20	16	12	8
3 types present	(19)	15	11	7
2 types present	18	14	10	6
1 type present	17	13	9	5
No types present	0			

☐ No woody vegetation in riparian zone Remarks_____ Subtotal 19

III. Bottom Substrate (silt, sand, detritus, gravel, cobble, boulder) Look at entire reach for substrate scoring, but only look at riffle for embeddedness, and use rocks from all parts of riffle-look for "mud line" or difficulty extracting rocks.

	Score
A. substrate with good mix of gravel, cobble and boulders	
1. embeddedness <20% (very little sand, usually only behind large boulders)	(15)
2. embeddedness 20-40%	12
3. embeddedness 40-80%	8
4. embeddedness >80%	3
B. substrate gravel and cobble	
1. embeddedness <20%	14
2. embeddedness 20-40%	11
3. embeddedness 40-80%	6
4. embeddedness >80%	2
C. substrate mostly gravel	
1. embeddedness <50%	8
2. embeddedness >50%	4
D. substrate homogeneous	
1. substrate nearly all bedrock	3
2. substrate nearly all sand	3
3. substrate nearly all detritus	2
4. substrate nearly all silt/ clay	1

Remarks_____ Subtotal 15

IV. Pool Variety Pools are areas of deeper than average maximum depths with little or no surface turbulence. Water velocities associated with pools are always slow. Pools may take the form of "pocket water", small pools behind boulders or obstructions, in large high gradient streams, or side eddies.

	Score
A. Pools present	
1. Pools Frequent (>30% of 200m area surveyed)	
a. variety of pool sizes	(10)
b. pools about the same size (indicates pools filling in)	8
2. Pools Infrequent (<30% of the 200m area surveyed)	
a. variety of pool sizes	6
b. pools about the same size	4
B. Pools absent	0

Subtotal 10

☒ Pool bottom boulder-cobble=hard ☐ Bottom sandy-sink as you walk ☐ Silt bottom ☐ Some pools over wader depth

Remarks_____ Page Total 49

Lamm UT-1

V. Riffle Habitats

Definition: Riffle is area of reaeration-can be debris dam, or narrow channel area.

	Riffles **Frequent** Score	Riffles **Infrequent** Score
A. well defined riffle and run, riffle as wide as stream and extends 2X width of stream....	16	12
B. riffle as wide as stream but riffle length is not 2X stream width	14	7
C. riffle not as wide as stream and riffle length is not 2X stream width	10	3
D. riffles absent.....	0	

Channel Slope: ☒Typical for area ☐Steep=fast flow ☐Low=like a coastal stream

Subtotal 16

VI. Bank Stability and Vegetation

FACE UPSTREAM

	Left Bank Score	Rt. Bank Score
A. Banks stable		
1. little evidence of erosion or bank failure(except outside of bends), little potential for erosion..	7	7
B. Erosion areas present		
1. diverse **trees**, shrubs, grass; plants healthy with good root systems.....	6	6
2. few trees or small trees and **shrubs**; vegetation appears generally healthy.....	5	5
3. sparse **mixed** vegetation; plant types and conditions suggest poorer soil binding.....	3	3
4. mostly **grasses**, few if any trees and shrubs, high erosion and failure potential at high flow..	2	2
5. little or no bank vegetation, mass erosion and bank failure evident.....	0	0

Total 14

Remarks_____

VII. Light Penetration Canopy is defined as tree or vegetative cover directly above the stream's surface. Canopy would block out sunlight when the sun is directly overhead. Note shading from mountains, but not use to score this metric.

	Score
A. Stream with **good** canopy with some breaks for light penetration	10
B. Stream with **full canopy** - breaks for light penetration absent.....	8
C. Stream with **partial** canopy - sunlight and shading are essentially equal.....	7
D. Stream with **minimal** canopy - full sun in all but a few areas.....	2
E. **No canopy** and no shading.....	0

Remarks_____ Subtotal 7

VIII. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width

Definition: Riparian zone for this form is area of natural vegetation adjacent to stream (can go beyond floodplain). Definition: A break in the riparian zone is any place on the stream banks which allows sediment or pollutants to directly enter the stream, such as paths down to stream, storm drains, uprooted trees, otter slides, etc.

FACE UPSTREAM

Dominant vegetation: ☐ Trees ☐ Shrubs ☐ Grasses ☐ Weeds/old field ☐Exotics (kudzu, etc)

	Lft. Bank Score	Rt. Bank Score
A. Riparian zone **intact** (no breaks)		
1. width > 18 meters.....	5	5
2. width 12-18 meters.....	4	4
3. width 6-12 meters.....	3	3
4. width < 6 meters.....	2	2
B. Riparian zone **not intact** (breaks)		
1. breaks rare		
a. width > 18 meters.....	4	4
b. width 12-18 meters.....	3	3
c. width 6-12 meters.....	2	2
d. width < 6 meters.....	1	1
2. breaks common		
a. width > 18 meters.....	3	3
b. width 12-18 meters.....	2	2
c. width 6-12 meters.....	1	1
d. width < 6 meters.....	0	0

Remarks_____ Total 10

Page Total 47

☐ Disclaimer-form filled out, but score doesn't match subjective opinion-atypical stream.

TOTAL SCORE 96

Supplement for Habitat Assessment Field Data Sheet

Diagram to determine bank angle:





This side is 45° bank angle.

Site Sketch:

Other comments:_____

180612

3/06 Revision 6

Habitat Assessment Field Data Sheet
Mountain/ Piedmont Streams

Lamm UT-2

Biological Assessment Unit, DWQ

TOTAL SCORE 95

Directions for use: The observer is to survey a **minimum of 100 meters with 200 meters preferred** of stream, preferably in an **upstream** direction starting above the bridge pool and the road right-of-way. The segment which is assessed should represent average stream conditions. To perform a proper habitat evaluation the observer needs to get into the stream. To complete the form, select the description which best fits the observed habitats and then circle the score. If the observed habitat falls in between two descriptions, select an intermediate score. A final habitat score is determined by adding the results from the different metrics.

Stream Lamm UT-2 Location/road: Major Hill Rd (Road Name Major Hill) County Alamance

Date 06-12-2018 **CC#** 03030002 Basin Cape Fear Subbasin 03-06-04

Observer(s) P.P.K.S Type of Study: ☐ Fish ☒ Benthos ☐ Basinwide ☐ Special Study (Describe) _____

Latitude 35.884683 Longitude -79.392336 Ecoregion: ☐ MT ☒ P ☐ Slate Belt ☐ Triassic Basin

Water Quality: Temperature _____ °C DO _____ mg/l Conductivity (corr.) _____ µS/cm pH _____

Physical Characterization: Visible land use refers to immediate area that you can see from sampling location - include what you estimate driving thru the watershed in watershed land use.

Visible Land Use: ____ %Forest ____ %Residential 50 %Active Pasture ____ % Active Crops
____ %Fallow Fields ____ % Commercial ____ %Industrial 50 %Other - Describe: 3 yr old Stream/wetland restoration site, early successional hardwood forest

Watershed land use : ☐Forest ☐Agriculture ☐Urban ☐ Animal operations upstream

Width: (meters) Stream 0.5 Channel (at top of bank) 1.5 **Stream Depth:** (m) Avg .01 Max .2
☐ Width variable ☐ Large river >25m wide

Bank Height (from deepest part of riffle to top of bank-first flat surface you stand on): (m) .3

Bank Angle: 45 ° or ☐ NA (Vertical is 90°, horizontal is 0°. Angles > 90° indicate slope is towards mid-channel, < 90° indicate slope is away from channel. NA if bank is too low for bank angle to matter.)

☐ Channelized Ditch
☐Deeply incised-steep, straight banks ☐Both banks undercut at bend ☐Channel filled in with sediment
☐ Recent overbank deposits ☐Bar development ☐Buried structures ☐Exposed bedrock
☐ Excessive periphyton growth ☐ Heavy filamentous algae growth ☐Green tinge ☐ Sewage smell
Manmade Stabilization: ☐N ☒Y: ☐Rip-rap, cement, gabions ☒ Sediment/grade-control structure ☐Berm/levee
Flow conditions : ☐High ☒Normal ☐Low
Turbidity: ☒Clear ☐ Slightly Turbid ☐Turbid ☐Tannic ☐Milky ☐Colored (from dyes)
Good potential for Wetlands Restoration Project?? ☒ **YES** ☐**NO Details** channel restored three years ago

Channel Flow Status

Useful especially under abnormal or low flow conditions.
A. Water reaches base of both lower banks, minimal channel substrate exposed ..... ☐
B. Water fills >75% of available channel, or <25% of channel substrate is exposed..... ☒
C. Water fills 25-75% of available channel, many logs/snags exposed..... ☐
D. Root mats out of water..... ☐
E. Very little water in channel, mostly present as standing pools..... ☐

Weather Conditions: Cloudy-humid **Photos:** ☐N ☒Y ☐ Digital ☐35mm Photos on/Dan

Remarks: Restored Channel, abundant salamanders

abundant gilled salamanders & tadpoles. lots of scuds

unseasonably cool, overcast some showers early

I. Channel Modification

	Score
A. channel natural, frequent bends	5
B. channel natural, infrequent bends (channelization could be old)	4
C. some channelization present	3
D. more extensive channelization, >40% of stream disrupted	2
E. no bends, completely channelized or rip rapped or gabioned, etc	0

☐ Evidence of dredging ☐Evidence of desnagging=no large woody debris in stream ☐Banks of uniform shape/height

Remarks of-cum channel has been colored

Subtotal 5

II. Instream Habitat: Consider the percentage of the reach that is favorable for benthos colonization or fish cover. If >70% of the reach is rocks, 1 type is present, circle the score of 17. Definition: leafpacks consist of older leaves that are packed together and have begun to decay (not piles of leaves in pool areas). Mark as Rare, Common, or Abundant.

A **Rocks** C **Macrophytes** ____ **Sticks and leafpacks** ____ **Snags and logs** C **Undercut banks or root mats**

AMOUNT OF REACH FAVORABLE FOR COLONIZATION OR COVER

	>70% Score	40-70% Score	20-40% Score	<20% Score
4 or 5 types present	20	16	12	8
3 types present	19	15	11	7
2 types present	18	14	10	6
1 type present	17	13	9	5
No types present	0			

☐ No woody vegetation in riparian zone Remarks

Subtotal 18

III. Bottom Substrate (silt, sand, detritus, gravel, cobble, boulder) Look at entire reach for substrate scoring, but only look at riffle for embeddedness, and use rocks from all parts of riffle-look for "mud line" or difficulty extracting rocks.

	Score
A. substrate with good mix of gravel, cobble and boulders	
1. embeddedness <20% (very little sand, usually only behind large boulders)	15
2. embeddedness 20-40%	12
3. embeddedness 40-80%	8
4. embeddedness >80%	3
B. substrate gravel and cobble	
1. embeddedness <20%	14
2. embeddedness 20-40%	11
3. embeddedness 40-80%	6
4. embeddedness >80%	2
C. substrate mostly gravel	
1. embeddedness <50%	8
2. embeddedness >50%	4
D. substrate homogeneous	
1. substrate nearly all bedrock	3
2. substrate nearly all sand	3
3. substrate nearly all detritus	2
4. substrate nearly all silt/ clay	1

Remarks

Subtotal 15

IV. Pool Variety Pools are areas of deeper than average maximum depths with little or no surface turbulence. Water velocities associated with pools are always slow. Pools may take the form of "pocket water", small pools behind boulders or obstructions, in large high gradient streams, or side eddies.

	Score
A. Pools present	
1. Pools Frequent (>30% of 200m area surveyed)	
a. variety of pool sizes	10
b. pools about the same size (indicates pools filling in)	8
2. Pools Infrequent (<30% of the 200m area surveyed)	
a. variety of pool sizes	6
b. pools about the same size	4
B. Pools absent	0

Subtotal 10

☑ Pool bottom boulder-cobble=hard ☐ Bottom sandy-sink as you walk ☐ Silt bottom ☐ Some pools over wader depth

Remarks Sandstone throughout pools and riffles embedded

Page Total 48

Lamm UT-2

V. Riffle Habitats

Definition: Riffle is area of reaeration-can be debris dam, or narrow channel area.

	Riffles **Frequent** Score	Riffles **Infrequent** Score
A. well defined riffle and run, riffle as wide as stream and extends 2X width of stream....	16	12
B. riffle as wide as stream but riffle length is not 2X stream width	14	7
C. riffle not as wide as stream and riffle length is not 2X stream width	10	3
D. riffles absent	0	

Channel Slope: ☐Typical for area ☐Steep=fast flow ☐Low=like a coastal stream

Subtotal 16

VI. Bank Stability and Vegetation

FACE UPSTREAM

	Left Bank Score	Rt. Bank Score
A. Banks stable		
1. little evidence of erosion or bank failure(except outside of bends), little potential for erosion.	7	7
B. Erosion areas present		
1. diverse **trees**, shrubs, grass; plants healthy with good root systems	6	6
2. few trees or small trees and **shrubs**; vegetation appears generally healthy	5	5
3. sparse **mixed** vegetation; plant types and conditions suggest poorer soil binding	3	3
4. mostly **grasses**, few if any trees and shrubs, high erosion and failure potential at high flow..	2	2
5. little or no bank vegetation, mass erosion and bank failure evident	0	0

Total 14

Remarks

VII. Light Penetration Canopy is defined as tree or vegetative cover directly above the stream's surface. Canopy would block out sunlight when the sun is directly overhead. Note shading from mountains, but not use to score this metric.

	Score
A. Stream with **good** canopy with some breaks for light penetration	10
B. Stream with **full canopy** - breaks for light penetration absent	8
C. Stream with **partial** canopy - sunlight and shading are essentially equal	7
D. Stream with **minimal** canopy - full sun in all but a few areas	2
E. **No canopy** and no shading	0

Remarks Areas along stream where shades are not as usefull as others

Subtotal 7

VIII. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width

Definition: Riparian zone for this form is area of natural vegetation adjacent to stream (can go beyond floodplain). Definition: A break in the riparian zone is any place on the stream banks which allows sediment or pollutants to directly enter the stream, such as paths down to stream, storm drains, uprooted trees, otter slides, etc.

FACE UPSTREAM

Dominant vegetation: ☐ Trees ☒ Shrubs ☒ Grasses ☐ Weeds/old field ☐Exotics (kudzu, etc)

	Lft. Bank Score	Rt. Bank Score
A. Riparian zone **intact** (no breaks)		
1. width > 18 meters	5	5
2. width 12-18 meters	4	4
3. width 6-12 meters	3	3
4. width < 6 meters	2	2
B. Riparian zone **not intact** (breaks)		
1. breaks rare		
a. width > 18 meters	4	4
b. width 12-18 meters	3	3
c. width 6-12 meters	2	2
d. width < 6 meters	1	1
2. breaks common		
a. width > 18 meters	3	3
b. width 12-18 meters	2	2
c. width 6-12 meters	1	1
d. width < 6 meters	0	0

Total 10

Remarks

☐ Disclaimer-form filled out, but score doesn't match subjective opinion-atypical stream.

Page Total 47

TOTAL SCORE 95

Supplement for Habitat Assessment Field Data Sheet

Diagram to determine bank angle:





This side is 45° bank angle.

Site Sketch:

Other comments: Lots of salamanders collected in riffles and pools, not included with benthic samples

APPENDIX G

MISCELLANEOUS

Figure-March 2016 Fescue Treatment

Herbicide Application Forms


HOLMAN MILL Rd.
NBUSH Rd.
MAJOR HILL Rd.
RESTORATION SYSTEMS | LLC
Legend - 3/2016 Fescue Treatment
Ingress_Egress
Abbey_Lamm_Conservation_Easement
Fescue Treatment Areas

Carolina Silvics, Inc. Pesticide Application Log

CarSilv - 0523

Client	Restoration Systems		
Project SIte	Abbey Lamm		
Date	05-07-2018		
Start Time	10:20	**End Time**	17:00
Only PAL for Site for This Day?	Yes	**If NO, this is PAL # of ##**	
Sky Cover	Partly Cloudy	**Temp (F)**	76
Wind Direction	NNE	**Wind Speed**	6-10 mph
Applicators	Joshua G Merritt (NC 026-33717) Grainger Coughtrey (NC 026-34612)		
Application Method	Foliar Spray (Backpack)		
Herbicide	Refuge® (glyphosate)		
Herbicide Rate (%)	4	**Total Concentrate**	20 fl oz
Surfactant or Adjuvant (1)	Hel-fire®		
Surfactant/Adjudivant 1 Rate (%)	.5		
Other			
Other Rate/Amt			
Diluent	Water		
Total Solution	4 gallons		
Species Controlled	Privet spp. Tree-of-Heaven Multiflora Rose		
Area Description	Very little invasives present through the entire site. Most found downstream near the fence. Small privet and multiflora found in the understory near the stream.		
Additional Comments			

Carolina Silvics, Inc. Pesticide Application Log

CarSilv - 0456

Client	Restoration Systems		
Project SIte	Abbey Lamm		
Date	08-28-2017		
Start Time	13:00	**End Time**	15:00
Only PAL for Site for This Day?	Yes	**If NO, this is PAL # of ##**	
Sky Cover	Partly Cloudy	**Temp (F)**	79
Wind Direction	N	**Wind Speed**	1-5 mph
Applicators	Joshua G Merritt (NC 026-33717) Grainger Coughtrey (NC 026-34612) Sebastian Kimlinger (NC 026-34613)		
Application Method	Foliar Spray (Backpack)		
Herbicide	Garlon® 3A (triclopyr)		
Herbicide Rate (%)	3	**Total Concentrate**	4 fl oz
Surfactant or Adjuvant (1)	Hel-fire®		
Surfactant/Adjudivant 1 Rate (%)	.5		
Other			
Other Rate/Amt			
Diluent	Water		
Total Solution	1 gallon		
Species Controlled	Privet spp. Tree-of-Heaven Multiflora Rose		
Area Description	Small Privet, multiflora, and Tree of Heaven scarce on the site.		
Additional Comments			

Carolina Silvics, Inc. Pesticide Application Log

CarSilv - 0399

Client	Restoration Systems		
Project SIte	Abbey Lamm		
Date	04-10-2017		
Start Time	9:00	End Time	11:10
Only PAL for Site for This Day?	Yes	If NO, this is PAL # of ##	
Sky Cover	Clear	Temp (F)	70
Wind Direction	NE	Wind Speed	6-10 mph
Applicators	Grainger Coughtrey (NC 026-34612) Sebastian Kimlinger (NC 026-34613)		
Application Method	Basal Bark		
Herbicide	Garlon® 4 (triclopyr)		
Herbicide Rate (%)	15	Total Concentrate	76 fl oz
Surfactant or Adjuvant (1)			
Surfactant/Adjudivant 1 Rate (%)			
Other			
Other Rate/Amt			
Diluent	Diesel fuel		
Total Solution	4 gallons		
Species Controlled	Privet spp. Multiflora Rose Russian Olive		
Area Description			
Additional Comments			

Carolina Silvics, Inc. Pesticide Application Log

CarSilv - 0342

Client	Restoration Systems		
Project SIte	Abbey Lamm		
Date	11-02-2016		
Start Time	12:40	End Time	14:10
Only PAL for Site for This Day?	Yes	If NO, this is PAL # of ##	
Sky Cover	Clear	Temp (F)	78
Wind Direction	SW	Wind Speed	1-5 mph
Applicators	Joshua G Merritt (NC 026-33717) Grainger Coughtrey (NC 026-34612) Sebastian Kimlinger (NC 026-34613)		
Application Method	Basal Bark		
Herbicide	Garlon® 4 (triclopyr)		
Herbicide Rate (%)	15	Total Concentrate	57 fl oz
Surfactant or Adjuvant (1)			
Surfactant/Adjudivant 1 Rate (%)			
Other	Blue Dye		
Other Rate/Amt	1 fl oz		
Diluent	Diesel fuel		
Total Solution	3 gallons		
Species Controlled	Autumn Olive Jap. Honeysuckle Privet spp. Multiflora Rose		
Area Description	Not many invasives present. The few invasives there were located in wooded infringements.		
Additional Comments			

Carolina Silvics, Inc. Pesticide Application Log

CarSilv - 0239

Client	Restoration Systems		
Project SIte	Abbey Lamm		
Date	07-20-2016		
Start Time	11:00	**End Time**	14:00
Only PAL for Site for This Day?	Yes	**If NO, this is PAL # of ##**	
Sky Cover	Clear	**Temp (F)**	93
Wind Direction	SW	**Wind Speed**	1-5 mph
Applicators	Joshua G Merritt (NC 026-33717) Kemper Sutto		
Application Method	Basal Bark		
Herbicide	Other (see comments)		
Herbicide Rate (%)	15	**Total Concentrate**	60 fl oz
Surfactant or Adjuvant (1)			
Surfactant/Adjudivant 1 Rate (%)			
Other	Blue Dye		
Other Rate/Amt	1 fl oz		
Diluent	Diesel fuel		
Total Solution	3 gallons		
Species Controlled	Autumn Olive Privet spp. Tree-of-Heaven Multiflora Rose Paulownia		
Area Description	Most of the invasives were present in the central wooded area on the north side of the easement. Also, there was large tree of heaven, autumn olive, and paulownia present at the north end of the easement next to the wooded area. Cattail was present in two small patches in the down stream easement.		
Additional Comments	Chemical used was Garlon 4 (triclopyr)		

Carolina Silvics, Inc. Pesticide Application Log

CarSilv - 0163

Client	Restoration Systems		
Project SIte	Abbey Lamm		
Date	03-11-2016		
Start Time	8:00	**End Time**	15:30
Only PAL for Site for This Day?	Yes	**If NO, this is PAL # of ##**	
Sky Cover	Partly Cloudy	**Temp (F)**	70
Wind Direction	E	**Wind Speed**	Calm
Applicators	William A Skinner (NC 026-32003/VA 129456)		
Application Method	Foliar Spray (ATV - Broadcast)		
Herbicide	Oust® XP (sulfometuron methyl)		
Herbicide Rate (%)		**Total Concentrate**	30oz
Surfactant or Adjuvant (1)			
Surfactant/Adjudivant 1 Rate (%)			
Other	Grounded (deposition agent)		
Other Rate/Amt	8oz/ac		
Diluent	Water		
Total Solution	125 gallon		
Species Controlled	fescue		
Area Description			
Additional Comments	Oust® application rate was 3oz/ac		