



**MONITORING YEAR 1
ANNUAL REPORT**
Final

GLADE CREEK II RESTORATION PROJECT

Alleghany County, NC

NCDEQ Contract 6843

NCDMS Project Number 92343

Data Collection Period: October 2016

Draft Submission Date: December 31, 2016

Final Submission Date: February 17, 2016

PREPARED FOR:



NC Department of Environment Quality

Division of Mitigation Services

1652 Mail Service Center

Raleigh, NC 27699-1652

PREPARED BY:



Wildlands Engineering, Inc.

1430 South Mint Street, Suite 104
Charlotte, NC 28203

Kirsten Y. Gimbert
kgimbert@wildlandseng.com
Phone: 704.332.7754
Fax: 704.332.3306

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Wildlands Engineering, Inc. (Wildlands) completed design and construction management on a design-bid-build project at the Glade Creek II Restoration Site (Site) for the North Carolina Division of Mitigation Services (DMS) in Alleghany County, NC. The project components included restoring and enhancing 2,579 linear feet (LF) and preserving 129 LF of perennial stream, restoring 0.16 acre of wetlands, and preserving 0.84 acre of existing wetland. Riparian buffers were also established by removing exotic invasive plants and installing a variety of native vegetation. The Site is expected to generate 2,167 stream mitigation units (SMUs) and 0.33 wetland mitigation units (WMUs) for the Glade Creek watershed (Table 1). The Site is located off US Highway 21 in the northern portion of Alleghany County, NC in the New River Basin, eight-digit Cataloging Unit (CU) 05050001 and the 14-digit Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) 05050001030020 (Figure 1). The project streams consist of one unnamed tributary, UT to Glade Creek, and two reaches along Glade Creek mainstem (Reach 1 and Reach 2) (Figure 2). Glade Creek flows into the Little River 4 miles northeast of the Site near Fox Trot Lane in the Town of Hooker, Alleghany County. The land adjacent to the streams and wetlands is primarily maintained for forestry production of White Pine trees.

The Glade Creek II Restoration Project is located within a DMS Targeted Local Watershed (TLW) (Brush Creek, HUC 05050001030020, as documented within the 2009 River Basin Restoration Priorities (RBRP) for the New River Basin. Furthermore, the project site is located within a priority subwatershed for stream and wetland restoration (and habitat protection), Middle Glade Creek, as identified within 2006 Local Watershed Plan and Preliminary Project Atlas for Little River and Brush Creek. Primary stressors within the Brush Creek TLW and the Middle Glade Creek subwatershed include stream channelization, livestock access, degraded riparian buffers, and Christmas tree farming. Glade Creek is also classified as trout water and the project will help improve trout habitat in the watershed.

The project goals established in the mitigation plan addendum (Confluence, 2013) were completed with careful consideration of goals and objectives described in the RBRP and to address stressors identified in the LWP. The following project goals established include:

- Improve water quality by repairing eroding stream banks and establishing riparian buffers;
- Improve the community structure of the buffers;
- Improve stream function and habitat by re-establishing stream-to-floodplain connections;
- Restore long-term stability through the restoration of channel dimension, pattern and profile;
- Improve in-stream habitat using in-stream structures; and
- Remove exotic invasive plant species.

The Site construction was completed between December 2015 and April 2016. The as-built survey was completed in January 2016. Planting was completed in February 2016. Monitoring Year 1 (MY1) activities occurred September to October 2016. MY1 profiles and cross section dimensions closely match the design parameters. Cross section widths and pool depths occasionally exceed design parameters, but are within a normal range of variability. The Site's overall average stem density of 614 stems/acres exceeds the requirement and is therefore on track for the interim vegetation success criterion of 320 stems/acres for MY3. Hydrologic success criteria were achieved in the groundwater gage (GWG), and at least one bankfull event occurred on all monitored reaches.



GLADE CREEK II RESTORATION PROJECT
Monitoring Year 1 Annual Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1: PROJECT OVERVIEW	1-1
1.1 Project Goals and Objectives	1-1
1.2 Monitoring Year 1 Data Assessment.....	1-2
1.2.1 Vegetation Assessment.....	1-2
1.2.2 Vegetation Areas of Concern	1-2
1.2.3 Stream Assessment.....	1-3
1.2.4 Hydrology Assessment.....	1-3
1.2.5 Wetland Assessment.....	1-3
1.3 Monitoring Year 1 Summary	1-3
Section 2: METHODOLOGY	2-1
Section 3: REFERENCES	3-1

APPENDICES

Appendix 1 General Tables and Figures

Figure 1	Project Vicinity Map
Figure 2	Project Component/Asset Map
Table 1	Project Components and Mitigation Credits
Table 2	Project Activity and Reporting History
Table 3	Project Contact Table
Table 4	Project Information and Attributes
Table 5	Monitoring Component Summary

Appendix 2 Visual Assessment Data

Figure 3	Integrated Current Condition Plan View
Table 6	Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table
Table 7	Vegetation Condition Assessment Table
	Stream Photographs
	Vegetation Photographs

Appendix 3 Vegetation Plot Data

Table 8	Vegetation Plot Criteria Attainment
Table 9	CVS Vegetation Plot Metadata
Table 10	Planted and Total Stem Counts (Species by Plot with Annual Means)

Appendix 4 Morphological Summary Data and Plots

Table 11	Baseline Stream Data Summary
Table 12	Morphology and Hydraulic Summary (Dimensional Parameters – Cross Section)
Table 13	Monitoring Data – Stream Reach Data Summary
	Longitudinal Profile Plots
	Cross Section Plots
	Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Appendix 5 Hydrology Summary Data and Plots

Table 14	Verification of Bankfull Events
Table 15	Wetland Gage Attainment Summary
	Groundwater Gage Plot
	Monthly Rainfall Data



Section 1: PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Site is a design-bid-build contract with DMS in Alleghany County, NC. The Site is located in the New River Basin, eight-digit Cataloging Unit (CU) 05050001 and the 14-digit Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) 05050001030020 (Figure 1). Located in the Blue Ridge Belt (USGS,2016), Blue Ridge physiographic province, the project watershed includes primarily agricultural and forest land uses. The drainage area for the project site is 8.0 square miles.

The project stream reaches consist of Glade Creek and UT to Glade (stream restoration). The project wetland areas consist of restoration and preservation (Wetlands A-D). Mitigation work within the Site included restoring and enhancing 2,579 linear feet (LF) and preserving 129 LF of perennial stream, restoring 0.16 acre of wetlands, and preserving 0.84 acre of existing wetland and proposes the generation of 2,167 SMUs and 0.33 WMUs. The stream and wetland areas were planted with native vegetation to improve habitat and protect water quality. Construction activities were completed by Carolina Environmental, Inc. in December 2015. Storm repairs prior to project closeout were completed in April 2016. Turner Land Surveying completed the as-built survey in January 2016 and the storm repairs were judged to have not resulted in changes that would warrant a revised as-built survey. The Site is located on a tract of land owned by the Sharon W. Beck. A 12.8-acre conservation easement on the tract was purchased in 2008 by the State of North Carolina and was recorded with Alleghany County Register of Deeds. The conservation easement protects the project area in perpetuity. Appendix 1 includes detailed project activity, history, contact information, and watershed/site background information. Directions and a map of the Site are provided in Figure 1 and project components are illustrated for the Site in Figure 2. Please refer to the Project Component Map (Figure 2) for the stream and wetland features and to Table 1 for the project component and mitigation credit information for the Site.

1.1 Project Goals and Objectives

Prior to construction, the streams had been impacted by historic agricultural practices, silviculture and valley filling. In addition, there was widespread bank erosion, especially along the outside meander bends, and mid-channel deposition. The wetlands had been impacted by vegetation clearing, exotic invasive plant species, and the valley fill buried hydric soils. Table 4 in Appendix 1 and Tables 6 and 6a in Appendix 2 present the pre-restoration conditions in detail.

This mitigation site is intended to provide numerous ecological benefits within the New River Basin and addresses habitat degradation, which is the primary water quality stressor described in the New River Basin Restoration Priorities Plan (2009). While many of the benefits are limited to the immediate project area, others, such as pollutant removal, reduced sediment loading, and improved aquatic and terrestrial habitat, have farther-reaching effects. Expected improvements to water quality and ecological processes are outlined below as project goals and objectives. These project goals were met by giving careful consideration to the goals and objectives described in the RBRP.

The project specific goals of the Glade Creek II Restoration Site included the following:

- Improve water quality by repairing eroding stream banks and establishing riparian buffers;
- Improve the community structure of the buffers;
- Improve stream function and habitat by re-establishing stream-to-floodplain connections;
- Restore long-term stability through the restoration of channel dimension, pattern and profile;
- Improve in-stream habitat using in-stream structures; and
- Remove exotic invasive plant species.



The project objectives have been defined as follows:

- Restoration and enhancement of approximately 2260 LF of Glade Creek;
- Restoration of 319 LF of the UT to Glade Creek;
- Preservation of 129 LF of UT to Glade Creek;
- Restoration of 0.16 acre of wetland by improving hydrologic connections;
- Preservation of 0.84 acre of existing jurisdictional wetland; and
- Establishment of riparian buffers by removing exotic invasive plants and installing a variety of native vegetation.

The stream and wetland performance criteria for the Site follow approved performance standards presented in the Glade Creek II Restoration Plan (December 2008). Annual monitoring and semi-annual site visits will be conducted to assess the condition of the finished project. The stream restoration and enhancement reaches (Glade Creek and UT to Glade Creek) of the project were assigned specific performance standards for stream morphology, hydrology, and vegetation. Wetland restoration areas were assigned specific performance standards for wetland hydrology, and vegetation. The Glade Creek Stream Restoration Project was instituted prior to 7/28/2010; therefore, the Site will be monitored for five years post-construction.

1.2 Monitoring Year 1 Data Assessment

Annual monitoring was conducted during MY1 to assess the condition of the project. The stream restoration success criteria for the Site follow the approved monitoring plan presented in the Glade Creek II Restoration Plan (Ward, 2008).

1.2.1 Vegetation Assessment

Planted woody vegetation is being monitored in accordance with the guidelines and procedures developed by the Carolina Vegetation Survey-NCEEP Level 2 Protocol (Lee et al., 2008). A total of six vegetation monitoring plots were established during the baseline monitoring within the project easement areas using a standard 10 by 10 meter plot. Please refer to Figure 3 in Appendix 2 for the vegetation monitoring locations. The final vegetation success criterion will be the survival of 260 planted stems per acre in the riparian corridor along restored and enhanced reaches at the end of year five of the monitoring period. The interim measure of vegetation success for the Site is the survival of at least 320 planted stems per acre at the end of year three of the monitoring period.

The MY1 vegetation survey was completed in October 2016, resulting in an average stem density of 614 stems per acre. The Site has met the interim requirement of 320 stems per acre, with 5 of the 6 plots (83%) individually meeting this requirement. The planted stem mortality was approximately 17% from the baseline recorded in May 2016 at MY0 of 742 stems per acre. There is an average of 15 stems per plot as compared to 18 stems per plot in MY0. Approximately 25% of the planted stems scored a vigor of 2 or less, indicating that they are unlikely to survive. These low vigor ratings are due to damage from insects deer, exposed roots, and other unknown factors. Vegetation monitoring plot 1 contains only 6 stems, resulting in a density of 243 stems per acre. Species identification during baseline monitoring was partially incorrect, and has been updated to reflect current conditions to the best of the observer's knowledge. Please refer to Appendix 2 for vegetation plot photographs and Appendix 3 for vegetation data tables.

1.2.2 Vegetation Areas of Concern

The MY1 vegetation monitoring and visual assessment revealed few vegetation areas of concern. Small patches of bare or poor herbaceous cover in the riparian area of Glade Creek Reach 1 and 2 were observed, as shown in Figure 3 in Appendix 2.

1.2.3 Stream Assessment

Morphological surveys for MY1 were conducted in September and October 2016. Results indicate that the channel dimensions are stable and functioning as designed. In general, the cross sections on Glade Creek and UT to Glade Creek show little to no change in the bankfull area, maximum depth ration, or width-to-depth ratio compared to baseline. Surveyed riffle cross sections fell within the parameters defined for channels of the appropriate Rosgen stream type (Rosgen, 1996). In general, substrate materials in the restoration reaches indicated maintenance of coarser materials in the riffle reaches and finer particles in the pools. The particle size distributions for MY1 cross section 2 and 5 are similar to as-built conditions while pebble count data for cross section 1 indicates a slight increase in smaller gravel size particles in MY1. The surveyed longitudinal profile data for the project streams illustrates that bedform features are maintaining lateral and vertical stability. The longitudinal profiles on Glade Creek and UT to Glade Creek showed little change from MY0 in slope (riffle, water surface, bankfull) and pool-to-pool spacing. The overall pattern of all project streams remained the same compared to the baseline data. Refer to Appendix 2 for the visual stability assessment table, CCPV map, and reference photographs. Refer to Appendix 4 for the morphological summary data and plots.

1.2.4 Hydrology Assessment

At least one bankfull event occurred on all reaches during the MY1 data collection, which was recorded on crest gages and by visual indicators. Two bankfull flow events must be documented on the restoration reaches within the five-year monitoring period. The two bankfull events must occur in separate years. Therefore, the performance standard has been partially met in MY1. Refer to Appendix 5 for hydrologic data and graphs.

1.2.5 Wetland Assessment

One groundwater monitoring gage (GWG 1) was established during the baseline monitoring within the restoration area using logging hydrology pressure transducers. The gage was installed at an appropriate location so that the data collected will provide an indication of groundwater levels throughout the wetland restoration area. The target performance standard for wetland hydrology success consists of groundwater surface within 12 inches of the ground surface for 21 consecutive days (12.5 percent) of the defined 168 day growing season for Alleghany County (April 26th to October 11th) under typical precipitation conditions. The onsite rainfall gage malfunctioned therefore no onsite data is available. Daily precipitation data was collected from closest NC CRONOS Station, Glade Valley 3.0 ENE. The GWG 1 recorded 127 consecutive days (76%), meeting the performance standard for MY1. According to the climate data from nearby NC CRONOS station, the Site received less than typical amounts of rain in 2016. The monthly rainfall in January, March and April fell below the 30th percentile for the area (USDA, 2016). Please refer to Appendix 2 for the groundwater gage locations and Appendix 5 for groundwater hydrology data and plots.

1.3 Monitoring Year 1 Summary

All restored streams within the Site appear stable and functioning as designed. The average stem density (614 stems per acre) for the Site is currently on track to meeting the MY3 success criterion with one plot not individually meeting the interim success criterion as noted in CCPV. The Site's groundwater gage met the performance standard for MY1. The bankfull performance standard is partially met in MY1.

Summary information and data related to the performance of various project and monitoring elements can be found in the tables and figures in the report appendices. Narrative background and supporting information formerly found in these annual monitoring reports can be found in the Mitigation Plan documents available on DMS's website. All raw data supporting the tables and figures in the appendices are available from DMS upon request.



Section 2: METHODOLOGY

Geomorphic data was collected following the standards outlined in The Stream Channel Reference Site: An Illustrated Guide to Field Techniques (Harrelson et al., 1994) and in the Stream Restoration: A Natural Channel Design Handbook (Doll et al., 2003). Longitudinal and cross sectional data were collected using a total station and were georeferenced. All Integrated Current Condition Plan View mapping was recorded using a Trimble handheld GPS with sub-meter accuracy and processed using Pathfinder and ArcView. Crest gages were installed in surveyed riffle cross sections and monitored quarterly. Hydrology attainment installation and monitoring methods are in accordance with the USACE (2003) standards. Vegetation monitoring protocols followed the Carolina Vegetation Survey-NCEEP Level 2 Protocol (Lee et al., 2008).



Section 3: REFERENCES

- Confluence Engineering, P.C. (2013). Glade Creek II Restoration Project Final Mitigation Plan Addendum. NCEEP, Raleigh, NC.
- Doll, B.A., Grabow, G.L., Hall, K.A., Halley, J., Harman, W.A., Jennings, G.D., and Wise, D.E. 2003. Stream Restoration A Natural Channel Design Handbook.
- Harrelson, Cheryl C; Rawlins, C.L.; Potyondy, John P. 1994. *Stream Channel Reference Sites: An Illustrated Guide to Field Technique*. Gen. Tech. Rep. RM-245. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 61 p.
- Lee, Michael T., Peet, Robert K., Steven D., Wentworth, Thomas R. 2008. CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation Version 4.2. Retrieved from: <http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/protocol/cvs-EEP-protocol-v4.2-lev1-2.pdf>
- North Carolina Division of Water Resources (NCDWR), 2011. Surface Water Classifications. <http://portal.ncdenr.org/web/wq/ps/csu/classifications>
- North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program (NCEEP), 2009. New River Basin Restoration Priorities. Accessed from: https://ncdenr.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/Mitigation%20Services/PublicFolder/Work%20With/Watershed%20Planners/New_RBRP_2009.pdf
- North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program (NCEEP). Little River and Brush Creek Local Watershed Plan. Accessed from: <https://ncdenr.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/documents/files/LittleRiver-BrushCrk%20LWP%20FactSheet.pdf>
- Rosgen, D.L. 1996. Applied River Morphology. Pagosa Springs, CO: Wildland Hydrology Books.
- United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), 2003. Stream Mitigation Guidelines. USACE, NCDENR-DWQ, USEPA, NCWRC.
- United States Geological Survey (USGS), 2016. North Carolina Geology. Accessed from: <http://ngmdb.usgs.gov/maps/mapview/>
- Ward Consulting Engineers, P.C. (2008). Glade Creek II Restoration Project Restoration Plan. NCEEP, Raleigh, NC.



APPENDIX 1. General Tables and Figures




Figure 1 Project Vicinity Map
 Glade Creek II Restoration Project
 DMS Project No. 92343
 Monitoring Year 1 - 2016



Figure 2 Project Component/Asset Map
 Glade Creek II Restoration Project
 DMS Project No. 92343
 Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Credits

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No.92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Mitigation Credits								
	Stream		Riparian Wetland	Non-Riparian Wetland		Buffer	Nitrogen Nutrient Offset	Phosphorous Nutrient Offset
Type	R	RE	R	R	RE			
Totals	2,141	26	0.33	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A
Project Components								
Reach ID	Existing Footage/Acreage	Approach	Restoration (R) or Restoration Equivalent (RE)	As-Built Stationing/Location	Restoration Footage/Acreage	Mitigation Ratio	Credits (SMU/WMU)	
STREAMS								
Glade Creek Reach 1	1200 LF	P2	Restoration (R)	10+00 - 21+70	1,170	1:1	1170	
Glade Creek Reach 2*	1074 LF	P2	Enhancement I (R)	21+70-26+41; 26+86-29+69; 30+59-32+60	1,090	1.5:1	652	
UT to Glade Creek Reach 1	129 LF	N/A	Preservation (RE)	10+00 - 11+29	129	5:1	26	
UT to Glade Creek Reach 2	197 LF	P1	Restoration (R)	11+29 - 14+48	319	1:1	319	
WETLANDS								
Wetland A, B, C	0.84 AC	N/A	Preservation (RE)	N/A	0.84	5:1	0.17	
Wetland D	0.16 AC	N/A	Restoration (R)	N/A	0.16	1:1	0.16	

Component Summation						
Restoration Level	Stream (LF)	Riparian Wetland (acres)		Non-Riparian Wetland (acres)	Buffer (square feet)	Upland (acres)
		Riverine	Non-Riverine			
Restoration	1,489		0.16			
Preservation	129		0.84			
Enhancement I	1,090					
Enhancement II						
Creation						

* Stream Enhancement I credit reduced; 90 LF removed at break in conservation easement and 45 LF reduced by 50% at overhead power easement.

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History

Glade Creek II Restoration Project
 DMS Project No.92343
Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Activity or Report	Data Collection Complete	Completion or Scheduled Delivery
Mitigation Plan	December 2008	December 2008
Mitigation Plan Addendum	January 2013	January 2013
Final Design - Construction Plans	January 2015	January 2015
Construction	December 2015 - April 2016	April 2016
Temporary S&E mix applied to entire project area ¹	December 2015 - April 2016	April 2016
Permanent seed mix applied to reach/segments ¹	December 2015 - April 2016	April 2016
Bare root and live stake plantings for reach/segments	February 2016	February 2016
Baseline Monitoring Document (Year 0)	May 2016	June 2016
Year 1 Monitoring	September-October 2016	December 2016
Year 2 Monitoring	2017	November 2017
Year 3 Monitoring	2018	November 2018
Year 4 Monitoring	2019	November 2019
Year 5 Monitoring	2020	November 2020

¹Seed and mulch is added as each section of construction is completed.

Table 3. Project Contact Table

Glade Creek II Restoration Project
 DMS Project No.92343
Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Designer Andrew Bick, PE, CFM	Wildlands Engineering, Inc. 167-B Haywood Rd. Asheville, NC 28806 828.774.5547
Construction Contractor	Carolina Environmental Contracting, Inc. PO Box 1905 Mt. Airy NC 27030
Planting Contractor	Keller Environmental 7921 Haymarket Lane Raleigh, NC 27615
Seeding Contractor	Carolina Environmental Contracting, Inc. PO Box 1905 Mt. Airy NC 27030
Seed Mix Sources	Carolina Environmental Contracting, Inc.
Wetland Enhancement Nursery Stock Suppliers Bare Roots Live Stakes Plugs	---
Monitoring Performers	Wildlands Engineering, Inc.
Monitoring, POC	Kirsten Gimbert 704.332.7754, ext. 110

--- Data not provided

Table 4. Project Information and Attributes

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No.92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Project Information				
Project Name	Glade Creek II Restoration Project			
County	Allegheny			
Project Area (acres)	44.50			
Project Coordinates (latitude and longitude)	36° 28' 37.0878"N, -81° 3' 42.7896"W			
Project Watershed Summary Information				
Physiographic Province	Blue Ridge Mountains			
River Basin	New River			
USGS Hydrologic Unit 8-digit	05050001			
USGS Hydrologic Unit 14-digit	05050001030020			
DWR Sub-basin	05-07-03			
Project Drainage Area (acres)	5,120			
Project Drainage Area Percentage of Impervious Area	<1%			
CGIA Land Use Classification	61% Forested, 35% Agriculture/Livestock, 3% Residential/Commercial			
Reach Summary Information				
Parameters	Glade Creek Reach 1	Glade Creek Reach 2	UT to Glade Creek Reach 1	UT to Glade Creek Reach 2
Length of reach (linear feet) - Post-Restoration	1,170	1,090	129	319
Drainage area (acres)	5,120		13	
NCDWR stream identification score	47		31	
NCDWR Water Quality Classification	C; Tr			
Morphological Description (stream type)	C4		B4	
Underlying mapped soils	Suncook			
FEMA classification	no regulated floodplain		no regulated floodplain	
Native vegetation community	White Pine Plantation			
Percent composition exotic invasive vegetation -Post-Restoration	0%		0%	
Parameters	Wetlands A, B & C		Wetland D	
Size of Wetland (acres)	0.84		0.16	
Wetland Type	Riparian-Non Riverine			
Underlying mapped soils	Suncook			
Drainage class	frequently flooded, excessively drained			
Soil hydric status	N/A			
Source of Hydrology	hillside seep			
Restoration or Enhancement Method (hydrologic, vegetative, etc.)	Preservation		hydrologic/ vegetative	
Regulatory Considerations				
Regulation	Applicable?	Resolved?	Supporting Documentation	
Waters of the United States - Section 404	Yes	Yes	USACE Nationwide Permit No.27 and DWQ 401 Water Quality Certification No. 3885. Action ID # 2009-00589	
Waters of the United States - Section 401	Yes	Yes		
Division of Land Quality (Erosion and Sediment Control)	Yes	Yes	NPDES Construction Stormwater General Permit NCG010000	
Endangered Species Act	Yes	Yes	Glade Creek II Restoration Project; Ward Consulting determined "no affect" on Allegheny County listed endangered species	
Historic Preservation Act	Yes	Yes	No recommendations received.	
Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA)/Coastal Area Management Act (CAMA)	N/A	N/A	N/A	
FEMA Floodplain Compliance	N/A	N/A	The upper portion of Glade Creek is not currently mapped as a regulated flood zone	
Essential Fisheries Habitat	N/A	N/A	N/A	

--- Data not provided

Table 5. Monitoring Component Summary

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No.92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Parameter	Monitoring Feature	Quantity/ Length by Reach			Frequency
		Glade Creek	UT to Glade Creek	Wetlands	
Dimension	Riffle Cross Section	2	1	N/A	Annual
	Pool Cross Section	1	1	N/A	
Pattern	Pattern	Yes	Yes	N/A	See Footnote ¹
Profile	Longitudinal Profile	Yes	Yes	N/A	Annual
Substrate	Reach Wide (RW) / Riffle 100 Pebble Count (RF)	RW-1, RF 1	RW-1, RF-1	N/A	Annual
Stream Hydrology	Crest Gage	1	1	N/A	Semi-Annual
Wetland Hydrology	Groundwater Gages	N/A	N/A	Enhancement I (R)	Semi-Annual
Vegetation	CVS Level 2	6			Annual
Visual Assessment	All Streams	Y	Y	Y	Semi-Annual
Exotic and nuisance vegetation					Semi-Annual
Project Boundary					Semi-Annual
Reference Photos	Photographs	9			Annual

¹Pattern measurements will include sinuosity and meander width ratio and will be performed yearly. Measurements of radius of curvature will be monitored on newly constructed meanders for the first year only.

APPENDIX 2. Visual Assessment Data




Figure 3 Integrated Current Condition Plan View
 Glade Creek II Restoration Project
 DMS Project No. 92343
 Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Table 6a. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 -2016

Glade Creek (2,260 LF)

Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjust % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed	1. Vertical Stability (Riffle and Run units)	Aggradation			0	0	100%			
		Degradation			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	Texture/Substrate	9	9			100%			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	Depth Sufficient	6	6			100%			
		Length Appropriate	6	6			100%			
	4. Thalweg Position	Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	6	6			100%			
		Thalweg centering at downstream of meander bend (Glide)	6	6			100%			
Totals										
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroded	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	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%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Totals										
3. Engineered Structures ¹	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs.	7	7			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill	7	7			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms.	7	7			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%.	7	7			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~Max Pool Depth : Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at baseflow.	7	7			100%			

¹Excludes constructed riffles since they are evaluated in section 1.

Table 6b. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 -2016

UT (448 LF)

Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjust % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed	1. Vertical Stability (Riffle and Run units)	Aggradation			0	0	100%			
		Degradation			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	Texture/Substrate	5	5			100%			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	Depth Sufficient	4	4			100%			
		Length Appropriate	4	4			100%			
	4. Thalweg Position	Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	4	4			100%			
		Thalweg centering at downstream of meander bend (Glide)	4	4			100%			
Totals										
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroded	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	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%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
Totals										
3. Engineered Structures ¹	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs.	7	7			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill	7	7			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms.	7	7			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%.	7	7			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~Max Pool Depth : Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at baseflow.	7	7			100%			

¹Excludes constructed riffles since they are evaluated in section 1.

Table 7. Vegetation Condition Assessment Table

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 -2016

Planted Acreage

6.4

Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold (acres)	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Planted Acreage
Bare Areas	Very limited cover of both woody and herbaceous material	0.1	7	0.4	6.3%
Low Stem Density Areas¹	Woody stem densities clearly below target levels based on MY3, 4, 5, or 7 stem count criteria.	0.1	1	0.025	0.4%
			Total	0.4	6.6%
Areas of Poor Growth Rates or Vigor	Areas with woody stems of a size class that are obviously small given the monitoring year.	0	0	0.0	0%
			Cumulative Total	0.4	6.6%

Easement Acreage

12.8

Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold (SF)	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Planted Acreage
Invasive Areas of Concern	Areas or points (if too small to render as polygons at map scale).	1000	0	0.0	0%
Easement Encroachment Areas	Areas or points (if too small to render as polygons at map scale).	none	0	0	0%

¹Acreage calculated from vegetation plots monitored for site.

Stream Photographs



Photo Point 1 – view upstream UT Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 1 – view downstream UT Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 2 – view upstream UT Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 2 – view upstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 2 – view downstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 3 – view upstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 3 – view downstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 4 – view upstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 4 – view downstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 5 – view upstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 5 – view downstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 6 – view upstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 6 – view downstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 7 – view upstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 7 – view downstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 8 – view upstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 8 – view downstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 9 – view upstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)



Photo Point 9 – view downstream Glade Creek (10/04/2016)

Vegetation Photographs



Vegetation Plot 1 - (10/04/2016)



Vegetation Plot 2 - (10/04/2016)



Vegetation Plot 3 - (10/04/2016)



Vegetation Plot 4 - (10/04/2016)



Vegetation Plot 5 - (10/04/2016)



Vegetation Plot 6 - (10/04/2016)

APPENDIX 3. Vegetation Plot Data

Table 8. Vegetation Plot Criteria Attainment

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Plot	MY1 Success Criteria Met (Y/N)	Tract Mean
1	N	83%
2	Y	
3	Y	
4	Y	
5	Y	
6	Y	

Table 9. CVS Vegetation Plot Metadata

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Report Prepared By	Alea Tuttle
Date Prepared	10/10/2016 12:17
Database Name	cvs-eep-entrytool-v2.5.0 Glade MY1.mdb
Database Location	Q:\ActiveProjects\005-02161 Glade Creek II Monitoring\Monitoring\Monitoring Year 1\Vegetation Assessment
Computer Name	ALEA
File Size	47894528
DESCRIPTION OF WORKSHEETS IN THIS DOCUMENT-----	
Metadata	Description of database file, the report worksheets, and a summary of project(s) and project data.
Proj, planted	Each project is listed with its PLANTED stems per acre, for each year. This excludes live stakes.
Proj, total stems	Each project is listed with its TOTAL stems per acre, for each year. This includes live stakes, all planted stems, and all natural/volunteer stems.
Plots	List of plots surveyed with location and summary data (live stems, dead stems, missing, etc.).
Vigor	Frequency distribution of vigor classes for stems for all plots.
Vigor by Spp	Frequency distribution of vigor classes listed by species.
Damage	List of most frequent damage classes with number of occurrences and percent of total stems impacted by each.
Damage by Spp	Damage values tallied by type for each species.
Damage by Plot	Damage values tallied by type for each plot.
Planted Stems by Plot and Spp	A matrix of the count of PLANTED living stems of each species for each plot; dead and missing stems are excluded.
ALL Stems by Plot and spp	A matrix of the count of total living stems of each species (planted and natural volunteers combined) for each plot; dead and missing stems are excluded.
PROJECT SUMMARY-----	
Project Code	92343
project Name	Glade Creek II Restoration Project
Description	Glade Creek II Restoration Project
River Basin	
Length(ft)	
Stream-to-edge Width (ft)	
Area (sq m)	
Required Plots (calculated)	6
Sampled Plots	6

Table 10. Planted and Total Stem Counts

Glade Creek II Restoration Project
 DMS Project No. 92343
 Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	Current Plot Data (MY1 2016)																		Annual Summary								
			92343-WEI-0001			92343-WEI-0002			92343-WEI-0003			92343-WEI-0004			92343-WEI-0005			92343-WEI-0006			MY1 (2016)			MY0 (2016)					
			PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T			
<i>Acer rubrum</i>	Red Maple	Tree	3	3	3																			3	3	3	6	6	6
<i>Alnus serrulata</i>	Tag Alder	Shrub Tree				1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	1	1	1	7	7	14	13	13	20	14	14	14			
<i>Carpinus caroliniana</i>	American Hornbeam	Shrub Tree				1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1	4	4	4	4	4	4			
<i>Cercis canadensis</i>	Eastern Redbud	Shrub Tree						1															1						
<i>Diospyros virginiana</i>	American Persimmon	Tree				2	2	2				3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	10	10	10	11	11	11			
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	Green Ash	Tree	2	2	2																2	2	2	3	3	3			
<i>Hamamelis virginiana</i>	Witch-hazel	Shrub Tree				4	4	4	1	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3				10	10	10	10	10	10			
<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>	Tulip Poplar	Tree				3	3	3	12	12	12	3	3	3	4	4	4	2	2	2	24	24	24	28	28	28			
<i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>	Black Gum	Tree				2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2							6	6	6	7	7	7			
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	Sycamore	Tree	1	1	1	3	3	3	5	5	5	2	2	2	3	3	3				14	14	14	22	22	22			
<i>Sambucus canadensis</i>	Common Elderberry	Shrub Tree				1	1	1				1	1	1	3	3	3				5	5	5	5	5	5			
Stem count			6	6	6	17	17	18	22	22	22	17	17	17	17	17	17	12	12	19	91	91	99	110	110	110			
size (ares)			1			1			1			1			1			6			6								
size (ACRES)			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.15			0.15								
Species count			3	3	3	8	8	9	6	6	6	8	8	8	6	6	6	4	4	4	10	10	11	10	10	10			
Stems per ACRE			243	243	243	688	688	728	890	890	890	688	688	688	688	688	688	486	486	769	614	614	668	742	742	742			

Color for Density

- Exceeds requirements by 10%
- Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10%
- Fails to meet requirements, by less than 10%
- Fails to meet requirements by more than 10%
- Volunteer species included in total

PnoLS: Number of planted stems excluding live stakes
 P-all: Number of planted stems including live stakes
 T: Total stems

APPENDIX 4. Morphological Summary Data and Plots

Table 11. Baseline Stream Data Summary
 Glade Creek II Restoration Project
 DMS Project No. 92343
 Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Parameter	Gage	Pre-Restoration Condition				Reference Reach Data				Design				As-Built/	
		Glade Creek		UT to Glade Creek		Glade Creek Restoration		UT to Little Pine Trib 1		Glade Creek		UT to Glade Creek		Glade Creek	
		Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max
Dimension and Substrate - Shallow															
Bankfull Width (ft)	N/A	17.7	38.5	5.2	9.9	36.3	48.8	6.2	11.1	33.0		5.4		34.6	37.4
Floodprone Width (ft)		47	115	7	12	69	118	14	46	99	165	22	33	106	111
Bankfull Mean Depth		2.6	2.1	0.3	0.5	0.9	1.3	0.9	0.5	2.3		0.3		1.9	2.2
Bankfull Max Depth		2.9	4.1	0.5	0.8	1.9	1.9	0.8	1.6	3.0		0.4		2.9	3.2
Bankfull Cross-sectional Area (ft ²)		46.9	79.0	2.1	5.1	45.6	64.1	3.8	5.1	76.5		1.7		70.2	77.1
Width/Depth Ratio		6.7	18.8	17.3	26.8	40.3	37.2	6.9	24.2	14.2		17.4		15.5	19.9
Entrenchment Ratio		2.7	3.1	1.2	1.5	1.9	2.4	2.3	4.1	3.0	5.0	4.0	6.0	2.8	3.2
Bank Height Ratio		1.1	1.7	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.1	1.0		1.0		1.0	
D50 (mm)		28.0	31.0	7.0	7.0	44.0	47.0	7.0	7.0	28.0	31.0	7.0		90.0	
Riffle Length (ft)		N/A					---	---			---	---			33
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)						---	---			---	---			0.0087	0.0271
Pool Length (ft)						---	---			5		---		64.0	197.8
Pool Max Depth (ft)	4.4		6.6	0.8		5.0	0.7	1.5	3.3	4.1	0.8	1.0	3.8	5.9	
Pool Spacing (ft)						---	---			---	---			107	353
Pool Volume (ft ³)															
Pattern															
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	N/A	60	240	7	16	---	---	19	26	112	205	17		155	282
Radius of Curvature (ft)		21	114	---	---	---	---	30		59.0	99.0	30		59.0	99.0
Rc:Bankfull Width (ft/ft)		1.2	3.0	---	---	---	---	3.2	5.9	1.8	3.0	5.5-6.0		1.8	3.0
Meander Length (ft)				---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	230	620
Meander Width Ratio		3.4	6.2	1.3	1.6	---	---	2.5	3.5	3.4	6.2	3.1	7.0	3.4	6.2
Substrate, Bed and Transport Parameters															
Ri%/Ru%/P%/G%/S%	N/A														
SC%/Sa%/G%/C%/B%/Be%															
d16/d35/d50/d84/d95/d100		-/3.1/8.6/11.0/16.0		---			-/0.1/0.2/0.5/4.0/8.0	0.1/3.0/8.8/77/180/-						1/26.47/42.3/128/180/>2048	
Reach Shear Stress (Competency) lb/ft ²		---		---						0.48	0.52	0.82	0.11	0.12	
Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankfull															
Stream Power (Capacity) W/m ²															
Additional Reach Parameters															
Drainage Area (SM)	N/A	8.00		0.02		4.60		0.05		8.00		0.02		8.00	
Watershed Impervious Cover Estimate (%)		---		---		---		---		---		---		---	
Rosgen Classification		E4/C4		F4/B4		C4		C4/B4		C4		B4		C4	
Bankfull Velocity (fps)		3.8	5.3	3.8	4.9	3.1	4.4	4.5	6.1	3.9		4.7			
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)		250	300	8	25	200		23		300		8			
Q-NFF regression (2-yr)		493		5		352									
Q-USGS extrapolation (1.2-yr)		561		4		335									
Q-Mannings		213	320	8		153	228								
Valley Length (ft)		---		---		---		---		1,322		280		1,322	
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)		1200		197		---		---		2,120		197		2,120	
Sinuosity		1.68		1.04		1.18		1.09		1.68		1.14		1.60	
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft) ²		0.0038		0.048		0.0049		0.0473		0.0038		0.0440		0.0031	
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)		---		---		---		---		---		---		0.0031	

SC: Silt/Clay <0.062 mm diameter particles

(---): Data was not provided

N/A: Not Applicable

N/A¹: The Rosgen classification system is for natural streams. These channels have been heavily manipulated by man and therefore the Rosgen classification system is not applicable

N/A²: Downstream of the confluence with overflow channel, hydraulic regime not applied

*: Channel was dry during survey, slope was calculated using channel thalweg

Table 12. Morphology and Hydraulic Summary (Dimensional Parameters - Cross Section)

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Dimension and Substrate	Cross Section 1, Glade Creek (Riffle)						Cross Section 2, Glade Creek (Riffle)						Cross Section 3, Glade Creek (Pool)					
	Base	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	Base	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	Base	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5
<i>based on fixed bankfull elevation</i>	2571.8	2571.8					2569.7	2569.7					2569.8	2569.8				
Bankfull Width (ft)	37.4	34.4					34.6	35.0					31.9	30.0				
Floodprone Width (ft)	106	106					111	110					---	---				
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	1.9	1.9					2.2	2.2					2.8	2.9				
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	2.9	2.9					3.2	3.2					4.2	4.2				
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)	70.2	66.9					77.1	78.0					89.0	88.4				
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	19.9	17.7					15.5	15.7					11.5	10.2				
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	2.8	3.1					3.2	3.2					---	---				
Bankfull Bank Height Ratio	1.0	1.0					1.0	1.0					---	---				
Dimension and Substrate	Cross Section 4, UT to Glade Creek (Pool)						Cross Section 5, UT to Glade Creek (Riffle)											
	Base	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	Base	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5						
<i>based on fixed bankfull elevation</i>	2574.0	2574.0					2573.6	2573.6										
Bankfull Width (ft)	5.3	7.1					5.3	6.1										
Floodprone Width (ft)	---	---					61	61										
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	0.9	0.8					0.5	0.4										
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	1.5	1.3					0.9	0.8										
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)	4.7	5.5					2.4	2.7										
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	6.0	9.6					11.8	13.5										
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	---	---					11.4	10.0										
Bankfull Bank Height Ratio	---	---					1.0	1.0										

---: not applicable



Longitudinal Profile Plots

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Glade Creek Reach 1 and 2 (STA 10+00 - STA 31+20)





Longitudinal Profile Plots

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

UT Glade Creek (STA 11+29 - STA 14+48)




Cross Section Plots

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Cross Section 1 - Glade Creek



Bankfull Dimensions

66.9	x-section area (ft.sq.)
34.4	width (ft)
1.9	mean depth (ft)
2.9	max depth (ft)
35.2	wetted perimeter (ft)
1.9	hydraulic radius (ft)
17.7	width-depth ratio
106	W flood prone area (ft)
3.1	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 09/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering



View Downstream


Cross Section Plots

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Cross Section 2 - Glade Creek



Bankfull Dimensions

78.0	x-section area (ft.sq.)
35.0	width (ft)
2.2	mean depth (ft)
3.2	max depth (ft)
36.0	wetted perimeter (ft)
2.2	hydraulic radius (ft)
15.7	width-depth ratio
110	W flood prone area (ft)
3.2	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 09/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering



View Downstream


Cross Section Plots

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Cross Section 3 - Glade Creek



Bankfull Dimensions

88.4	x-section area (ft.sq.)
30.0	width (ft)
2.9	mean depth (ft)
4.2	max depth (ft)
32.0	wetted perimeter (ft)
2.8	hydraulic radius (ft)
10.2	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 09/2016
Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering



View Downstream


Cross Section Plots

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Cross Section 4 -UT Glade Creek



Bankfull Dimensions

5.5	x-section area (ft.sq.)
7.1	width (ft)
0.8	mean depth (ft)
1.3	max depth (ft)
7.7	wetted perimeter (ft)
0.7	hydraulic radius (ft)
9.0	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 10/2016
Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering



View Downstream


Cross Section Plots

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Cross Section 5 - UT Glade Creek



Bankfull Dimensions

2.7	x-section area (ft.sq.)
6.1	width (ft)
0.4	mean depth (ft)
0.8	max depth (ft)
6.3	wetted perimeter (ft)
0.4	hydraulic radius (ft)
13.5	width-depth ratio
61	W flood prone area (ft)
10.0	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 10/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering



View Downstream

Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Glade Creek II Restoration Project



DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Glade, Reachwide

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Particle Count			Reach Summary	
		min	max	Riffle	Pool	Total	Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
<i>SILT/CLAY</i>	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062					0
<i>SAND</i>	Very fine	0.062	0.125		3	3	3	3
	Fine	0.125	0.250		1	1	1	4
	Medium	0.25	0.50		8	8	8	12
	Coarse	0.5	1.0		1	1	1	13
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0		2	2	2	15
<i>GRAVEL</i>	Very Fine	2.0	2.8					15
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0		2	2	2	17
	Fine	4.0	5.6	1	2	3	3	20
	Fine	5.6	8.0	1	2	3	3	23
	Medium	8.0	11.0		2	2	2	25
	Medium	11.0	16.0	2	4	6	6	31
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	4	3	7	7	38
	Coarse	22.6	32	12	2	14	14	52
	Very Coarse	32	45	3	3	6	6	58
	Very Coarse	45	64	6	3	9	9	67
<i>COBBLE</i>	Small	64	90	9	5	14	14	81
	Small	90	128	7	6	13	13	94
	Large	128	180	4	1	5	5	99
	Large	180	256	1	1	1	1	100
<i>BOULDER</i>	Small	256	362					100
	Small	362	512					100
	Medium	512	1024					100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048					100
<i>BEDROCK</i>	Bedrock	2048	>2048					100
Total				50	50	100	100	100

Reachwide	
Channel materials (mm)	
D ₁₆ =	3.35
D ₃₅ =	19.49
D ₅₀ =	30.4
D ₈₄ =	97.6
D ₉₅ =	137.0
D ₁₀₀ =	256.0



Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Glade Creek II Restoration Project



DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Glade, Cross Section 1

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Riffle 100-Count	Summary	
		min	max		Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062			0
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			0
	Fine	0.125	0.250			0
	Medium	0.25	0.50			0
	Coarse	0.5	1.0			0
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0			0
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			0
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0			0
	Fine	4.0	5.6			0
	Fine	5.6	8.0			0
	Medium	8.0	11.0	2	2	2
	Medium	11.0	16.0	2	2	4
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	22	22	26
	Coarse	22.6	32	20	20	46
	Very Coarse	32	45	20	20	66
Very Coarse	45	64	16	16	82	
COBBLE	Small	64	90	8	8	90
	Small	90	128	2	2	92
	Large	128	180	6	6	98
	Large	180	256	2	2	100
BOULDER	Small	256	362			100
	Small	362	512			100
	Medium	512	1024			100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048			100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048			100
		Total		100	100	100

Cross Section 1	
Channel materials (mm)	
D ₁₆ =	19.32
D ₃₅ =	26.43
D ₅₀ =	34.3
D ₈₄ =	69.7
D ₉₅ =	151.8
D ₁₀₀ =	256.0



Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Glade Creek II Restoration Project



DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Glade, Cross Section 2

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Riffle 100-Count	Summary	
		min	max		Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062			0
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			0
	Fine	0.125	0.250			0
	Medium	0.25	0.50			0
	Coarse	0.5	1.0			0
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0			0
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			0
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0			0
	Fine	4.0	5.6			0
	Fine	5.6	8.0			0
	Medium	8.0	11.0	2	2	2
	Medium	11.0	16.0	8	8	10
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	12	12	22
	Coarse	22.6	32	22	22	44
	Very Coarse	32	45	20	20	64
Very Coarse	45	64	20	20	84	
COBBLE	Small	64	90	10	10	94
	Small	90	128	2	2	96
	Large	128	180			96
	Large	180	256	2	2	98
BOULDER	Small	256	362	2	2	100
	Small	362	512			100
	Medium	512	1024			100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048			100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048			100
		Total		100	100	100

Cross Section 2	
Channel materials (mm)	
D ₁₆ =	19.02
D ₃₅ =	27.76
D ₅₀ =	35.4
D ₈₄ =	64.0
D ₉₅ =	107.3
D ₁₀₀ =	362.0



Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Glade Creek II Restoration Project



DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

UT Glade, Reachwide

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Particle Count			Reach Summary	
		min	max	Riffle	Pool	Total	Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062	4	4	8	8	8
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125		4	4	4	12
	Fine	0.125	0.250	3	4	7	7	19
	Medium	0.25	0.50		4	4	4	23
	Coarse	0.5	1.0					23
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0		1	1	1	24
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8		1	1	1	25
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0	2	4	6	6	31
	Fine	4.0	5.6	4	5	9	9	40
	Fine	5.6	8.0	3	3	6	6	46
	Medium	8.0	11.0	2	1	3	3	49
	Medium	11.0	16.0	4	1	5	5	54
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	3	2	5	5	59
	Coarse	22.6	32					59
	Very Coarse	32	45	2		2	2	61
	Very Coarse	45	64	5	1	6	6	67
COBBLE	Small	64	90	5		5	5	72
	Small	90	128	11	2	13	13	85
	Large	128	180	11	3	14	14	99
	Large	180	256	1		1	1	100
BOULDER	Small	256	362					100
	Small	362	512					100
	Medium	512	1024					100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048					100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048					100
Total				60	40	100	100	100

Reachwide	
Channel materials (mm)	
D ₁₆ =	0.19
D ₃₅ =	4.65
D ₅₀ =	11.9
D ₈₄ =	124.6
D ₉₅ =	163.3
D ₁₀₀ =	256.0



Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Glade Creek II Restoration Project



DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

UT Glade, Cross Section 5

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Riffle 100-Count	Summary	
		min	max		Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062			0
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			0
	Fine	0.125	0.250	14	14	14
	Medium	0.25	0.50	20	20	34
	Coarse	0.5	1.0	2	2	36
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0			36
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8	6	6	42
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0	2	2	44
	Fine	4.0	5.6			44
	Fine	5.6	8.0	2	2	46
	Medium	8.0	11.0	2	2	48
	Medium	11.0	16.0			48
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	2	2	50
	Coarse	22.6	32			50
	Very Coarse	32	45			50
	Very Coarse	45	64	2	2	52
COBBLE	Small	64	90	2	2	54
	Small	90	128	28	28	82
	Large	128	180	12	12	94
	Large	180	256	6	6	100
BOULDER	Small	256	362			100
	Small	362	512			100
	Medium	512	1024			100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048			100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048			100
		Total		100	100	100

Cross Section 5	
Channel materials (mm)	
D ₁₆ =	0.27
D ₃₅ =	0.71
D ₅₀ =	22.6
D ₈₄ =	135.5
D ₉₅ =	190.9
D ₁₀₀ =	256.0



APPENDIX 5. Hydrology Summary Data and Plots

Table 14. Verification of Bankfull Events

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Glade Creek, UT

Reach	Date of Data Collection	Date of Occurrence	MY of Occurrence	Method
Glade Creek	10/4/2016	6/27/2016	1	Crest Gage
UT	10/4/2016	6/27/2016	1	Crest Gage

Table 15. Wetland Gage Attainment Summary

Glade Creek II Restoration Project

DMS Project No. 92343

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Summary of Groundwater Gage Results for MY1					
Gage	Success Criteria Achieved/Max Consecutive Days During Growing Season (%)				
	Year 1 (2016)	Year 2 (2017)	Year 3 (2018)	Year 4 (2019)	Year 5 (2020)
1	Yes/127 Days (75.6%)				


Wetland success criteria is 12.5% of growing season (21 consecutive days).

Groundwater Gage Plots


Glade Creek II Restoration Project (DMS Project No. 92343)

Monitoring Year 1 - 2016

Wetland D



Monthly Rainfall Data
Glade Creek II Restoration Project
 DMS Project No. 92343
Monitoring Year 1 - 2016



¹ 2016 rainfall collected from NC CRONOS Station Name: Glade Valley 3.0 ENE (NCSU, 2016)

² 30th and 70th percentile rainfall data collected from weather station Sparta, NC8158 (USDA, 2016)

³ Onsite rainfall gage malfunctioned. No onsite data available.