

Town Creek Restoration Project – Option B Final Monitoring Report/Closeout Report

Stanly County, North Carolina

DMS Project ID Number – 95026; NC DEQ Contract No. 003990

Yadkin Pee-Dee River Basin: 03040105060040



Project Info:

Monitoring Year: 5 of 5

Year of Data Collection: 2020

Year of Completed Construction: 2016

Submission Date: January 2021

Submitted To:

NCDEQ – Division of Mitigation Services

1625 Mail Service Center

Raleigh, NC 27699

NCDEQ Contract ID No. 003990

Mitigation Project Name	Town Creek Restoration Project	USACE Action ID	2014-00016
DMS ID	95026	DWR Permit	2014-1259 v2
River Basin	Yadkin	Date Project Instituted	7/27/2011
Cataloging Unit	03040105	Date Prepared	4/20/2020
County	Stanly	Stream/Wet. Service Area	Yadkin 03040105



Signature & Date of Official Approving Credit Release

1 - For NCDMS, no credits are released during the first milestone
 2 - For NCDMS projects, the initial credit release milestone occurs automatically when the as-built report (baseline monitoring report) has been made available to the IRT by posting it to the DMS portal, provided the following have been met:

- 1) Approved of 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) Receipt of necessary DA permit authorization or written DA approval for projects 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.

Credit Release Milestone	Warm Stream Credits						
	Scheduled Releases %	Proposed Releases %	Proposed Released #	Not Approved # Releases	Approved Credits	Anticipated Release Year	Actual Release Date
1 - Site Establishment	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2 - Year 0 / As-Built	30.00%	30.00%	1,014.500	0.000	1,016.600	2016	11/30/2016
3 - Year 1 Monitoring	10.00%	10.00%	338.167	2.100	336.067	2017	10/20/2017
4 - Year 2 Monitoring	10.00%	10.00%	338.167	0.000	338.167	2018	4/25/2018
5 - Year 3 Monitoring	10.00%	10.00%	338.167	0.000	338.167	2019	6/14/2019
6 - Year 4 Monitoring	10.00%	10.00%	338.167	0.000	338.167	2020	4/20/2020
7 - Year 5 Monitoring	15.00%					2021	
Stream Bankfull Standard	15.00%	15.00%	507.250	0.000	507.250	2018	4/25/2018
			Totals		2,874.418		

Total Gross Credits	3,381.667
Total Unrealized Credits to Date	0.000
Total Released Credits to Date	2,874.418
Total Percentage Released	85.00%
Remaining Unreleased Credits	507.249

Notes

10/20/2017: Adjustment required due to IRT concerns on how the as-built credits were calculated.

Contingencies (if any)

Project Quantities

Mitigation Type	Restoration Type	Physical Quantity
Warm Stream	Restoration	2,755.000
Warm Stream	Enhancement I	940.000

Debits

Stream Restoration Credits

Beginning Balance (mitigation credits)							3,381.667
Released Credits							2,874.418
Unreleased Credits							507.249
Owning Program	Req. Id	TIP #	Project Name	USACE Permit #	DWR Permit #	DCM Permit #	
NCDOT Stream & Wetland ILF Program	REQ-007422	R-2248E	I-485 - Charlotte Outer Loop	2011-01237	2011-0431		2,198.083
Total Credits Debited							2,198.083
Remaining Available balance (Released credits)							676.335
Remaining balance (Unreleased credits)							507.249

January 15, 2021

Harry Tsomides, Project Manager
NCDEQ - Division of Mitigation Services
5 Ravenscroft Drive, Ste. 102
Asheville, NC 28801

Subject: Task 9: Annual Final Monitoring Report/Closeout Report – Monitoring Year 5 & Response to Comments
Town Creek Restoration Project – Option B
Yadkin River Basin – CU# 03040105 – Stanly County, NC
NCDMS Project ID No. 95026; NCDEQ Contract No. 003990

Dear Mr. Tsomides:

Please find enclosed the Final Year 5 Monitoring Report/Closeout Report and our responses to the Division of Mitigation Services (DMS) review comments received on January 15th, 2021 regarding the Town Creek Restoration Project – Option B, located in Stanly County, NC. We have revised Final Year 5 Monitoring Document in response to the referenced review comments. Each response has been grouped with its corresponding comment and is outlined below.

Comment – This report will serve as the 2021 close out report since it is being proposed for close out. If Baker wishes to add anything to the report it considers pertinent to close out, please do so and explain in the responses. Please indicate on the cover page that this is an MY5/Close Out Report. Stream morphological, hydrological and vegetative data for all 5 years should be included.

Response – MY5 Report has been revised to include stream morphological, hydrological and vegetative data from all 5 years of monitoring to serve as a monitoring report and close out report.

Comment - Please update the asset table to the current version (attached to this email), including significant digits. Please note that the second part of Table 1 should be a project credits table rather than a component summation table.

Response – Table 1 has been revised per DMS request.

Comment - Supplemental planting is noted on the CCPVs but not in Table 2, Project Activities. Please update the table accordingly. In addition, please include the 2020 invasive treatment in the table (not necessary to include in the maps since you indicated the occurrences were below the mapping threshold).

Response – Revisions have been made per DMS request.

Digital support file comments

Comment - Please submit the features that characterize the cross sections, crest gauge, and in-stream pressure transducers in Figs. 2A-2B.

Response – Shapefiles that characterize the cross sections, crest gauge, and flow gauges have been added per DMS request.

Comment - Please submit photos as JPEG's

Response – Revisions have been made per DMS request.

Comment - There are 75 photo points contained in the digital submission, but only 43 points in the CCPV, which has been the case since the as-built. The unique ID's included in the submitted shapefile also do not appear to match the CCPV. It looks like the submitted shapefile may contain points for cross section and veg photos as well. Please update this shapefile and resubmit so that the spatial data reflects only the photo stations in the CCPV with matching unique ID's.

Response – The Shapefile including the unique ID's and the correct amount of photo points have been added to the digital submission file as requested.

Comment - Please be sure that all BHR calculations are using MY5 data. For example, XS4 is using the MY4 LTOB elevation. When using the MY5 LTOB elevation, the BHR is 1.12. Please also ensure that any footnotes are updated to include the proper elevations.

Response – Revisions have been made per DMS request.

If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at (919) 463-5732 or via my email address at Andrew.Powers@mbakerintl.com.

Sincerely,



Andrew Powers
Environmental Associate

Cc: File

Town Creek Restoration Project – Option B Year 5 Monitoring Report/Closeout Report

Stanly County, North Carolina

DMS Project ID Number – 95026; NC DEQ Contract No. 003990

SAW-2014-00016; DWR#14-1259 V2

Yadkin Pee-Dee River Basin: 03040105060040

Report Prepared and Submitted by Michael Baker Engineering, Inc.

NC Professional Engineering License # F-1084

The logo for Michael Baker International features the company name in white, bold, sans-serif font. "Michael Baker" is contained within a dark blue rectangular box, while "INTERNATIONAL" is positioned below it in a separate line of the same font style.

I N T E R N A T I O N A L

Michael Baker Engineering, Inc.
8000 Regency Parkway, Suite 600
Cary, NC 27518

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2.0 METHODOLOGY	2
2.1 Stream Monitoring	3
2.1.1 Morphologic Parameters and Channel Stability.....	3
2.1.1.1 Dimension	3
2.1.1.2 Longitudinal Profile	3
2.1.1.3 Substrate and Sediment Transport.....	3
2.1.2 Stream Hydrology.....	4
2.1.2.1 Bankfull Events.....	4
2.1.2.2 Flow Documentation.....	4
2.1.3 Photographic Documentation of Site	4
2.1.3.1 Lateral Reference Photos.....	4
2.1.3.2 Longitudinal Station Photos	4
2.1.4 Visual Assessment.....	5
2.2 Vegetation Monitoring	5
3.0 REFERENCES	6

APPENDICES

Appendix A	<i>Project Vicinity Map and Background Tables</i>
Figure	1 Vicinity Map and Directions
Table	1 Project Mitigation Components
Table	2 Project Activity and Reporting History
Table	3 Project Contacts
Table	4 Project Attribute
Appendix B	<i>Visual Assessment Data</i>
Figure	2 Current Condition Plan View (CCPV)
Table	5a-e Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment
Table	5f Stream Problem Areas
Table	6a Vegetation Condition Assessment
Table	6b Vegetation Problem Areas
	Stream Station Photos
	Before and After Photos (MY0 and MY5)
Appendix C	<i>Vegetation Plot Data</i>
Table	7 Vegetation Plot Criteria Attainment
Table	8 CVS Vegetation Plot Metadata
Table	9 CVS Stem Count of Planted Stems by Plot and Species
	Vegetation Plot Photos
Appendix D	<i>Stream Survey Data</i>
Figure	3 Year 5 Cross-sections with Annual Overlays

Figure 4 Riffle Pebble Count Size Class Distribution with Annual Overlays

Table 10 Baseline Stream Summary

Table 11a Cross-section Morphology Data

Table 11b Stream Reach Morphology Data

Appendix E *Hydrologic Data*

Figure 5a-b In-stream Flow Gauge Graphs

Figure 6 Monthly Rainfall Data

Table 12 Verification of Bankfull Events

Table 13 Verification of In-stream Flow Conditions

Hydrologic Data Photos

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Michael Baker Engineering, Inc. (Michael Baker) restored 2,760 linear feet (LF) and enhanced approximately 943 LF of jurisdictional stream along UT to Town Creek. This report documents and presents the Year 5 monitoring data as required during the five-year monitoring period.

The primary restoration goals of the project are described below:

- Create geomorphically stable conditions along the channels,
- Enhance hydrologic connections between streams and the degraded riparian buffer and overall ecosystem functionality;
- Restore and protect riparian buffer functions and corridor habitat in perpetuity by establishing a permanent conservation easement.
- Improve terrestrial habitat and reduce sediment and nutrient loading to the project reaches and the Little Long Creek Watershed.

To accomplish these goals, the following objectives were identified:

- Restore existing incised, eroding, and channelized streams by creating a stable stream channel with access to its floodplain,
- Improve in-stream habitat by providing a more diverse bedform with riffles and pools, creating deeper pools and areas of water re-aeration, and reducing bank erosion,
- Prevent cattle from accessing the project boundary by installing permanent fencing and thus reduce excessive bank erosion and undesired nutrient inputs,
- Plant native species riparian buffer vegetation along stream bank and floodplain areas, protected by a permanent conservation easement, to increase stormwater runoff filtering capacity, improve bank stability, and shade the stream to decrease water temperature,
- Control invasive species vegetation within the project area and, if necessary, continue treatments during the monitoring period.

The Town Creek Restoration Project – Option B (Site) is located in Stanly County, approximately 1.5 miles west of the Town of New London, within cataloging unit 03040105 of the Yadkin Pee-Dee River Basin. The Site is located in a North Carolina Division of Mitigation Services (NCDMS) - Targeted Local Watershed (HUC 03040105060-040). Directions to the Project Site can be found in Figure 1 of Appendix A.

During Year 5 monitoring, the planted acreage performance categories were functioning at over 90 percent with no bare areas and no low stem density. The VPA 4-1 and VPA 4-2 reported in year 4 monitoring report were addressed by planting thirty 3 gallon container trees in January 2020 that will thrive in the specific areas and conditions. For the dryer upland areas we planted Sycamore, Green ash, Willow oak, and White oak. The species planted in VPA 4-2 were Swamp chestnut oak, Black gum and Water oak, as the area is very wet soil. No invasive species areas of concern, exceeding the mapping threshold were documented. Areas of invasive encroachment have been treated with the proper herbicidal application method over the 2020 winter/spring months.

Based on data collected from the eight monitoring plots during Year 5 monitoring, the average density of total planted stems per plot ranges from 324 to 607 stems per acre with a tract mean of 486 stems per acre. Therefore, the Year 5 data demonstrate that the Site has exceeded the minimum interim success criteria of 260 trees per acre by the end of Year 5. The presence of volunteer woody vegetation was noted in VP1, VP5, VP6 and VP7; however, these species were not included in the average vegetation plot data densities. Vegetation stem counts are summarized in Tables 7 and 9 of Appendix C.

The thirteen (13) permanent cross-sections located throughout the Site show minimal adjustment to stream dimension since Monitoring Year 4. Since construction, fine sediment has been moving through the system as expected causing the cross sections over time to appear to be filling in slowly. However, with site inspections and photo points it is clear that the stream bed and banks are stable. In addition, Tables 5a through 5f (Appendix B) indicate the Site has remained geomorphically stable with lateral/vertical stability and in-stream structure performance of 100% on all stream reaches and no noted areas of bank scour and/or erosion around structures. Visual observations and a review of pebble count data collected indicated that stream is sufficiently moving fines through the system. Riffles are comprised of a mix of substrates with the bed material continuing to move towards a mix of coarser substrates. Cross-sectional and pebble count data are provided in Figures 3 and 4, respectively, in Appendix D.

In-stream pressure transducers, TC FL1 and TC FL2, were installed on Reach 1 to document intermittent flow conditions throughout the monitoring year. Since post-construction installation, each gauge has documented at least one period of consecutive stream flow for the required minimum of 30 days for all five monitoring years so far, with a maximum of 202 consecutive days for TC FL1 and 214 consecutive days for TC FL2 this year. Due to a data logger failure TC FL1 did not capture data from 1/01/2020 to 2/01/2020, this failure did not have any effect on the success of the stream flow for this year. Figures 5a and 5b in Appendix E, depict the documented flow conditions for each gauge from installation through Monitoring Year 5 relative to local rainfall data, while Table 13 documents both the total cumulative days of flow and the maximum number of consecutive days of flow.

At least one post-construction bankfull events occurred during Monitoring Year 5, with a recorded event at 1.01 feet above bankfull. By using the flow gauge data, along with the rain data the over bankfull even occurred on May 21st. Nine or more bankfull events have been documented spread across the five years of monitoring since construction, thus the site has met the two bankfull flow events have been documented in separate years. Documentation of the event is in Table 12 of Appendix E.

The past five monitoring years have proven that the site has met success criteria for; vegetation, stream flow, and channel bank stability. The Vegetation plots data shows that over the 5 years there is consistent vegetation density, height, and vigor throughout the site. The asbuilt stem density averaged 804 stems/acre where in 5 years the stem density averaged at 486 stems/acre. This meets the closeout success criteria and proves that the site has established vegetation. The stream flow gauges on reaches 1 and 2 have meet success criteria 5 out of 5 years. Lastly, the cross sections throughout the 5 monitoring years shows channel stability with no incision and erosion. Photos of MY0 and MY5 located in appendix B shows the stream stability and vegetation establishment. These photos also show that the stream has performed as designed.

Summary information/data related to the Site and statistics related to 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 reports can be found in the Baseline Monitoring Report and in the Mitigation Plan available on the NCDMS' website. All raw data supporting the tables and figures in the appendices is available from NCDMS upon request.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

The five-year monitoring plan for the Site includes criteria to evaluate the success of the stream and vegetation components of the project. Monitoring methods used will follow the NCDMS Monitoring Report Template, Version 1.30 – 1/15/10 and are based on the design approaches and overall project goals. To evaluate success criteria associated with a geomorphically stable channel, hydrologic connectivity, and aquatic habitat diversity, geomorphic monitoring methods will be conducted for project reaches that involve Restoration and Enhancement Level I mitigation. The specific locations of monitoring features, such as vegetation plots, permanent cross-sections, reference photograph stations and crest gauges, are shown on the CCPV sheets found in Figure 2 of Appendix B.

Stream survey data were collected to meet the requirements for a topographic ground survey to the accuracy of Class C Vertical and Class A Horizontal (21 NCAC-56 section .1606) and was geo-referenced to the NAD83 State Plane Coordinate System, FIPS3200 in US Survey Feet, which was derived from the Town Creek Restoration Project Option B's As-built Survey.

2.1 Stream Monitoring

Geomorphic monitoring of the Restoration and Enhancement Level I reaches has been conducted once a year for a minimum of five years following the completion of construction. These activities evaluate the success criteria associated with a geomorphically stable channel, hydrologic connectivity, and aquatic habitat diversity. The stream parameters monitored include stream dimension (cross-sections), pattern (planimetric survey), profile (longitudinal profile survey), visual observation with photographic documentation, and documentation of bank full events. Additionally, monitoring methods for all reaches included those described under Photo Documentation of Site, Visual Assessment, and Vegetation Monitoring. The methods used and related success criteria are described below for each parameter. Figure 2 shows approximate locations of the proposed monitoring devices throughout the project site.

2.1.1 Morphologic Parameters and Channel Stability

2.1.1.1 Dimension

A total of thirteen (13) permanent cross-sections, nine (9) riffles and four (4) pools, were installed throughout the entire project area. Cross-sections selected for monitoring included representative riffle and pool facets for each of the three project reaches, Reach 2, 3, and 5, which implemented at least 500 linear feet of Restoration or Enhancement I activities.

Each cross-section was marked on both banks with permanent pins to establish the exact transect used. A common benchmark was also chosen to consistently reference and facilitate the comparison of year-to-year data. The cross-sectional surveys have been conducted annually and include measurements of Bank Height Ratio (BHR) and Entrenchment Ratio (ER). The monitoring survey includes points measured at all breaks in slope, including top of stream banks, bankfull, inner berm, edge of water, and thalweg, if the features are present. Riffle cross-sections are classified using the Rosgen Stream Classification System (Rosgen 1994), and all monitored cross-sections should fall within the quantitative parameters defined for channels of the design stream type.

There should be little change in annual cross-sectional surveys from those collected during the post-construction as-built survey. If changes do take place, they would be evaluated to determine if they represent a movement toward a more unstable condition (e.g., down-cutting or erosion) or a movement toward increased stability (e.g., settling, vegetative changes, deposition along the banks, or decrease in width/depth ratio). Cross-sectional data is presented in Figure 3 of Appendix D.

2.1.1.2 Longitudinal Profile

A longitudinal profile was surveyed for the entire length of channel immediately after construction to document as-built baseline conditions for the first year of monitoring only. The survey was tied to a permanent benchmark and measurements included thalweg, water surface, bankfull, and top of low bank. Each of these measurements were taken at the head of each feature (e.g., riffle, pool) and at the maximum pool depth. Yearly longitudinal profiles were not be conducted during subsequent monitoring years as no channel instability has been documented or remedial actions/repairs required by the USACE or NCDMS.

2.1.1.3 Substrate and Sediment Transport

After construction, there should be minimal change in the pebble count data over time given the current watershed conditions and sediment supply regime. A substrate sample was collected for each riffle

cross-sections where constructed riffles were installed (X1, X4, X5, X7, X9, X10, and X12). Samples collected combined with evidence provided by changes in cross-sectional data and visual assessments will reveal changes in sediment gradation that occur over time as the stream adjusts to upstream sediment loads. Significant changes in sediment gradation were evaluated with respect to stream stability and watershed changes. Bed material distribution data are located in Figure 4 of Appendix D.

2.1.2 Stream Hydrology

2.1.2.1 Bankfull Events

The occurrence of bankfull events within the monitoring period were documented using a crest gauge and photographs. The crest gauge records the highest watermark between site visits, and the gauge was checked at each site visit to determine if a bankfull event has occurred. The crest gauge was installed the floodplain of Reach 5 within ten feet (horizontal) of the restored channel. Photographs was used to document the occurrence of debris lines and sediment deposition on the floodplain during monitoring site visits.

2.1.2.2 Flow Documentation

A combination of photographic and flow gauge data were collected from two in-stream pressure transducers (TC FL1 and TC FL2) and a remote in-field camera that were installed on Reach 1. Collected data will document that the restored intermittent stream system continues to exhibit base flow for of at least 30 consecutive days throughout each monitoring year under normal climatic conditions. In order to determine if rainfall amounts were normal for the given year, rainfall gauge data was obtained from the nearest Stanly County weather station (CRONOS Database, NEWL – North Stanly Middle School, if available) and compared to the average monthly rainfall amounts from the Stanly County WETS Table (USDA 2018). If a normal year of precipitation had not occur during the first five years of monitoring, flow conditions would continue to be monitored on the site until it documents that the intermittent streams have been flowing during the appropriate times of the year.

Flow data and photographic documentation collected during Year 5 monitoring are located in Appendix E.

2.1.3 Photographic Documentation of Site

Photographs were used to document restoration success visually. Reference stations and cross-section photos were photographed during the as-built survey; this was repeated for at least five years following construction. Reference photos were taken once a year, from a height of approximately five to six feet. Permanent markers ensure that the same locations (and view directions) are utilized during each monitoring period. Photographers made an effort to consistently maintain the same area in each photo over time. Selected site photographs are shown in Appendix B for reference stations and Appendix D for cross-sections.

2.1.3.1 Lateral Reference Photos

Reference photo transects were taken of the right and left banks at each permanent cross-section. A survey tape was captured in most photographs which represents the cross-section line located perpendicular to the channel flow. The water line was located in in the center of the photograph as much as possible to capture bank, riparian and channel conditions.

2.1.3.2 Longitudinal Station Photos

Stream reaches were photographed longitudinally beginning at the upstream portion of the Site and moving downstream. Photographs were taken looking both upstream and downstream at delineated locations throughout the restored stream valley. The photograph points were established close enough together to provide an overall view of the reach lengths, primary grade control structures, and valley

crenulations. The angle of the photo depends on what angle provided the best view, was noted and continued each year. Site photographs are located in Appendix B.

2.1.4 Visual Assessment

Visual monitoring assessments of all stream sections was conducted by qualified personnel twice per monitoring year with at least five months in between each site visit. Photographs were used to document system performance and any areas of concern related to stream bank stability, condition of in-stream structures, channel migration, aggradation/degradation, headcuts, live stake mortality, impacts from invasive plant species or animal species, floodplain vegetative conditions, and condition of pools and riffles. The photo locations are shown on a plan view map and descriptions are documented as either stream problem areas (SPAs) or vegetative problem areas (VPAs) in there associated monitoring assessment tables located in Appendix B as needed.

2.2 Vegetation Monitoring

To determine if the criteria are achieved, vegetation-monitoring quadrants were installed and monitored across the restoration site in accordance with the CVS-NCEEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.0 (Lee 2006). The vegetation monitoring plots are a minimum of 2 percent of the planted portion of the site with eight plots established randomly within the planted riparian buffer areas. No monitoring quadrants were established within the undisturbed wooded areas of the project area. The size of individual quadrants are 100 square meters for woody tree species.

Level 1 CVS vegetation monitoring was conducted between spring, after leaf-out had occurred, and fall prior to leaf fall. Individual quadrant data provided during subsequent monitoring events included species composition, density, survival, and stem height. Relative values were calculated, and importance values were determined. Individual seedlings were marked to ensure that they can be found in succeeding monitoring years. Mortality was determined from the difference between the previous year's living, planted seedlings and the current year's living, planted seedlings.

The interim measure of vegetative success for the site is the survival of at least 320, -year old, planted trees per acre at the end of Year 5 of the monitoring period. The final vegetative success criteria are the survival of 260, 5-year old, planted trees per acre at the end of Year 5 of the monitoring period.

Photographs were used to visually document vegetation success in sample plots and are located in Appendix C.

3.0 REFERENCES

Carolina Vegetation Survey (CVS) and NC Division of Mitigation Services (formerly NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program). 2012. CVS-NCEEP Data Entry Tool v. 2.3.1. University of North Carolina, Raleigh, NC.

Lee, M., Peet R., Roberts, S., Wentworth, T. 2006. CVS-NCEEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.0.

North Carolina Division of Mitigation Services (formerly NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program). 2010. Procedural Guidance and Content Requirements for EEP Monitoring Reports, v. 1.30, dated 1/15/10. Raleigh, NC.

Rosgen, D. L. 1994. A Classification of Natural Rivers. *Catena* 22:169-199.

State Climate Office of North Carolina, 2020. CRONOS Database, North Stanly Middle School (NEWL), Stanly County, NC. <http://climate.ncsu.edu/cronos/?station=NEWL&temporal=sensormeta>

United States Department of Agriculture, 2020. WETS Table. Climate Data for Stanly County, NC. Wets Station: Albemarle, NC 0090, FIPS: 37167, 1971 - 2018. <http://agacis.rcc-acis.org/>

APPENDIX A


Project Vicinity Map and Background Tables

DIRECTIONS TO SITE FROM RALEIGH, NC:

Take I-40 West toward Sanford/Wake Forest. Take Exit 293 (I-40/US-64 W/US-1) toward Sanford/Wake Forest. Keep left at the fork toward US-1 S/US-64 W. Take Exit 293A for US-1 S/US-64 W toward Sanford/Asheboro. Keep left at the fork toward US-1 S/US-64 W. Continue on US-1 S/US-64 W towards Apex/Sanford/Asheboro. Take exit 98B to merge onto US-64 W towards Pittsboro/Asheboro. After 62 miles, turn left onto Connector Rd. Turn right onto NC 49 S. After 28.4 miles, take a slight left onto N Main St. After 1.1 miles, turn left onto Old Salisbury Rd. Follow Old Salisbury Rd. for approximately 2.0 miles to its intersection with Misenheimer Rd. / Steakhouse Rd. Go through the intersection and continue on Old Salisbury Rd. for approximately 0.4 miles and the Project site is on the left accessed via a paved driveway.

The subject project site is an environmental restoration site of the NCDEQ Division of Mitigation Services (DMS) and is encompassed by a recorded conservation easement, but is bordered by land under private ownership. Accessing the site may require traversing areas near or along the easement boundary and therefore access by the general public is not permitted. Access by authorized personnel of state and federal agencies or their designees/contractors involved in the development, oversight and stewardship of the restoration site is permitted within the terms and timeframes of their defined roles. Any intended site visitation or activity by any person outside of these previously sanctioned roles and activities requires prior coordination with DMS.

Project Location
35.434 N, -80.2421 W



Reference: NCDOT'02 & NC One Map

Michael Baker
INTERNATIONAL

December 2020

0 1,500 3,000 Feet
1" = 3000'

Map Vicinity

Project Site

Stanly County, NC

LEGEND

- Streams
- Project Boundary
- US Highways
- Roads
- Major Waterways
- Municipalities
- Yadkin (03040105060-040)

Figure 1. Vicinity Map
Town Creek Restoration Site - Option B
Stanly County, NC

NC DMS Project No. 95026
NC DEQ Contract No. 003990

Table 1. Project Mitigation Components

Town Creek Restoration Project - Option B: DMS Project No ID. 95026

Project Component (reach ID, etc.)	Wetland Position and Hydro Type	Existing Footage or Acreage	Stationing	Restored Footage, Acreage, or SF	Creditable Footage, Acreage, or SF*	Restoration Level	Approach		Mitigation Credits	Notes/Comments
							Priority Level	Mitigation Ratio (X:1)		
Reach 1		363	10+33 - 13+50	317	317.0	R	PI	1.000	317.000	Full Channel Restoration, Planted Buffer, Exclusion of Livestock, and Permanent Conservation Easement.
Reach 2		737	13+50 - 20+61	711	711.0	EI	PIII	1.500	474.000	Dimension and Profile modified in keeping with reference, Planted Buffer, Livestock Exclusion, Permanent Conservation Easement and a culverted farm road crossing. The crossing lies within an easement break between Reach 2 and Reach 3. Due to stability issues along the crossing during construction, the upstream face of the crossing extends into the easement by 6 feet. To account for this encroachment Reach 2 ends at Station 20+61 to account for loss of stream footage.
Reach 3		1,849	20+87 - 37+08	1,621	1,621.0	R	PI	1.000	1,621.000	Full Channel Restoration, Planted Buffer, Exclusion of Livestock, and Permanent Conservation Easement.
Reach 4		234	37+08 - 39+40	232	232.0	EI	PIII	1.500	154.667	Dimension and Profile modified in keeping with reference, Planted Buffer, Livestock Exclusion, Permanent Conservation Easement.
Reach 5		849	39+40 - 47+87	847	815.0	R	PI	1.000	815.000	Full Channel Restoration, Planted Buffer, Exclusion of Livestock, Permanent Conservation Easement and a culverted farm road crossing. The crossing lies within an easement break that coincides with a 25-ft overhead powerline right-of-way. Due to stability issues along the crossing during construction, the upstream and downstream faces of the crossing extend into the easement by a total of 7 feet. To account for the easement break and encroachment the creditable footage has been reduced by 35 feet.
Wetland Group 1 (WG1)										
Wetland Group 2 (WG2)										
Buffer Group 1 (BG1)										
Buffer Group 2 (BG2)										
Buffer Group 3 (BG3)										

Length and Area Summations by Mitigation Category

Restoration Level	Stream (linear feet)	Riparian Wetland (acres)		Non-riparian Wetland (acres)	Credited Buffer (square feet)
		Riverine	Non-Riverine		
Restoration	2,753.000				
Enhancement					
Enhancement I	943.000				
Enhancement II					
Creation					
Preservation					
High Quality Pres					
Totals	3696.000				

* Creditable footage reflects approved credit lengths as outlined in the project Mitigation Plan.

Overall Assets Summary

Asset Category	Overall Credits
Stream	3,381.667

General Note - The above component table is intended to be a close complement to the asset map. Each entry in the above table should have clear distinction and appropriate symbology in the asset map.

1 - **Wetland Groups** represent pooled wetland polygons in the map with the same wetland type and restoration level. If some of the wetland polygons within a group are in meaningfully different landscape positions, soil types or have different community targets (as examples), then further segmentation in the table may be warranted. **Buffer groups** represent pooled buffer polygons with common restoration levels.

2 - **Wetland Position and Hydro Type** - Indicates Riparian Riverine (RR), riparian non-riverine (RNR) or Non Riverine (NR)

3 - **Restored Footage, Acreage or Square Feet (SF)**

4 - **Creditable Footage, Acreage or Square feet** - creditable amounts after exclusion and reductions are accounted for, such as utility impacts, crossings, single

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History**Town Creek Restoration Project - Option B: DMS Project No ID. 95026**

Elapsed Time Since Grading/Planting Complete: 4 Years 9 Months
Number of Reporting Years: 5

Activity or Report	Scheduled Completion	Data Collection Complete	Actual Completion or Delivery
Mitigation Plan Prepared	N/A	N/A	Aug-14
Mitigation Plan Amended	N/A	N/A	Oct-14
Mitigation Plan Approved	N/A	N/A	Feb-15
Final Design – (at least 90% complete)	N/A	N/A	Feb-15
Construction Begins	N/A	N/A	Oct-15
Temporary S&E mix applied to entire project area	N/A	N/A	Jan-16
Permanent seed mix applied to entire project area	Feb-16	N/A	Jan-16
Planting of live stakes	Feb-16	N/A	Mar-16
Planting of bare root trees	Feb-16	N/A	Mar-16
End of Construction	Feb-16	N/A	Jan-16
Survey of As-built conditions (Year 0 Monitoring-baseline)	Apr-16	May-16	Jun-16
Baseline Monitoring Report	May-16	Jun-16	Nov-16
Year 1 Stream Monitoring	-	Nov-16	-
Year 1 Vegetation Monitoring	-	Oct-16	-
Year 1 Monitoring Report	Dec-16	Dec-16	Jan-17
Year 2 Stream Monitoring	-	Nov-17	-
Year 2 Vegetation Monitoring	-	Nov-17	-
Year 2 Monitoring Report	Dec-17	Nov-17	Dec-17
Year 3 Stream Monitoring	-	Oct-18	-
Year 3 Vegetation Monitoring	-	Sep-18	-
Year 3 Monitoring Report	Dec-18	Nov-18	Dec-18
Year 4 Monitoring	Dec-19	Nov-19	Dec-19
Year 5 Stream Monitoring	-	Sep-20	-
Year 5 Vegetation Monitoring	-	Sep-20	-
Year 5 Invasive Treamtent	-	-	Apr-20
Year 5 Supplemental Planting	-	-	Jan-20
Year 5 Monitoring Report	Dec-20	Nov-20	Jan-21

Table 3. Project Contacts	
Town Creek Restoration Project - Option B: DMS Project ID No. 95026	
Designer	
Michael Baker Engineering, Inc.	8000 Regency Parkway, Suite 600 Cary, NC 27518 <u>Contact:</u> Kathleen M. McKeithan, PE, Tel. 919-481-5703
Construction Contractor	
Wright Contracting, LLC.	160 Walker Road Lawndale, NC 28090 <u>Contact:</u> Joe Wright, Tel. 919-663-0810
Planting Contractor	
H.J. Forest Service	P.O. Box 458 Holly Ridge, NC 28445 <u>Contact:</u> Matt Hitch, Tel. 910-512-1743
Seeding Contractor	
Wright Contracting, LLC.	160 Walker Road Lawndale, NC 28090 <u>Contact:</u> Joe Wright, Tel. 919-663-0810
Seed Mix Sources	Green Resources, Tel. 336-855-6363 Mellow Marsh Farm, Tel. 919-742-1200
Nursery Stock Suppliers	Mellow Marsh Farm, Tel. 919-742-1200 Foggy Mountain Nursery, Tel. 336-384-5323 ArborGen, Tel. 843-528-3203
Monitoring Performers	
Michael Baker Engineering, Inc.	8000 Regency Parkway, Suite 600 Cary, NC 27518 <u>Contact:</u>
Stream Monitoring Point of Contact	Andrew Powers, Tel. 919-481-5732
Vegetation Monitoring Point of Contact	Andrew Powers, Tel. 919-481-5732

Table 4. Project Attributes					
Town Creek Restoration Project - Option B: DMS Project ID No. 95026					
Project Information					
Project Name	Town Creek Restoration Project - Option B				
Project County	Stanly				
Project Area (Acres)	11.97				
Project Coordinates	35.434 N, -80.2421 W				
Project Watershed Summary Information					
Physiographic Region	Piedmont				
Ecoregion	Carolina Slate Belt				
Project River Basin	Yadkin - Pee Dee				
USGS Hydrologic Unit Code 8- and 14-digit	03040105 / 03040105060-040				
NCDWR Sub-basin for Project	03-07-13				
Project Drainage Area (Acres)	134.8				
Project Drainage Area Percent Impervious	<5%				
CGIA Land Use Classification	2.01, 412 / Forest (40%) Agriculture (25%) Impervious Cover (7%)				
Within Extent of DMS Watershed Plan	Lower Yadkin RBRP, 2009				
WRC Class (Warm Cool Cold)	Warm				
% Project Easement Fenced/Demarcated	100%				
Beaver activity observed during design phase	No activity observed				
Reach Summary Information					
	Reach 1	Reach 2	Reach 3	Reach 4	Reach 5
Restored Length of Reach (LF)	317	711	1,621	232	822
Valley Classification (Rosgen)	VII	VII	VII	VII	VII
Drainage Area (acres)	59.8	77.8	115.6	119.4	134.8
NCDWR Stream Identification Score	27.25	27.25 - 32.0	32	32	32
NCDWR Water Quality Classification	C, Index #: 13-17-31-1-1				
Existing Morphological Description (Rosgen stream type)	E4b: Incised, unstable & straight	E4 : Incised, unstable & straight	C4: variable; unstable	E4: Incised & unstable	C4 and E4: Incised & straight
Evolutionary Trend	Eb→G→B	E→G→F→Bc	C→G→F→C	E→Gc→F→C	C→Gc→F→C
As-built Morphological Description (Rosgen stream type)	C4	C4	C4	C4	C4
Underlying Mapped Soils	BaD	BaD, BaF	BaF	BaF	OaA
Drainage Class	Well drained	Well drained	Well drained	Well drained	Moderately well drained
Soil Hydric Status	Non-Hydric	Non-Hydric	Non-Hydric	Non-Hydric	Hydric
Average Channel Slope (ft/ft)	0.0181	0.0180	0.0122	0.0120	0.0128
FEMA Classification	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Native Vegetation Community	Piedmont Small Stream				
Percent Composition of Exotic/Invasive Vegetation	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Regulatory Considerations					
Regulation	Applicable	Resolved	Supporting Documentation		
Waters of the United States – Section 404	Yes	Yes	Categorical Exclusion		
Waters of the United States – Section 401	Yes	Yes	Categorical Exclusion		
Endangered Species Act	Yes	Yes	Categorical Exclusion		
Historic Preservation Act	Yes	Yes	Categorical Exclusion		
Coastal Area Management Act (CAMA)	No	N/A	Categorical Exclusion		
FEMA Floodplain Compliance	No	N/A	Categorical Exclusion		
Essential Fisheries Habitat	No	N/A	Categorical Exclusion		

APPENDIX B

Visual Assessment Data




Fig 2A





Fig 2B

- In-Stream Pressure Transducer
- Crest Gauge
- Reach Boundary
- Photo Station
- Station Markers
- Vegetation Plots
- Supplemental Planting
- Cross Section - Pool
- Cross Section - Riffle
- Stream Top of Bank
- Stream**
- Enhancement I
- Restoration
- Conservation Easement

NC OneMap, NC Center for Geographic Information and Analysis, NC 911





Begin Reach 1
(Station 10+33)

Supplemental Planting (.12 ac)

End Reach 1 // Begin Reach 2
(Station 13+50)


Supplemental Planting (.13 ac)

End Reach 2
(Station 20+61)

Begin Reach 3
(Station 20+87)

- In-Stream Pressure Transducer
- Crest Gauge
- Reach Boundary
- Photo Station
- Station Markers
- Vegetation Plots
- Supplemental Planting
- Cross Section - Pool
- Cross Section - Riffle
- Stream Top of Bank
- Stream**
- Enhancement I
- Restoration
- Fencing
- Conservation Easement

NC Center for Geographic Information & Analysis



NC Center for Geographic Information & Analysis



Table 5a. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment										
Town Creek Restoration Project - Option B: Project No. 95026										
Reach ID		Town Creek - Reach 1								
Assessed Length (LF)		317								
Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number per As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Veg.	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Veg.	Adjusted % for Stabilizing Woody Veg.
1. Bed	1. Vertical Stability	1. Aggradation			0	0	100%			
		2. Degradation			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	1. Texture/Substrate	8	8			100%			
		3. Pool Condition	1. Depth	9	9					
	2. Length		9	9			100%			
	4. Thalweg position	1. Thalweg centering for riffle/run	8	8			100%			
2. Thalweg centering for pool/glide		9	9			100%				
2. Bank	1. Scoured /Eroding	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	0	0	100%
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely			0	0	100%	0	0	100%
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse			0	0	100%	0	0	100%
	Totals					0	0	100%	0	0
3. Engineering 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.	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%	12	12			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~ Max Pool Depth	10	10			100%			

Table 5b. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment												
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026												
Reach ID		Town Creek - Reach 2										
Assessed Length (LF)		711										
Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number per As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Veg.	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Veg.	Adjusted % for Stabilizing Woody Veg.		
1. Bed	1. Vertical Stability	1. Aggradation			0	0	100%					
		2. Degradation			0	0	100%					
	2. Riffle Condition	1. Texture/Substrate		21	21			100%				
		3. Pool Condition	1. Depth	20	20			100%				
	2. Length		20	20			100%					
	4. Thalweg position	1. Thalweg centering for riffle/run		21	21			100%				
2. Thalweg centering for pool/glide		20	20			100%						
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroding	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion				0	0	100%	0	0	100%	
		2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely				0	0	100%	0	0	100%
			3. Mass Wasting		Bank slumping, calving, or collapse				0	0	100%	0
	Totals					0	0	100%	0	0	100%	
3. Engineering Structures	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs		20	20			100%				
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill.		20	20			100%				
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms		20	20			100%				
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%		20	20			100%				
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~ Max Pool Depth		20	20			100%				

Table 5c. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment											
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026											
Reach ID		Town Creek - Reach 3									
Assessed Length (LF)		1,621									
Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number per As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Veg.	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Veg.	Adjusted % for Stabilizing Woody Veg.	
1. Bed	1. Vertical Stability	1. Aggradation			0	0	100%				
		2. Degradation			0	0	100%				
	2. Riffle Condition	1. Texture/Substrate	32	32			100%				
		3. Pool Condition	1. Depth	32	32						100%
	4. Thalweg position	2. Length	32	32			100%				
		1. Thalweg centering for riffle/run	32	32			100%				
2. Bank	1. Scoured /Eroding	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	0	0	100%	
		2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely			0	0	100%	0	0	100%
			3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse			0	0	100%	0	0
	Totals					0	0	100%	0	0	100%
3. Engineering Structures	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs	66	66			100%				
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill.	15	15			100%				
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms	15	15			100%				
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%	66	66			100%				
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~ Max Pool Depth	15	15			100%				

Table 5d. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment										
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026										
Reach ID		Town Creek -Reach 4								
Assessed Length (LF)		232								
Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number per As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Veg.	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Veg.	Adjusted % for Stabilizing Woody Veg.
1. Bed	1. Vertical Stability	1. Aggradation			0	0	100%			
		2. Degradation			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	1. Texture/Substrate	4	4			100%			
		1. Depth	4	4			100%			
	3. Pool Condition	2. Length	4	4			100%			
		1. Thalweg centering for riffle/run	4	4			100%			
4. Thalweg position	2. Thalweg centering for pool/glide	4	4			100%				
	Totals									
2. Bank	1. Scoured /Eroding	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	0	0	100%
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely			0	0	100%	0	0	100%
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse			0	0	100%	0	0	100%
	Totals									
3. Engineering Structures	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs	0	0			N/A			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill.	0	0			N/A			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms	0	0			N/A			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%	0	0			N/A			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~ Max Pool Depth	0	0			N/A			

Table 5e. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment										
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026										
Reach ID		Town Creek -Reach 5								
Assessed Length (LF)		820								
Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number per As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Veg.	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Veg.	Adjusted % for Stabilizing Woody Veg.
1. Bed	1. Vertical Stability	1. Aggradation			0	0	100%			
		2. Degradation			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	1. Texture/Substrate	18	18			100%			
		3. Pool Condition	1. Depth	16	16					
		2. Length	16	16			100%			
	4. Thalweg position	1. Thalweg centering for riffle/run	18	18			100%			
		2. Thalweg centering for pool/glide	16	16			100%			
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroding	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	0	0	100%
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely			0	0	100%	0	0	100%
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse			0	0	100%	0	0	100%
	Totals					0	0	100%	0	0
3. Engineering Structures	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs	31	31			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill.	5	5			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms	5	5			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%	31	31			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~ Max Pool Depth	5	5			100%			

Table 5f. Stream Problem Areas			
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026			
Town Creek Reach 1			
Feature Issue	Station No.	Suspected Cause	Photo Number
No issues in Year 5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Town Creek Reach 2			
Feature Issue	Station No.	Suspected Cause	Photo Number
No issues in Year 5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Town Creek Reach 3			
Feature Issue	Station No.	Suspected Cause	Photo Number
No issues in Year 5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Town Creek Reach 4			
Feature Issue	Station No.	Suspected Cause	Photo Number
No issues in Year 5	N/A	N/A	N/A
Town Creek Reach 5			
Feature Issue	Station No.	Suspected Cause	Photo Number
No issues in Year 5	N/A	N/A	N/A
<p>Note: The first digit in the Photo Number column references the monitoring year and the second digit references the problem area or photo (which would be identical to a prior years problem area/photo number when persisting from a previous monitoring year).</p>			

Table 6a. Vegetation Condition Assessment						
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026						
Reach ID	Reaches 1 - 5					
Planted Acreage	10.73					
Low Vigor	Definitions	Mapping Threshold	CCPV Depiction	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Planted Acreage
1. Bare Areas	Very limited cover of both woody and herbaceous material.	0.1 acres	N/A	0	0.00	0.0%
2. Low Stem Density Areas	Woody stem densities clearly below target levels based on MY4 or 5 stem count criteria.	0.1 acres	N/A	0	0.00	0.0%
Low Vigor				0	0.00	0.0%
3. Areas of Poor Growth Rates or Vigor	Areas with woody stems of a size class that are obviously small given the monitoring year.	0.25 acres	N/A	0	0.00	0.0%
Cumulative Total				0	0.00	0.0%
Easement Acreage 11.97						
Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold	CCPV Depiction	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Easement Acreage
4. Invasive Areas of Concern	Areas or points (if too small to render as polygons at map scale).	1000 SF	NA	0	0.00	0.0%
5. Easement Encroachment Areas	Areas or points (if too small to render as polygons at map scale).	N/A	N/A	0	0.00	0.0%

Table 6b. Vegetation Problem Areas			
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026			
Reach 1			
Feature Issue	Station No.	Suspected Cause	Photo Number
No Issues in Year 5.	N/A	N/A	-
Reach 2			
Feature Issue	Station No.	Suspected Cause	Photo Number
No Issues in Year 5.	N/A	N/A	-
Reach 3			
Feature Issue	Station No.	Suspected Cause	Photo Number
No Issues in Year 5.	N/A	N/A	-
Reach 4			
Feature Issue	Station No.	Suspected Cause	Photo Number
No Issues in Year 5.	N/A	N/A	-
Reach 5			
Feature Issue	Station No.	Suspected Cause	Photo Number
No Issues in Year 5.	N/A	N/A	-
*Note: The first digit in the Photo Number column references the monitoring year and the second digit references the problem area or photo (which would be identical to a prior years problem area/photo number when persisting from a previous monitoring year).			

Town Creek – Reach 1



PID 1: Station 10+40 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 2: Station 10+60 – Downstream (10/15/20)



PID 3: Station 10+70 – Left Floodplain Rock Lined Channel (10/15/20)



PID 4: Station 11+25 – Downstream (10/15/20)



PID 5: Station 12+20 – Downstream (10/15/20)



PID 6: Station 13+60 – Upstream (10/15/20)

Town Creek – Reach 2



PID 7: Station 13+75 – Downstream (10/15/20)



**PID 8: Station 14+65 – Left Floodplain
Matted Drainage Swale (10/15/20)**



PID 9: Station 14+65 – Downstream (10/15/20)



PID 10: Station 16+15 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 11: Station 16+90 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 12: Station 17+75 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 13: Station 18+75 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 14: Station 19+25 – Upstream (10/15/20)



**PID 15: Station 20+50 – Downstream
(10/15/20)**



PID 16: Station 20+70 – Upstream (10/15/20)

Town Creek – Reach 3



PID 17: Station 21+75 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 18: Station 23+30 – Upstream (10/15/20)




PID 19: Station 23+60 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 20: Station 23+60 – Left Bank (10/15/20)



PID 21: Station 24+50 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 22: Station 25+50 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 23: Station 27+50 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 24: Station 28+10 – Upstream (10/15/20)



**PID 25: Station 28+35 – Right Floodplain
Rock Lined Channel (10/15/20)**



PID 26: Station 28+90 – Upstream (10/15/20)



**PID 27: Station 29+80 – Downstream
(10/15/20)**



PID 28: Station 31+40 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 29: Station 33+00 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 30: Station 33+45 – Downstream (10/15/20)



PID 31: Station 35+50 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 32: Station 36+90 – Upstream (10/15/20)

Town Creek – Reach 4



PID 33: Station 37+15–Downstream (10/15/20)



PID 34: Station 39+05 – Upstream (10/15/20)

Town Creek – Reach 5



PID 35: Station 42+00 – Downstream (10/15/20)



PID 36: Station 43+25 – Downstream (10/15/20)



PID 37: Station 44+25 – Downstream (10/15/20)



PID 38: Station 45+30 Downstream (10/15/20)



PID 39: Station 45+50 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 40: Station 46+90 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 41: Station 47+00 – Right Floodplain Rock Lined Channel from Wetland (10/15/20)



PID 42: Station 47+75 – Upstream (10/15/20)



PID 43: Station 48+05 – Downstream (10/15/20)

Before and After Photos (MY0 and MY5)



Reach 1 (MY0)



Reach 1 (MY5)



Reach 1 (MY0)



Reach 1 (MY5)



Reach 2 (MY0)



Reach 2 (MY5)

Before and After Photos (MY0 and MY5)




Reach 3 (MY0)



Reach 3 (MY5)




Reach 3 (MY0)



Reach 3 (MY5)



Reach 5 (MY0)



Reach 5 (MY5)

APPENDIX C

Vegetation Plot Data

Table 7. Vegetation Plot Criteria Attainment
Town Creek Restoration Project No. 95026

Wetland/Stream Vegetation Totals (per acre)				
Plot #	Stream/ Wetland Stems¹	Volunteers²	Total³	Success Criteria Met?
VP1	607	40	647	Yes
VP2	567	0	567	Yes
VP3	567	0	567	Yes
VP4	567	0	567	Yes
VP5	324	81	405	Yes
VP6	405	121	526	Yes
VP7	486	243	729	Yes
VP8	364	0	364	Yes
Project Avg	486	61	546	Yes

¹Native planted woody stems. Includes shrubs, does NOT include live stakes. No vines
²Native woody stems. Not planted. No vines.
³Planted + volunteer native woody stems. Includes live stakes. Excl. exotics. Excl. vines.

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%

Table 8. CVS Vegetation Plot Metadata
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026

Report Prepared By Andrew Powers
Date Prepared 9/29/2020 9:26

database name 124526_TownCreek_cvs-eep-entrytool-v2.3.1_MYS.mdb
database location R:\124526_TownCreek\DISCIPLINE\DISCIPLINE\Docs\Reports\Monitoring\YR-5\App C - Vegetation Plot Data
computer name ASHELJYORK
file size 58146816

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 95026
project Name Town Creek Restoration Project - Option B
Description
River Basin Yadkin-Pee Dee
length(ft)
stream-to-edge width (ft)
area (sq m)
Required Plots (calculated)
Sampled Plots 8

Table 9. CVS Stem Count of Planted Stems by Plot and Species
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026

Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	Current Plot Data (MY5 2020)																				
			95026-01-VP1			95026-01-VP2			95026-01-VP3			95026-01-VP4			95026-01-VP5			95026-01-VP6			95026-01-VP7		
			P	V	T	P	V	T	P	V	T	P	V	T	P	V	T	P	V	T	P	V	T
<i>Asimina triloba</i>	pawpaw	Tree																					
<i>Betula nigra</i>	river birch	Tree	2	1	3							1		1									
<i>Callicarpa americana</i>	American beautyberry	Shrub																					
<i>Carpinus caroliniana</i>	American hornbeam	Tree				1		1	2		2												
<i>Carya glabra</i>	Pignut hickory	Tree																			1	1	
<i>Cercis canadensis</i>	eastern redbud	Tree													2		2						
<i>Cornus amomum</i>	silky dogwood	Shrub				2		2	3		3	1		1	1		1						
<i>Diospyros virginiana</i>	common persimmon	Tree							5		5						1		1		2	5	
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash	Tree	1		1																1	1	
<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>	tuliptree	Tree	3		3	3		3	1		1			2		2	1		1		1	1	
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	American sycamore	Tree	2		2																5	5	
<i>Quercus alba</i>	white oak	Tree																					
<i>Quercus falcata</i>	southern red oak	Tree																					
<i>Quercus lyrata</i>	overcup oak	Tree																					
<i>Quercus michauxii</i>	swamp chestnut oak	Tree				1		1									2		2				
<i>Quercus pagoda</i>	cherrybark oak	Tree	2		2							1		1							1	1	
<i>Quercus phellos</i>	willow oak	Tree	5		5	7		7	3		3	11		11	3		3		3		4	4	
<i>Sambucus canadensis</i>	Common Elderberry	Shrub																					
<i>Sambucus nigra</i>	European black elderberry	Shrub																					
<i>Ulmus americana</i>	American Elm	Tree														2		2					
Stem count			15	1	16	14	0	14	14	0	14	14	0	14	8	2	10	10	3	13	12	6	18
size (ares)			1			1			1			1			1			1			1		
size (ACRES)			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02		
Species count			6	1	6	5	0	5	5	0	5	4	0	4	4	1	5	6	2	7	5	2	7
Stems per ACRE			607	40	647	567	0	567	567	0	567	567	0	567	324	81	405	405	121	526	486	243	728

Table 9. CVS Stem Count of Planted Stems by Plot and Species
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026

Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	Current Plot Data (MY5 2020)									Annual Means											
			95026-01-VP8			MY5 (2020)			MY4 (2019)			MY3 (2018)			MY2 (2017)			MY1 (2016)			MY0 (2016)		
			P	V	T	P	V	T	P	V	T	P	V	T	P	V	T	P	V	T	P	V	T
<i>Asimina triloba</i>	pawpaw	Tree				1		1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1		1	1		1
<i>Betula nigra</i>	river birch	Tree	2		2	7	1	8	7		7	8		8	9		9	8		8	12		12
<i>Callicarpa americana</i>	American beautyberry	Shrub												1		1	2		2	1		1	
<i>Carpinus caroliniana</i>	American hornbeam	Tree				3		3	3		3	3		3	3		3	3		3	1		1
<i>Cercis canadensis</i>	eastern redbud	Tree					1	1	3		3	4		4	11		11	11		11	11		11
<i>Cornus amomum</i>	silky dogwood	Shrub				2		2	9		9	10		10	12		12	13		13	14		14
<i>Diospyros virginiana</i>	common persimmon	Tree				7		7	5	4	9	5	6	11	5		5	4		4	4		4
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash	Tree				6	10	16	2		2	2		2	2		2	2		2	2		2
<i>Liriodendron tulipifera</i>	tuliptree	Tree				2		2	16		16	21		21	24		24	26		26	27		27
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	American sycamore	Tree	1		1	12		12	13		13	13		13	13		13	13		13	14		14
<i>Quercus alba</i>	white oak	Tree	5		5	12		12								1		1		4		3	
<i>Quercus falcata</i>	southern red oak	Tree															2		2		5		5
<i>Quercus lyrata</i>	overcup oak	Tree							2		2	2		2	2		2						
<i>Quercus michauxii</i>	swamp chestnut oak	Tree							3		3	5		5	5		5	8		8	9		9
<i>Quercus pagoda</i>	cherrybark oak	Tree				3		3	5		5	5		5	8		8	8		8	6		6
<i>Quercus phellos</i>	willow oak	Tree				4		4	39		39	41	1	42	44		44	43		43	47		47
<i>Sambucus canadensis</i>	Common Elderberry	Shrub	1		1	37		37						1		1	1		1				
<i>Sambucus nigra</i>	European black elderberry	Shrub																			2		2
<i>Ulmus americana</i>	American Elm	Tree								1		1											
Stem count			9	0	9	96	12	108	108	5	113	121	7	128	142	142	142	149	149	149	159	159	159
size (ares)			1			8			8			8			8			8			8		
size (ACRES)			0.02			0.20			0.20			0.20			0.20			0.20			0.20		
Species count			4	0	4	12	3	13	13	2	14	14	2	14	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
Stems per ACRE			364	0	364	486	61	546	546	25	572	612	35	647	718	718	718	754	754	754	804	804	804

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%

Town Creek – Vegetation Plot Photos



Vegetation Plot 1 (9/22/20)



Vegetation Plot 2 (9/22/20)



Vegetation Plot 3 (9/22/20)



Vegetation Plot 4 (9/22/20)



Vegetation Plot 5 (9/22/20)



Vegetation Plot 6 (9/22/20)



Vegetation Plot 7 (9/22/2020)



Vegetation Plot 8 (9/22/2020)

APPENDIX D

Stream Survey Data

Figure 3. Cross-sections with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026


Permanent Cross-section
X1 Riffle - Reach 2
(Monitoring Year 5 - Collected September 2020)



LEFT BANK

RIGHT BANK

Feature	Stream Type	BKF Area	BKF Width	BKF Depth	Max BKF Depth	W/D	BH Ratio*	ER	BKF Elev	TOB Elev	WFPA
Riffle	C	3.45	7.10	0.50	0.90	14.50	0.90	3.60	586.35	586.51	25.30



*BHR=0.9 is based on asbuilt bkf area of 5.79 at an elevation of 586.61. Remainder of data based on actual bankfull elevation from as-built which is 586.35.

Figure 3 Cont. Cross-sections with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026

Permanent Cross-section

X2 Riffle - Reach 2

(Monitoring Year 5 - Collected September 2020)




LEFT BANK



RIGHT BANK

Feature	Stream Type	BKF Area	BKF Width	BKF Depth	Max BKF Depth	W/D	BH Ratio*	ER	BKF Elev	TOB Elev	WFPA
Riffle	E	6.17	8.10	0.80	1.40	10.60	0.90	4.10	583.31	583.43	33.30



*BHR=0.90 is based on asbuilt bkf area of 8.28 at an elevation of 583.52. Remainder of data based on actual bankfull elevation from as-built which is 583.31.

Figure 3 Cont. Cross-sections with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026

Permanent Cross-section
X3 Pool - Reach 2
(Monitoring Year 5 - Collected September 2020)



LEFT BANK

RIGHT BANK

Feature	Stream Type	BKF Area	BKF Width	BKF Depth	Max BKF Depth	W/D	BH Ratio	ER	BKF Elev	TOB Elev	WFGPA
Pool		8.03	8.30	1.00	1.80	8.60	-	-	582.09	582.44	35.30




Figure 3 Cont. Cross-sections with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026


Permanent Cross-section
X4 Riffle - Reach 2
(Monitoring Year 5 - Collected September 2020)



LEFT BANK

RIGHT BANK

Feature	Stream Type	BKF Area	BKF Width	BKF Depth	Max BKF Depth	W/D	BH Ratio	ER	BKF Elev	TOB Elev	WFGPA
Riffle	C	7.24	9.80	0.70	1.30	13.30	1.00	3.50	576.81	577.09	37.40



*BHR = 1.0 is based on as-built bkf area of 8.38 at an elevation of 576.92. Remainder of data based on actual bankfull elevation from as-built which is 576.81

Figure 3 Cont. Cross-sections with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026


Permanent Cross-section
X5 Riffle - Reach 3
(Monitoring Year 5 - Collected September 2020)



LEFT BANK

RIGHT BANK

Feature	Stream Type	BKF Area	BKF Width	BKF Depth	Max BKF Depth	W/D	BH Ratio	ER	BKF Elev	TOB Elev	WSPA
Riffle	C	6.98	10.60	0.70	1.00	16.10	1.00	4.50	568.85	568.94	48.10



*BHR = 1.0 is based on as-built bkf area of 8.68 at an elevation of 568.99. Remainder of data based on actual bankfull elevation from as-built which is 568.85.

Figure 3 Cont. Cross-sections with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026

Permanent Cross-section
X6 Pool - Reach 3
(Monitoring Year 5 - Collected September 2020)



LEFT BANK

RIGHT BANK

Feature	Stream Type	BKF Area	BKF Width	BKF Depth	Max BKF Depth	W/D	BH Ratio	ER	BKF Elev	TOB Elev	WFGPA
Pool		15.38	21.70	0.70	2.10	30.50	-	-	568.83	568.71	50.00




Figure 3 Cont. Cross-sections with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026


Permanent Cross-section
X7 Riffle - Reach 3
 (Monitoring Year 5 - Collected September 2020)



LEFT BANK

RIGHT BANK

Feature	Stream Type	BKF Area	BKF Width	BKF Depth	Max BKF Depth	W/D	BH Ratio	ER	BKF Elev	TOB Elev	WFGPA
Riffle	C	4.83	9.30	0.50	0.80	18.00	0.90	4.10	563.96	563.98	38.60



*BHR = 0.9 is based on as-built bkf area of 6.51 at an elevation of 564.11. Remainder of data based on actual bankfull elevation from as-built which is 563.96.

Figure 3 Cont. Cross-sections with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026

Permanent Cross-section
X8 Pool - Reach 3
(Monitoring Year 5 - Collected September 2020)



LEFT BANK

RIGHT BANK

Feature	Stream Type	BKF Area	BKF Width	BKF Depth	Max BKF Depth	W/D	BH Ratio	ER	BKF Elev	TOB Elev	WFPA
Pool		11.48	9.60	1.20	2.00	8.00	-	-	555.44	555.35	50.50




Figure 3 Cont. Cross-sections with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026


Permanent Cross-section
X9 Riffle - Reach 3
(Monitoring Year 5 - Collected September 2020)



LEFT BANK

RIGHT BANK

Feature	Stream Type	BKF Area	BKF Width	BKF Depth	Max BKF Depth	W/D	BH Ratio	ER	BKF Elev	TOB Elev	WFPA
Riffle	C	4.05	9.40	0.40	0.80	22.00	0.90	3.30	555.19	555.34	31.20



*BHR = 0.9 is based on as-built bkf area of 6.79 at an elevation of 555.42. Remainder of data based on actual bankfull elevation from as-built which is 555.19.

Figure 3 Cont. Cross-sections with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026


Permanent Cross-section
X10 Riffle - Reach 5
(Monitoring Year 5 - Collected September 2020)



LEFT BANK

RIGHT BANK

Feature	Stream Type	BKF Area	BKF Width	BKF Depth	Max BKF Depth	W/D	BH Ratio	ER	BKF Elev	TOB Elev	WFGA
Riffle	C	6.54	10.00	0.70	1.10	15.30	1.00	5.90	550.83	551.00	58.90



*BHR = 1.0 is based on as-built bkf area of 8.0 at an elevation of 550.97. Remainder of data based on actual bankfull elevation from as-built which is 550.83.

Figure 3 Cont. Cross-sections with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026

Permanent Cross-section
X11 Pool - Reach 5
(Monitoring Year 5 - Collected September 2020)



LEFT BANK

RIGHT BANK

Feature	Stream Type	BKF Area	BKF Width	BKF Depth	Max BKF Depth	W/D	BH Ratio	ER	BKF Elev	TOB Elev	WFPA
Pool		17.12	17.80	1.00	2.20	18.40	-	-	549.52	549.41	63.60




Figure 3 Cont. Cross-sections with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026


Permanent Cross-section
X12 Riffle - Reach 5
(Monitoring Year 5 - Collected September 2020)



LEFT BANK

RIGHT BANK

Feature	Stream Type	BKF Area	BKF Width	BKF Depth	Max BKF Depth	W/D	BH Ratio	ER	BKF Elev	TOB Elev	WFPA
Riffle	C	4.96	10.30	0.50	0.80	21.50	0.90	3.90	549.04	549.12	40.6



*BHR = 0.9 is based on as-built bkf area of 5.71 at an elevation of 549.11. Remainder of data based on actual bankfull elevation from as-built which is 549.04.

Figure 3 Cont. Cross-sections with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026


Permanent Cross-section
X13 Riffle - Reach 5
(Monitoring Year 5 - Collected September 2020)



LEFT BANK

RIGHT BANK

Feature	Stream Type	BKF Area	BKF Width	BKF Depth	Max BKF Depth	W/D	BH Ratio	ER	BKF Elev	TOB Elev	WFPA
Riffle	C	5.85	12.30	0.50	0.90	25.90	0.90	4.60	546.93	546.84	56.6



*BHR = 0.9 is based on as-built bkf area of 5.97 at an elevation of 546.94. Remainder of data based on actual bankfull elevation from as-built which is 546.93.

Figure 4. Riffle Pebble Count Size Class Distribution with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026

		BAKER PROJECT NO. 124526			
SITE OR PROJECT:		Town Creek Stream Restoration Project - Monitoring Year 5			
REACH/LOCATION:		Town Creek - Reach 2, XS 1			
DATE COLLECTED:		10/14/2020			
FIELD COLLECTION BY:		AP, JY			
DATA ENTRY BY:		JY			
		PARTICLE CLASS COUNT		Summary	
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Riffle	Class %	% Cum
SILT/CLAY		< .063	11	11%	11%
SAND	Very Fine	.063 - .125			11%
	Fine	.125 - .25			11%
	Medium	.25 - .50			11%
	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	11	11%	22%
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0	3	3%	25%
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8	5	5%	30%
	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0	4	4%	34%
	Fine	4.0 - 5.6	11	11%	45%
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0	17	17%	62%
	Medium	8.0 - 11.0	14	14%	76%
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0	9	9%	85%
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	7	7%	92%
	Coarse	22.6 - 32	3	3%	95%
	Very Coarse	32 - 45			95%
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	3	3%	98%
	COBBLE	Small	64 - 90	1	1%
Small		90 - 128	1	1%	100%
Large		128 - 180			100%
Large		180 - 256			100%
BOULDER	Small	256 - 362			100%
	Small	362 - 512			100%
	Medium	512 - 1024			100%
	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%
		Total	100	100%	100%

Riffle	
Channel materials (mm)	
D ₁₆ =	0.69
D ₃₅ =	4.12
D ₅₀ =	6.22
D ₈₄ =	15.35
D ₉₅ =	45.00
D ₁₀₀ =	90 - 128





Figure 4 Cont. Riffle Pebble Count Size Class Distribution with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026

MATERIAL		PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	PARTICLE CLASS COUNT		Summary	
				Riffle	Class %	% Cum	
SILT/CLAY		Silt / Clay	< .063	4	4%	4%	
SAND	Very Fine	.063 - .125	0	0%	4%		
	Fine	.125 - .25	0	0%	4%		
	Medium	.25 - .50	0	0%	4%		
	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	4	4%	8%		
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0	0	0%	8%		
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8	0	0%	8%		
	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0	0	0%	8%		
	Fine	4.0 - 5.6	8	8%	16%		
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0	4	4%	20%		
	Medium	8.0 - 11.0	8	8%	28%		
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0	8	8%	36%		
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	4	4%	40%		
	Coarse	22.6 - 32	12	12%	52%		
	Very Coarse	32 - 45	16	16%	68%		
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	12	12%	80%		
COBBLE	Small	64 - 90	12	12%	92%		
	Small	90 - 128	4	4%	96%		
	Large	128 - 180	4	4%	100%		
	Large	180 - 256	0	0%	100%		
BOULDER	Small	256 - 362	0	0%	100%		
	Small	362 - 512	0	0%	100%		
	Medium	512 - 1024	0	0%	100%		
	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048	0	0%	100%		
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048	0	0%	100%		
Total				100	100%	100%	

Riffle	
Channel materials (mm)	
D ₁₀ =	5.60
D ₃₅ =	15.27
D ₅₀ =	30.20
D ₆₄ =	71.70
D ₉₅ =	117.21
D ₁₀₀ =	> 2048





Figure 4 Cont. Riffle Pebble Count Size Class Distribution with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026

		BAKER PROJECT NO. 124526			
SITE OR PROJECT:		Town Creek Stream Restoration Project - Monitoring Year 5			
REACH/LOCATION:		Town Creek - Reach 3, XS 5			
DATE COLLECTED:		10/14/2020			
FIELD COLLECTION BY:		AP, JY			
DATA ENTRY BY:		JY			
		PARTICLE CLASS COUNT		Summary	
MATERIAL	PARTICLE SIZE (mm)	Riffle	Class %	% Cum	
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	3	3%	3%
	Very Fine	.063 - .125			
SAND	Fine	.125 - .25			3%
	Medium	.25 - .50	2	2%	5%
	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	1	1%	6%
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			6%
	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			6%
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0	6	6%	12%
	Fine	4.0 - 5.6	4	4%	16%
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0	5	5%	21%
	Medium	8.0 - 11.0	8	8%	29%
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0	2	2%	31%
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	13	13%	44%
	Coarse	22.6 - 32	17	17%	61%
	Very Coarse	32 - 45	13	13%	74%
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	11	11%	85%
	COBBLE	Small	64 - 90	9	9%
Small		90 - 128	3	3%	97%
Large		128 - 180	2	2%	99%
Large		180 - 256	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			100%
Total		100	100%	100%	

Riffle	
Channel materials (mm)	
D ₁₆ =	5.60
D ₃₅ =	17.79
D ₅₀ =	25.55
D ₈₄ =	61.98
D ₉₅ =	101.21
D ₁₀₀ =	> 2048





Figure 4 Cont. Riffle Pebble Count Size Class Distribution with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026

BAKER PROJECT NO. 124526						
SITE OR PROJECT: Town Creek Stream Restoration Project - Monitoring Year 5						
REACH/LOCATION: Town Creek - Reach 3, XS 7						
DATE COLLECTED: 10/14/2020						
FIELD COLLECTION BY: AP, JY						
DATA ENTRY BY: JY						
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	PARTICLE CLASS COUNT		Summary	
			Riffle	Class %	% Cum	
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	2	2%	2%	
SAND	Very Fine	.063 - .125	0	0%	2%	
	Fine	.125 - .25	0	0%	2%	
	Medium	.25 - .50	0	0%	2%	
	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	0	0%	2%	
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0	2	2%	4%	
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8	1	1%	5%	
	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			5%	
	Fine	4.0 - 5.6	2	2%	7%	
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0	8	8%	15%	
	Medium	8.0 - 11.0	11	11%	26%	
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0	10	10%	36%	
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	9	9%	45%	
	Coarse	22.6 - 32	10	10%	55%	
	Very Coarse	32 - 45	17	17%	72%	
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	9	9%	81%	
COBBLE	Small	64 - 90	7	7%	88%	
	Small	90 - 128	6	6%	94%	
	Large	128 - 180	0	0%	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			100%	
Total			100	100%	100%	

Riffle	
Channel materials (mm)	
D ₁₆ =	8.23
D ₃₅ =	15.41
D ₅₀ =	26.89
D ₆₄ =	74.07
D ₈₅ =	190.88
D ₁₀₀ =	> 2048





Figure 4 Cont. Riffle Pebble Count Size Class Distribution with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026

BAKER PROJECT NO. 124526					
SITE OR PROJECT:		Town Creek Stream Restoration Project - Monitoring Year 5			
REACH/LOCATION:		Town Creek - Reach 3, XS 9			
DATE COLLECTED:		10/14/2020			
FIELD COLLECTION BY:		AP, JY			
DATA ENTRY BY:		JY			
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Summary	
			Riffle	Class %	% Cum
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	2	2%	2%
	Very Fine	.063 - .125	0	0%	2%
SAND	Fine	.125 - .25	0	0%	2%
	Medium	.25 - .50	0	0%	2%
	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	0	0%	2%
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0	0	0%	2%
	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8	1	1%	3%
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0	0	0%	3%
	Fine	4.0 - 5.6	1	1%	4%
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0	2	2%	6%
	Medium	8.0 - 11.0	2	2%	8%
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0	14	14%	22%
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	10	10%	32%
	Coarse	22.6 - 32	8	8%	40%
	Very Coarse	32 - 45	18	18%	58%
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	20	20%	78%
	COBBLE	Small	64 - 90	8	8%
Small		90 - 128	6	6%	92%
Large		128 - 180	0	0%	92%
Large		180 - 256	8	8%	100%
BOULDER	Small	256 - 362	0	0%	100%
	Small	362 - 512	0	0%	100%
	Medium	512 - 1024	0	0%	100%
	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048	0	0%	100%
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048	0	0%	100%
Total			100	100%	100%

Riffle	
Channel materials (mm)	
D ₁₅ =	13.63
D ₃₅ =	25.75
D ₅₀ =	38.67
D ₈₄ =	82.65
D ₉₅ =	205.42
D ₁₀₀ =	> 2048





Figure 4 Cont. Riffle Pebble Count Size Class Distribution with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026

		BAKER PROJECT NO. 124526			
SITE OR PROJECT:		Town Creek Stream Restoration Project - Monitoring Year 5			
REACH/LOCATION:		Town Creek - Reach 5, XS 10			
DATE COLLECTED:		10/14/2020			
FIELD COLLECTION BY:		AP, JY			
DATA ENTRY BY:		JY			
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Summary	
			Riffle	Class %	% Cum
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	4	4%	4%
	Very Fine	.063 - .125	3	3%	7%
SAND	Fine	.125 - .25			7%
	Medium	.25 - .50			7%
	Coarse	.50 - 1.0			7%
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0	0	0%	7%
	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8	1	1%	8%
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0	1	1%	9%
	Fine	4.0 - 5.6	2	2%	11%
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0	4	4%	15%
	Medium	8.0 - 11.0	2	2%	17%
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0	14	14%	31%
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	11	11%	42%
	Coarse	22.6 - 32	13	13%	55%
	Very Coarse	32 - 45	17	17%	72%
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	18	18%	90%
COBBLE	Small	64 - 90	4	4%	94%
	Small	90 - 128	4	4%	98%
	Large	128 - 180	2	2%	100%
BOULDER	Large	180 - 256			100%
	Small	256 - 362			100%
	Small	362 - 512			100%
	Medium	512 - 1024			100%
BEDROCK	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%
	Bedrock	> 2048			100%
Total			100	100%	100%

Riffle	
Channel materials (mm)	
D ₁₅ =	9.38
D ₃₅ =	18.14
D ₅₀ =	27.99
D ₈₄ =	56.91
D ₉₅ =	98.28
D ₁₀₀ =	128 - 180





Figure 4 Cont. Riffle Pebble Count Size Class Distribution with Annual Overlays
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026

BAKER PROJECT NO. 124526					
SITE OR PROJECT: Town Creek Stream Restoration Project - Monitoring Year 5					
REACH/LOCATION: Town Creek - Reach 5, XS 12					
DATE COLLECTED: 10/14/2020					
FIELD COLLECTION BY: AP, JY					
DATA ENTRY BY: JY					
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	PARTICLE CLASS COUNT		
			Riffle	Class %	% Cum
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	2	2%	2%
SAND	Very Fine	.063 - .125	0	0%	2%
	Fine	.125 - .25	0	0%	2%
	Medium	.25 - .50	0	0%	2%
	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	0	0%	2%
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0	4	4%	6%
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8	0	0%	6%
	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0	0	0%	6%
	Fine	4.0 - 5.6	0	0%	6%
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0	0	0%	6%
	Medium	8.0 - 11.0	5	5%	11%
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0	11	11%	22%
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	12	12%	34%
	Coarse	22.6 - 32	22	22%	56%
	Very Coarse	32 - 45	18	18%	74%
Very Coarse	45 - 64	8	8%	82%	
COBBLE	Small	64 - 90	11	11%	93%
	Small	90 - 128	4	4%	97%
	Large	128 - 180	2	2%	99%
	Large	180 - 256	1	1%	100%
BOULDER	Small	256 - 362	0	0%	100%
	Small	362 - 512	0	0%	100%
	Medium	512 - 1024	0	0%	100%
	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048	0	0%	100%
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048	0	0%	100%
Total			100	100%	100%

Riffle	
Channel materials (mm)	
D ₁₆ =	13.04
D ₃₅ =	22.96
D ₅₀ =	29.10
D ₆₄ =	68.09
D ₉₅ =	107.33
D ₁₀₀ =	> 2048





Table 10. Baseline Stream Summary
Town Creek Restoration Project - Option B: DMS Project ID No. 95026

Reach 1 (317 LF)																							
Parameter		USGS Gauge	Regional Curve Interval (Harman et al, 1999)*			Pre-Existing Condition						Design						Monitoring Baseline (As-built)					
			LL	UL	Eq.	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle																							
	BF Width (ft)	----	23.0	80.0	4.2	5.5	----	----	7.2	----	2	----	9.0	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Floodprone Width (ft)	----	----	----	----	72.1	----	----	76.6	----	2	20	----	----	50	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	BF Mean Depth (ft)	----	2.3	5.8	0.7	0.8	----	----	1.1	----	2	----	0.68	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	BF Max Depth (ft)	----	----	----	----	1.8	----	----	2.3	----	2	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	BF Cross-sectional Area (ft ²)	----	80.0	300.0	4.2	5.4	----	----	5.9	----	2	----	6.1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Width/Depth Ratio	----	----	----	----	5.22	----	----	9.43	----	2	----	13.3	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Entrenchment Ratio	----	----	----	----	10.1	----	----	13.8	----	2	----	----	----	>2.2	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Bank Height Ratio	----	----	----	----	1.3	----	----	1.5	----	2	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	d50 (mm)	----	----	----	----	----	6.9	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Pattern																							
	Channel Beltwidth (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Radius of Curvature (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Meander Wavelength (ft)	----	----	0.0	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Meander Width Ratio	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Profile																							
	Riffle Length (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.022	----	----	----	----	----	0.012	----	----	----	8
	Pool Length (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Pool Spacing (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	14.0	----	----	45.0	----	----	12.0	----	----	----	42.0	11
	Pool Max Depth (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1.4	----	----	2.4	----	----	0.2	----	----	----	0.8	11
	Pool Volume (ft ³)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Substrate and Transport Parameters																							
	Ri% / Ru% / P% / G% / S%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	SC% / Sa% / G% / B% / Be%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.2 / 4.3 / 6.9 / 30.8 / 54.5	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/ft ²	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankfull (Rosgen Curve)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m ²	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Additional Reach Parameters																							
	Drainage Area (SM)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.09	----	----	----	0.09	----	----	----	----	----	0.09	----	----	----	----
	Impervious cover estimate (%)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Rosgen Classification	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	E4b (incised)	----	----	----	C4	----	----	----	----	----	C4	----	----	----	----
	BF Velocity (fps)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	2.76	----	----	----	2.72	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	BF Discharge (cfs)	----	290.0	2000.0	15.6	----	----	----	16.3	----	----	----	16.3	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Valley Length	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	301.9	----	----	----	----
	Channel length (ft) ²	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	363	----	----	----	316	----	----	----	----	----	317.0	----	----	----	----
	Sinuosity	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1.17	----	----	----	1.02	----	----	----	----	----	1.1	----	----	----	----
	Water Surface Slope (Channel) (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.0212	----	----	----	0.0217	----	----	----	----	----	0.0181	----	----	----	----
	BF slope (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Bankfull Floodplain Area (acres)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	BEHI VL% / L% / M% / H% / VH% / E%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Channel Stability or Habitat Metric	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Biological or Other	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

* Harman, W.A., G.D. Jennings, J.M. Patterson, D.R. Clinton, L.O. Slate, A.G. Jessup, J.R. Everhart, and R.E. Smith. 1999. Bankfull hydraulic geometry relationships for North Carolina streams. Wildland Hydrology. AWRA Symposium Proceedings. D.S. Olsen and J.P. Potyondy, eds. American Water Resources Association. June 30-July 2, 1999. Bozeman, MT.

Table 10. Baseline Stream Summary																						
Town Creek Restoration Project - Option B: DMS Project ID No. 95026																						
Reach 2 (711 LF)																						
Parameter	USGS Gauge	Regional Curve Interval (Harman et al, 1999)*			Pre-Existing Condition						Design						Monitoring Baseline (As-built)					
		LL	UL	Eq.	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle																						
BF Width (ft)	----	23.0	80.0	4.8	6.6	----	----	8.8	----	2	----	9.0	----	----	----	----	8.8	----	----	12.0	----	3
Floodprone Width (ft)	----	----	----	----	25.5	----	----	42.7	----	2	20	----	----	50.0	----	----	27.1	----	----	42.6	----	3
BF Mean Depth (ft)	----	2.3	5.8	0.8	1.1	----	----	1.6	----	2	----	0.7	----	----	----	----	0.7	----	----	1.0	----	3
BF Max Depth (ft)	----	----	----	----	1.9	----	----	2.4	----	2	----	1.0	----	----	----	----	1.1	----	----	2.3	----	3
BF Cross-sectional Area (ft ²)	----	80.0	300.0	5.1	6.9	----	----	14.0	----	2	----	6.1	----	----	----	----	5.8	----	----	12.0	----	3
Width/Depth Ratio	----	----	----	----	5.6	----	----	6.2	----	2	----	13.3	----	----	----	----	10.2	----	----	13.2	----	3
Entrenchment Ratio	----	----	----	----	3.9	----	----	4.8	----	2	----	----	----	>2.2	----	----	3.1	----	----	3.7	----	3
Bank Height Ratio	----	----	----	----	1.5	----	----	1.6	----	2	----	1.0	----	----	----	----	1.0	----	----	1.0	----	3
d50 (mm)	----	----	----	----	----	16.7	----	----	----	1	----	----	----	----	----	----	17.1	----	----	23.3	----	2
Pattern																						
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Radius of Curvature (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Meander Wavelength (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Meander Width Ratio	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Profile																						
Riffle Length (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.0175	----	----	----	----	----	0.010	----	----	----	----	9
Pool Length (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Pool Spacing (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	14	----	----	45	----	----	19.0	----	----	63.0	----	19
Pool Max Depth (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1.4	----	----	2.4	----	----	0.200	----	----	3.4	----	20
Pool Volume (ft ³)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Substrate and Transport Parameters																						
Ri% / Ru% / P% / G% / S%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
SC% / Sa% / G% / B% / Be%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	<0.063 / 7.2 / 16.7 / 54.5 / 85.7	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	<0.063 - 4.4 / 8.7 - 12.1 / 17.1 - 23.3 / 55.3 - 77.1 / 75.6 - 117.2	----	----	----	----	----
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/ft ²	----	----	----	----	0.79	----	----	----	----	----	0.65	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankfull (Rosgen Curve)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m ²	----	----	----	----	34.9	----	----	----	----	----	32.9	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Additional Reach Parameters																						
Drainage Area (SM)	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.1	----	----	----	0.12	----	----	----	----	----	0.12	----	----	----	----	----
Impervious cover estimate (%)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Rosgen Classification	----	----	----	----	----	----	E4 (incised)	----	----	----	C4	----	----	----	----	----	C4 / E4	----	----	----	----	----
BF Velocity (fps)	----	----	----	----	----	----	1.49	----	----	----	3.48	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
BF Discharge (cfs)	----	290.0	2000.0	19.3	----	----	20.9	----	----	----	20.9	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Valley Length	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	695	----	----	----	----	----
Channel length (ft) ²	----	----	----	----	----	----	737	----	----	----	708	----	----	----	----	----	711	----	----	----	----	----
Sinuosity	----	----	----	----	----	----	1.06	----	----	----	1.02	----	----	----	----	----	1.02	----	----	----	----	----
Water Surface Slope (Channel) (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.0159	----	----	----	0.0177	----	----	----	----	----	0.0180	----	----	----	----	----
BF slope (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Bankfull Floodplain Area (acres)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
BEHI VL% / L% / M% / H% / VH% / E%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Biological or Other	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

* Harman, W.A., G.D. Jennings, J.M. Patterson, D.R. Clinton, L.O. Slate, A.G. Jessup, J.R. Everhart, and R.E. Smith. 1999. Bankfull hydraulic geometry relationships for North Carolina streams. Wildland Hydrology. AWRA Symposium Proceedings. D.S. Olsen and J.P. Potyondy, eds. American Water Resources Association. June 30-July 2, 1999. Bozeman, MT.

Table 10. Baseline Stream Summary																										
Town Creek Restoration Project - Option B: DMS Project ID No. 95026																										
Reach 3 (1,621 LF)																										
Parameter	USGS Gauge	Regional Curve Interval (Harman et al, 1999)*			Pre-Existing Condition ¹						Design						Monitoring Baseline (As-built)									
		LL	UL	Eq.	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n				
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle																										
BF Width (ft)	----	23.0	80.0	5.5	6.0	----	----	16.1	----	4	----	10.0	----	----	----	----	9.8	----	----	10.7	----	3				
Floodprone Width (ft)	----	----	----	----	32.0	----	----	>89	----	4	2	----	----	80.0	----	----	37.8	----	----	48.1	----	3				
BF Mean Depth (ft)	----	2.3	5.8	0.9	0.5	----	----	1.3	----	4	----	0.7	----	----	----	----	0.6	----	----	0.8	----	3				
BF Max Depth (ft)	----	----	----	----	1.3	----	----	1.9	----	4	----	1.0	----	----	----	----	1.0	----	----	1.4	----	3				
BF Cross-sectional Area (ft ²)	----	80.0	300.0	6.4	5.7	----	----	13.6	----	4	----	7.0	----	----	----	----	6.5	----	----	8.7	----	3				
Width/Depth Ratio	----	----	----	----	4.6	----	----	35.6	----	4	----	14.3	----	----	----	----	13.1	----	----	16.9	----	3				
Entrenchment Ratio	----	----	----	----	5.0	----	----	8.2	----	4	----	----	----	>2.2	----	----	3.5	----	----	4.5	----	3				
Bank Height Ratio	----	----	----	----	1.1	----	----	1.9	----	4	----	1.0	----	----	----	----	1.0	----	----	1.0	----	3				
d50 (mm)	----	----	----	----	6.5	----	----	7.3	----	2	----	----	----	----	----	----	18.6	----	----	28.9	----	3				
Pattern																										
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	35.0	----	----	80.0	----	----	22.0	----	----	52.1	----	12				
Radius of Curvature (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	20.0	----	----	30.0	----	----	28.7	----	----	43.6	----	15				
Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	2.0	----	----	3.0	----	----	3.0	----	----	3.8	----	3				
Meander Wavelength (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	70.0	----	----	120.0	----	----	90.2	----	----	130.9	----	15.0				
Meander Width Ratio	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	3.5	----	----	8.0	----	----	3.0	----	----	4.9	----	3				
Profile																										
Riffle Length (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.016	----	----	----	----	----	0.011	----	----	----	23				
Pool Length (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				
Pool Spacing (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	36	----	----	63	----	----	11	----	----	80	----	35				
Pool Max Depth (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1.4	----	----	2.4	----	----	0.2	----	----	1.3	----	34				
Pool Volume (ft ³)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				
Substrate and Transport Parameters																										
Ri% / Ru% / P% / G% / S%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				
SC% / Sa% / G% / B% / Be%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				
d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95	----	----	----	----	<0.063 / 3.9 - 4.6 / 6.5 - 7.3 / 19.3 - 20.4 / 30.8 - 32.0											<0.063 - 5.6 / 9.9 - 16.3 / 18.6 - 28.9 / 85.1 - 99.5 / 154.8 - >2048 / 180 - >2048										
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/ft ²	----	----	----	----	0.3	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.47	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				
Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankfull (Rosgen Curve)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m ²	----	----	----	----	15.7	----	----	----	----	----	----	25.6	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				
Additional Reach Parameters																										
Drainage Area (SM)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.2	----	----	----	----	----	0.2	----	----	----	----	----	0.2	----	----				
Impervious cover estimate (%)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				
Rosgen Classification	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	C4 / E4 (incised)	----	----	----	C4	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	C4	----	----				
BF Velocity (fps)	----	----	----	----	3.6	----	----	3.6	----	2	----	3.8	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				
BF Discharge (cfs)	----	290.0	2000.0	24.8	26.4	----	----	28.0	----	2	----	26.4	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				
Valley Length	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1377	----	----	----	----				
Channel length (ft) ²	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1,849	----	----	----	1,630	----	----	----	----	----	1621	----	----	----	----				
Sinuosity	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1.31	----	----	----	1.17	----	----	----	----	----	1.18	----	----	----	----				
Water Surface Slope (Channel) (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.0111	----	----	----	0.0122	----	----	----	----	----	0.0122	----	----	----	----				
BF slope (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				
Bankfull Floodplain Area (acres)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				
BEHI VL% / L% / M% / H% / VH% / E%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				
Biological or Other	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----				

* Harman, W.A., G.D. Jennings, J.M. Patterson, D.R. Clinton, L.O. Slate, A.G. Jessup, J.R. Everhart, and R.E. Smith. 1999. Bankfull hydraulic geometry relationships for North Carolina streams. Wildland Hydrology. AWRA Symposium Proceedings. D.S. Olsen and J.P. Potyondy, eds. American Water Resources Association. June 30-July 2, 1999. Bozeman, MT.

Table 10. Baseline Stream Summary
Town Creek Restoration Project - Option B: DMS Project ID No. 95026

Reach 4 (232 LF)																							
Parameter		USGS Gauge	Regional Curve Interval (Harman et al, 1999)*			Pre-Existing Condition						Design						Monitoring Baseline (As-built)					
			LL	UL	Eq.	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle																							
	BF Width (ft)	----	23.0	80.0	5.7	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	10.5	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Floodprone Width (ft)	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	25	----	----	110.0	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	BF Mean Depth (ft)	----	2.3	5.8	0.9	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.8	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	BF Max Depth (ft)	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1.2	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	BF Cross-sectional Area (ft ²)	----	80.0	300.0	6.7	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	8.7	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Width/Depth Ratio	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----	12.5	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Entrenchment Ratio	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	>2.2	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Bank Height Ratio	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1.0	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	d50 (mm)	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Pattern																							
	Channel Beltwidth (ft)	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Radius of Curvature (ft)	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Meander Wavelength (ft)	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Meander Width Ratio	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Profile																							
	Riffle Length (ft)	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Pool Length (ft)	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Pool Spacing (ft)	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Pool Max Depth (ft)	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Pool Volume (ft ³)	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Substrate and Transport Parameters																							
	Ri% / Ru% / P% / G% / S%	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	SC% / Sa% / G% / B% / Be%	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/ft ²	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankfull (Rosgen Curve)	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m ²	----				----	----	----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Additional Reach Parameters																							
	Drainage Area (SM)	----				----	----	----	0.2	----	----	----		----	0.2	----	----	----	----	0.2	----	----	----
	Impervious cover estimate (%)	----				----	----	----		----	----	----		----		----	----	----		----	----	----	----
	Rosgen Classification	----				----	----	----		----	----	C4	----	----		----	----	----	C4	----	----	----	----
	BF Velocity (fps)	----				----	----	----		----	----	3.22	----	----		----	----	----		----	----	----	----
	BF Discharge (cfs)	----	290.0	2000.0	25.8	----	----	----	28	----	----	28	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
	Valley Length	----				----	----	----		----	----		----		----	----	----	202	----	----	----	----	----
	Channel length (ft) ²	----				----	----	----	234	----	----	232	----	----	----	----	----	232	----	----	----	----	----
	Sinuosity	----				----	----	----	1.21	----	----	1.20	----	----	----	----	----	1.15	----	----	----	----	----
	Water Surface Slope (Channel) (ft/ft)	----				----	----	----	0.0094	----	----	0.0113	----	----	----	----	----	0.012	----	----	----	----	----
	BF slope (ft/ft)	----				----	----	----		----	----		----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----
	Bankfull Floodplain Area (acres)	----				----	----	----		----	----		----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----
	BEHI VL% / L% / M% / H% / VH% / E%	----				----	----	----		----	----		----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----
	Channel Stability or Habitat Metric	----				----	----	----		----	----		----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----
	Biological or Other	----				----	----	----		----	----		----	----	----	----	----		----	----	----	----	----

* Harman, W.A., G.D. Jennings, J.M. Patterson, D.R. Clinton, L.O. Slate, A.G. Jessup, J.R. Everhart, and R.E. Smith. 1999. Bankfull hydraulic geometry relationships for North Carolina streams. Wildland Hydrology. AWRA Symposium Proceedings. D.S. Olsen and J.P. Potyondy, eds. American Water Resources Association. June 30-July 2, 1999. Bozeman, MT.

Table 10. Baseline Stream Summary
Town Creek Restoration Project - Option B: DMS Project ID No. 95026


Reach 5 (820 LF)																						
Parameter	USGS Gauge	Regional Curve Interval (Harman et al, 1999)*			Pre-Existing Condition						Design						Monitoring Baseline (As-built)					
		LL	UL	Eq.	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD	n
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle																						
BF Width (ft)	----	23.0	80.0	6.1	5.2	----	----	17.0	----	3	----	10.5	----	----	----	----	10.2	----	----	11.1	----	3
Floodprone Width (ft)	----	----	----	----	51.0	----	----	84.0	----	3	25	----	----	110.0	----	----	43.8	----	----	59.4	----	3
BF Mean Depth (ft)	----	2.3	5.8	0.9	0.7	----	----	1.5	----	3	----	0.8	----	----	----	----	0.5	----	----	0.8	----	3
BF Max Depth (ft)	----	----	----	----	1.6	----	----	2.1	----	3	----	1.2	----	----	----	----	0.9	----	----	1.2	----	3
BF Cross-sectional Area (ft ²)	----	80.0	300.0	7.4	8.0	----	----	12.3	----	3	----	8.7	----	----	----	----	5.7	----	----	8.0	----	3
Width/Depth Ratio	----	----	----	----	3.5	----	----	23.5	----	3	----	12.5	----	----	----	----	13.4	----	----	21.5	----	3
Entrenchment Ratio	----	----	----	----	3.0	----	----	13.2	----	3	----	----	----	>2.2	----	----	4.0	----	----	5.7	----	3
Bank Height Ratio	----	----	----	----	1.3	----	----	1.3	----	3	----	1.0	----	----	----	----	1.0	----	----	1.0	----	3
d50 (mm)	----	----	----	----	5.6	----	----	8.6	----	2	----	----	----	----	----	----	27.5	----	----	41.8	----	2
Pattern																						
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	37.0	----	----	84.0	----	----	23.8	----	----	44.2	----	10
Radius of Curvature (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	21.0	----	----	31.5	----	----	24.5	----	----	40.9	----	9
Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	2.0	----	----	3.0	----	----	2.8	----	----	3.5	----	3
Meander Wavelength (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	73.5	----	----	126.0	----	----	95.2	----	----	139.9	----	9
Meander Width Ratio	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	3.5	----	----	8.0	----	----	2.9	----	----	3.9	----	3
Profile																						
Riffle Length (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.02	----	----	----	----	----	0.018	----	----	----	11
Pool Length (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Pool Spacing (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	42.0	----	----	74.0	----	----	25.0	----	----	96.0	----	14
Pool Max Depth (ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1.7	----	----	2.9	----	----	0.4	----	----	1.1	----	15
Pool Volume (ft ³)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Substrate and Transport Parameters																						
Ri% / Ru% / P% / G% / S%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
SC% / Sa% / G% / B% / Be%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	<0.063 / 2 - 4.8 / 5.6 - 8.6 / 20.4 - 28.7 / 77 - 87.7						13.2 - 13.6 / 20.4 - 27.8 / 27.5 - 41.8 / 65.1 - 84.1 / 114.6 - 122.5 / 128 - 256					
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/ft ²	----	----	----	----	----	0.55	----	----	----	----	----	0.47	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankfull (Rosgen Curve)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m ²	----	----	----	----	----	19.4	----	----	----	----	----	23.4	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Additional Reach Parameters																						
Drainage Area (SM)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.210	----	----	----	----	0.2	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.2	----	----
Impervious cover estimate (%)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Rosgen Classification	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	C4 / E4	----	----	----	C4	----	----	----	----	----	----	C4	----	----	----
BF Velocity (fps)	----	----	----	----	2.41	----	----	3.15	----	----	----	3.4	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
BF Discharge (cfs)	----	290.0	2000.0	28.8	----	----	----	29.6	----	----	----	29.6	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Valley Length	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	742	----	----	----	----
Channel length (ft) ²	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	849	----	----	----	809	----	----	----	----	----	822	----	----	----	----
Sinuosity	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	1.17	----	----	----	1.17	----	----	----	----	----	1.11	----	----	----	----
Water Surface Slope (Channel) (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	0.0133	----	----	----	0.0106	----	----	----	----	----	0.0128	----	----	----	----
BF slope (ft/ft)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Bankfull Floodplain Area (acres)	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
BEHI VL% / L% / M% / H% / VH% / E%	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric Biological or Other	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----

* Harman, W.A., G.D. Jennings, J.M. Patterson, D.R. Clinton, L.O. Slate, A.G. Jessup, J.R. Everhart, and R.E. Smith. 1999. Bankfull hydraulic geometry relationships for North Carolina streams. Wildland Hydrology. AWRA Symposium Proceedings. D.S. Olsen and J.P. Potyondy, eds. American Water Resources Association. June 30-July 2, 1999. Bozeman, MT.

APPENDIX E

Hydrologic Data

Figure 5a. In-Stream Flow Gauge Graphs
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026




* Surface water flow is estimated to have occurred when the pressure transducer reading is equal to or above 0.03 feet in depth.

MICHAEL BAKER ENGINEERING, INC., DMS PROJECT NO. 95026

TOWN CREEK RESTORATION PROJECT - OPTION B

YEAR 5 MONITORING REPORT - 2020, YEAR 5 OF 5

Figure 5b. In-Stream Flow Gauge Graphs
Town Creek Restoration Project: Project No. 95026




* Surface water flow is estimated to have occurred when the pressure transducer reading is equal to or above 0.03 feet in depth.

MICHAEL BAKER ENGINEERING, INC., DMS PROJECT NO. 95026

TOWN CREEK RESTORATION PROJECT - OPTION B

YEAR 5 MONITORING REPORT - 2020, YEAR 5 OF 5

Figure 6. Monthly Rainfall Data
Town Creek Restoration Project - Option A: Project No. 95026



Historic rainfall data from WETS Station : ALBEMARLE, NC0090

Observed 2019 - 2020 Precipitation from CHRONOS Station NEWL, North Stanly Middle School

Table 12. Verification of Bankfull Events					
Town Creek Restoration Project: DMS Project ID No. 95026					
Date of Data Collection	Date of Occurrence	Method	Reach Location	Gauge Height (FT)	Photo # (if available)
10/12/2016	Between 5/2016 and 10/12/2016	Crest Gauge	Reach 5 Station 42+50	0.2	MY1 Report
10/3/2017	Between 5/3/2017 and 10/3/2017	Crest Gauge	Reach 5 Station 42+50	0.17	MY2 Report
1/11/2018	Between 10/3/2017 and 1/11/2018	Crest Gauge	Reach 5 Station 42+50	0.18	MY3 Report
6/6/2018	Between 4/19/2018 and 6/6/2018	Crest Gauge	Reach 5 Station 42+50	1.03	MY3 Report
7/17/2018	Between 6/6/2018 and 7/17/2018	Crest Gauge	Reach 5 Station 42+50	0.20	MY3 Report
8/23/2018	Between 7/17/2018 and 8/23/2018	Crest Gauge	Reach 5 Station 42+50	0.65	MY3 Report
11/14/2018	Between 8/23/2018 and 11/14/2018	Crest Gauge	Reach 5 Station 42+50	1.06	MY3 Report
3/20/2019	Between 11/14/2018 and 3/20/2019	Crest Gauge	Reach 5 Station 42+50	0.38	MY4 Report
9/22/2020	5/21/2020 based on Flow Gauge Data	Crest Gauge	Reach 5 Station 42+50	1.01	Crest Gauge Photo 1

Table 13. Verification of In-stream Flow Conditions				
Town Creek Restoration Project: DMS Project ID No. 95026				
	Flow Gauge ID	Reach Location	Consecutive Days of Flow¹	Cumulative Days of Flow²
Monitoring Year 1	TCFL1	Reach 1 Station 11+05	168	231
	TCFL2	Reach 2 Station 13+02	150	195
Monitoring Year 2	TCFL1	Reach 1 Station 11+05	250	279
	TCFL2	Reach 2 Station 13+02	202	205
Monitoring Year 3	TCFL1	Reach 1 Station 11+05	109	248
	TCFL2	Reach 2 Station 13+02	156	287
Monitoring Year 4	TCFL1	Reach 1 Station 11+05	36	200
	TCFL2	Reach 2 Station 13+02	146	181
Monitoring Year 5	TCFL1	Reach 1 Station 11+05	202	245
	TCFL2	Reach 2 Station 13+02	214	283

Notes:

¹Indicates the number of consecutive days within the monitoring year where flow was measured.

²Indicates the number of cumulative days within the monitoring year where flow was measured.

Flow success criteria for the Site is stated as: A surface water flow event will be considered intermittent when the flow duration occurs for a minimum of 30 days.

Town Creek – Hydrologic Data Photos



Crest Gauge Photo 1 – (9/22/2020)



Crest Gauge Photo – (10/15/2020)



Flow Documentation Photo – Located at TCFL 1 (2/24/2020)



TC FL1 Photo (10/15/2020)



TC FL2 Photo (10/15/2020)



Flow Documentation Photo – Located at TCFL 2 (2/20/2020)



Flow Documentation Photo – Located at TCFL 2 (3/8/2020)