UT to Fourth Creek Stream Mitigation Site Water Sampling and Benthic Macroinvertebrate Survey TIP I-3819A

Iredell County, North Carolina

Year 6 Monitoring Report



UT to Fourth Creek, Site 2 during 2021 survey



The North Carolina Department of Transportation Environmental Analysis Unit

July 19, 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRO)DUCTION1
2.0 SITE I	DESCRIPTIONS1
3.0 METH	ODOLOGY
3.1 BMI	Sampling2
3.1.1	Field Methods2
3.1.2	Water Chemistry2
3.1.3	Sample Processing
3.1.4	Data Analysis
4.0 RESU	LTS
4.1 BMI	Community Analysis
4.2 Phys	icochemical Analysis4
4.3 Hab	tat Assessment Scores
5.0 DISCU	SSION/CONCLUSIONS
6.0 LITER	ATURE CITED
Table 1. BM	Analysis Metrics4
Table 2. Phy	sicochemical Data4
v	
Table 3. Hat	itat Assessment Scores5
Table 3. Hat	itat Assessment Scores5
Table 3. HatAppendix A.	sitat Assessment Scores5 Survey Site Location Map
Table 3. HatAppendix A.Appendix B.	itat Assessment Scores5 Survey Site Location Map Benthic Macroinvertebrate Survey Results
Table 3. HatAppendix A.Appendix B.	itat Assessment Scores5 Survey Site Location Map Benthic Macroinvertebrate Survey Results
Table 3. HatAppendix A.Appendix B.Table 4. Bas	itat Assessment Scores5 Survey Site Location Map Benthic Macroinvertebrate Survey Results dine MY-00 (2014) and MY-01 (2015) Taxa list with indications of
Table 3. HatAppendix A.Appendix B.Table 4. Basrelative abun	itat Assessment Scores
Table 3. HatAppendix A.Appendix B.Table 4. Basrelative abunTable 5. 2010	Survey Site Location Map Benthic Macroinvertebrate Survey Results Pline MY-00 (2014) and MY-01 (2015) Taxa list with indications of dance for Sites 1-3
Table 3. HatAppendix A.Appendix B.Table 4. Basrelative abunTable 5. 2010Table 6. Tax	Survey Site Location Map Benthic Macroinvertebrate Survey Results Seline MY-00 (2014) and MY-01 (2015) Taxa list with indications of dance for Sites 1-3
Table 3. Hat Appendix A. Appendix B. Table 4. Bas relative abun Table 5. 2010 Table 6. Tax County, Nort	 Sitat Assessment Scores
Table 3. HatAppendix A.Appendix B.Table 4. Basrelative abunTable 5. 2010Table 6. TaxCounty, NortTable 7. Tax	Sitat Assessment Scores
Table 3. Hat Appendix A. Appendix B. Table 4. Bas relative abun Table 5. 2010 Table 5. 2010 Table 6. Tax County, Nort Table 7. Tax Creek, Iredel	Survey Site Location Map Benthic Macroinvertebrate Survey Results eline MY-00 (2014) and MY-01 (2015) Taxa list with indications of dance for Sites 1-3
Table 3. Hat Appendix A. Appendix B. Table 4. Bas relative abun Table 5. 2010 Table 5. 2010 Table 6. Tax County, Nort Table 7. Tax Creek, Iredel Table 8. Tax	Sitat Assessment Scores5Survey Site Location Map Benthic Macroinvertebrate Survey Resultseline MY-00 (2014) and MY-01 (2015) Taxa list with indications of dance for Sites 1-3
Table 3. Hat Appendix A. Appendix B. Table 4. Bas relative abun Table 5. 2010 Table 6. Tax County, Nort Table 7. Tax Creek, Iredel Table 8. Tax Creek, Iredel	Sitat Assessment Scores
Table 3. Hat Appendix A. Appendix B. Table 4. Bas relative abun Table 5. 2016 Table 5. 2016 Table 6. Tax County, Norf Table 7. Tax Creek, Iredel Table 8. Tax Creek, Iredel Table 9. Tax	Sitat Assessment Scores
Table 3. Hat Appendix A. Appendix B. Table 4. Bas relative abun Table 5. 2010 Table 5. 2010 Table 6. Tax County, Nort Table 7. Tax Creek, Iredel Table 8. Tax Creek, Iredel Table 9. Tax Creek, Iredel	Sitat Assessment Scores 5 Survey Site Location Map Benthic Macroinvertebrate Survey Results Eline MY-00 (2014) and MY-01 (2015) Taxa list with indications of 11 dance for Sites 1-3 11 6 MY-02 Taxa list 13 a richness and summary parameters, UT to Fourth Creek, Iredell 13 h Carolina, May 2014, June 2015, and June 2016 17 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 17 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 17 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 19 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 19 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 19 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 19 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 19 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 19 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 19 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 24
Table 3. HatAppendix A.Appendix B.Table 4. Basrelative abunTable 5. 2010Table 5. 2010Table 6. TaxCounty, NorthTable 7. TaxCreek, IredelTable 8. TaxCreek, IredelTable 9. TaxCreek, IredelTable 9. TaxCreek, IredelTable 10. Tax	Sitat Assessment Scores 5 Survey Site Location Map Benthic Macroinvertebrate Survey Results eline MY-00 (2014) and MY-01 (2015) Taxa list with indications of 11 dance for Sites 1-3 11 5 MY-02 Taxa list 13 a richness and summary parameters, UT to Fourth Creek, Iredell 13 h Carolina, May 2014, June 2015, and June 2016. 17 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 17 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 17 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 19 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 19 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 10 County, North Carolina, MY-04 (2018) 19 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 12 County, North Carolina, MY-05 (2019) 24 xa list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 12
Table 3. Hat Appendix A. Appendix B. Table 4. Bas relative abun Table 5. 2016 Table 5. 2016 Table 6. Tax County, Norf Table 7. Tax Creek, Iredel Table 8. Tax Creek, Iredel Table 9. Tax Creek, Iredel Table 10. Tax Creek, Iredel	sitat Assessment Scores 5 Survey Site Location Map Benthic Macroinvertebrate Survey Results eline MY-00 (2014) and MY-01 (2015) Taxa list with indications of dance for Sites 1-3. 11 5 MY-02 Taxa list. 13 a richness and summary parameters, UT to Fourth Creek, Iredell 17 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 17 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 17 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 19 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 19 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 12 County, North Carolina, MY-04 (2018) 24 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 24 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 24 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 24 a list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth 24

Appendix C. Site Photos (Sites 1-3) Appendix D. Habitat Assessment Field Data Sheets and Benthos Collection Cards

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) is evaluating the benthic macroinvertebrate (BMI) community for the Unnamed Tributary (UT) to Fourth Creek Stream Mitigation Site, related to impacts associated with TIP I-3819A, located in Iredell County, North Carolina. The project includes three sites in UT to Fourth Creek (Figure 1). Three Oaks Engineering (Three Oaks) conducted the Monitoring Year (MY)-06 water sampling and benthic macroinvertebrate surveys on June 15, 2021. UT to Fourth Creek is a tributary to the South Yadkin River and is located within U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Hydrologic Unit (HUC) #03040102 and NC Division of Water Resources (NCDWR) sub-basin 03-07-06 of the Yadkin-Pee Dee River Basin.

2.0 SITE DESCRIPTIONS

Collections of benthic macroinvertebrates were made from three sampling locations: Site 1, Site 2, and Site 3 (Appendix A, Figure 1). The stream conditions for 2021 MY-06 at each site were very similar in most respects to the 2014-2019 survey conditions, however during MY-06 surveys, moderate to significant red silt was present and layered over bottom substrate at Site 1 and Site 2. See Appendix C for MY-06 site photos.

Site 1. Site 1 is the most upstream site located on UT to Fourth Creek. At the time of the surveys, top of bank width was approximately 3 meters (m) while wetted width was between 1 and 2 m. The bank height was approximately 3 m from the deepest part of the channel to the top of bank with moderate bank erosion evident on the left descending bank. Water depth ranged from 0.2 to 0.3 m. Flow conditions were moderate and the channel was wetted in most of the reach with substrate exposed at the edges of meanders and in bars. The habitat consisted of a riffle/pool/run complex. Substrate was composed of cobble, gravel, sand, and silt. No aquatic vegetation was present (Appendix C, Photos 1 and 2). The riparian canopy on the left descending bank was moderate with construction beyond the buffer. The surrounding buffer was dominated by shrubs and grasses with few mature trees. Significant red silt was present in the stream channel covering the substrate; this was not observed in previous survey years.

Site 2. Site 2 is located approximately 200 m downstream of Site 1. The stream was moderately channelized and narrow. The top of bank width was estimated to be 2 m and stream wetted width was approximately 1 m. The bank height from the deepest part of the channel to the top of bank was approximately 2 m, while water depth ranged from 0.1 to 0.2 m. Flow conditions were normal; the channel was wetted with little to no substrate exposed. In-stream habitat consisted of a riffle/pool/run complex with a run dominating the survey reach. The substrate was composed mainly of sand with some gravel and silt. There was very little aquatic vegetation (Appendix C, Photos 3 and 4). In contrast to Site 1 and Site 3, the riparian buffer was composed mostly of grasses and shrubs with only partial canopy shading by black willow saplings and herbaceous vegetation. Similar to Site 1, the right descending bank buffer was bordered by active construction and significant red silt deposition was present in the stream channel.

Site 3. Site 3 is the most downstream sampling site, approximately 600 m downstream of Site 2 and just downstream of Interstate 40. The top of bank width was approximately 4 m and stream wetted width ranged from 2 to 3 m. Bank height from the deepest part of the channel to the top of bank was approximately 3 m and stream depth ranged from 0.25 to 0.75 m. The stream banks exhibited severe erosion over much of the survey reach. Flow conditions were normal; the channel was wetted with little to no substrate exposed. Substrate was made up primarily of boulder, cobble, gravel, and sand with some silt present. Instream habitat consisted of a riffle/pool/run sequence (Appendix C, Photos 5 and 6). The riparian buffer was more mature than at the other sites and provided shade throughout the reach, however recent clearing has reduced the width of the riparian buffer on the right descending bank.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 BMI Sampling

MY-06 surveys were conducted on June 15, 2021, by Three Oaks Personnel Lizzy Stokes-Cawley, Evan Morgan, and Marissa Dellinger and NCDOT Personnel Matt Haney.

3.1.1 Field Methods

Water quality monitoring programs have been implemented by North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ, formerly the NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources, NCDENR) Division of Water Resources (NCDWR) to assess water quality trends in North Carolina. One method used is the monitoring of BMI, or benthos, to assess water quality by sampling for selected organisms. The species richness and overall biomass, as well as the presence of various benthic groups intolerant of water quality degradation, are reflections of water quality.

Sites were sampled one time utilizing methodology described in the NCDWR's *Standard Operating Procedures for Collection and Analysis of Benthic Macroinvertebrates, Version 5.0* (NCDEQ 2016). All sites were sampled utilizing the NCDWR Qual 4 collection method with the addition of a log wash with a fine mesh sampler. Qualitative collections of aquatic macroinvertebrates were made with D-frame aquatic dip nets, kick nets, a #30 sieve sand sample, and hand picking organisms from substrates. A multiple habitat approach was used, where specimens from all available habitats (stream margins, leaf packs, aquatic vegetation, detritus, woody debris and logs, and sand accumulations) were combined to form one aggregate sample. Samples were preserved in the field with 90% ethyl alcohol and delivered to Eaton Scientific on June 15, 2021. Habitat scores were determined using the Habitat Assessment Field Data Sheet for Mountain/Piedmont Streams (Appendix D). Benthos Collection Cards are also included (Appendix D).

3.1.2 Water Chemistry

Water chemistry was measured at each site in conjunction with BMI sampling. Parameters measured were temperature, dissolved oxygen (DO), specific conductivity, and pH (Table 2).

3.1.3 Sample Processing

BMI were sorted from debris, counted, and identified to the lowest taxonomic level with microscopic techniques and taxonomic keys (Appendix B). Eaton Scientific maintains the collected specimens. Please note that a different lab (Pennington and Associates) was used to determine benthic species for MY-02, therefore those results are presented in a different format.

3.1.4 Data Analysis

Analysis of, and comparison between, the BMI communities at each site were determined with established indices and metrics described in the *Standard Operating Procedures for Collection and Analysis of Benthic Macroinvertebrates, Version 5.0* (NCDEQ 2016). The metrics used in this evaluation included total taxa richness; Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera, and Trichoptera (EPT) taxa richness; and NC Biotic Index (BI) assigned value (Table 1). Other information used in the analysis included Habitat Assessment Field Data Sheet scores, observations, and best professional judgment (Table 3). The primary output was a taxa list, which included total number of organisms, total number for each taxon, EPT index, and assigned BI values.

Several data-analysis summaries (metrics) can be produced from such samples to evaluate biological conditions. These metrics are based on the idea that unstressed streams and rivers have many invertebrate taxa and are dominated by intolerant species. Conversely, polluted or otherwise stressed streams have fewer numbers of invertebrate taxa and are dominated by tolerant species. The diversity of the invertebrate fauna is evaluated using taxa richness counts; the tolerance of the stream community is evaluated using a BI.

Total taxa, EPT taxa richness, and BI values were compared between sites and monitoring year. In general, higher EPT taxa richness values and lower BI values usually indicate better stream quality. BI ratings range from 1-10 with a score of 1 generally reflecting high stream quality based on benthic macroinvertebrate diversity and habitat availability, while a higher score generally reflects lower stream quality.

4.0 RESULTS

4.1 BMI Community Analysis

The taxa list, analysis metrics, and additional laboratory data are presented in Appendix B. Table 1 compiles the analysis metrics created from data collected from 2014 through 2021.

Date	Site	Total Taxa Richness	EPT Taxa Richness	Biotic Index
Develop MX 00	1	31	11	4.7
$\begin{array}{c} \text{Baseline MY-00} \\ (2014) \end{array}$	2	32	7	5.8
(2014)	3	40	10	6.1
	1	17	8	4.5
MY-01 (2015)	2	38	8	5.6
	3	26	7	5.6
	1	39	12	5.5
MY-02 (2016)	2	52	12	5.7
	3	55	11	6.1
	1	23	6	4.9
MY-03 (2017)	2	18	2	5.1
	3	27	7	5.7
	1	18	6	5.0
MY-04 (2018)	2	26	4	5.7
	3	35	7	5.6
	1	38	9	5.6
MY-05 (2019)	2	40	8	6.2
	3	24	6	5.9
	1	33	7	5.4
MY-06 (2021)	2	36	6	5.9
	3	27	9	6.0

 Table 1. BMI Analysis Metrics

4.2 Physicochemical Analysis

Measured water chemistry data is listed in Table 2.

Sampling		Water Temp		Dissolved	Specific
Date	Site		pН	Oxygen (DO)	Conductivity
Date		(C)		(mg/L)	(uS/cm)
Densiliary MAX 00	1	18.6	8*	9.6	197.3
$\begin{array}{c} \text{Baseline M Y-00} \\ (2014) \end{array}$	2	18.9	7.18*	9.08	202.0
(2014)	3	20.7	7.43	8.4	110.0
	1	20.3	7.85	8.13	193.2
MY-01 (2015)	2	19.9	7.1	8.8	193.4
	3	24.5	7.3	7.02	106.2
	1	22.0	6.95	8.07	193.2
MY-02 (2016)	2	21.9	6.90	8.4	189.3
	3	24.4	7.85	8.28	129.7
	1	18.6	8.1	8.2	200.8
MY-03 (2017)	2	19.3	6.75	9.5	192.5
	3	25.5	7	7.5	102.7
	1	17.3	7.06	11.48	188.3
MY-04 (2018)	2	17.4	6.69	10.35	190.3
	3	23.1	7.55	9.6	98.0
	1	15.7	6.76	8.21	227.0
MY-05 (2019)	2	15.5	6.88	8.15	217.3
	3	20.6	7.2	8.29	109.2
	1	18.4	6.45	7.71	164.1
MY-06 (2021)	2	18.3	6.70	7.78	166.2
	3	25.0	6.78	7.71	111.9

 Table 2. Physicochemical Data

*Re-measured on 5/23/14 due to pH probe malfunction.

4.3 Habitat Assessment Scores

Habitat scores were determined using the Habitat Assessment Field Data Sheet for Mountain/Piedmont Streams (Table 3). These visual-based habitat evaluation scores consist of eight parameters that rate channel modification, instream habitat, bottom substrate, pool variety, riffle habitat, bank stability and vegetation, light penetration, and riparian vegetation zone width for each sampling reach. A numerical score is used to rate each parameter and the total score gives a relative measure of overall habitat quality (Appendix D).

Sample Year	Site	Channel Modification	Instream Habitat	Bottom Substrate	Pool Variety	Riffle Habitats	Bank Stability and Vegetation	Light Penetration	Riparian Vegetation Zone Width	Total
	1	5	16	12	6	14	11	8	5	77
Baseline MY - $00(2014)$	2	3	10	3	4	3	4	2	0	29
00 (2014)	3	4	16	11	8	7	12	10	10	78
	1	5	16	11	10	16	13	10	5	86
MY-01 (2015)	2	4	10	3	6	7	8	7	10	55
(2013)	3	4	16	11	10	14	13	10	5	88
	1	5	16	11	10	16	13	10	10	86
MY-02 (2016)	2	4	10	3	6	7	11	7	10	58
(2010)	3	4	16	11	10	14	13	10	5	86
	1	4	16	11	10	16	13	10	10	90
MY-03 (2017)	2	4	10	3	6	7	11	7	10	58
(2017)	3	4	16	14	10	14	13	10	10	91
MV 04	1	4	16	12	10	14	13	20	10	89
(2018)	2	4	10	3	6	7	11	7	9	57
(2018)	3	4	16	12	10	16	13	10	10	91
MV 05	1	4	16	14	10	14	10	10	10	88
(2010)	2	4	11	3	6	7	12	7	9	59
(2019)	3	4	16	15	10	14	13	10	10	92
MV OC	1	4	16	14	10	14	10	10	8	86
(2021)	2	4	11	3	6	7	11	7	7	56
(2021)	3	3	16	12	10	12	10	10	7	78
Highest Possible Score	Total	5	20	15	10	16	14	10	10	100

Table 3. Habitat Assessment Scores

5.0 DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS

The benthic macroinvertebrate fauna were analyzed to produce BI values; physiochemical properties and habitat were measured to assess site quality. The 2021 MY-06 BI values range from 5.4 to 6.0 (mean 5.8) and, when compared to previous monitoring data, there is little change in BI values indicating little change in stream quality.

Water quality parameters measured included temperature, pH, DO, and specific conductivity. Overall, the water chemistry results were similar to previous monitoring years. According to the NCDEQ and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Water Quality Standards Table, all sites have pH and DO levels within the appropriate range for freshwater aquatic life. The pH range for freshwater aquatic wildlife is between 6 and 9 (NCDENR 2013) and Sites 1-3 ranged from 6.45 -

6.78 in 2021. The DO levels for all sites were above the minimum standard of 5.0 m/L ranging from 7.71 to 7.78 mg/L (NCDENR 2013). DO has consistently been above the minimum standard in all monitoring years. Specific conductivity readings within rivers in the United States generally range from 50 to 1500 μ S/cm (EPA 2012). Studies of inland fresh waters indicate that streams supporting good mixed fisheries have a specific conductivity range between 150 and 500 μ S/cm (EPA 2012). Sites 1-3 had results between 111.9 to 166.2 μ S/cm. Specific conductivity ratings for all three sites were in range for streams in the United States: Sites 1 and 2 had specific conductivity readings of 164.1 uS/cm and 166.2 uS/cm, respectively, values which fall into the range for streams supporting good mixed fisheries. Site 3's value of 111.9 fell outside of this range.

Total taxa values ranged between 27 and 36 and EPT Taxa Richness between 6 and 9 at all three sites. Habitat assessment scores in 2021 were similar to scores in 2019. Prior to 2019, there had been overall improvement in habitat assessment scores with the biggest improvement seen from the baseline surveys in 2014 to MY-01 surveys in 2015. During sampling in 2021, both Sites 1 and 2 exhibited moderate to significant siltation within the stream channel. Red silt, most likely erosion from nearby construction, was evident in both reaches. The siltation was not observed or noted in previous years. In fall 2018, the region was hit by damaging flooding associated with Hurricanes Florence and Michael. Sites 2 and 3 exhibited moderate to severe bank erosion first noted in 2019 sampling; the erosion is still present and worsening in portions of Site 3.

This data provides baseline and post construction conditions for aquatic community parameters in the project area that can be used to monitor changes in water quality over time.

6.0 LITERATURE CITED

- NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources (NCDENR). 2013. North Carolina Surface Waters and Wetland Standards (NC Administrative Code 15A NCAC 02B. .0100 & .0200) Amended Effective April 1, 2003.
- NC Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ). 2016. Standard Operating Procedures for the Collection and Analysis of Benthic Macroinvertebrates, Version 5.0. Division of Water Resources. Raleigh, North Carolina. February 2016.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2012. Water: Monitoring & Assessment. 5.9 Conductivity. What is conductivity and why is it important? http://water.epa.gov/type/rsl/monitoring/vms59.cfm

Appendix A.

BMI Survey Site Location Map



Appendix B.

Benthic Macroinvertebrate Survey Results

Table 4. Baseline MY-00 (2014) and MY-01 (2015) Taxa list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3.

[A=Abundant (>10), C=Common (3-9), and R=Rare (1-2)]

			2014			2015	
	Site:	1	2	3	1	2	3
EPHEMEROPTERA							
Maccaffertium modestum		Α	Α	С	Α	Α	Α
Baetis flavistriga		R	-	R	-	-	-
Baetis intercalaris		R	-	С	-	-	R
Baetis pluto		Α	Α	С	Α	С	-
Labiobaetis frondale		С	R	_	-	R	-
Labiobaetis propinguum		-	R	С	-	R	-
<i>Callibaetis</i> sp		-	-	-	R	-	-
Eurylophella verisimilis		R	С	-	-	-	-
PL ECOPTER A							
Eccoptura xanthenes		_	_	R	_	_	_
Amphinemura sp		-	-	C	-	-	-
TRICHOPTERA							
Chaumatonsycha spp		R	_	Δ	C	Δ	C
Hydronsyche betteni		C		Δ	C	C	د ۵
Diplactrong modesta		C	-	Л	C	C	Л
Chimarra sp		C	-	-	1	1	- C
Chimarra sp Occertic persimilie		-	-	- D	A	А	C
Vecetis persimilis		-	-	Λ	-	-	-
Neophylax allania		A D	- D	-	A	-	- D
<i>Pychopsyche</i> sp		ĸ	К D	-	-	-	ĸ
Ironoquia punctatissima		-	ĸ	-	-	-	-
Lype diversa		-	-	-	-	-	R
COLEOPTERA							
Macronychus glabratus		-	-	С	-	-	C
Stenelmis sp		-	-	R	-	С	С
Helichus spp		R	С	-	-	R	-
Anchytarsus bicolor		-	-	R	-	-	С
Neoporus spp		R	С	-	-	С	-
Dineutus sp		-	-	С	-	-	R
Cymbiodyta sp		-	-	-	-	R	-
ODONATA							
Calopteryx sp		Α	С	С	-	Α	R
Gomphus sp		-	-	R	-	-	-
Lanthus sp		-	-	-	-	R	-
Baesiaeschna janata		-	-	С	-	-	-
Boyeria vinosa		-	-	R	-	С	С
Cordulegaster sp		-	-	-	-	R	-
MEGALOPTERA							
Nigronia serricornis		_	_	R	R	-	С
Corydalus cornutus		-	-	R	-	-	R
DIPTERAMISC							
Dicranota sp		C	R	R	R	R	-
- ici unora sp		\sim	11	11	11	11	

Anthocha sp	-	-	-	1	R	-	-
Hexatoma sp	-	-	R		-	-	-
<i>Pseudolimnophila</i> sp	R	C	-		-	R	-
		2014				2015	
Site:	1	2	3	- -	1	2	3
Simulium spp	Α	Α	Α	1	R	С	A
Dixa spp	A	R	С		-	С	R
Muscidae (Limnophora?)	-	С	-		-	-	-
Empididae	-	-	-		-	R	-
DIPTERA: CHIRONOMIDAE							
Conchapelopia group	С	С	С	(С	Α	R
Zavrelimyia sp	-	R	-		R	-	-
Brillia sp	R	-	-		-	-	-
Cricotopus annulator Gr	С	С	-		-	-	-
Orthocladius obumbratus	R	Α	-		-	-	-
Paraphaenocladius sp	-	R	-		-	-	-
Parametriocnemus lundbecki	С	-	-		R	Α	С
Tvetenia bavarica gr	_	-	R		-	R	-
Eukiefferiella claripennis gr	R	R	-		_	-	-
Odontomesa fulva	C	C	-		_	-	-
Chironomus sp	Ċ	Ĉ	R		R	С	-
Cryptochironomus spp	-	R	R	-	_	Ĉ	_
Microtendines sp	-	-	-		-	R	-
Paratendipes sp	R	С	-		_	R	_
Phaenonsectra obediens gr	-	C C	R		_	R	-
Phaenopsectra sp	-	-	-		_	R	_
Polypedilum flayum	С	R	С		_	A	С
Polypedilum tritum	R	-	R		_	-	-
Polypedilum fallax	-	R	-		_	_	_
Polypedilum illingense	_	-	-		_	R	_
Stenochironomus sp	_	_	-		_	-	R
Stictochironomus sp	C	_	-		_	C	-
Tribelos jucundum	-	_	R		_	-	_
Micropsectra sp	C	C	<i>N</i>		_	C	_
Paratanytarsus sp	C	C	R		_	C	_
Rhootanytarsus sp		_	R		_	_	R
Kneolanylarsus spp	_	-	Λ		-	_	Λ
OLIGOCHAETA			-				
Stylaria lacustris	-	-	R		-	-	-
Ecclipidrilus spp	-	-	R		-	-	-
CRUSTACEA							
<i>Caecidotea</i> sp (small)	-	С	R		-	R	R
Cambarus spp	-	-	Α	1	R	-	A
MOLLUSCA							
Corbicula fluminea	-	-	Α		_	-	A
-							11
OTHER							
Hirudinea							
Placobdella parasitica	-	-	R		-	-	-
Hemiptera							
Corixidae	-	-	-		-	R	-

STATION			SITE 1	SITE 2	SITE 3
SPECIES	T.V.	F.F.G.			
MOLLUSCA					
Bivalvia					
Veneroida					
Corbiculidae					
Corbicula fluminea	6.6	FC			6
Gastropoda					
Mesogastropoda					
Pleuroceridae	2.7				
Elimia proxima	2.7	SC			9
Basommatophora					
Ancylidae		SC			
Ferrissia rivularis	6.6	SC			1
ANNELIDA					
Clitellata					
Oligochaeta		CG			
Tubificida					
Naididae					
Naidinae		CG			1
Nais behningi	8.7	CG			2
Nais communis	8.7	CG		1	2
Nais sp.	8.7	CG			1
Tubificinae w.h.c.		CG			2
Tubificinae w.o.h.c.		CG	1		9
Pristininae					
Pristina sp.	7.7	CG		1	2
ARTHROPODA					
Arachnoidea					
Acariformes				3	2
Sperchontidae					
Sperchon sp.					1
Crustacea					
Isopoda					
Asellidae		SH			
Caecidotea sp.	8.4	CG	3	1	
Decapoda					
Cambaridae			16		
Cambarus sp.	7.5	CG	2	11	3
STATION			SITE 1	SITE 2	SITE 3

Table 5. 2016 MY-02 Taxa list.

SPECIES	T.V.	F.F.G.			
Insecta					
Collembola					
Isotomidae			3	8	
Ephemeroptera					
Baetidae		CG	3		2
Acentrella sp.	2.5	CG	1		
Baetis sp.		CG		2	
Baetis intercalaris	5	CG		2	5
Baetis pluto	3.4			2	
Labiobaetis sp.		CG		1	1
Ephemerellidae		SC	1		
Heptageniidae		SC	4		13
Maccaffertium sp.		SC	59	34	30
Leptophlebiidae		CG		3	
Odonata					
Aeshnidae		Р			1
Calopterygidae		Р			
Hetaerina sp.	4.9	Р	8	25	20
Coenagrionidae		Р			
Argia sp.	8.3	Р			2
Cordulegastridae		Р			
Cordulegaster sp.	5.7	Р	1	1	
Gomphidae		Р		1	1
Progomphus obscurus	8.2	Р		1	2
Stylogomphus albistylus	5	Р	2	4	
Hemiptera					
Veliidae		Р	1	2	
Rhagovelia obesa		Р	3		
Trichoptera					
Hydropsychidae		FC	22		13
Cheumatopsyche sp.	6.6	FC			17
Diplectrona modesta	2.3	FC	8	8	
Hydropsyche depravata gp.	7.9	FC		1	14
Hydropsyche sp.		FC	2	1	19
Lepidostomatidae		SH			
Lepidostoma sp.	1	FC	11	3	
Leptoceridae		CG			1
Philopotamidae		FC			
Chimarra aterrima	3.3	FC	27	7	7
Dolophilodes distinctus	1	FC	1		
Psychomyiidae		CG			
STATION			SITE 1	SITE 2	SITE 3

SPECIES	T.V.	F.F.G.			
Lype diversa	3.9	SC	2		
Rhyacophilidae		Р			
Rhyacophila carolina	0.4	Р		1	
Coleoptera					
Dryopidae					
Helichus sp.	4.1	SC		1	
Elmidae		CG			
Macronychus glabratus	4.7	SH			5
Optioservus sp.	2.1	SC			1
Stenelmis sp.	5.6	SC	5	4	6
Ptilodactylidae		SH			
Anchytarsus bicolor	2.4	SH			3
Diptera					
Ceratopogonidae		Р			
Atrichopogon sp.	6.1	Р	2		
Chironomidae					
Ablabesmyia mallochi	7.4	Р			7
Conchapelopia sp.	8.4	Р	30	35	18
Corynoneura sp.	5.7	CG	3	2	5
Cryptochironomus sp.	6.4	Р			1
Eukiefferiella sp.		CG	2		
Eukiefferiella claripennis gp.	6.2	CG	2	1	
Nilotanypus fimbriatus	4.1				2
Odontomesa fulva	4.9			1	
Paracladopelma sp.	6.3	CG			1
Parametriocnemus sp.	3.9	CG	10	15	14
Paratanytarsus dissimilis	8				1
Paratendipes albimanus/duplicatus	5.6			2	
Phaenopsectra obediens gp.	6.6	SC	40	2	1
Phaenopsectra punctipes gp.	7.1	SC	2		
Polypedilum fallax gp.	6.5	SH		1	
Polypedilum flavum	5.7	SH	3	15	20
Polypedilum illinoense gp.	8.7	SH	10	4	
Pseudosmittia sp.		CG		1	
Rheotanytarsus exiguus gp.	6.5	FC	13	16	14
Rheotanytarsus pellucidus	6.5	FC		2	
Rheocricotopus robacki	7.9	CG			4
Stenochironomus sp.	6.3	SH			6
Tanytarsus sp.	6.6	FC	3	5	1
Thienemanniella xena	8	CG			1
Tribelos jucundum	5.7				1
STATION			SITE 1	SITE 2	SITE 3

SPECIES	T.V.	F.F.G.			
Zavrelimyia sp.	8.6	Р	2	1	2
Dixidae		CG			
Dixa sp.	2.5	CG	1	2	1
Dolichopodidae		Р		2	
Empididae		Р		1	
Hemerodromia sp.		Р		1	5
Psychodidae		CG			
Pericoma sp.		CG		2	
Sciaridae				1	
Simuliidae		FC			
Simulium tuberosum	4.9	FC		9	4
Tabanidae		PI			
Tabanus sp.	8.5	PI			1
Tipulidae		SH		1	
Dicranota sp.	0	Р	1	6	
Limnophila sp.		Р			1
Pseudolimnophila sp.	6.2	Р	17	15	
Tipula sp.	7.5	SH		1	
TOTAL NO. OF ORGANISMS			327	273	315
TOTAL NO. OF TAXA			39	52	55
EPT INDEX			12	12	11
NCBI Assigned values			5.48	5.67	6.09

		2014			2015			2010	5
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Ephemeroptera	6	5	5	3	4	2	66	42	49
Plecoptera	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Trichoptera	5	2	3	5	4	5	73	21	71
Coleoptera	2	2	4	-	4	4	5	5	15
Odonata	1	2	4	-	4	2	11	32	26
Megaloptera	-	-	2	1	-	2	-	-	-
Diptera; Misc.	4	6	5	4	6	3	2	-	-
Diptera: Chironomidae	13	14	10	4	13	5	120	103	99
Oligochaeta	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	2	19
Crustacea	-	1	2	-	2	2	21	12	3
Mollusca	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	6
Other	-	-	1	-	1	-	45	67	37
Total Taxa Richness	31	32	41	17	38	26	327	273	315
EPT Taxa Richness	11	7	10	8	8	7	39	52	55
NC Biotic Index	4.7	5.8	6.1	4.5	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.7	6.9
Bioclassification									
(Small stream*)	G	G-F	F	G	G-F	G-F	G-F	G-F	F

Table 6. Taxa richness and summary parameters, UT to Fourth Creek, Iredell County, North Carolina, May2014, June 2015, and June 2016.

*Assumes permanent flow, unlikely for these streams—_Sites 2 and 3 fall right on the dividing line between Good-Fair and Fair; they are not significantly different. G=Good, G-F=Good-Fair, F=Fair

Table 7. Taxa list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth Creek, Iredell County, North Carolina, MY-03 (2017).

[A=Abundant (>10), C=Common (3-9), and R=Rare (1-2)]

Taxa / UT Fourth Cr	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
EPHEMEROPTERA			
Family Baetidae			
Baetis intercalaris (5.0)	-	-	С
Baetis pluto (3.4)	С	-	-
Pseudocloeon frondalis (4.6)	-	R	R
Family Heptageniidae	-	-	-
Maccaffertium modestum (5.7)	А	R	Α
PLECOPTERA			
Family Perlidae	-	-	R
TRICHOPTERA			
Family Hydropsychidae			
Cheumatopsyche spp (6.6)	С	-	Α
Diplectrona modesta (2.3)	А	-	-
Hydropsyche betteni (7.9)	-	-	А

Family Limnephilidae			
Neophylax atlanta	А	-	-
Family Philopotamidae			
Chimarra spp (3.3)	А	-	А
MISC DIPTERA			
Family Culicidae			
Anopheles sp (8.6)	-	R	-
Family Dixidae			
Dixa spp (2.5)	С	С	-
Dixella spp (4.9)	R	С	-
Family Simuliidae			
Simulium spp (4.9)	С	-	А
Family Tipulidae			
Antocha spp (4.4)	R	-	-
Dicranota spp (0)	-	R	R
Hexatoma spp (3.5)			R
Pseudolimnophila spp (6.2)	R	R	R
Tipula spp (7.5)	R	R	С
DIPTERA; CHIRONOMIDAE			
Brillia flavifrons (5.7)	-	R	-
Chironomus spp (9.3)	-	-	R
Corynoneura spp (5.7)	R	-	R
Nilotanypus spp (4.1)	-	-	R
Parametriocnemus lundbecki (3.7)	С	-	R
Paratendipes albimanus (5.6)	-	R	-
Polypedilum aviceps (3.6)	С	R	А
Polypedilum flavum (5.7)			А
Polypedilum illinoense (8.7)	С	С	R
Polypedilum tritum	R	-	-
Tanypus neopunctipenis	-	-	R
Thienemannimyia group (8.4)	С	R	С
Zavrelimyia spp (6.1)	-	R	-
COLEOPTERA			
Family Dryopidae			
Helichus spp (4.1)	-	R	-
Family Dytiscidae			
Agabus spp (8.9)	-	R	-
Neoporus spp (5.0)	-	R	-
Family Elmidae			
Stenelmis spp (5.6)	R	-	R
Family Gyrinidae			
Dineutus spp (5.0)	-	-	R
ODONATA			

Family Aeshnidae			
Boyeria vinosa (5.6)	-	-	С
Family Calopterygidae			
Calopteryx spp (7.5)	R	С	R
Family Coenagrionidae			
Argia spp (8.3)	-	-	С
OLIGOCHAETA			
Family Naidae			
Pristina spp (7.7)	R	-	С
MEGALOPTERA			
Family Corydalidae			
Nigronia serricornis (4.6)	-	-	С
CRUSTACEA			
Family Asellidae			
Caecidotea spp (8.4)	С	-	С
OTHER TAXA			
Family Vellidae			
Rhagovelia spp	R	-	-
Site	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Total Taxa Richness	23	18	27
EPT Taxa Richness	6	2	7
EPT Abundance	46	2	45
Taxa ≤ 4.0 Biotic Index	6	2	5
Biotic Index	4.88	5.09	5.71

Table 8. Taxa list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth Creek, Iredell County,
North Carolina, MY-04 (2018).[A=Abundant (>10), C=Common (3-9), and R=Rare (1-2)]

Statesville I-3819-A	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Taxa / Biotic Index Value			
EPHEMEROPTERA			
Family Baetidae			
Baetis pluto (3.4)	R	-	-
Family Ephemerellidae			
Euryloplella funeralis (2.5)	R	-	-
Family Heptageniidae			
Maccaffertium modestum (5.7)	А	А	А
TRICHOPTERA			
Family Hydropsychidae			
Ceratopsyche sparna (2.5)			
Cheumatopsyche spp (6.6)	С	R	А

UT to Fourth Creek (TIP I-3819A) BMI Report MY-06 Three Oaks Job #21-315

Diplectrona modesta (2.3)	А	С	R
Hydropsyche betteni (7.9)	-	-	С
Family Limnephilidae			
Pycnopsyche sp. (2.5)	-	-	R
Family Philopotamidae			
Chimarra spp (3.3)	А	R	С
Family Psychomyiidae			
Lype Diversa (3.9)	-	-	R
MISC DIPTERA			
Family Dixidae			
Dixa spp (2.5)	С	R	R
Dixella spp (4.9)	R	R	-
Dolichopodidae	-	R	-
Family Simuliidae			
Simulium spp (4.9)	R	R	Α
Family Tipulidae			
Antocha spp (4.4)	-	-	R
Dicranota spp (0.0)	R	-	R
Pseudolimnophila spp (6.2)	R	-	-
Tipula spp (7.5)	-	-	R
Family Ptychopteridae			
Bitticomorpha	-	R	-
DIPTERA; CHIRONOMIDAE			
Brillia flavifrons (3.9)	-	R	R
Corynoneura spp (5.7)	-	R	-
Parametriocnemus lundbecki (3.7)	-	R	R
Paratanytarsus spp (8.0)	-	R	-
Phaenopscetra obediens gp (6.5)	R	R	-
Polypedilum aviceps (3.6)	-	R	-
Polypedilum flavum (5.7)	-	R	С
Polypedilum illinoense (8.7)	С	R	R
Polypedilum tritum	R	R	R
Rheotanytarsus spp (6.5)			R
Stictochironomus devinctus (5.4)	-	R	-
Thienemaniella spp (6.4)	-	-	R
Thienemannimyia group (8.4)	R	R	C
Tribelos jacundum (5.7)	-	-	R
Tvetenia bavarica gp (E sp 1) (3.6)	-	-	R
COLEOPTERA			
Family Dryopidae			
Helichus spp (4.1)	-	R	R
Family Elmidae			
Macronychus glabratus (4.7)	-	-	R
Stenelmis spp (5.6)	С	С	R
Family Gyrinidae			

Dineutus spp (5.0)	-	-	R
Family Ptilodactylidae	_		
Anchytarsus bicolor (2.4)	-	-	R
ODONATA			
Family Aeshnidae			
Boyeria vinosa (5.6)	-	R	R
Family Calopterygidae			
Calopteryx spp (7.5)	А	А	-
Family Coenagrionidae			
Argia spp (8.3)	-	-	R
Family Gomphidae			
Gomphus spp (5.9)	-	-	R
Ophiogomphus spp (5.9)	-	-	R
Stylogomphus albistylus (5.0)	-	С	-
OLIGOCHAETA			
Family Naidae			
Nais spp (8.7)	-	-	R
Family Tubificidae			
Immature Tubificidae w/o hair setae (7.1)	-	-	R
CRUSTACEA			
Family Asellidae			
Caecidotea spp (8.4)	R	-	-
Family Cambaridae			
immature crayfish (7.5)	-	-	R
OTHER TAXA			
Family Veliidae			
Rhagovelia spp	-	С	R
Site	1	2	3
Total Taxa Richness	18	<u>-</u> 26	<u>-</u> 35
EPT Taxa Richness	6	4	7
EPT Abundance	35	15	29
Biotic Index	4.98	5.71	5.63

Table 9. Taxa list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth Creek, Iredell County, North Carolina, MY-05 (2019). [A=Abundant (>10), C=Common (3-9), and R=Rare (1-2)]

Statesville restoration sites	1	2	3
Taxa / Biotic Index Value			
EPHEMEROPTERA			
Family Baetidae			
Baetis flavistriga (6.8)	R	R	
Baetis intercalaris (5.0)			R
Baetis pluto (3.4)	А	С	
Labiobaetis frondalis (4.6)	R	С	
Labiobaetis propinquus (5.8)		R	
Family Heptageniidae			
Maccaffertium modestum (5.7)	А	С	С
TRICHOPTERA			
Family Hydropsychidae			
Cheumatopsyche spp (6.6)	А	С	А
Diplectrona modesta (2.3)	С		R
Hydropsyche betteni (7.9)	А	С	С
Family Philopotamidae			
Chimarra spp (3.3)	А	R	С
Family Psychomyiidae			
Lype Diversa (3.9)	С		
MISC DIPTERA			
Family Ceratopogonidae			
Palpomyia complex (5.7)			
Family Dixidae			
Dixa spp (2.5)	R		
Dixella spp (4.9)		R	
Dolichopodidae		R	
Family Simuliidae			
Simulium spp (4.9)	С	С	А
Family Tipulidae			
Hexatoma spp (3.5)	R		
Polymeda/Ormosa spp (6.5)		R	
Pseudolimnophila spp (6.2)	С	С	
Tipula spp (7.5)	R	R	R
DIPTERA; CHIRONOMIDAE			
Ablabesmyia mallochi (7.4)	R		
Brillia flavifrons (5.7)	R		R
Chironomus spp (9.3)	R		
Corynoneura spp (5.7)	R		
Cryptochironomus fulvus (6.7)		R	R
Dicrotendipes neomodestus (7.9)		R	
Microtendipes pedellus (4.6)	R	R	

Parametriocnemus lundbecki (3.7)	R		
Paratanytarsus spp (8.0)	R		
Paratendipes albimanus (5.6)	R		
Phaenopscetra obediens gp (6.5)		С	
Phaenopsctra punctipes gr (7.1)	R	С	
Polypedilum aviceps (3.6)	С		
Polypedilum flavum (5.7)	R	R	R
Polypedilum halterale (7.4)			R
Polypedilum illinoense (8.7)	R	С	
Polypedilum tritum		С	
Rheotanytarsus spp (6.5)	R	R	R
Tanytarsus acifer		R	
Tanytarsus sp U (6.6)		R	
Tanytarsus sp Z (6.6)		R	
Thienemaniella spp (6.4)	R		
Thienemannimyia group (8.4)	С	А	С
Tribelos jacundum (5.7)	R	R	
COLEOPTERA			
Family Dryopidae			
Helichus spp (4.1)		С	
Family Dytiscidae			
Neoporus spp (7.0)		R	
Family Elmidae			
Macronychus glabratus (4.7)			R
Stenelmis spp (5.6)		R	
Family Hydrophilidae			
Enochrus spp (8.5)		R	
ODONATA			
Family Aeshnidae			
Aeshna umbrosa		R	
Boyeria vinosa (5.6)		R	R
Family Calopterygidae			
Calopteryx spp (7.5)	С	R	
Family Cordulegasteridae			
Cordulegaster spp (5.7)			R
Family Gomphidae			
Ophiogomphus spp (5.9)			R
Progomphus obscurus (8.2)			С
Stylogomphus albistylus (5.0)	R	R	
OLIGOCHAETA			
Family Naidae			
Pristinellaa spp (7.7)			R
Slavina appendiculata (8.4)	R		
MEGALOPTERA			
Family Corydalidae			

Nigronia serricornis (4.6)	R		
Family Sialidae			
Sialis spp (7.0)	R		
CRUSTACEA			
Family Asellidae			
Caecidotea spp (8.4)	С	R	
Family Cambaridae			
immature crayfish (7.5)	R	R	
MOLLUSCA			
Family Pleuroceridae			
Elimia spp (2.7)		R	С
Family Corbiculidae			
Corbicula fluminea (6.6)			С
OTHER TAXA			
Family Hydrachnidae			
Lebertia spp (5.5)			R
Family Veliidae			
Rhagovelia spp	С	С	R
Total Taxa Richness	38	40	24
EPT Taxa Richness	9	8	6
EPT Abundance	58	18	21
Biotic Index	5.61	6.18	5.89
Qual 4 Bioclassification	Good-Fair	Fair	Fair

Table 10. Taxa list with indications of relative abundance for Sites 1-3, UT to Fourth Creek, Iredell County, North Carolina, MY-06 (2021). [A=Abundant (>10), C=Common (3-9), and R=Rare (1-2)]

Statesville BM 1 sites			
Taxa / Biotic Index Value (shaded taxa have BI value \leq 2.5)	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
EPHEMEROPTERA			
Family Baetidae			
Baetis flavistriga (6.8)		С	
Baetis intercalaris (5.0)			А
Baetis pluto (3.4)	С	А	С
Family Heptageniidae			
Maccaffertium modestum (5.7)	С	А	А
TRICHOPTERA			
Family Hydropsychidae			
Cheumatopsyche spp (6.6)	А	А	А
Diplectrona modesta (2.3)	R	С	R
Hydropsyche betteni (7.9)	R	А	А
Family Leptoceridae			

Statesville BM 1 sites			
Taxa / Biotic Index Value (shaded taxa have BI value ≤ 2.5)	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
Oecetis persimilis (4.6)			R
Family Philopotamidae			
Chimarra spp (3.3)	R	А	С
Family Psychomyiidae			
Lype diversa (3.9)			R
MISC DIPTERA			
Family Dixidae			
<i>Dixa</i> spp (2.5)	А	А	
Dixella spp (4.9)	С	С	
Family Dolichopodidae	R		
Family Empididae	R		
Family Simuliidae			
Prosimulium spp (4.5)	R		
Simulium spp (4.9)	С	R	С
Simulium venustum (7.3)	А	А	
Family Tipulidae			
Antocha spp (4.4)	R		
Tipula spp (7.5)		С	
DIPTERA; CHIRONOMIDAE			
Brillia flavifrons (5.7)	R	R	
Cardiocladius spp (6.2)			R
Chironomus spp (9.3)		R	R
Corynoneura spp (5.7)	R	R	
Cryptochironomus fulvus (6.7)		R	
Micropsectra spp (2.4)		R	
Microtendipes pedellus (4.6)			R
Odontomesa fulva (4.9)		R	
Parametriocnemus lundbecki (3.7)	С	R	
Paratanytarsus spp (8.0)	R		
Phaenopsctra obediens (6.5)		R	
Polypedilum aviceps (3.6)	А	А	R
Polypedilum fallax (6.5)			R
Polypedilum flavum (5.7)	А		
Polypedilum illinoense (8.7)	С	С	С
Polypedilum scalaenum (8.5)		R	
Polypedilum tritum	R		
Rheotanytarsus spp (6.5)	R	R	R
Stenochironomus spp (5.4)			С
Tanytarsus sp G (6.6)		R	
Thienemaniella spp (6.4)	R		
Thienemannimyia group (8.4)	А	А	С

Statesville BM 1 sites			
Taxa / Biotic Index Value (shaded taxa have BI value \leq 2.5)	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3
Tvetenia bavarica gp (E sp 1) (3.6)	С	R	
COLEOPTERA			
Family Dryopidae			
Helichus spp (4.1)		R	
Family Elmidae			
Macronychus glabratus (4.7)			R
Stenelmis spp (5.6)	С	С	R
Family Hydrophilidae			
<i>Cymbiodyta</i> spp		R	
ODONATA			
Family Aeshnidae			
Boyeria vinosa (5.6)	R		
Family Calopterygidae			
<i>Calopteryx</i> spp (7.5)	С	С	R
Family Gomphidae			
Stylogomphus albistylus (5.0)	R		
MEGALOPTERA			
Family Corydalidae			
Nigronia spp (v small) (6.1)			С
Family Sialidae			
Sialis (7.0)		R	
CRUSTACEA			
Family Asellidae			
Caecidotea spp (8.4)	R	С	
Family Cambaridae			
immature crayfish (7.5)		С	R
MOLLUSCA			
Family Pleuroceridae			
<i>Elimia</i> spp (2.7)	R	R	R
OTHER TAXA			
Family Hydrachnidae			
Lebertia spp (5.5)			R
Family Veliidae			
Microvelia spp		С	
<i>Rhagovelia</i> spp		С	R
Total Taxa Richness	33	36	27
EPT Taxa Richness	7	6	9
EPT Abundance	56	19	51
Taxa ≤ 4 Biotic Index	9	10	7
Biotic Index	5.42	5.86	6.04
Bioclassification	Good-Fair	Fair	Fair

Appendix C.

MY-06 Site Photos

(Sites 1-3)



Photo 1. Upstream facing view of Site 1.



Photo 2. Downstream facing view of Site 1



Photo 3. Downstream facing view of Site 2.



Photo 4. Upstream facing view of Site 2.



Photo 5. Silt layering bottom substrate observed at Site 2.



Photo 6. Downstream facing view of site 3.



Photo 7. Upstream facing view of Site 3.

Appendix D.

Habitat Assessment Field Data Sheet

for Mountain/Piedmont Streams and

Benthos Collection Cards

(Sites 1-3)

BENTHOS COLLECTION CARD	BENTHOS COLLECTION CARD
DATE 6/5/21 COLLECT TIME 12:00 COLLECTORS LSC, EM. MUCH SITE2	DATE G/1572021 COLLECT TIME 1:25 m COLLECTORS (SSEM, MP CARDY Site)
WATERBODY UT to Fourth	WATERBODY UT+ Fourth
STAT. LOC. Site2 RIVERBASIN Yad Kin COUNTY IWEDEL	STAT. LOC. Site I RIVER BASIN Yad Kin COUNTY Iwe dell
Substrate:River:Field Parameters:Boulder (10")% Mean depth.1 \checkmark Cobble (2 1/2-10")% Maxim depth.2 \checkmark Gravel (1/12-21/2")20 %% WidthImage: Sand (1/12")75 %Gravel (1/12")75 %GurrentmodPodostemumNModAbund.Silt fine Partic5 %Meecent Rain ?Tribs Present?Other%PoolsActivatersRifflesPetritusSnagsAquatic WeedsLeaf PacksConductivity (µmhos/cm)Undercut BanksOtherNoterSandVisualsOtherOtherSandVisualsOther	Substrate: River: Site Field Parameters Boulder (10") % Mean depth .2 Bank Erosion N Mod Sev Cobble (2 1/2-10") 2.5 % Maxim. depth .3 Canopy % POtype Occ. Game Aufwuchs N Mod Abund. Gravel (1/12-2 1/2") 400 % Width 3 Aufwuchs N Mod Abund. N Mod Abund. Sev Sand (1/12") 7.0 % Recent Rain ? Tribs Present? Mod Abund. Solution Mod Abund. Solution Solution Mod Abund. Solution Solution Mod Abund. Solution Solution Solution Mod Abund. Solution Solut
Field Observations:	Other
	held Observations:
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
X.	
DATE <u>Co/15/202</u> <u>collect time</u> <u>Z:15pm</u> <u>collectors</u> <u>LSC, EM, MI)</u> , waterbody <u>Fourth Creek</u> stat. LOC <u>River Basin</u> <u>county</u> <u>Fritchell</u>	BENTHOS COLLECTION CARD DATE WATERBODY
$\begin{array}{c c} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	BENTHOS COLLECTION CARD DATECOLLECT TIMECOLLECTORSCARD# WATERBODYSTAT. LOC. RIVER BASINCOUNTY Substrate: River: Field Parameters Boulder (10") % Mean depth Bank Erosion N Mod
$\begin{array}{c c} & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & & &$	BENTHOS COLLECTION CARD OATE COLLECT TIME COLLECTORS CARD# WATERBODY STAT. LOC. RIVER BASIN COUNTY Statzate: River: Field Parameters: Boulder (10") % Mean depth Bank Erosion N Mod Sev Cobble (2 1/2-10") % Maxim depth Canopy % Type Audit Gravel (1/12-2 1/2") % Width Aufwuchs N Mod Abund. Sand (1/12") % Current Podosternum M Mod Abund. Mod Abund. Mod Sitt, fine Partic % Recent Rain 7 Tribs Present? Tother Mod Abund. Mod Mod<

6/15/2021 @ 1:25pm

Site I

Habitat Assessment Field Data Sheet Mountain/ Piedmont Streams

Biological Assessment Branch, DWR

11/13 Revision 8

TOTAL SCORE 86

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

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

Visible Land Use: <u>%</u> % Forest % Residential % Active Pasture % Active Crops % Fallow Fields %

Width: (meters) Stream $\frac{1-2m}{2}$ Channel (at top of bank) 3m Stream Depth: (m) Avg 2m Max $\cdot 3$ \Box Width variable \Box Large river >25m wide Bank Height (from deepest part of riffle to top of bank-first flat surface you stand on): (m) 3m

Bank Angle: <u>+</u>O or □ NA (Vertical is 90°, horizontal is 0°. Angles > 90° indicate slope is towards mid-channel, < 90° indicate slope is away from channel. NA if bank is too low for bank angle to matter.) □ Channelized Ditch

Deeply incised-steep, straight banks Both banks undercut at bend

□Channel filled in with sediment □Buried structures □Exposed bedrock

Site 1

□ Excessive periphyton growth □ Heavy filamentous algae growth □ Green tinge □ Sewage smell Manmade Stabilization: □N, □Y: □Rip-rap, cement, gabions □ Sediment/grade-control structure □Berm/levee Flow conditions : □High △Normal □Low Turbidity: □Clear □ Slightly Turbid □Turbid □Tannic □Milloy □Colored (from dues) with (clear □ Slightly Turbid
Good potential for Wetlands Restoration Project?? YES DNO Details
Channel Flow Status Useful especially under abnormal or low flow conditions. A. Water reaches base of both lower banks, minimal channel substrate exposed
I. Channel Modification Score A. channel natural, frequent bends. 5 B. channel natural, infrequent bends (channelization could be old). 4 C. some channelization present. 3 D. more extensive channelization, >40% of stream disrupted. 2 E. no bends, completely channelized or rip rapped or gabioned, etc. 0 Evidence of dredging Evidence of desnagging=no large woody debris in stream Banks of uniform shape/height Kemarks Subtotal 4

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

Λ_{i}	\bigcirc	D	\square
H Bocks Macrophytes	Sticks and loofpacks	K Spage and logs	Undergut banks or root mats
NocksMacrophytes	Sucks and learpacks	Shags and logs	Ciluercut banks of root mats

.4

>70% 40-70% 20-40% <20% Score Score Score Score 4 or 5 types present..... 20 16 🗹 12 8 3 types present..... 19 🗖 15 11 7 2 types present..... 18 🗖 14 🗖 10 6 13 9 🗖 5 🗖 1 type present..... 17 No types present..... 0 Subtotal □ No woody vegetation in riparian zone Remarks

AMOUNT OF REACH FAVORABLE FOR COLONIZATION OR COVER

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

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

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

A. Pools present	Score
1. Pools Frequent (>30% of 200m area surveyed)	
a. variety of pool sizes	10 🔀
b. pools about the same size (indicates pools filling in)	8 🗖

2. Pools Infrequent (<30% of the 200m area surveyed) a. variety of pool sizes
b. pools about the same size
B. Pools absent
Subtotal VO
□ Pool bottom boulder-cobble=hard □ Bottom sandy-sink as you walk □ Silt bottom □ Some pools over wader depth Remarks
Page Total
V. Riffle Habitats
Definition: Riffle is area of reaeration-can be debris dam, or narrow channel area. Riffles Frequent_Riffles Infrequent_
Score Score
A. well defined riffle and run, riffle as wide as stream and extends 2X width of stream 16 12
B. riffle as wide as stream but riffle length is not 2X stream width 14 🟹 7 🛄
C. riffle not as wide as stream and riffle length is not 2X stream width 10 🔲 3 🛄
D. riffles absent
Channel Slope: \Box Typical for area \Box Steep=fast flow \Box Low=like a coastal stream Subtotal $\frac{1}{2}$
VI. Bank Stability and Vegetation
A. Erosion
1. No, or very little, erosion present
2. Erosion mostly at outside of meanders
3. Less than 50% of banks eroding
4. Massive erosion
B. Bank Vegetation
1. Mostly mature trees (>12" DBH) present
2. Mostly small trees (<12" DBH) present, large trees rare 5
3. No trees on bank, can have some shrubs and grasses
4. Mostly grasses or mosses on bank
5. Little or no bank vegetation, bare soil everywhere 0 🔲 Vegetation Score
RemarksSubtotal

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

they be the store through a bin mountaine, out not use to source and mounte.	
	Score
A. Stream with good canopy with some breaks for light penetration	10 🛛
B. Stream with full canopy - breaks for light penetration absent	8
C. Stream with partial canopy - sunlight and shading are essentially equal	7 🗖
D. Stream with minimal canopy - full sun in all but a few areas	2
E. No canopy and no shading	0 🗖

Subtotal Remarks

VIII. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width

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

FACE UPSTREAM	Lft. Bank	Rt. Bank
Dominant vegetation: Trees Shrubs Grasses Weeds/old field Exotics (kudzu, etc)	Score	Score
A. Riparian zone infact (no breaks)		
1. width > 18 meters	5 🖾	5
2. width 12-18 meters	4 🗖	4
3. width 6-12 meters	3 🗖	3 🔀
4. width < 6 meters	2 🗖	2
B. Riparian zone not intact (breaks)		
1. breaks rare		
a. width > 18 meters	4	4
b. width 12-18 meters	3	3
c. width 6-12 meters	2	$2\square$
d. width < 6 meters		1
2. breaks common		
a. width > 18 meters	3	3
b. width 12-18 meters	2	2
c. width 6-12 meters		1
d. width < 6 meters	0	0
Remarks	Subt	otal
	-	110
	Page To	tal
	<pre></pre>	91
Disclaimer-form filled out, but score doesn't match subjective opinion-atypical stream.	TOTAL SCOF	RE_06

Site

11/13 Revision 8

Habitat Assessment Field Data Sheet Mountain/ Piedmont Streams

6/15/2021 @ 12:00

Biological Assessment Branch, DWR

TOTAL SCORE 56

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

Stream <u>UT to Fourth Creek</u> <u>I-40</u> <u>I-77</u> Stream <u>UT to Fourth Creek</u> <u>I-40</u> <u>I-77</u> <u>Date 6/15/2021</u> <u>cc#</u> <u>Site2</u> <u>Basin Yacl Kin</u> <u>Subbasin Fourth Creek</u> <u>Basin Yacl Kin</u> <u>Subbasin Fourth Creek</u> <u>Observer(s) LSC, EM</u>, <u>MD</u>, <u>MH</u> <u>Observer(s) LSC, EM</u>, <u>MD</u>, <u>MH</u> <u>Type of Study:</u> I Fish <u>Benthos</u> I Basinwide ISpecial Study (Describe) <u>Latitude 35.813|27</u> Longitude <u>80.85 8322</u> Ecoregion: IMT <u>D</u> Slate Belt I Triassic Basin <u>Water Quality:</u> Temperature <u>18.3</u> <u>oc</u> DO <u>7.78</u> <u>mg/1</u> Conductivity (corr.) <u>16.2</u> µS/cm pH <u>6.7</u>

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

Visible Land Use: 30%Forest %Residential %Active Pasture 50% Active Crops %Fallow Fields %

Width: (meters) Stream m Channel (at top of bank) 2m Stream Depth: (m) Avg. m Max 2m \square Width variable \square Large river >25m wide Bank Height (from deepest part of riffle to top of bank-first flat surface you stand on): (m) 2m

 Bank Angle:
 75
 ° or □ NA
 (Vertical is 90°, horizontal is 0°. Angles > 90° indicate slope is towards mid-channel, < 90° indicate slope is away from channel. NA if bank is too low for bank angle to matter.)</td>

 □ Channelized Ditch
 □ Channel jied Ditch
 □ Channel filled in with sediment

 □ Recent overbank deposits
 □ Bar development
 □ Channel filled in with sediment

□ Excessive periphyton growth □ Heavy filamentous algae growth □Green tinge □ Sewage smell	
Manmade Stabilization: DN DY: DRip-rap, cement, gabions D Sediment/grade-control structure DBerm/levee	
Flow conditions : High Sormal Low	
Turbidity: Clear Slightly Turbid Turbid Tannic Milky Colored (from dyes)	
Good potential for Wetlands Restoration Project??	

Channel Flow Status

I. Channel Modification	Score
A. channel natural, frequent bends	5 🔼
B. channel natural, infrequent bends (channelization could be old)	4 🔁
C. some channelization present.	3 🗖
D. more extensive channelization, >40% of stream disrupted	2 🗖
E. no bends, completely channelized or rip rapped or gabioned, etc	0 🗆
Evidence of dredging Evidence of desnagging=no large woody debris in stream Banks of uniform shape/height	11
RemarksSu	ubtotal <u> </u>

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

Rocks Macrophytes Sticks and leafpacks Snags and logs Undercut banks or root ma	Rocks RM	lacrophytesSticks an	nd leafpacks <u>R</u> Snags a	and logsUndercut banks or ro	oot mats
---	----------	----------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------	----------

Site 2

AMOUNT OF REACH FAVORABLE FOR COLONIZATION OR COVER



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

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

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

A.	Pools present	Score
	1. Pools Frequent (>30% of 200m area surveyed)	
	a. variety of pool sizes	10
	b. pools about the same size (indicates pools filling in)	8 🗖

39

Site 2

2. Pools Infrequent (<30% of the 200m area surveyed)
a. variety of pool sizes
b. pools about the same size
B. Pools absent
Subtotal
□ Pool bottom boulder-cobble=hard □ Bottom sandy-sink as you walk □ Silt bottom □ Some pools over wader depth Remarks
Page Total Z
V. Riffle Habitats
Definition: Riffle is area of reaeration-can be debris dam, or narrow channel area. Riffles Frequent Riffles Infrequent
Score Score
A. well defined riffle and run, riffle as wide as stream and extends 2X width of stream 16 12
B. riffle as wide as stream but riffle length is not 2X stream width 14 7
C. riffle not as wide as stream and riffle length is not 2X stream width
D. riffles absent.
Channel Slope: Typical for area Steep=fast flow Low=like a coastal stream Subtotal
VI. Bank Stability and Vegetation
A. Erosion
1. No, or very little, erosion present
2. Erosion mostly at outside of meanders
3. Less than 50% of banks eroding $3\overline{1}$
4. Massive erosion
B. Bank Vegetation
1. Mostly mature trees (>12" DBH) present 7
2. Mostly small trees (<12" DBH) present, large trees rare 5
3. No trees on bank, can have some shrubs and grasses 3
4. Mostly grasses or mosses on bank
5. Little or no bank vegetation, bare soil everywhere 0 Vegetation Score
Remarks Subtotal

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

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

40

Sitez

Appendix A – Mountain/Piedmont Habitat Assessment Form

David In	7
Remarks	Subtotal

VIII. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width

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

FACE UPSTREAM	Lft. Bank	Rt. Bank
Dominant vegetation: 🗆 Trees 🗆 Shrubs 🗆 Grasses 🗆 Weeds/old field 🗅 Exotics (kudzu, etc)	Score	Score
A. Riparian zone intact (no breaks)		
1. width > 18 meters	5 📉	5
2. width 12-18 meters	4 🖂	4
3. width 6-12 meters	3	3 🖂
4. width < 6 meters	2	2
B. Riparian zone not intact (breaks)		
1. breaks rare		
a. width > 18 meters	4 🗖	4
b. width 12-18 meters	3	3
c. width 6-12 meters	2	2
d. width ≤ 6 meters	1	1
2. breaks common		
a. width > 18 meters	3	3
b. width 12-18 meters	2	2
c. width 6-12 meters	1	1
d. width < 6 meters	0	0
Remarks	_ Subt	otal
		77
	Page To	tal <u> </u>
Disclaimer-form filled out, but score doesn't match subjective opinion-atypical stream.	TOTAL SCOP	9C 35



11/13 Revision 8

Habitat Assessment Field Data Sheet

6/15/2021 @ 2:15

Mountain/ Piedmont Streams

TOTAL SCORE 78

Biological Assessment Branch, DWR

IIA

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

Stream Fauth Creek Location/road: <u>Felow</u> (Road Name)County Ivredel] Date 6/15/2021 CC# Basin Vacl Kin Subbasin Fourth Creek Observer(s) LSC, EM MD, M H Type of Study: \Box Fish \Box Basinwide \Box Special Study (Describe) Latitude 35.809.652 Longitude 80.55441 Ecoregion: \square MT \square P \square Slate Belt \square Triassic Basin Water Quality: Temperature 25.0 °C DO 7.71 mg/l Conductivity (corr.) 11.9 µS/cm pH 6.78

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

Watershed land use : DForest DAgriculture DUrban D Animal operations upstream

Width: (meters) Stream 2-3 Channel (at top of bank) 4m Stream Depth: (m) Avg .25 Max .75 MaxBank Height (from deepest part of riffle to top of bank-first flat surface you stand on): (m) 3 ~

Bank Angle: +5 or \square NA (Vertical is 90°, horizontal is 0°. Angles > 90° indicate slope is towards mid-channel, < 90° indicate slope is away from channel. NA if bank is too low for bank angle to matter.) □ Channelized Ditch

Deeply incised-steep, straight banks DBoth banks undercut at bend Channel filled in with sediment □ Recent overbank deposits Bar development Buried structures Exposed bedrock

\Box Excessive periphyton growth \Box	Heavy filamentous algae growth Green tinge	□ Sewage smell
Manmade Stabilization:	p-rap, cement, gabions D Sediment/grade-control	structure Berm/levee
Flow conditions : High Normal	Low	
Turbidity: DClear D Slightly Turbid	□Turbid □Tannic □Milky □Colored (from d	lyes)
Good potential for Wetlands Restoratio	n Project??	

Channel Flow Status

Useful especially under abnormal or A. Water reaches base of both lower B. Water fills >75% of available char C. Water fills 25-75% of available ch	low flow conditions. banks, minimal cham nnel, or <25% of cham nannel, many logs/sna	nel sub nnel su ags ext	ostrate exposed Ibstrate is exposed	
D. Root mats out of water E. Very little water in channel, mostly	y present as standing	pools.		
Weather Conditions:	Photos: 🗆N	ΠY	Digital D35mm	
Remarks:				

I. Channel Modification	Score
A. channel natural, frequent bends	5 🗖
B. channel natural, infrequent bends (channelization could be old)	4
C. some channelization present	3 🗹
D. more extensive channelization, >40% of stream disrupted	2
E. no bends, completely channelized or rip rapped or gabioned, etc	0 🗖
Evidence of dredging Evidence of desnagging=no large woody debris in stream Banks of uniform shape/height	2
RemarksSu	btotal 🔾

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

/		K	$\boldsymbol{\mathbf{x}}$	C	0
<u> </u>	_Rocks	Macrophytes	Sticks and leafpacks	<u>Snags</u> and logs	Undercut banks or root mats

38

Site 3

Appendix A – Mountain/Piedmont Habitat Assessment Form

AMOUNT OF REACH FAVORABLE FOR COLONIZATION OR COVER

	>70%	40-70%	20-40%	<20%
	Score	Score	Score	Score
4 or 5 types present	20	16 🖂	12 🗖	8
3 types present	19 🗖	15	11 🗖	7 🗖
2 types present	18 🗖	14 🗖	10	6 🗖
1 type present	17 🗖	13 🗖	9 🗖	5
No types present	0			17
□ No woody vegetation in riparian zone Remarks				Subtotal

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

A. substrate with good mix of gravel, cobble and boulders	Score
1. embeddedness <20% (very little sand, usually only behind large boulders)	15
2. embeddedness 20-40%	12 🔽
3. embeddedness 40-80%	8 🗋
4. embeddedness >80%	3 🗖
B. substrate gravel and cobble	
1. embeddedness <20%	14 🗖
2. embeddedness 20-40%	11
3. embeddedness 40-80%	6 🗖
4. embeddedness >80%	$2 \square$
C. substrate mostly gravel	
1. embeddedness <50%	8
2. embeddedness >50%	4 🗖
D. substrate homogeneous	
1. substrate nearly all bedrock	3
2. substrate nearly all sand	3
3. substrate nearly all detritus	$2 \square$
4. substrate nearly all silt/ clay	
emarks	total T2

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

А.	Pools present	Score
	1. Pools Frequent (>30% of 200m area surveyed)	
	a. variety of pool sizes	10 🗹
	b. pools about the same size (indicates pools filling in)	8 🗖

2. Pools Infrequent (<30% of the 200m area surveyed)	
a. variety of pool sizes	6 🗖
b. pools about the same size	4 🗖
B. Pools absent	0 🖵 👝
	Subtotal []
□ Pool bottom boulder-cobble=hard □ Bottom sandy-sink as you walk □ Silt bottom □ Some pools over wader dept Remarks	h 41
	Page Total
V. Riffle Habitats	<u> </u>
Definition: Riffle is area of reaeration-can be debris dam, or narrow channel area. Riffles Frequent Ri	ffles Infrequent
Score	Score
A. well defined riffle and run, riffle as wide as stream and extends 2X width of stream 16 \Box	12
B. riffle as wide as stream but riffle length is not 2X stream width	7 🗔
C. riffle not as wide as stream and riffle length is not 2X stream width 10 🔲	3
D. riffles absent	17
Channel Slope: Typical for area Steep=fast flow Low=like a coastal stream	Subtotal
VI. Bank Stability and Vegetation	
A. Erosion	
1. No, or very little, erosion present7	
2. Erosion mostly at outside of meanders	
3. Less than 50% of banks eroding	
4. Massive erosion	
B. Bank Vegetation	
1. Mostly mature trees (>12" DBH) present	
2. Mostly small trees (<12" DBH) present, large trees rare 5	
3. No trees on bank, can have some shrubs and grasses	
4. Mostly grasses or mosses on bank	
5. Little or no bank vegetation, bare soil everywhere	1.6
Remarks	Subtotal 10

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

over overheud. Totte bladding nom mountains, out not use to beere uns metric.		
	Score	2
A. Stream with good canopy with some breaks for light penetration	10 🛛	5
B. Stream with full canopy - breaks for light penetration absent	8	
C. Stream with partial canopy - sunlight and shading are essentially equal	7	ב
D. Stream with minimal canopy - full sun in all but a few areas	2	Ī
E. No canopy and no shading	0	

Site 3



VIII. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width

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

FACE UPSTREAM	Lft. Bank	Rt. Bank
Dominant vegetation: Trees Shrubs Grasses Weeds/old field Exotics (kudzu, etc)	Score	Score
A. Riparian zone intact (no breaks)		
1. width > 18 meters	5 🗖	5
2. width 12-18 meters	4 🗖	4
3. width 6-12 meters	3 🗖	3
4. width < 6 meters	2 🗖	2
B. Riparian zone not intact (breaks)		
1. breaks rare		
a. width > 18 meters	4	4 🖾
b. width 12-18 meters	3 📈	3
c. width 6-12 meters	2	2
d. width < 6 meters	1	1
2. breaks common		
a. width > 18 meters	3	3
b. width 12-18 meters	2	2
c. width 6-12 meters	1	1
d. width < 6 meters	0 🗖	0
Remarks	Subt	otal T
		27
	Page Total 37	
	0	- 0
	TOTAL COOL	78
Disclaimer-form filled out, but score doesn't match subjective opinion-atypical stream. TOTAL SCORE		