


Camp Branch Stream and Restoration

EEP Project No. 92350
USACE Action ID # 200531348
Closeout Report
Stream and Wetland Project

Construction Completed: February 2007
Submission Date: April 2012



Project Setting & Classifications

County	Anson
General Location	Ansonville
Basin:	Yadkin
Physiographic Region:	Piedmont
Ecoregion:	Triassic Basin
USGS Hydro Unit:	03040105-081060
NCDWQ Sub-basin:	03-07-14
Wetland Classification	
Thermal Regime:	Warm
Trout Water:	No
Project Performers	
Source Agency:	NC DOT
Designer:	EcoScience Corporation
Monitoring Firm	Jordan, Jones, Goulding
Channel Remediation	N/A
Plant remediation	N/A
Property Interest Holder	NC DOT

Overall Project Activities and Timeline

Milestone	Month-Year
Restoration Plan	Sept 2004
Final Design	June 2005
Construction & Plantings completed	Feb 2007
As-built survey	May 2007
Monitoring Year-1	Oct 2007
Veg Monitoring Year 2	Sept 2008
Monitoring Year 2	Nov 2008
Veg Monitoring Year 3	July 2009
Monitoring Year 3	Jan 2010
Veg Monitoring Year 4	Feb 2011
Monitoring Year 4	July 2011
Veg Monitoring Year 5	Aug 2011
Monitoring Year 5	March 2012
Closeout Submission	April 2012



PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project Setting and Background Summary

The Camp Branch Stream Restoration Project (Site) is located in Anson County, North Carolina within the Piedmont Eco-Region of the Yadkin River Basin (USGS Subbasin HUC 03040105). The Site includes one of the two Ecosystem Enhancement Program project sites located on the 200-acre Bishop Site: Camp Branch EEP Project #92350 and Dula Thoroughfare EEP Project #65. The Site is confined within a North Carolina Department of Transportation-owned conservation easement.

The project channels have exhibited very limited bank erosion and no degradation of the profile and have generally maintained the dimension of the cross-section (see cross-section overlays below). The one area of erosion/floodplain scour that does exist on site is downstream of a crossing at station 4+55 – 5+60 on reach 1. Two areas lack vegetative growth on the floodplain because of poor soil conditions located at stations 10+60 – 11+50 and 12+15 - 13+00 on reach 1, although the bank heights are very low and these will likely vegetate with time. Collectively this represents 5 % of the project footage indicating that 95% of the reach bank footage is stable. The site is characterized by small, low energy channels that were subject to intense drought conditions during the first year, which like many other small streams in the piedmont during this time resulted in vegetation growth in the channel in some areas. Beaver have also colonized parts of the site on 2 occasions and have decolonized the site recently in 2012. These factors in combination with potential sediment inputs above the project as noted by the monitoring firm seems to have resulted in fining of the bed substrate distributions and has muted bedform, which is observable in the tributary profile and substrate measurements. However, this hasn't resulted in any widespread bar formation capable of deflecting flows into neighboring banks. Assuming any potential upstream sediment sources moderate with time, future storm events will likely evacuate this finer. It should also be noted that according to the monitoring contractor the precipitous fining described in the 2011 substrate data may be related to a change in monitoring personnel material and inconsistencies in the monitoring experience/methodology. Except for localized low-growth areas, riparian zones were vegetating as expected and providing adequate soil stabilization and protection. All vegetative plots, except for plot 1, met the vegetative success criteria.

Goals and Objectives

Prior to restoration, the Site was predominantly utilized for row cropping and recreational activities, such as hunting and wildlife viewing. Historically, drainage features and wetland areas within the Site were dredged, straightened, and filled for conversion into agriculturally developed land. These activities are thought to have impacted stream channel stability; therefore, producing an incised, eroded stream and degraded water quality.



The primary goal for the site included:

- Improve water quality by reducing erosion through reconnection of the stream with a flood prone area, riparian buffer filtering, and reconfiguring the stream to better attenuate flow velocities.

Secondary Site restoration goals included:

- Increased stream biology through enhancement activities
- Protection of functional areas via preservation.

The project goals were achieved by incorporating the following objectives:

1. Priority II stream restoration (including all attendant benefits outlined in Rosgen 1996) via excavation of approximately 1,767 linear feet (lf) of a designed E/C-type stream of the main Camp Branch channel on new location (creating 1810 lf), including adjacent floodplain excavation to achieve an entrenchment ratio characteristic of E/C-type streams.
2. Priority I stream restoration (including all attendant benefits outlined in Rosgen 1996) of approximately 403 lf and Priority II restoration of approximately 143 lf of a designed E/C-type stream of a unnamed tributary (UT) to Camp Branch, including floodplain excavation along the UT upstream of Camp Branch to achieve a stable confluence.
3. Re-establishment of the characteristic, pre-disturbance Piedmont Bottomland Forest (Schafale and Weakley 1990) community adjacent to restoration reaches using bare root seedling plantings.



Success Criteria

Characteristic	Standard
Dimension	Insignificant change in dimension from as-built measurements or the previous year's monitoring measurements. Minor changes in channel dimension are allowed; however, dimension changes should not represent a trend towards instability (e.g. increased width to depth ratio or decreased width to depth ratio with decreased entrenchment ratio)
Profile	Little change in longitudinal profile
Pattern and Profile	Pool/riffle spacing should remain fairly constant
Substrate	Pools should not be aggrading and riffles should not scour
Substrate	Pebble count should trend toward a desired bed material
Wetland Hydrology	Wetland hydrology success criteria of 12.5% for lower elevation wetland areas and between 5-12% for upper landscape wetlands
Vegetation	Vegetative Plots success criteria of 260 stems/acre




Figure 1: Aerial Map
 Camp Branch Stream Restoration
 EEP Project No. 92350
 Anson County, NC
 Closeout Report



Aerial Source: National Agriculture Imagery Program, 2010



Figure 2: USGS Topography and Hydrologic Features Map
 Camp Branch Stream Restoration
 EEP Project No. 92350
 Anson County, NC
 Closeout Report



Topographical Source: USGS
 Scale 1:9000




Figure 3: Soils Map
 Camp Branch Stream Restoration/EEP Project No. 92350
 Anson County, NC
 Closeout Report



Table 1
Project Components
Closeout Report: Camp Branch Stream Restoration EEP Project No. 92350

Restoration Segment/Reach	Pre –Construction (acreage/linear feet)	Mitigation Approach	As-Built Linear Footage/Acreage	Mitigation Ratio	Mitigation Units (SMU/WMU)
Camp Branch					
Reach 1	1,500	R (P2)	1,767	1:1	1,767
Reach 2	945	P	945	7:1	135
Reach 3 (Ut CB)	220	R (P1)	403	1:1	403
Reach 4 (Ut CB)		R (P2)	143	1:1	143
Reach 5	952	P	NA	7:1	135
Reach 6	2,162	P	NA	7:1	309
Reach 7 (Ut CB)	2,305	P	NA	5:1	461
Reach 8 (Ut CB)	1,481	P	NA	5:1	296
WETLAND					
Wetland 1	2.36	P	NA	5:1	0.47
Wetland 2	2.75	P	NA	5:1	0.55

MITIGATION UNIT TOTALS

Stream Mitigation Units (SMU)	Riparian Wetland Units	Non-riparian Wetland Units	Total Wetland (WMU)	Riparian Buffer	Nutrient Offset
3649	1.02	0	1.02	0	0

Table 2
Closeout Report - Stream Areas Requiring Observation
Camp Branch Stream Restoration EEP Project No. 92350

MY5	Veg Plot 1	Planted stem survivability did not meet the required average of 260 stems/acre
MY5	Camp Branch Stations: 0+00 - 0+25	Bank Scour/Bare Bank - Sharp bend transition into new channel - Left Bank looking downstream
	Camp Branch Stations: 0+75 - 1+00	Bank Scour/Bare Bank - No matting, poor veg - Right Bank looking downstream
	Camp Branch Stations: 2+50 - 3+50	Bank Scour/Bare Bank - Poor vegetation cover, no matting - Right Bank looking downstream
	Camp Branch Stations: 4+55 - 5+60	Bank Scour/Bare Bank - Poor vegetation cover, poor soils, radius of curvature - Left Bank looking downstream
	Camp Branch Stations: 6+91 7+23	Bank Scour/Bare Bank - Poor vegetative cover, poor soils - Right Bank looking downstream
	Camp Branch Stations: 8+75 - 9+00	Bank Scour/Bare Bank - Poor vegetation cover, poor soils - Right Bank looking downstream
	Camp Branch Stations: 13+67 - 13+96	Bank Scour/Bare Bank - Poor vegetation cover, no matting - Left Bank looking downstream
MY5	Camp Branch Stations: 2+50 - 3+50	Poor vegetative cover; poor soils - Both banks
	Camp Branch Stations: 9+20 - 9+40	Poor vegetative cover; poor soils- Left Bank looking downstream
	Camp Branch Stations: 10+60 - 11+50	Lack of vegetative growth on floodplain-poor soil conditions- Left Bank looking downstream
	Camp Branch Stations: 11+27 - 11+52	Poor vegetation cover/soil conditions - Right Bank looking downstream
	Camp Branch Stations: 12+15 - 13+00	Lack of vegetative growth on floodplain-poor soil conditions- Left Bank looking downstream
	Camp Branch Stations: 15+60 - 16+15	Poor vegetation cover/soil conditions - Left Bank looking downstream
MY5	Camp Branch Stations: 2+54 - 2+72	Vegetation growing in middle of channel
	Camp Branch Stations: 7+19 - 7+30	
	Camp Branch Stations: 8+06 - 8+12	
	Camp Branch Stations: 9+50 - 10+10	
	Camp Branch Stations: 10+75 - 11+00	
	Camp Branch Stations: 11+62 - 11+85	
	Camp Branch Stations: 13+04 - 13+48	
	Camp Branch Stations: 13+99 - 14+27	
Camp Branch Stations: 14+62 - 14+91		
MY5	Camp Branch Station: 0+00	Beaver dam - Removed Early 2012

Table 3: Cross Section and Longitudinal Profile Graphs





Table 3: Cross Section and Longitudinal Profile Graphs





Table 3: Cross Section and Longitudinal Profile Graphs





Table 3: Cross Section and Longitudinal Profile Graphs





Table 3: Cross Section and Longitudinal Profile Graphs





Table 4 Closeout Report - Verification of Bankfull Events Camp Branch Main Channel DEP Project No. 92350		
Date of Collection	Date of Event	Method
		Location
Mar-2012	Unknown	Crest Gauge
		(Main Channel and Tributary)
Jul-2011	Unknown	Crest Gauge
		(Main Channel and Tributary)
Jun-2011	Unknown	Crest Gauge
		(Main Channel and Tributary)
Apr-2011	Unknown	Crest Gauge
		(Main Channel and Tributary)
Feb-2011	2010	Visual
Jan-2010	2009	Visual Assessment-wrack lines
Aug-2008	Unknown	Crest Gauge
		(Main Channel and Tributary)
Dec-2007	N/A*	Crest Gauge
		(Main Channel and Tributary)

*Note from previous monitoring report: No bankfull events were observed to have occurred during the MY1 monitoring period.

Table 5: Morphologic and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary
Closeout Report: Camp Branch Stream Restoration EEP Project No. 92350
Camp Branch Tributary

PARAMETER	Cross-Section 1 Riffle						
DIMENSION	Pre-Construction	As-Built	MY1-2007	MY2-2008	MY3-2009	MY4-2010	MY5-2011
Drainage Area (sq mi)	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70
Mean Bankfull Width (ft)	11.00	6.00	8.00	8.97	8.22	7.83	8.95
Mean Bankfull Depth (ft)	1.10	0.36	0.70	0.71	0.66	0.70	0.69
Mean Bankfull Cross-sectional Area (ft ²)	9.40	6.40	5.80	6.33	5.46	5.50	6.22
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)	37.30	37.42	37.42	37.42	37.42	37.42	37.42
Channel Slope	0.0047	0.0034	0.0034	0.0036	0.0039	0.0041	0.0041
Channel Sinuosity	1.05	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20

PARAMETER	Cross-Section 2 Pool						
DIMENSION	Pre-Construction	As-Built	MY1-2007	MY2-2008	MY3-2009	MY4-2010	MY5-2011
Drainage Area (sq mi)	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.70
Mean Bankfull Width (ft)	11.00	6.80	6.80	6.80	5.63	6.14	5.96
Mean Bankfull Depth (ft)	1.10	0.84	0.84	0.86	0.81	0.58	0.65
Mean Bankfull Cross-sectional Area (ft ²)	9.40	5.90	5.90	5.68	4.86	4.97	5.96
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)	37.30	37.42	37.42	37.42	37.42	37.42	37.42
Channel Slope	0.0047	0.0034	0.0034	0.0036	0.0039	0.0041	0.0041
Channel Sinuosity	1.05	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20	1.20

*Pre-construction cross-section locations do not correspond to monitoring cross-section locations, therefore, pre-construction cross-section data was averaged along the entire reach.

**As-built data based on Monitoring Year 1 survey

Table 5: Morphologic and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary
Closeout Report: Camp Branch Stream Restoration PEP Project No. 92350
Camp Branch Main Channel

PARAMETER	Cross-Section 5 Riffle						
DIMENSION	Pre-Construction*	As-Built**	MY1-2007	MY2-2008	MY3-2009	MY4-2010	MY5-2011
Drainage Area (sq mi)	2.40	2.40	2.40	2.40	2.40	2.40	2.40
Mean Bankfull Width (ft)	17.80	21.00	21.00	20.03	20.43	20.47	19.95
Mean Bankfull Depth (ft)	2.40	1.80	1.80	1.86	1.77	1.60	1.64
Mean Bankfull Cross-sectional Area (ft ²)	42.00	37.80	37.80	37.32	36.18	32.81	32.65
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)	182.00	182.04	182.04	182.04	182.04	182.04	182.04
Channel Slope	0.0047	0.0100	0.0100	0.0103	0.0103	0.0110	0.0116
Channel Sinosity	1.05	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10

PARAMETER	Cross-Section 6 Pool						
DIMENSION	Pre-Construction*	As-Built**	MY1-2007	MY2-2008	MY3-2009	MY4-2010	MY5-2011
Drainage Area (sq mi)	2.40	2.40	2.40	2.40	2.40	2.40	2.40
Mean Bankfull Width (ft)	17.80	18.10	18.10	22.74	20.95	20.67	18.60
Mean Bankfull Depth (ft)	2.40	1.30	1.30	1.19	1.16	1.18	1.17
Mean Bankfull Cross-sectional Area (ft ²)	42.00	24.00	24.00	27.00	24.20	24.48	21.74
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)	182.00	182.04	182.04	182.04	182.04	182.04	182.04
Channel Slope	0.0047	0.0100	0.0100	0.0103	0.0103	0.0110	0.0116
Channel Sinosity	1.05	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10	1.10

*Pre-construction cross-section locations do not correspond to monitoring cross-section locations, therefore, pre-construction cross-section data was averaged along the entire reach.

**As-built data based on Monitoring Year 1 survey

Table 6
Stem Count Total and Planted by Plot and Species
Closeout Report: Camp Branch Stream Restoration/EFP Project 92350

		Current Data (MY5-2011)														
Species	Common Name	Type	Plot 1		Plot 2		Plot 3		Plot 4		Plot 5		Plot 6		Plot 7	
			P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T		
<i>Acer negundo</i>	box elder	T			5	55				2						
<i>Acer rubra</i>	red maple	T				17		8								
<i>Alnus serrulata</i>	hazel alder	S				2							1			
<i>Asimina triloba</i>	pawpaw	T	3	3												
<i>Baccharis hamifolia</i>	groundsel tree	S														
<i>Betula nigra</i>	river birch	T			6	28			10	14	6	16	10	13	7	8
<i>Celtis laevigata</i>	sugarberry	T				1							1	1		
<i>Cephalanthus occidentalis</i>	common buttonbush	S									1	3	2	3	5	5
<i>Cornus amomum</i>	silky dogwood	T							11	11	5	12	8	8	10	10
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash	T					2	3	3	6			2	5		
<i>Juniperus virginiana</i>	eastern red cedar	S	1	1		1						1				
<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	sweet gum	T				11				2						
<i>Nyssa biflora</i>	swamp tupelo	T							1	1						
<i>Pinus taeda</i>	loblolly pine	T				39										
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	American sycamore	T			2	6	2	2	1	2		1	1	1		
<i>Quercus michauxii</i>	swamp chestnut oak	T			2	2	1	2				1			1	1
<i>Quercus nigra</i>	water oak	T						2							1	1
<i>Quercus pagoda</i>	cherrybark oak	T			3	3			2	2	1	1	1	3	3	3
<i>Quercus phellos</i>	willow oak	T			2	2	4	4			2	3	1	1		
<i>Salix nigra</i>	black willow	T												2		
<i>Ulmus americana</i>	American elm	T					5	6	1	1			1	1	1	1
Plot Area (acres)			0.0247													
Species Count			2	2	6	12	5	7	7	9	5	8	9	11	7	7
Stem Count			4	4	20	167	14	27	29	41	15	38	27	39	28	29
Stems per Acre			162	162	810	6761	567	1093	1174	1660	607	1538	1093	1579	1134	1174

Type=Shrub or Tree
P = Planted, T =Total

Table 6
Stem Count Total and Planted by Plot and Species
Closeout Report - Camp Branch Stream Restoration/EIP Project 92350

Species	Common Name	Type	Annual Means									
			Current Mean		MY1 - 2007		MY2 - 2008		MY3 - 2009		MY4 - 2010	
			P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T
<i>Acer negundo</i>	box elder	T	5	29	N/A	N/A	N/A	20	N/A	N/A	N/A	13
<i>Acer rubra</i>	red maple	T	N/A	13	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Alnus serrulata</i>	hazel alder	S	N/A	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8
<i>Asimina triloba</i>	pawpaw	T	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	4	N/A	N/A
<i>Baccharis hamifolia</i>	groundsel tree	S	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	7
<i>Betula nigra</i>	river birch	T	8	16	6	6	9	9	9	8	9	13
<i>Celtis laevigata</i>	sugarberry	T	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2
<i>Cephalanthus occidentalis</i>	common buttonbush	S	3	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	5
<i>Cornus amomum</i>	silky dogwood	T	9	10	9	9	8	8	9	9	8	8
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash	T	2	5	9	9	8	8	N/A	N/A	2	3
<i>Juniperus virginiana</i>	eastern red cedar	S	1	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	sweet gum	T	N/A	7	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	12
<i>Nyssa biflora</i>	swamp tupelo	T	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
<i>Pinus taeda</i>	loblolly pine	T	N/A	39	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	25
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	American sycamore	T	2	2	2	2	1	3	1	2	N/A	2
<i>Quercus michauxii</i>	swamp chestnut oak	T	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3
<i>Quercus nigra</i>	water oak	T	1	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<i>Quercus pagoda</i>	cherrybark oak	T	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
<i>Quercus phellos</i>	willow oak	T	2	3	2	2	3	3	2	2	2	2
<i>Salix nigra</i>	black willow	T	N/A	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1
<i>Ulmus americana</i>	American elm	T	2	2	3	3	3	3	2	3	2	2
Plot Area (acres)												
Species Count			15	20	12	12	12	13	11	12	10	17
Stem Count			42	143	44	44	45	67	35	41	34	110
Stems per Acre			742	2065	1087	1087	995	1215	989	1001	931	2296

Type=Shrub or Tree
P = Planted, T =Total

Table 7
Closeout Report - Comparison of Historic Rainfall to Observed Rainfall
Camp Branch Stream Restoration and Wetland EFP Project No. 92350

Month	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	Average	30%	70%
Jan	3.86	1.63	2.04	3.07	1.05	3.74	2.55	4.92
Feb	3.31	3.35	1.93	4.34	3.01	3.63	2.59	4.67
Mar	3.43	4.25	5.37	2.65	4.36	4.50	3.42	5.57
April	14.61	4.62	2.40	0.47	1.98	3.09	2.16	4.02
May	0.24	1.85	5.24	4.89	3.46	3.21	2.29	4.12
June	4.61	0.67	2.16	4.73	6.49	4.25	3.01	5.48
July	1.97	4.48	4.66	3.74	3.91	4.31	3.42	5.20
Aug	2.79	5.84	2.64	6.18	5.09	4.29	3.04	5.53
Sept	1.14	4.43	2.09	1.06	8.60	3.84	2.61	5.07
Oct	4.10	2.17	2.15	0.00	3.75	3.54	2.50	4.57
Nov	0.28	2.29	7.00	0.36	3.75	3.14	2.47	3.81
Dec	5.48	3.34	5.68	2.24	1.93	3.02	2.35	3.69
Year	45.82	38.92	43.36	33.73	47.38	44.53	32.41	56.65

30%						70%					
Month	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	Month	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5
Jan	1.16	0.49	0.61	0.92	0.32	Jan	2.70	1.14	1.43	2.15	0.74
Feb	0.99	1.01	0.58	1.30	0.90	Feb	2.32	2.35	1.35	3.04	2.11
Mar	1.03	1.28	1.61	0.80	1.31	Mar	2.40	2.98	3.76	1.86	3.05
April	4.38	1.39	0.72	0.14	0.59	April	10.23	3.23	1.68	0.33	1.39
May	0.07	0.56	1.57	1.47	1.04	May	0.17	1.30	3.67	3.42	2.42
June	1.38	0.20	0.65	1.42	1.95	June	3.23	0.47	1.51	3.31	4.54
July	0.59	1.34	1.40	1.12	1.17	July	1.38	3.14	3.26	2.62	2.74
Aug	0.84	1.75	0.79	1.85	1.53	Aug	1.95	4.09	1.85	4.33	3.56
Sept	0.34	1.33	0.63	0.32	2.58	Sept	0.80	3.10	1.46	0.74	6.02
Oct	1.23	0.65	0.65	0.00	1.13	Oct	2.87	1.52	1.51	0.00	2.63
Nov	0.08	0.69	2.10	0.11	1.13	Nov	0.20	1.60	4.90	0.25	2.63
Dec	1.64	1.00	1.70	0.67	0.58	Dec	3.84	2.34	3.98	1.57	1.35

All information gathered from nearby weather station KNCTROY1, information gathered from www.wunderground.com



SUMMARY


EEP Recommendation and Conclusion

Overall the Site has matured as expected and is trending towards complete stability and self-sustainability. Stream related inefficiencies discussed earlier appear to be attributed to watershed contribution and not instability within restored reaches. Regarding vegetation, the Site has exhibited acceptable coverage, survivability and diversity that coincide with similar mitigation projects. Areas of vegetative inefficiencies appear to be attributed to a lack of establishment in areas of mineral soil dominance, as is common during restoration construction.

EEP recommends site closure pending the implementation of contingencies



Cross Section 1: View Upstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 1: View Upstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)



Cross Section 1: View Downstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 2: View Downstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)

Prepared For:



Figure 4: Photographs
Camp Branch Stream Restoration Project
EEP Project No. 92350
Closeout Report
Page 1

Prepared By:






Cross Section 2: View Upstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 2: View Upstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)



Cross Section 2: View Downstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 2: View Downstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)


Prepared For:



Figure 4: Photographs
Camp Branch Stream Restoration Project
EEP Project No. 92350
Closeout Report
Page 2

Prepared By:





Cross Section 3: View Upstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 3: View Upstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)



Cross Section 3: View Downstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 3: View Downstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)


Prepared For:



Figure 4: Photographs
Camp Branch Stream Restoration Project
EEP Project No. 92350
Closeout Report
Page 3

Prepared By:







Cross Section 4: View Upstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 4: View Upstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)



Cross Section 4: View Downstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 4: View Downstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)


Prepared For:



Figure 4: Photographs
Camp Branch Stream Restoration Project
EEP Project No. 92350
Closeout Report
Page 4

Prepared By:





Cross Section 5: View Upstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 5: View Upstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)



Cross Section 5: View Downstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 5: View Downstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)


Prepared For:



Figure 4: Photographs
Camp Branch Stream Restoration Project
EEP Project No. 92350
Closeout Report
Page 5

Prepared By:





Cross Section 6: View Upstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 6: View Upstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)



Cross Section 6: View Downstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 6: View Downstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)

Prepared For:



Figure 4: Photographs
Camp Branch Stream Restoration Project
EEP Project No. 92350
Closeout Report
Page 6

Prepared By:






Cross Section 7: View Upstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 7: View Upstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)



Cross Section 7: View Downstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 7: View Downstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)

Prepared For:



Figure 4: Photographs
Camp Branch Stream Restoration Project
EEP Project No. 92350
Closeout Report
Page 7

Prepared By:





Cross Section 8: View Upstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 8: View Upstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)



Cross Section 8: View Downstream
(MY 1 - 11/2006)



Cross Section 8: View Downstream
(MY 5 - 7/2011)

Prepared For:



Figure 4: Photographs
Camp Branch Stream Restoration Project
EEP Project No. 92350
Closeout Report
Page 8

Prepared By:



Subject: [Fwd: Bishop Property Stream and Wetland Enhancement and Restoration, Anson Co., 05-0377]

From: Jeff Jurek <Jeff.Jurek@ncmail.net>

Date: Thu, 14 Apr 2005 14:02:07 -0400

To: Lin Xu <lin.xu@ncmail.net>

File email, serves as write off for certification.

----- Original Message -----

Subject: Bishop Property Stream and Wetland Enhancement and Restoration, Anson Co., 05-0377

Date: Thu, 14 Apr 2005 13:46:51 -0400

From: Cyndi Karoly <cyndi.karoly@ncmail.net>

To: Jeff Jurek <jeff.jurek@ncmail.net>

Cc: ~~ken.averette@ncmail.net~~

Jeff - please file this project as Deemed Issued. The 30-day clock expired 3/26/05.

--

Jeff Jurek
Assistant Operations Manager
NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program
1652 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1652
(919) 715-1157 *phone*
(919) 715-2219 *fax*
jeff.jurek@ncmail.net

