FINAL MITIGATION PLAN

CROATAN WETLAND MITIGATION BANK
Craven County, North Carolina

TIP No. R-1015 WM

Consultant Project No. 00-ES-10

The North Carolina Department of Transportation
Raleigh, North Carolina

April 2002

Table of Contents

List of Figures iii
List of Tables iii
List of Appendices iii
1.0 Introduction 1
2.0 Methods 2
2.1 Physiography, Topography, and Land Use 2
2.2 Geology 3
2.3 Water Resources 3
2.4 Soils 3
2.5 Plant Communities 4
2.6 Wildlife 4
2.7 Threatened and Endangered Species 4
2.8 Wetlands 4
2.9 Cultural Resources 5
2.10 Hazardous Materials 5
2.11 Key Project Personnel 5
2.11.1 Environmental Services, Inc. 5
2.11.2 Eddy Engineering, P.C. 6
2.11.3 North Carolina Department of Transportation 7
3.0 Existing Conditions 8
3.1 Physiography, Topography, and Land Use 8
3.2 Geology 8
3.3 Water Resources 9
3.3.1 Surface Waters 9
3.3.2 Water Quality 11
3.3.3 Neuse River Drainage Basin Buffer Rules 11
3.4 Soils 12
3.5 Plant Communities 12
3.6 Wildlife 13
3.6 Terrestrial Wildlife 13
3.6 Aquatic Wildlife 13
3.7 Threatened and Endangered Species 14
3.7.1 Federal Protected Species 14
3.7.1.1 American Alligator 15
3.7.1.2 Leatherback Sea Turtle 15
3.7.1.3 Bald Eagle 15
3.7.1.4 Red-cockaded Woodpecker 16
3.7.1.5 Manatee 17
3.7.1.6 Sensitive Joint-vetch 17
3.7.2 Federal Species of Concern and State Listed Species 18
3.8 Wetlands 19
3.9 Cultural Resources 20
3.10 Hazardous Materials 20
4.0 Wetland Restoration Studies 22
4.1 Groundwater and Subsurface Investigation 22
4.2 Surface Water Investigation 24
4.3 Vegetation Evaluation 25
5.0 Wetland Mitigation Plan 26
5.1 Proposed Site Hydrology Treatment 26

5.1.1 Site Ditch Removal and Modifications 26
5.1.1.1 Ditch Plugs 26
5.1.1.2 Surface Water Diversions 27
5.1.1.3 Scarification of Consolidated Soils 27
5.1.1.4 Removal of Existing Conveyance Structures 28
5.1.2 Site Road Modifications 28
5.1.2.1 Improving Road Surface Course 28
5.1.2.2 Surface Water Conveyance Measures 28
5.1.2.3 Subsurface Aggregate Drains 30
5.1.3 Locating Site HydrologyTreatments 30
5.2 Proposed Soil Treatment 30
5.3 Proposed Vegetation Treatment 31
5.3.1 Target Communities 31
5.3.1.1 Coastal Plain Small Stream Swamp 32
5.3.1.2 Nonriverine Wet Hardwood Forest – Type a 32
5.3.1.3 Nonriverine Wet Hardwood Forest – Type b 32
5.3.1.4 Nonriverine Swamp Forest 32
5.3.1.5 Bay Forest 33
5.3.1.6 Pond Pine Woodland 33
5.3.1.7 Wet Pine Flats 33
5.3.1.8 Mesic Pine Flats 33
5.3.2 Site Preparation 33
5.3.3 Planting 34
6.0 Implementation Schedule 36
7.0 Monitoring Plan 37
7.1 Hydrology 37
7.1.1 Hydrology Monitoring 37
7.1.2 Hydrology Success Criteria 37
7.2 Vegetation 37
7.2.1 Vegetation Monitoring 37
7.2.2 Vegetation Success Criteria 38
7.3 Soils 39
7.4 Report Submittal 39
7.5 Contingency 39
8.0 Mitigation Credit Composition and Release Schedule 40
8.1 Mitigation Credits 40
8.2 Mitigation Release Schedule 42
9.0 Geographic Service Area 44
10.0 Final Disposition of Property 45
11.0 Financial Assurances 47
12.0 Accounting Procedures 47
13.0 References 48

List of Figures

1-1 Location Map 50
3-1 Topography....51
3-2 Soil Map....52
3-3 Existing Vegetation 53
3-4 Jurisdictional Delineation 54
5-1 Dominant Channel Reaches and Natural Drainage Features 55
5-2 Proposed Point Ditch Plugs & Surface Water Diversions 56
5-3 Proposed Reach Ditch Plugs & Surface Water Diversions 57
5-4 Proposed Site Layout - Point & Reach Ditch Plug & Surface Water Diversions....58
5-5 Proposed Site Layout - Road Removals....59
5-6 Typical Ditch Filling and Road Removal....60
5-7 Typical Ditch Filling and Road Stabilization....61
5-8 Proposed Site Layout - Permananent Road Crossing Locations 62
5-9 Lower Road Elev. and Stabilize Road Surface at Natural Drainage Feature 63
5-10 Lower Road Elev. and Stabilize Road Surface at Natural Drainage Feature 64
5-11 Proposed Treatment Flow Chart 65
5-12 Target Communities....66
5-13 Clearing and Planting Areas....67
7-1 Pre-implementation Hydrologic Monitoring Sites....68
8-1 Mitigation Components 69
9-1 Geographic Service Area 70

List of Tables

3-1 Federal Protected Species Listed for Craven County....14
3-2 Federal Species of Concern Listed for Craven County....19
5-1 Peak Design Discharges at Permanent Road Crossings....29
5-2 Planting Regimen for the CWMB 35
8-1 Mitigation Components at the CWMB 40
8-2 Credits Generated at the CWMB....41
8-3 Proposed Credit Release Schedule 43
8-4 Anticipated Availability of Credits 43

List of Appendices

A Historical Aerial Photographs....71
B Wildlife Documented on the CWMB 78
C Account Ledger 83

Wetland Mitigation Plan
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina
T.I.P. Number R-1015WM

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) recognizes in fulfilling its public service mission of roadway and other transportation constructions, it has an important responsibility to protect the State's environment and to protect the State's wetland resources in a prudent manner in compliance with applicable State and Federal law. The Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank (CWMB) is proposed for use in providing in-kind compensatory mitigation for unavoidable wetland impacts on NCDOT projects for which no on-site, in-kind mitigation is available.

General Assembly House Bill 399, ratified in 1989, provides for the establishment of the North Carolina Highway Trust Fund. This fund was established to facilitate the development of free-flowing, safe intrastate travel for motorists, and to support statewide growth and development objectives. In 1999 the North Carolina Board of Transportation adopted the 2000-2006 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), the NCDOT's blueprint for statewide transportation projects. The TIP also sets aside funding for environmental protection, including wetland mitigation. As part of the 2000-2006 TIP, the NCDOT is planning roadway improvement projects in the eastern portion of North Carolina. Locating suitable on-site, in-kind compensatory mitigation sites is sometimes difficult for projects involving wetland impacts.

NCDOT is attempting to establish up-front mitigation in regions of North Carolina projected to receive multiple roadway improvement projects. In 1997, NCDOT commissioned a preliminary feasibility investigation of an approximately 4035-acre site in Craven County that resulted in the identification of the subject site as a property suitable for the development of a wetland mitigation bank. Following more detailed site investigations (1998-2000) the NCDOT is now preparing to develop the subject site as the CWMB (Figure 1-1).

NCDOT contracted Environmental Services, Inc., (ESI) to provide assistance with wetland restoration components of the mitigation plan. Additional technical expertise was provided by Eddy Engineering, P.C., (EEPC) to model surface water hydrology and develop the conceptual mitigation design.

The purpose of this document is to: 1) describe existing conditions at the CWMB, including a summary of wetland component analysis; 2) present a mitigation plan for restoring, enhancing, and preserving nonriverine wetlands and riverine wetlands; and 3) present a plan for monitoring and measuring success of the mitigation efforts.

2.0 METHODS

The site assessment included a review of existing background material as well as intensive field investigations. A preliminary feasibility study was conducted between June and August 1997, with a report of findings and recommendations provided to NCDOT in September 1997 (ESI 1997).

When NCDOT initiated CWMB planning in 1997, the goal was to segment the CWMB into smaller, more manageable phases for implementation. The preliminary feasibility study identified three phases for sequential development and implementation of mitigation plans. Preliminary data collection was initiated for the approximately 1,470-acre Phase I area in 1998. Results of the Phase I investigation were provided in series of summary reports (ESI 1998; EEPC 1998; ESI 1999a). Subsequently, a comparable level of documentation and planning was requested for the remaining phases of CWMB as part of the approval process for the mitigation banking process. The remaining 2,565 acres were combined into Phase II and preliminary data collection was initiated in 1999. Results of this investigation were provided in a series of summary reports (ESI 1999b; ESI 2000a; ESI 2000b; EEPC 2000). The present document summarizes existing site conditions, summarizes wetland investigations, and provides a mitigation plan for both Phase I and Phase II of the CWMB.

2.1 Physiography, Topography, and Land Use

General topographic information was obtained from U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) topographic mapping (USGS 1994a, 1994b). Detailed topographic mapping was developed for portions of the CWMB by NCDOT using aerial photography and land elevation surveys. Land surveys were used to obtain accurate land surface elevations along a series of 29 transects established through densely vegetated portions of the CWMB. Additional land surveys were performed to obtain accurate land surface elevations at groundwater piezometers, within streams and ditches, and Long Lake.

A mosaic aerial photograph provided by NCDOT (photo date March 7, 1997) was used to assist in mapping relevant environmental features. Additional aerial photographs (January 9, 1994) obtained from Weyerhaeuser Company and historical aerial photographs (1949, 1958, 1964, 1970, 1974, and 1981) obtained from the Craven County Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS, formerly Soil Conservation Service) office were used to document recent on-site changes. The 1974 aerial photograph is the base used in the *Soil Survey of Craven County* (USDA 1989); the other aerial photographs are presented in Appendix A.

The CWMB has been sectioned into two phases (see Figure 3-1) for proposed planning and implementation activities. Proposed phasing allows for progressive watershed control and hydrologic management beginning in upper reaches of the watershed and proceeding down-slope. Each phase has been subdivided into discrete sections (Management Units). The use of Management Units facilitates data presentation and analysis. Management Units are typically bounded by roadside ditches or other major ditches; larger Management Units have been divided into subsections (*i.e.*, MU12A and MU12B) utilizing surveyed transects as subsection boundaries.

2.2 Geology

Investigations were conducted to evaluate subsurface and hydrogeological conditions on the CWMB. These investigations were undertaken to: 1) evaluate local geology, including determination of the extent and condition of shallow clay layers; 2) evaluate the degree of soil degradation; 3) evaluate local hydrogeology, including groundwater flow patterns; 4) model predicted drainage for existing conditions and post-restoration conditions; and 5) to evaluate hydraulic trespass issues. This investigation also was used to provide data and recommendations for facilitating completion of the mitigation plan. More detailed discussions of groundwater and subsurface investigations are provided in Section 4.1.

2.3 Water Resources

Water quality information for streams and tributaries was derived from available sources; quantitative sampling was not undertaken to support existing data. Stream channels on the CWMB were delineated, mapped using GPS technology, and classified using the Natural Stream Channel Classification System (Rosgen 1996). The classification effort was a Level I classification, consisting of a general description of channel type without detailed measurement. Physical descriptions of water resources and quality information are provided in Section 3.3.

Surface water investigations were undertaken to: 1) determine the area contributing runoff to the CWMB; 2) develop a means to predict flood flows within and around the CWMB; 3) select locations and types of site modifications to the existing road and ditch system needed to enhance or restore wetland hydrology; and 4) determine if increased peak flood flows are likely after site modifications, because of the increase in soil moisture and the large percentage of the drainage area that will be restored to wetland function. More detailed discussion of the surface water investigation is provided in Section 4.2.

2.4 Soils

Preliminary studies of the CWMB utilized existing soils mapping (USDA 1989) to determine the extent of hydric and nonhydric soils. Mapping indicated nonhydric soils were a minor component of the CWMB. Mapped nonhydric soil areas and soil series with the potential for nonhydric soil inclusions were investigated, confirmed, field delineated, and mapped using GPS technology.

Initial subsurface investigations revealed that organic soil series have been severely degraded due to the lack of natural hydrology. Additionally, during well installation several boring profiles were found not to match typical pedon descriptions as published by the NRCS (USDA 1989). During the course of field data collection for mitigation planning, a series of 396 shallow soil borings were established across the CWMB, to better define existing soil boundaries. NRCS mapping was modified if sufficient data were available to indicate a different soil series than published data indicated. Several areas were found to be nonhydric soil pockets not shown on NRCS mapping. Some areas containing organic soils were found having up to six feet of organic material oxidized; these areas were no longer conforming to published typical pedon descriptions and physical characteristics.

Modifications were made to update soil mapping for use in DRAINMOD modeling. This refinement of the published county soils mapping was conducted under the direction of a State

of North Carolina Licensed Soil Scientist. Descriptions of soils of the CWMB are provided in Section 3.4.

2.5 Plant Communities

Existing plant communities within the CWMB were mapped. Plant community descriptions are based on a classification system utilized by North Carolina Natural Heritage Program (NHP) (Schafale and Weakley 1990). When appropriate, community classifications were modified to better reflect field observations. Descriptions of existing plant communities within the CWMB are provided in Section 3.5.

To aid in developing a planting plan, 146 vegetation evaluation plots were established across the CWMB. The vegetation sampling was conducted to quantify the structural layers of vegetation in a given area. Vegetation sampling was conducted using a plot method. Trees and shrubs within the respective plots were identified to species and diameter at breast height (dbh) recorded. Importance values were generated for the tree and shrub values. Importance values are an index generated for a species based on relative density, relative frequency, and relative dominance. Groundcover species occurring within the shrub plots were recorded and relative dominance noted.

2.6 Wildlife

Wildlife sightings were documented during the course of field investigations. These observations were mostly incidental to other efforts. Techniques used to document terrestrial wildlife included visual observations, identification of bird and frog calls and songs, and identification of tracks and scat. Cursory sampling of aquatic wildlife was conducted through the limited use of dip nets, seines, and backpack electroshocker.

2.7 Threatened and Endangered Species

NHP records were consulted for the presence of federal and state listed species as well as to identify designated natural areas that may serve as reference (relatively undisturbed) wetlands for restoration design. Protected species surveys were undertaken for federally protected species for which potentially suitable habitat was identified on the CWMB. A discussion of threatened and endangered species is provided in Section 3.7.

2.8 Wetlands

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) mapping, USGS topographic mapping, and NRCS soil survey were consulted at the onset of the investigation to determine the approximate extent of potential wetland areas on the CWMB. The field delineation of jurisdictional areas was conducted using the three parameter approach (hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, wetland hydrology) following U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (COE) delineation guidelines (DOA 1987).

Beginning in 1998 and continuing into 2000, Remote Data Systems (RDS) continuous monitoring wells were installed throughout the CWMB in selected locations to assist in jurisdictional hydrology determination efforts. A total of 156 monitoring well stations were established, including five on-site and five off-site hydrology reference stations. The monitoring well stations also provide data for baseline hydrology conditions under pre-mitigation conditions.

The jurisdictional wetland delineation has been reviewed by the COE. Details of the jurisdictional delineation have been provided in summary report (ESI 2000b). A discussion of the jurisdictional wetlands of the CWMB is provided in Section 3.8.

2.9 Cultural Resources

To assist in planning for the CWMB, an archaeological reconnaissance survey of the approximately 4035-acre site was conducted in June 1999. The goal of this field and background study was to evaluate the potential of the CWMB to contain significant prehistoric and historic cultural resources. The results of this investigation were provided in a report to NCDOT (ESI 1999b). A summary of the cultural resource investigation is provided in Section 3.9.

2.10 Hazardous Materials

A preliminary evaluation was conducted during the preliminary feasibility investigation (ESI 1997) to determine whether implementation of wetland mitigation activities on the CWMB could be affected by the presence of hazardous materials. The preliminary hazardous materials assessment included a limited on-site evaluation of the CWMB along with a review of agency file information. Database research included review of the National Priorities List (NPL) (search radius 1.0 mile), Active and Inactive Superfund Sites Lists (search radius 0.5 mile), Hazardous Waste Notifiers List (search radii 0.5 mile for generators, 1.0 mile for transporters, storers, disposers [TSDs]), and the Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Incident Lists (search radius 0.5 mile). A summary of the hazardous materials evaluation is provided in Section 3.10.

2.11 Key Project Personnel

2.11.1 Environmental Services, Inc.

Kevin Markham served as project manager for this investigation and mitigation plan development. Mr. Markham has a M.S. in Marine Biology with a concentration in Coastal Ecology from the University of North Carolina at Wilmington. He has more than 14 years professional experience with natural resource investigations, wetlands, threatened and endangered species, and mitigation planning and monitoring.

Brian L. Hayes, P.G., conducted the Hydrogeological Site Assessment. Mr. Hayes has a B.S. in Geology from North Carolina State University and is licensed to practice geology in North Carolina (License # 1018). Mr. Hayes has over 19 years of experience conducting geological and hydrogeological investigations.

Jan U Gay, Licensed Soil Scientist (North Carolina License # 1158), supervised the soil characterization efforts, monitoring well installation, and planting plan data collection. Mr. Gay has a M.S. in Forestry from Clemson University with a research emphasis in Landscape Ecosystem Classification. Mr. Gay has over 10 years of professional experience in the Southeast in soils assessments, forestry, wetlands, and natural resource investigations.

Greg C. Smith, a Registered Professional Archaeologist, conducted the cultural resource investigation. Mr. Smith has a Ph.D. in Anthropology from the University of Florida. Dr. Smith has over 23 years professional experience conducting and managing cultural resource management projects throughout the Southeast.

Matthew K. Smith supervised much of the jurisdictional delineation, vegetation characterization, and threatened and endangered species surveys. Mr. Smith has a B.S. in Marine Biology from the University of North Carolina at Wilmington and more than 7 years professional experience in natural resources, wetlands, and threatened and endangered species.

B. Gail Tyner supervised the monitoring well data collection and compilation, and assisted with jurisdictional delineation and threatened and endangered species surveys. Ms. Tyner has a B.S. in Fisheries and Wildlife from North Carolina State University and more than 4 years professional experience in natural resource investigations, wetlands, and red-cockaded woodpecker evaluations.

Joseph (Josh) Witherspoon, a North Carolina Soil-Scientist-in-Training, assisted with the soil characterizations, well installations, and jurisdictional delineation. Mr. Witherspoon has a B.S. in Natural Resources with a concentration in Soils and Water Systems from North Carolina State University. Mr. Witherspoon has more than 6 years professional experience in soil investigations, wetlands, and natural resource investigations.

Clay H. DeVane, a North Carolina Soil-Scientist-in-Training, assisted with the soil characterizations, well installations, and jurisdictional delineation. Mr. DeVane has a B.S. in Natural Resources with a concentration in Soils and Water Systems from North Carolina State University. Mr. DeVane has more than 3 years professional experience in soil investigations, wetlands, and natural resource investigations.

2.11.2 Eddy Engineering, P.C.

John L. Eddy, P.E., (NC License No. 17604) has a M.S. degree in Geotechnical and Water Resources Engineering from North Carolina State University and is licensed to practice engineering in North Carolina, Virginia, and Florida. Mr. Eddy is a civil engineer experienced in geotechnical engineering, hydrologic engineering, hydraulic engineering, and dam engineering. He has performed engineering investigations, analyses, design, or evaluations on building, roadway, dam, pipeline, airport, harbor, stream, wetland, and landfill projects. He has over 13 years of experience on projects representing a wide range of locations including Coastal Plain, Piedmont, and Mountain physiographic provinces in several states.

Patrick K. Smith, P.E., (NC License No. 25525) has a M.E. degree in Civil Engineering with a concentration in Environmental and Hydrologic Engineering from Clarkson University and is licensed to practice engineering in North Carolina. Mr. Smith is a civil engineer experienced in hydrologic engineering, hydraulic engineering, and dam engineering. He has performed engineering analyses and design on streams, wetlands, open and closed stormwater systems, dams, and sediment and erosion control projects. He has over 13 years of design and

construction management experience on projects representing a wide range of domestic and overseas locations.

Christopher G. Ply, E.I.T., has a M.S. degree in Structural Engineering from North Carolina State University. Mr. Ply is a civil engineer experienced in foundation engineering, structural concrete design, and hydrologic engineering. He has performed engineering analyses and design on wetlands, dams, and concrete structures to include foundations, retaining walls, headwalls, and dam spillways.

2.11.3 North Carolina Department of Transportation

LeiLani Paugh serves as the current NCDOT project manager for the CWMB. Ms. Paugh has a M.S. degree in Natural Resources Management from North Carolina State University. Her responsibilities include management of the planning, design, implementation, and monitoring of NCDOT mitigation projects.

Clarence Coleman, P.E., (NC License No. 22954) served as the NCDOT project manager from February 2000 through December 2001. Mr. Coleman has a B.S. degree in Civil Engineering from North Carolina State University. He served as a Natural Systems Engineer in the Natural Systems Unit of the Project Development and Environmental Analysis Branch. His major duties included management of the planning, design, implementation, and monitoring of NCDOT mitigation projects.

Previous NCDOT project managers have included Mr. Tanner Holland, Ms. Kelly Williams, and Ms. Robin Little.

3.0 EXISTING CONDITIONS

The CWMB constitutes a contiguous parcel of approximately 4035 acres located approximately 3.6 miles (mi) northwest of the City of Havelock in Craven County (Figure 1-1). Specifically, the CWMB is located between the northeastern shore of Long Lake and East Prong Brice Creek at Catfish Lake Road (SR 1100).

3.1 Physiography, Topography, and Land Use

The CWMB is located in the Atlantic Coastal Plain Physiographic Province of North Carolina within the lower portion of the Neuse River Drainage Basin. The CWMB is included in USGS hydrologic cataloging unit 03020204 which includes watersheds of the Neuse and associated tributaries from the Pamlico Sound upstream to New Bern.

USGS 7.5-minute topographic mapping (Havelock, NC and Catfish Lake, NC) shows the CWMB as nearly level with a gradual down-gradient slope from Long Lake at 38 feet (ft) above mean sea level (MSL), north to East Prong Brice Creek at approximately 20 ft above MSL (Figure 3-1). This elevation difference equates to approximately 18 ft over a distance of approximately 17,000 ft, for an average land slope of 0.001 ft per ft rise/run.

The northeastern shore of Long Lake forms the southern boundary of the CWMB. U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Forest Service (USFS) lands border the entire western and northern boundaries of the CWMB and much of the eastern boundary. A single private holding abuts the CWMB along the southeastern boundary. The only other non-Forest Service tract adjoining the CWMB is a tract located along the central portion of the eastern boundary; this tract was purchased by NCDOT as part of right-of-way acquisition for the planned Havelock Bypass (T.I.P. R-1015).

Land use of the CWMB under previous ownership was for timber production and recreational hunting. A hunting lodge and associated out-structures (sheds, dog pens) were formerly located in the southwestern portion of the CWMB on the shore of Long Lake. A Carolina Power & Light (CP&L) power transmission line, with 170 ft of associated cleared easement, crosses the northern portion of the CWMB.

The USFS lands and private holding that border the CWMB appear to be used for timber production and recreational hunting. The designated Sheep Ridge Wilderness Area, located west of the CWMB, is separated from the CWMB by a buffer of other USFS land; this buffer generally increases in width from approximately 400 ft wide at Long Lake to 8000 ft wide at Catfish Lake Road. Residential development occurs within 1.0 mi to the east of the CWMB along US 70, and along Catfish Lake Road (SR 1100) to the northeast; the proportion of landscape occupied by residential, commercial, and military development progressively increase eastward towards Havelock and Cherry Point.

3.2 Geology

The North Carolina Geological Map (Brown *et al.* 1985) describes the primary geologic unit in the vicinity of the CWMB to be the Yorktown and Duplin Formations, Undivided, of Tertiary Age. The Yorktown Formation is described as a fossiliferous clay with varying amounts of fine-

grained sand, bluish-gray (gleyed), with shell material commonly concentrated in lenses, and mainly present in areas north of the Neuse River. The Duplin Formation is described as a bluish gray, shelly, medium to coarse grained sand, sandy marl, and limestone occurring mainly in the area south of the Neuse River (Brown *et al.* 1985).

The subsurface investigation revealed that deeper sediments become gleyed in color and consist of marine sediments. The underlying Geologic Formation at the CWMB was confirmed as the Tertiary-aged Yorktown and Duplin formation. Geological cross sections of the CWMB are presented in the *Subsurface Investigation and Hydrogeological Assessment* (ESI 2000a).

Soil borings in the Phase I area revealed shallow clay in numerous locations at depths ranging from 0.5 to 5.5 ft below land surface. The borings installed during soil mapping indicate that the shallow clays are generally localized and are not present as a continuous stratum. At several other locations clay was not encountered until reaching a clay layer within the Yorktown/Duplin Formation at depths ranging from 11 to 45 ft below land surface. The type and thickness of the shallow clay varied from organic rich mucky clay to stiff, plastic, silty clays.

Soil borings in the Phase II area, which is farther north and more distant from Long Lake, encountered shallow clay layers at depths ranging from 0.5 to 5.5 ft below land surface at several locations. The borings installed during soil mapping indicate that some of the shallow clays are generally localized and are not present as a continuous stratum. In all borings below the clay bearing stratum, an unconsolidated sand was encountered at an average depth of 5 ft below land surface that prevented further advance of the hand auger borings. This sand was also present in the other boring locations in the Phase II area.

In some locations, the clay layer extended below the invert of the nearest ditch/canal, while in others it did not. In areas where the inverts of the ditches are below the bottom of the shallow clay layer, a hydraulic connection between the upper and lower shallow saturated zones would have been established. These areas are discussed in Section 4.1. Section 4.1 also summarizes the results of the detailed investigations of subsurface and hydrogeological investigations conducted for the CWMB (ESI 2000a).

3.3 Water Resources

A summary is provided of surface waters present on the CWMB (Section 3.3.1), water quality (Section 3.3.2), and Neuse River Drainage Basin Buffer Rules (Section 3.3.3). A summary of the results of more detailed investigations of surface waters is presented in Section 4.2.

3.3.1 Surface Waters

The northeastern shore of Long Lake forms the southern boundary of the CWMB. Long Lake is located at a higher elevation than most of the CWMB and is presumed to have provided a substantial amount of radial to lateral groundwater flow into the historic wetlands. Long Lake is approximately 1125 acres in size with an average depth of 3 ft and a maximum depth of 5 ft (DEHNR 1996). Groundwater flow from Long Lake historically extended through Gum Swamp and into East Prong Brice Creek.

Two main stream channels are present on the CWMB or form part of the boundary. These streams are East Prong Brice Creek and an unnamed tributary to East Prong Brice Creek (hereafter referred to as the Oates Branch). In total, approximately 15,030 linear ft of stream channel exists within the CWMB or form part of the boundary.

East Prong Brice Creek, which originates on the CWMB, forms part of the northeastern boundary of the CWMB. Approximately 8770 linear ft of stream channel comprises the northeast boundary; most of the stream channel along the boundary has been channelized and straightened. Additionally, 720 linear ft of the stream channel of East Prong Brice Creek occurs from the origin on the CWMB to the boundary and an additional approximately 153 linear ft of a side branch to the main channel also occurs on the CWMB.

- From its origin to the CWMB boundary, East Prong Brice Creek has been classified as an **"E"** type stream. **"E"** type streams are gently to moderately sloped, relatively deep and narrow, slightly entrenched channels with high sinuosity. From the point where it begins to follow the CWMB boundary downstream to the boundary between Management Units 2A and 2B, East Prong Brice Creek has been channelized and is contained within large berms. This segment alternates between a **"B"** type stream and **"G"** type stream, depending on site specific conditions. **"B"** type streams are moderately sloped, relatively wide and shallow, moderately entrenched channels with low to moderate sinuosity. **"G"** type streams are moderately to gently sloped, relatively deep and narrow, highly entrenched, moderately to highly sinuous channels. East Prong Brice Creek alternates between an **"E"** type stream and **"C"** type stream for most of its length from the 2A/2B boundary downstream to the crossing at Catfish Lake Road. **"C"** type streams are gently sloped, relatively wide and shallow, slightly entrenched channels with moderate to high sinuosity.

The Oates Branch is located in the northern portion of the CWMB. The Oates Branch flows northward from its origin on the CWMB to its confluence with East Prong Brice Creek along the CWMB property boundary near Catfish Lake Road. The entire main stream channel for the Oates Branch, which is approximately 4809 linear ft, is contained on the CWMB. Approximately 275 ft of the total represents an impounded stretch where the channel was not mapped. An additional approximately 578 linear ft of side branches to the main channel also occur on the CWMB. Ditching through the headwaters of this system has intercepted a substantial amount of groundwater and surface water flow, effectively isolating the Oates Branch from most of its historic watershed.

- The Oates Branch alternates from a **"DA"** type stream to a **"C"** type stream from its origin to the center of Management Unit 5. **"DA"** type streams are highly interconnected, very gently sloped channel systems associated with broad, unconfined valleys with well-developed floodplains. From the center of Management Unit 5 downstream to the boundary between Management Units 5 and 2A, the Oates Branch is characterized as a **"C"** type stream. Downstream from this point to its confluence with East Prong Brice Creek, the Oates Branch has been subjected to impoundment activities by beavers.

A large portion of the interstream area between Long Lake and the headwaters of East Prong Brice Creek is dominated by the remains of Gum Swamp, which historically appeared to be a large, nonriverine forested wetland system.

3.3.2 Water Quality

East Prong Brice Creek has not been assigned a stream index number (SIN) or separate best use classification by the Division of Water Quality, but carries the same **C Sw NSW** classification as its receiving water, Brice Creek (SIN 27-101-40-[1]) (DEM 1993a). Gum Swamp and Long Lake (SIN 27-101-40-2) have been assigned the same **C Sw NSW** classification. Class **C** waters are freshwaters protected for secondary recreation, fishing, aquatic life (including propagation and survival), and wildlife. The **Sw** supplemental classification refers to swamp waters, which are waters with low velocities and other natural characteristics different from adjacent streams. The **NSW** supplemental designation refers to Nutrient Sensitive Waters that are waters subject to growths of microscopic or macroscopic vegetation and as such, require limitations on nutrient inputs. There are no High Quality Waters (**HQW**), Outstanding Resources Waters (**ORW**), Water Supply I (**WS-I**), or Water Supply II (**WS-II**) waters within 2 mi of the CWMB. East Prong Brice Creek is not designated as a North Carolina Natural and Scenic River, nor is it designated as a national Wild and Scenic River.

Brice Creek and tributaries are characterized as "partially supporting" their designated use (DEM 1993b). Non-point sources are identified as problems affecting pH and dissolved oxygen in Brice Creek near Riverdale (SR 1101). Long Lake is an oligotrophic lake fully supporting its designated uses in 1995 (DEM 1996). There are no NPDES discharges into the Brice Creek system (DEM 1993b). Another measure of water quality is provided by long-term studies of benthic macroinvertebrate populations. No benthic macroinvertebrate study sites are located in East Prong Brice Creek, but a special study site is located on West Prong Brice Creek approximately 3.9 mi west of the CWMB. This West Prong Brice Creek study site, sampled as part of a study to identify undisturbed coastal blackwater swamps, received a bioclassification of "good" rather than "excellent" due to stresses from naturally low pH (DEM 1993b). Wetlands mitigation activities at the CWMB will protect water quality in this nutrient sensitive watershed by providing protection against non-point source discharges within a large portion of the East Prong Brice Creek watershed.

3.3.3 Neuse River Drainage Basin Buffer Rules

Temporary rules for the protection and maintenance of riparian buffers in the Neuse River Basin became effective as permanent rules on August 1, 2000 (15A NCAC 2B .0233). These riparian buffer rules protect riparian areas immediately adjacent to surface waters within the Neuse River Basin, including intermittent and perennial streams, lakes, ponds, and estuaries. For the purposes of this rule, a surface water is considered present if the feature is approximately shown as a water feature on either the most current version of the NRCS county soil survey map or the most recent version of the 1:24000 scale (7.5 minute) quadrangle USGS topographic maps.

A review of the applicable mapping (USDA 1989, USGS 1994a) indicates that Long Lake is present as a surface water subject to the Rules. East Prong Brice Creek is depicted on USGS maps (USGS 1994a, 1994b) as extending for a distance of only approximately 250 ft upstream

of Catfish Lake Road, but is depicted on NRCS maps (USDA 1989) as extending along the northeast boundary of the CWMB from Catfish Lake Road to the eastern boundary of Management Unit 3. The East Prong Brice Creek channel was verified, field-delineated to its origin, and GPS mapped. The Oates Branch is not depicted on USGS topographic quadrangles, but is present on NRCS soil mapping as occurring in Management Units 2A and 5; this stream channel was verified, field-delineated upstream to the point where stream function is no longer present, and mapped using GPS technology.

NRCS soil mapping indicates two small tributaries extending from the CWMB into East Prong Brice Creek in the north-central portion of the site; an extensive ditch network exists in the vicinity of these two features. Field investigations failed to find defined stream channels for either feature. Another channel is shown within the CWMB boundary on NRCS soil mapping as crossing the northwestern portion of the CWMB parallel and adjacent to Catfish Lake Road; field investigations indicate this feature is acting more as a roadside ditch than a stream. This feature is currently subject to the Rules, but is located in an area of the CWMB not slated for any clearing activities. Two of the borrow pits on the CWMB show up on USGS topographic maps as surface waters; both areas have been confirmed as seasonally flooded or saturated.

3.4 Soils

Figure 3-2 presents soils mapping for the CWMB. This map includes modifications to the NRCS county soils mapping for the CWMB based on detailed soil investigations conducted under the direction of a State of North Carolina Licensed Soil Scientist. Detailed investigations included confirmation of mapped series and evaluation of organic soil degradation.

Nonhydric soil mapping units account for less than 30 acres of the 4035-acre CWMB. Nonhydric soil boundaries have been delineated in the field and mapped using GPS technology. Nonhydric soil series on the CWMB include Goldsboro loamy fine sand and Lynchburg fine sandy loam.

The dominant hydric soils on the CWMB include Croatan muck (an organic soil), Bayboro mucky loam, and Pantego fine sandy loam. Other organic soils present include Dare muck along Long Lake and Dorovan muck along the upper floodplain of the headwaters of the Oates Branch. Masontown mucky fine sandy loam, found along the floodplain of the Oates Branch, and Murville mucky loamy sand, found along the interstream divide, have relatively higher organic content compared to other mapped mineral soils. Muckalee sandy loam is also found along the Oates Branch floodplain and would have been frequently flooded under undisturbed conditions. The remaining hydric soils (Leaf silt loam, Leon sand, and Rains fine sandy loam) are found in broad flats and depressions. No Torhunta fine sandy loam was confirmed onsite despite intensive investigations in the area mapped as Torhunta on the NRCS county soils map. More detailed discussion of soils is provided in the *Subsurface Investigation and Hydrogeological Assessment* (ESI 2000a).

3.5 Plant Communities

The CWMB has seen heavy degradation of its natural plant communities over the last several decades. Ditching has altered natural hydrologic patterns across the CWMB. The CWMB was actively managed for forest production for nearly 50 years prior to purchase by NCDOT. During

this period (and prior to this period), most of the desirable hardwood species were removed. Successional, opportunistic hardwoods such as sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*) and red maple (*Acer rubrum*) along with swamp red bay (*Persea palustris*) have achieved dominance in stands that under natural conditions should be dominated by bald cypress (*Taxodium distichum*), swamp tupelo (*Nyssa biflora*), Atlantic white cedar (*Chamaecyparis thyoides*), and a mixture of hydrophytic oaks (*Quercus* spp.). The CWMB presently contains a mix of forested stands of varying degrees of disturbance, regenerating cut-overs, and recent clear cuts. Figure 3-3 presents a recent (March 1997) aerial photograph of the CWMB with the existing vegetation communities.

Although most communities have been altered, many areas retain characteristics of natural communities as described in Schafale and Weakley (1990). Natural communities present on the CWMB include: Bay Forest, Coastal Plain Small Stream Swamp (Blackwater Subtype), Nonriverine Swamp Forest, Nonriverine Wet Hardwood Forest, Wet Pine Flatwoods, Mesic Pine Flatwoods, and Natural Lake Shoreline. Target vegetation communities for the CWMB are presented in Section 5.3.1.

3.6 Wildlife

3.6.1 Terrestrial Wildlife

The location of the CWMB is nearly ideal with respect to wildlife and wildlife potential. The CWMB has a diversity of plant community types ranging from open areas to early-, mid-, and late-successional forests. Food, cover, nesting sites, and water are all available for a variety of wildlife species. The potential for wildlife is further enhanced by the presence of large, adjacent tracts of forest lands of the Croatan National Forest which nearly encircle the CWMB. The CWMB is a large, contiguous tract providing wildlife habitat for a variety of species and serving as a wildlife corridor for adjacent tracts designated as Croatan Game Lands on USFS property.

Of special note are area-sensitive species occurring on the CWMB. Area-sensitive species documented on the CWMB include black bear (*Ursus americanus*) and wild turkey (*Meleagris gallopavo*) which require large tracts of land for foraging. Area-sensitive Neotropical migrants that are conspicuous breeders in the extant forested areas of the CWMB include species such as Acadian flycatcher (*Empidonax virescens*), black-and-white warbler (*Mniotilta varia*), prothonotary warbler (*Prothonotaria citrea*), northern parula (*Parula americana*), black-throated green warbler (*Dendroica virens*), ovenbird (*Seiurus aurocapillus*), Kentucky warbler (*Oporornis formosus*), and hooded warbler (*Wilsonia citrina*). Mitigation activities resulting in maintenance of existing contiguous forested areas will benefit area-sensitive species. A list of wildlife species documented on the CWMB is provided in Appendix B.

3.6.2 Aquatic Wildlife

Fish species documented in waters of the CWMB are species common to the blackwater systems of this portion of the Coastal Plain. Limited observations and surveys in the Oates Branch and adjacent ditches documented yellow bullhead (*Ameirus natalis*), redfin pickerel (*Esox americanus*), eastern mudminnow (*Umbra pygmaea*), pirate perch (*Aphredoderus sayanus*), swampfish (*Chologaster cornuta*), and flier (*Centrarchus macropterus*) on the CWMB. Yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*) were documented in Long Lake.

The streams, lake, ditches, and borrow pits provide habitat for aquatic amphibians and reptiles. Species documented during the course of field investigations include a variety of species expected to occur in these types of habitats within this portion of the Coastal Plain. Commonly observed aquatic amphibians include green frog (*Rana clamitans*), southern leopard frog (*Rana utricularia*), and carpenter frog (*Rana virgatipes*). The most commonly observed aquatic reptile species documented on the CWMB include American alligator (*Alligator mississippiensis*), yellowbelly slider (*Trachemys scripta*), Florida cooter (*Chrysemys floridana*), spotted turtle (*Clemmys guttata*), redbelly watersnake (*Nerodia erythrogaster*), brown watersnake (*Nerodia taxispilota*), and cottonmouth (*Agkistrodon piscivorus*).

Waters of ditches, borrow pits, and depressional areas on the CWMB provide seasonal breeding pools for a variety of other amphibians. Breeding choruses were commonly heard for species including southern toad (*Bufo terrestris*), southern cricket frog (*Acris gryllus*), green treefrog (*Hyla cinerea*), pine woods treefrog (*Hyla femoralis*), Cope's gray treefrog (*Hyla chrysoscelis*), and little grass frog (*Limnaoedus ocularis*).

3.7 Threatened and Endangered Species

3.7.1 Federal Protected Species

Species with the federal classification of Endangered (E) or Threatened (T), or officially proposed (P) for such listing, are protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*). The most current FWS listing of federal protected species with ranges that extend into Craven County was obtained prior to initiation of the field investigation and periodically checked to verify changes. Table 3-1 presents the federal protected species listed for Craven County at the time of this current report (FWS list date April 12, 2001).

Table 3-1. Federal Protected Species Listed for Craven County.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status	Potential Habitat on CWMB	Biological Conclusion
American alligator	*Alligator mississippiensis*	T (S/A)	Yes	No Effect
Leatherback sea turtle	*Dermochelys coriacea*	E	No	No Effect
Bald eagle	*Halieaeetus leucocephalus*	T*	Yes	No Effect
Red-cockaded woodpecker	*Picoides borealis*	E	Yes	No Effect
Manatee	*Trichechus manatus*	E	No	No Effect
Sensitive joint-vetch	*Aeschynomene virginica*	E	Yes	No Effect

*proposed for delisting

NHP records were consulted prior to initiating the field investigation and periodically reviewed for changes. NHP records document the presence of American alligator in Long Lake. NHP records do not provide any documentation for the presence of any other federal protected species on the CWMB. Synopses for each of these species are provided in the following sections.

3.7.1.1 American Alligator

American alligator is federal listed as threatened due to similarity of appearance to other crocodilians. This species is not biologically endangered or threatened on the federal level, is not subject to Section 7 consultation, and does not require a biological conclusion. American alligator is State listed as Threatened and receives limited protection under state regulations. Field investigations documented American alligator in several locations on the CWMB including Long Lake, the Oates Branch, roadside ditches, and borrow pit ponds. Successful hatching of young by females was noted for individual alligators in 1999, 2000, and 2001. Alligators documented on the CWMB range from hatchlings to large adults. Excluding hatchlings, at least eight individual alligators have been documented on the CWMB.

3.7.1.2 Leatherback Sea Turtle

The leatherback sea turtle is distinguished by its large size (46- to 70-inch carapace, 650 to 1,500 pounds) and a ridged shell of soft, leathery skin (Martof *et al.* 1980). The leatherback sea turtle feeds extensively on jellyfish, although the diet includes other sea animals and seaweed. Although primarily tropical in distribution, the range of the leatherback sea turtle may extend to Nova Scotia and Newfoundland (Martof *et al.* 1980). The leatherback sea turtle sometimes moves into shallow bays, estuaries, and even river mouths.

Biological Conclusion: No Effect

There is no habitat on the CWMB for leatherback sea turtle. Implementation of the mitigation plan will not affect this species.

3.7.1.3 Bald Eagle

The bald eagle is a large raptor with a wingspan greater than 6 ft. Adult bald eagles are dark brown with white head and tail. Immature eagles are brown with whitish mottling on their tail, belly, and wing linings. Bald eagles typically feed on fish but may also take birds and small mammals. In the Carolinas, nesting season extends from December through May (Potter *et al.* 1980).

Bald eagles typically nest in tall, living trees in a conspicuous location near water and forage over large bodies of water with adjacent trees available for perching (Hamel 1992). Preventing disturbance activities within a primary zone extending 750 to 1,500 ft outward from a nest tree is considered critical for maintaining acceptable conditions for eagles (FWS 1987). FWS guidelines recommend avoiding any disturbance activities, including construction and tree-cutting, within this primary zone. Within a secondary zone extending from the primary zone boundary out to a distance of 1.0 mi from a nest tree, construction and land-clearing activities should be restricted to the non-nesting period. FWS also recommends avoiding alteration of natural shorelines where bald eagles forage and avoiding significant land-clearing activities within 1,500 ft of roosting sites.

Biological Conclusion: No Effect

Potential nesting habitat for bald eagle, consisting of tall, living trees near large open water bodies, exists on the CWMB along Long Lake. Two adult bald eagles were documented flying over the CWMB near Long Lake in December 1998; subsequent sightings of adults continued through spring 1999. An aerial survey was conducted of

the CWMB in June 1999. The aerial survey, utilizing a helicopter, surveyed for the presence of potential eagle nests along the shoreline of Long Lake and adjacent forested areas. No nests of sufficient size to be considered eagle nests were identified, but several osprey nests were identified. The pair of adult bald eagles was documented roosting in trees on the south shore of Long Lake during the aerial survey. Although eagle nesting was not documented on the CWMB, the continued presence of a pair of adult bald eagles through the 1998-1999 breeding season and confirmed presence in June 1999 indicates that nesting may be taking place nearby. Although bald eagle is proposed for delisting, to reduce the risk of disturbing nesting, roosting, or foraging activities of bald eagles utilizing Long Lake, the existing forested strip along the Long Lake shoreline will be maintained as part of CWMB mitigation plan. Road and ditch removal activities within 1.0 mi of the Long Lake shoreline will be avoided during the December through May nesting season.

3.7.1.4 Red-cockaded Woodpecker

The red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) is a small woodpecker identified by a black head, prominent white cheek patch, black-and-white barred back and distinctive call. RCWs are found in association with a group, which is a cooperative breeding group consisting of a breeding pair and one or more male offspring that were fledged in the previous one to three years (Hooper *et al.* 1980).

The RCW is endemic to pine forests of the southeastern United States. In North Carolina, the RCW is most prevalent in the Sandhills and Coastal Plain (Hamel 1992). Primary RCW habitat consists of mature to over-mature southern pine forests. Traditionally, pine flatwoods or pine-dominated savannas which have been maintained by frequent fires serve as ideal nesting and foraging sites for RCWs. Nesting and roosting cavities are constructed in the heartwood of living pines which are generally older than 60 years and often infected with red-heart fungus (*Fomes pini*). Cavities are usually located 20 to 50 ft above ground and below live branches. Development of a thick understory may result in abandonment of cavity trees. The resinous buildup around cavity openings allows for easy detection during surveys for RCWs. Most cavity trees tend to be clustered such that a cluster can typically be encompassed by a circle 1500 ft in diameter, although some cavity trees can be as much as 0.5 mi apart (Hooper *et al.* 1980).

RCW foraging areas are typically centered on cluster sites and range in size from 100 acres to as much as 1000 acres, depending on the quality of habitat (Hooper *et al.* 1980). RCWs typically forage on pines in stands aged 30 years or older within 0.5 mi of the cluster site (Henry 1989). Stands dominated by pines larger than 9 inches dbh are considered to provide good foraging habitat, but RCWs will forage in stands dominated by pines 4 to 9 inches dbh (Hooper *et al.* 1980). Extreme impacts to foraging habitat can lead to reduced productivity and/or abandonment of the cluster site. Minor habitat changes within the foraging range may have little or no impact to RCW behavior patterns.

Biological Conclusion: No Effect

NHP records indicate that one inactive and eight active RCW clusters have been documented within 2.0 mi of the CWMB; none are within 0.5 mi of the CWMB. Surveys were conducted for RCWs due to the presence of active clusters in close proximity to the

CWMB and the presence of potentially suitable nesting and foraging habitat on the CWMB. Aerial surveys were conducted by ESI biologists in June 1999 for all stands of pines, pine-hardwoods, and hardwood-pines trees on the CWMB as well as within 0.5 mi of the CWMB that may be affected by mitigation implementation activities. The aerial survey was conducted using a Robinson R22 piston-powered helicopter flown by a pilot from Raleigh Helicopters with previous experience conducting RCW aerial surveys. Prior to initiation of surveys, a known RCW cluster located within 2.0 mi of the CWMB was visited by biologists for field familiarization with local conditions for the species; overflights of this or another nearby site were also conducted to familiarize the biologists with RCW cavity trees from the air. Aerial surveys consisted of slow passes along north-south transects, spaced between approximately 250 to 500 ft apart, depending on stand canopy density. Surveys were conducted by flying at low speeds over potential RCW nesting habitat at a height ranging from 10 to 50 ft above the forest canopy. Any trees with suspicious cavities or sap flow were mapped and then ground-truthed to determine if RCW activity was involved.

Systematic surveys revealed no evidence of RCW activity on the CWMB or within 0.5 mi of the CWMB. A cluster of artificial cavities was identified within 0.5 mi of the CWMB entrance; discussions with the USFS indicated that this artificial cavity site has not been occupied by RCWs (Megan Martoglio, personal communication, 4 August 1999). No evidence of RCWs was found during ground-truthing.

Implementation of the mitigation plan at the CWMB will not adversely affect RCW. Existing mature pine stands will not be cleared and young pine stands will be thinned to promote better potential foraging habitat. The planting plan incorporates establishing pines in selected disturbed areas to provide for eventual linkage of pine stands on the CWMB with suitable RCW habitat located northwest of the CWMB and with suitable RCW habitat located southeast of the CWMB.

3.7.1.5 Manatee

The manatee is a large aquatic mammal that averages 10 to 13 ft in length and weighs up to 1,000 pounds. The manatee maintains a year-round presence in Florida (FWS 1993). During summer months manatees may disperse from their normal Florida wintering areas up the east coast to as far north as Virginia. These mammals inhabit warm waters, both fresh and salt, where their diet consists mostly of aquatic vegetation (Webster *et al.* 1985).

Biological Conclusion: No Effect

There is no habitat on the CWMB for manatee. Implementation of the mitigation plan will not affect this species.

3.7.1.6 Sensitive Joint-vetch

Sensitive joint-vetch is a robust, bushy-branched, annual legume often exceeding 3 ft in height. Young stems have bristly hairs with large swollen bases (Leonard 1985). The alternate, compound leaves are even-pinnate, approximately 1.25 to 2 inches wide, with 30 to 56 toothless leaflets (Radford *et al.* 1968). Flowers are about 0.5 inch long, bright greenish-yellow with red veins, and are subtended by bractlets with toothed margins (Leonard 1985). The

flowers are produced on few-flowered racemes from July to October. The jointed legume (loment) is about 2 inches long, has 6 to 10 segments, and a 0.5- to 1.0-inch long stalk.

Habitat for this species in North Carolina consists of moist to wet coastal roadside ditches and moist fields that are nearly tidal (FWS 1994), especially in full sun (Leonard 1985). This species seems to favor microhabitats where there is some reduction in competition from other plant species, and usually some form of soil disturbance (FWS 1994).

Biological Conclusion: No Effect

During preliminary investigations, ten sites on the CWMB could not be eliminated from consideration as at least marginally suitable habitat for this species. These areas included selected roadside ditches near East Prong Brice Creek and Oates Branch, ditches that crossed clear-cuts and the powerline easement, and selected borrow pits. A field survey was conducted of these potentially suitable habitats by ESI biologists on 24-26 August 1999 to determine if sensitive joint-vetch is present on the CWMB. A reference population was visited to confirm the flowering status of sensitive joint-vetch prior to initiating on-site surveys. Surveys on the CWMB were conducted by walking transects 50 ft apart through all areas of potentially suitable habitat. No individuals of sensitive joint-vetch were observed during the survey. The development of the CWMB should not affect this species.

3.7.2 Federal Species of Concern and State Listed Species

The FWS also maintains a list of Federal Species of Concern (FSC). Species designated as FSC do not receive protection under the ESA unless formally proposed for listing. Most of these species are state listed and receive limited protection under state regulations. Species with the North Carolina status of Endangered (E), Threatened (T), or Special Concern (SC) receive limited protection under the North Carolina Endangered Species Act (G.S. 113-331 *et seq.*) and the North Carolina Plant Protection Act of 1979 (G.S. 106-202,12 *et seq.*).

Table 3-2 presents a list of species with the FSC designation listed for Craven County (FWS list dated April 21, 2001). State listing status is also given as well as the determination of whether potential habitat for these species is present on the CWMB. Potential habitat determinations were based on habitat descriptions provided in LeGrand *et al.* (2001) and Amoroso (1999).

NHP records were consulted before commencing the field investigation and periodically reviewed for changes. NHP records do not provide any documentation for the presence of FSC or state listed species on the CWMB.

NHP records indicate that Croatan crayfish (*Procambarus plumimanus*) has been documented in a roadside ditch adjacent to East Prong Brice Creek near the CWMB entrance off Catfish Lake Road. Crayfish were noted in many of the roadside ditches of the CWMB and may belong to this species.

Spring flowering goldenrod (*Solidago verna*) has also been documented along Catfish Lake Road near the CWMB entrance. Potential habitat on the CWMB for this species was investigated on 17 May 2000, following a visit to a reference population in Maysville, located in

Jones County. All roadside and cleared areas on the CWMB containing potential habitat and prominent species noted in association with the reference population were checked. No spring-flowering goldenrod were documented on the CWMB.

Limited habitat occurs on the CWMB for several other FSC and state-listed species. With the possible exception of Croatan crayfish, none of the FSC species were documented during the course of other field investigations; however, no surveys were conducted to determine the presence of any of these species.

In addition to the state-listed bald eagle and American alligator, two other species tracked by NHP were identified on the CWMB. A large number of black-throated green warblers (*Dendroica virens waynei*) (SR) were documented singing on territory throughout much of the extant bay forest on site. Timber rattlesnakes (*Crotalus horridus*) (SR, state listed as PSC) were commonly observed.

Table 3-2. Federal Species of Concern Listed for Craven County.

Common Name	Scientific Name	State Status*	Potential Habitat
Bachman's sparrow	*Aimophila aestivalis*	SC	Y
Southern hognose snake	*Heterodon simus*	SR (PSC)	Y
Black rail	*Laterallus jamaicensis*	SR	N
Croatan crayfish	*Procambarus plumimanus*	W3	Y
Annointed sallow moth	*Pyreferra ceromatica*	SR	Y
Carolina spleenwort	*Asplenium heteroresiliens*	E	N
Chapman's sedge	*Carex chapmanii*	W1	N
Venus flytrap	*Dionaea muscipula*	C-SC	Y
White wicky	*Kalmia cuneata*	E-SC	Y
Pondspice	*Litsea aestivalis*	C	Y
Godfrey's sandwort	*Minuartia godfreyi*	E	N
Loose watermilfoil	*Myriophyllum laxum*	-	Y
Savanna cowbane	*Oxypolis ternata*	W1	Y
Spring-flowering goldenrod	*Solidago verna*	T	Y
Carolina asphodel	*Tofieldia glabra*	C	Y

*Note: Status of Significantly Rare (SR), or Watch List species (W) are NHP designations and do not confer state protection on these species.

3.8 Wetlands

A large proportion of the interstream area between Long Lake and the headwaters of East Prong Brice Creek is dominated by the remains of Gum Swamp, which historically appeared to be a large, nonriverine wetland forest system. Field efforts were undertaken to delineate the extent of jurisdictional wetlands on the CWMB. Figure 3-4 presents the results of the jurisdictional delineation. The jurisdictional delineation indicates that wetlands may remain on an estimated 2391 acres of the approximately 3826 acres of nonriverine hydric soils presumed to have been present historically.

The jurisdictional delineation and soils mapping indicate that wetlands may remain on an estimated 129 acres of the approximately 179 acres of riverine influenced soils presumed to have been present historically. These riverine wetlands are associated with channels of East Prong Brice Creek along the northeastern boundary and the Oates Branch located within the northwestern portion of the CWMB. Field efforts were undertaken to delineate and characterize the stream channels (see Section 3.3.1) and associated floodplain wetlands.

Approximately 17 miles of large roadside ditches and more than 11 miles of other ditches have been identified on the CWMB. A review of historic aerial photography shows that ditch construction was initiated between 1949 and 1964. Most of the road and ditch network was completed before 1974. Under historic conditions, the majority of the interior wetlands associated with Gum Swamp likely served as an above-headwater storage area for East Prong Brice Creek. The southern portion of the CWMB also historically received hydrologic input from groundwater flow from Long Lake.

Field evaluations, ditch drainage modeling, surficial monitoring well data, and jurisdictional delineation show that the ditches have depressed adjacent water tables throughout much of the CWMB. Most of the areas currently considered jurisdictional have greatly reduced hydroperiods compared to hydrologic reference wells in similar soil types and compared to published data. Extensive artificial drainage features throughout the CWMB have resulted in subsidence of organic layers within the organic soils.

3.9 Cultural Resources

Background data collection efforts indicate that one previously recorded site is within the CWMB. This site (31CV37**) that was apparently first recorded by Loftfield in 1987, and later revisited by Harmon and Ruesch, consisted of a scatter of late 19th/20th Century artifacts in a location that corresponds with a structure shown on 1929 soil and 1983 topographic maps. The site was judged to be not significant, and no additional work was recommended (Mike Harmon, personal communication, 1999). This location was not visited during the present field study.

A reconnaissance survey of the CWMB was conducted in June 1999 by ESI archaeologists. Surface inspection and limited testing were conducted in locations that exhibited the potential to contain prehistoric and historic sites or structures. With the exception of one previously recorded site (31CV37**) and an isolated occurrence of 20th century material, no prehistoric or historic sites are known to occur within the CWMB. Based on the results of this investigation (ESI, August 1999), and the poorly drained characteristics of the property, the CWMB was determined to represent a low probability for containing significant cultural resources.

3.10 Hazardous Materials

As part of the preliminary feasibility investigation, in June 1997 ESI conducted a vehicular reconnaissance of the CWMB to identify visible conditions warranting potential environmental concern. One structure was observed near the southwestern property boundary, situated on the shore of Long Lake. This structure appeared to be used occasionally as a hunting and/or fishing camp, and several out-buildings were associated with it. An empty 55-gallon drum, a container of unknown contents, and a discarded battery were observed in the vicinity of one of the out-buildings; however, no dead vegetation or soil staining was noted in the area.

Reconnaissance of the remainder of the CWMB revealed a rusted tractor and motor grader (subsequently removed from the premises), discarded empty containers, and very minor dumping; however, no dead vegetation or soil staining was observed in connection with these objects.

Limited research was conducted in order to determine whether activities at properties/facilities within specified radii influence the environmental integrity of the CWMB. No facilities were listed within the parameters of the database search.

Based on field observations and limited records research, no obvious sources of contamination are associated with the CWMB that may affect its use or development as a wetlands mitigation bank. Therefore, no further environmental hazardous materials inquiry was recommended for this site.

As part of the hydrogeologic assessment, hydraulic conductivity data were collected from surficial soils to facilitate the modeling effort for predicting hydrologic restoration and enhancement. Hydraulic conductivity was determined by administering slug tests (*in situ* rising head tests).

The ground water modeling software selected as most appropriate for simulating shallow subsurface conditions and ground water behavior at the site was DRAINMOD. This model, developed by Dr. R.W. Skaggs of North Carolina State University (NCSU), simulates the performance of water table management systems. The model was originally developed to simulate the performance of agricultural drainage and water table control systems on sites with shallow water table conditions. DRAINMOD was subsequently modified for application to wetland studies by adding a counter that accumulates the number of times the water table rises above a specified depth and remains there for a given duration during the growing season. The model results can then be analyzed to determine if wetland hydrology criteria are satisfied during the growing season, on average, more frequently than 50 percent of the years modeled. Required model inputs include the threshold water table depth, required duration of high water tables, and beginning and ending dates of the growing season. Output from the DRAINMOD model was applied to the CWMB to determine which areas were not likely to achieve wetland hydrology.

DRAINMOD performs water balances in the soil-water regime at the midpoint between two drains of equal elevation. The model is capable of calculating hourly values for water table depth, surface runoff, subsurface drainage, infiltration, and actual evapotranspiration over long periods of climatological data. The reliability of DRAINMOD has been tested for a wide range of soil, crop, and climatological conditions. Results of tests in North Carolina (Skaggs 1982), Ohio (Skaggs *et al.* 1981), Louisiana (Gayle *et al.* 1985; Fouss *et al.* 1987), Florida (Rogers 1985), Michigan (Belcher and Merva 1987), and Belgium (Susanto *et al.* 1987) indicate the model can be used to reliably predict water table elevations and drain flow rates. DRAINMOD has also been used to evaluate wetland hydrology (Skaggs *et al.* 1991; Skaggs *et al.* 1993).

DRAINMOD was used to simulate existing conditions and conditions under a variety of restoration scenarios to determine the preferred alternative from both a hydrologic restoration perspective as well as a cost perspective. DRAINMOD was instrumental in modeling and forecasting the extent of hydrologic enhancement potential available for existing degraded jurisdictional wetlands on the CWMB.

As part of the hydrology monitoring, three rain gauge stations, 17 surface water gauges, and 151 shallow monitoring well stations have been established on the CWMB. Surface water gauges consist of RDS WL-80 (80-inch) Continuous Monitoring Wells installed within the ditch network of CWMB, Long Lake, and East Prong Brice Creek. Shallow monitoring well stations consist of RDS WL-20 (20-inch) and WL-40 (40-inch) Continuous Monitoring Wells installed individually or clustered. Rain gauges consisted of Infinities USA, Inc., Rain Gauge Data Loggers, which record rainfall in 0.01-inch increments.

Reference wetland hydrology data are being collected using shallow monitoring wells installed at five on-site locations and five off-site reference wetland locations. On-site reference wetland

monitoring sites are located along the periphery of the CWMB in areas with little hydrologic disturbance. Off-site reference wetland monitoring sites are located in close proximity to the CWMB on USFS lands. Hydrology monitoring data were used to aid in validating jurisdictional delineations, to establish baseline groundwater hydrology data (pre-implementation conditions), and to validate modeling efforts. Hydrology monitoring following implementation will be used to document mitigation success.

Results of the jurisdictional delineation as well as predictive modeling supported by available data from the groundwater monitoring wells and reference wells were used to generate the various components of mitigation areas (*i.e.*, restoration, enhancement, preservation) on the CWMB. Results of this determination are presented in Section 8.1.

4.2 Surface Water Investigation

Hydrologic and hydraulic (H&H) analyses were conducted to model surface water runoff potential and estimate flows for watersheds and flow networks on the CWMB. The ability to predict surface water runoff potential was necessary for future design of water control and other features at this site in addition to understanding site hydrology. H&H analyses were conducted by EEPC in 1998 and 1999. Details of these investigations are presented in summary reports (EEPC 1998, EEPC 2000).

The CWMB was visited for site characterization purposes and to take specific measurements of stream flow and other site features. Visits were also made to the CWMB to observe characteristics of site and surrounding area, verify surface and channel flow conditions, and observe water conveyance structures. Drainage catchments were initially identified using topographic data from USGS maps. This delineation was confirmed by visual observation during site visits. Aerial topographic survey data were used in watershed delineation where feasible.

A conceptual connectivity diagram of the ditch/stream/lake network was developed based on site data. This network was confirmed by visual observation during site visits. This information was later used in both hydrologic and hydraulic modeling of site conditions. Soils, cover, and land use data were used to assign Soil Conservation Service (SCS) runoff Curve Numbers (CN) to the various watershed elements.

Velocities were measured at select channel locations after rainfall events for use in developing stage-discharge relationships. The use of stage-discharge relationships at key site locations allowed for the conversion of water surface elevations to estimated channel discharges during the collection period.

Site data were collected and reduced to a useable format and selected portions were used in model calibration and verification. Using rainfall data from each of the three rain gauges, an areal averaging technique was used to determine probable average rainfall over specific watershed elements.

To develop a hydrologic model of the contributing watersheds, several options for modeling were evaluated. Both existing and future developed conditions were analyzed. The model included allowances for Base Flow Recession during storm events.

A hydraulic model was developed of the existing and future ditch/stream channel network. Models were later calibrated to more closely match site conditions based on site observations.

Site features were selected and evaluated in an attempt to attain site restoration goals. These included increases in hydroperiods for soils in select locations rather than across the entire site. Site features were selected for existing channels to meet wetland hydrology goals. To attain site hydrology goals, recommendations for modifications or removal of existing roadways were made to restore surface water flow conditions.

After proposed conceptual designs for restoring wetland hydrology were identified, their effects were evaluated on surrounding properties and other areas of the site. Evaluation of site flood levels before and after recommended hydraulic modifications was important to reduce the possibility of undesirable effects on surrounding properties and on the site itself. The potential for flooding of off-site properties due to the proposed site modifications was evaluated.

Upon completion of the analysis and development of conceptual designs, conceptual site plans and a report documenting findings and recommendations was prepared (EEPC 2000).

4.3 Vegetation Evaluation

A detailed evaluation of existing CWMB vegetative community composition and structure was conducted to develop a planting plan that incorporates existing vegetation wherever possible. Site mapping and stand evaluations were undertaken to identify components and maturity of existing vegetative community units on the CWMB. These data were used to aid in preparation of stand prescriptions and planting plan. The planting plan was developed in coordination with the NCDOT Roadside Environmental Unit, which will oversee implementation of the planting plan. The North Carolina Division of Forest Resources provided recommendations for meeting the objectives of the CWMB planting plan.

5.0 WETLAND MITIGATION PLAN

Without implementation of the CWMB, the site would be expected to be used primarily for timber production with the areas containing drained hydric soils candidates for intensive silvicultural plantation operations. No net loss or gain in wetland acreage is expected; however, some loss in wetland function is expected. Within existing organic soil wetlands, degradation of soils is expected to continue in the absence of hydrologic restoration. With continuing oxidation of organic soils, loss of mature trees in these areas is expected to continue. Some loss in wetland function is expected to accompany the reduction in water storage and retention capacity.

A wetland mitigation plan has been developed to address hydrologic concerns across the CWMB and to restore vegetative communities in suitable areas.

5.1 Proposed Site Hydrology Treatments

In order to assist in a return of site hydrology to a more natural condition, sections of the existing road and ditch network will require removal or modification. However, to allow continued access to a large portion of the CWMB, some roads must remain in place. As such, various "treatments" or methods must be applied across the CWMB to meet hydrologic goals. These various treatments are described below.

5.1.1 Site Ditch Removal and Modifications

Existing roads and ditches must allow for conveyance of both surface and groundwater along the desired "natural" flow path. Figure 5-1 provides a schematic of the ditch network and natural drainage features. At first glance, one obvious solution might be to return existing road materials into the ditches with the hope that historic hydrology would return. Unfortunately, although some benefits might be realized through this method, some problems exist in this approach. First, existing zones of compressed soil and the fill material returned to the ditch will serve to restrict groundwater movement perpendicular to the road/ditch axis. Second, it is likely that a significant volume of soil was lost due to erosion, oxidation, and consolidation. It is therefore unlikely that sufficient local soil materials exist to completely fill the ditches, and as such the potential exists for surface water to eventually become concentrated such that ditches are reformed. More significant to restoration success is the potential for the ditches to reform through erosion. This is particularly true where post-restoration flow will parallel the alignment of the existing ditches. Another problem of simply returning the road fill to the ditches is that the site would no longer have road access. Thus, additional work is required to restore and enhance hydrologic function while avoiding these problems. The additional work is discussed in the following sections.

5.1.1.1 Ditch Plugs

In order to eliminate flow in the existing ditch network, earth plugs will be installed in selected site ditches. Two types or sizes are proposed. The first type of plug is a "Point" ditch plug, serving to stop the longitudinal flow of water in an existing ditch while limiting the volume of fill required. These plugs will be constructed from fill material placed to the top of bank elevation over a discrete segment of the ditch. Details for proposed "Point" ditch plugs are shown in Figure 5-2. The second type of plug is a "Reach" ditch plug again serving to stop longitudinal

flow of water in an existing ditch, but requiring significantly more fill. Fill requirements could exceed that available from the adjacent road. These plugs would be constructed over substantial ditch lengths, possibly hundreds or even thousands of feet. Details for proposed "Reach" ditch plugs are shown in Figure 5-3.

Placement of "Point" ditch plugs would typically occur at locations where the surface water gradient is generally perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the ditch. Placement of "Reach" ditch plugs would typically occur at locations where the surface water gradient is generally parallel to the longitudinal axis of the ditch. The reach ditch plugs are placed along such reaches since, due to their orientation, a greater potential exists for surface waters to become concentrated leading to ditch reformation.

Locations of "Point" and "Reach" ditch plugs will be selected based on a localized assessment of surface conditions and local topography. An initial estimate of plug locations, based on hydrogeological, subsurface, jurisdictional wetland investigations by ESI, and reaches deemed critical to the restoration of natural hydrology by EEPC, is identified on Figure 5-4. Locations have been identified where the confining clay layer has been penetrated causing it to be desirable from a groundwater control standpoint to plug these ditch locations or reaches. These reaches to be plugged include all of channels (CH's) 14, 16, 20, and 21, as well as portions of CH's 13 and 18. Similarly, sections have been identified which will also require "Reach" ditch plugs along selected portions of the other reaches deemed critical to the restoration of natural hydrology. These reaches to be plugged include the remaining portions of CH 18, as well as CH's 2, 4, 5, and a portion of CH 12. Other "Reach" ditch plug locations may be identified during final design. "Point" ditch plug locations, occurring in many of the remaining channels, will be evaluated and identified during final design; these locations will be included in the final design plans.

5.1.1.2 Surface Water Diversions

To assist in the return of more natural surface water movement across the CWMB, particularly along ditches where the potential for surface waters to become concentrated, surface water diversions are proposed. These earthen berms, approximately 2 ft in height would be constructed perpendicular to, or at a slight angle to, the longitudinal axis of the ditch. Diversions could be as single entities, or as groups and, although they would be constructed to a standard height and depth, their length would be allowed to vary such that they could be tied to local topography to better serve their intended purpose. These diversions should be based on a localized assessment of surface conditions and local topography and may be field adjusted during construction. Details for proposed surface water diversions are shown in Figures 5-2 and 5-3.

5.1.1.3 Scarification of Consolidated Soils

Due to road construction, zones of consolidated, and therefore less pervious, soils are present beneath existing road segments. With ditch filling, fill materials may also be less permeable than surrounding soils. To what extent these zones limit the flow of groundwater is unknown and will likely vary across the CWMB. However, scarification (ripping) of all such areas perpendicular to the expected flow will create a greater horizontal permeability. This will aid in returning groundwater conveyance to a more natural condition. Where roads are to be

completely removed, scarification will be the least costly means of increasing horizontal groundwater conveyance. Scarification depth should be controlled to reduce the potential for penetrating confining layers. Unfortunately, for roads to remain in service, scarification is not a good alternative.

5.1.1.4 Removal of Existing Conveyance Structures

To assist in the achievement of site hydrology goals and better reduce the potential of surface flow returning to the existing channel network, all existing site culverts will be removed during the installation of "Point" and "Reach" ditch plugs as part of the restoration plan. Because restoration construction will occur generally in an upstream to downstream direction, the sequence of removal of site culverts is likely to occur in similar fashion.

As described in the *Preliminary Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analysis* (EEPC 1998) an outlet control structure does exist along the northeast side of Long Lake (POI 1). The structure appears to be in poor, if not unusable, condition, with the corrugated metal outlet barrel showing severe corrosion on exposed portions. Although no evidence of overtopping or surface flow was observed in the vicinity of the structure, the water control structure at Long Lake will be pressure grouted to seal and prevent future activation.

5.1.2 Site Road Modifications

To allow continued access to a large portion of the CWMB, some roads or road sections must remain in place, and as such steps must be taken to allow for conveyance of both surface and groundwater along the desired "natural" flow path. Details of which roads are to remain and which roads are to be removed are shown in Figure 5-5.

5.1.2.1 Improving Road Surface Course

Virtually all of the roads on the CWMB will be experiencing some type of modification. At some locations it is desired to completely remove the existing road. In these cases, road material would be used to fill ditches and entire cross-section would be scarified. A typical cross-section where the ditch is filled and the road removed is provided in Figure 5-6. A similar treatment will be applied at locations where roads will be removed coincident with natural drainage features. As a result of proposed site modifications, conditions where surface water exists within close vertical proximity of the remaining road surface are likely to occur more frequently. One result of this increased local water surface elevation is the degradation of existing subsurface conditions beneath the road, and in turn destabilization of the road surface itself. Accordingly, sections of road that are to remain open will require improvements for stability under these new conditions. The placement of a new compacted aggregate surface course is proposed. Details of an improved road cross-section are shown in Figure 5-7.

5.1.2.2 Surface Water Conveyance Measures

Using the synthesized hydrologic model (EEPC 2000), peak discharges were developed to be used to size required surface water conveyance structures. Since the model requires input of main channel length, centroid location, and watershed area the model could then be used for any locations around the project site. The Snyder's watershed timing coefficient, C_t, remains the same regardless of the location on the CWMB. Because the required structures are being designed for "Normal" site conditions, the SCS curve number (CN) associated with Antecedent

Moisture Condition II (AMC II) (Normal), in this case 80, is used. Additionally, a percent impervious of 23 for "Normal" site conditions is used.

Structures at road crossings, such as those at the CWMB, are sized to allow for the passage of the 10-Year peak discharge through a culvert or culverts, without erosion in the vicinity of the structure. In this case, at select natural drainage features, not only is the safe passage of the 10-Year peak discharge desirable, but the ability to safely pass the 100-Year discharge over the road, again without erosion, is preferred. Accordingly the developed 12-hour design storm depths for the 10-Year and 100-Year storms of 5.77 inches and 8.55 inches of rainfall respectively were used. The resulting storm event hyetographs from the modified SCS Type III Rainfall Distribution (EEPC 2000) were used.

Details of locations for permanent road crossings at natural drainage features that were evaluated for conveyance structure requirements are shown in Figure 5-8. Results of the peak discharge analyses at specific locations are shown in Table 5-1.

Table 5-1. Peak Design Discharges at Permanent Road Crossings.

	Permanent Road Crossing Number			
Recurrence Interval	PRC1	PRC2	PRC3	PRC4
10-Year	750 cfs*	1085 cfs	670 cfs	815 cfs
100-Year	1230 cfs	1780 cfs	1090 cfs	1335 cfs

*cubic ft/second

Each road crossing was then evaluated to determine alternative conveyance measures suitable for passing predicted peak discharges. At these crossings, differences in existing top of road elevation and existing natural ground elevation at the crossings ranged from approximately 1 to 3 ft. Because of the limited elevation change at the crossings, constraints are encountered on the maximum diameter of pipes that can be used. Two likely alternatives were considered for construction at locations where roads to be maintained cross existing natural drainage features.

If the ability to meet conveyance requirements is considered critical such that the potential for water to backup at crossings is small, then sufficient culvert capacity may necessitate an increased road elevation to obtain sufficient pipe cover. Typically, minimum pipe cover is considered 1 ft. Reinforced concrete pipe culverts ranging in size from 12- to 36-inches were considered in various configurations, with various combinations of pipe diameters. These pipes could be installed in conjunction with subsurface conveyance measures such as aggregrate drains, if needed. Culvert analyses were conducted for the 10-Year peak discharge only. Findings showed that even when using 30- and 36-inch diameter culverts, the number of pipes was large and would require an increase in road elevations to meet minimum cover requirements. Additionally, the use of culverts of smaller diameter would require the installation of too many culverts to be practical. Even with the larger culverts, crossings would still require design for overtopping of the existing road surface to safely pass the 100-Year discharge.

The second alternative for such road crossings is the installation of one or more smaller culverts at topographically low points along the road crossings to allow for the passage of daily

discharges. These culverts would be located such that they coincided with the apparent low points in local topography to reduce the potential for standing water in the vicinity of the crossing. The crossing itself would consist of an improved and hardened road surface that would allow for vehicular traffic, while simultaneously allowing for the passage of peak discharges over the road surface. An example of such a crossing configuration alternative is shown in Figures 5-9 and 5-10.

Preliminary analyses on conditions where allowable depth of head over road surface is varied between 6 inches up to as much as two feet indicate weir or ford lengths ranging from around 150 ft to many hundreds of feet. These crossing sites can be constructed in conjunction with subsurface conveyance measures such as aggregate drains, if needed. Improvements and armoring of the road surface at these locations may be required depending on design velocities.

5.1.2.3 Subsurface Aggregate Drains

As described previously, due to road construction significant consolidation of subsurface soils is likely beneath the existing road network. This has the effect of reducing horizontal conveyance of groundwater. Scarification is not compatible with roads that are to remain in service. For cases where groundwater conveyance is needed and the road must remain in service, aggregate drains would be a better choice. The aggregate drains can be sized and spaced such that the effective conveyance of the combined fill and drain section can be made equal to or greater than the undisturbed soils. Aggregates such as open graded sands and gravels have a higher permeability than on-site soils so a relatively small area of aggregate drain would be needed to dramatically increase effective conveyance. These drains would be installed in conjunction with surface conveyance measures such as culverts and lowered road crossings or ford sites as would be the case where roads are to remain as shown in Figures 5-9 and 5-10.

5.1.3 Locating Site Hydrology Treatments

As shown in Figures 5-5 and 5-8, approximate locations have already been identified for some specific site treatments. The type of treatment for roads and ditches is dependent on many factors. Because of the size of the site and the small variation in elevations over the CWMB, the locating of all site treatments as described above should be conducted through localized on-site evaluation during final design to be followed by confirmation during construction. Such evaluation includes, but is not limited to, local surface topography, existing road or ditch conditions, and expected future drainage conditions. In order to assure consistency in application of treatments and to estimate what features are likely to be applied at a given location on the project site the flow chart provided in Figure 5-11 can be used.

5.2 Proposed Soil Treatment

Since the majority of the CWMB has been documented as containing soils formed under hydric conditions, successful restoration or enhancement of hydrology to these applicable areas is all that proposed. No agricultural activities have been practiced on the CWMB, and disturbance to the soils other than that associated with ditch and road removal (see Section 5.1) is unwarranted.

5.3 Proposed Vegetation Treatment

As part of the mitigation banking process, NCDOT coordinated with the N.C. Divison of Forest Resources to evaluate a selective clearing and planting regimen across portions of the 4,035-acre CWMB. The specific targets of this regimen will vary across the CWMB, depending on site-specific conditions. Approximately 674.5 acres of cut-over and early successional areas will be cleared and replanted. Existing contiguous forested areas will be maintained.

Target planting areas will include riverine wetlands associated with East Prong Brice Creek and Oates Branch, and nonriverine wetlands throughout the remainder of the CWMB. Specific wetland community types targeted for restoration and/or enhancement on the CWMB are based on natural community descriptions presented by Schafale and Weakley (1990).

5.3.1 Target Communities

Vegetative restoration within the CWMB is based on a landscape approach and generally follows the U.S. Forest Service Forestwide Management Direction outlined in the proposed Croatan National Forest Land & Resource Management Plan (November 1999). Because of the nature of the forested communities proposed for restoration, active long-term management of these systems is imperative for success (see Section 10.0). Management of these systems may include selected herbicide treatment to reduce competition and allow for better survival and growth of target species, selected thinning of undesirable species, and limited use of prescribed fire. Long-term management would not include altering the vegetative composition or hydrologic regimes of these areas for commercial timber production nor the commercial harvesting of these areas.

Figure 5-12 depicts the target communities for the CWMB. Areas to be cleared and replanted with an appropriate mix of species are depicted in Figure 5-13. Communities are generally based on Schafale and Weakley Natural Community Descriptions (1990); however, the Nonriverine Wet Hardwood Forest (type b) is targeted with a pond pine (*Pinus serotina*) component to augment future RCW habitat (see Section 3.7.1.4). Target communities include:

- Coastal Plain Small Stream Swamp;
- Nonriverine Wet Hardwood Forest (type a);
- Nonriverine Wet Hardwood Forest (type b);
- Nonriverine Swamp Forest;
- Bay Forest
- Pond Pine Woodland;
- Wet Pine Flats, and
- Mesic Pine Flats.

Extensive areas of these communities will be restored through hydrologic restoration activities. No clearing or replanting of Bay Forest restoration areas is justified due to the maturity of the existing Bay Forest structure (see Figure 3-3). Although not quantified, other natural communities present on the CWMB will be preserved. Natural Lake Shoreline will be preserved to protect potential bald eagle roosting and foraging habitat; no clearing is proposed along the Natural Lake Shoreline. No plantings are proposed for the small excavated ponds which function as Small Depression Pond or Vernal Pool community types depending on local

hydrologic conditions; these small areas have not been segregated from adjacent community types.

Fifteen tree species are targeted for differing planting regimes within the CWMB. Species targeted for planting include river birch (*Betula nigra*), Atlantic white cedar, green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), loblolly bay (*Gordonia lasianthus*), swamp tupelo, longleaf pine (*Pinus palustris*), pond pine, loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*), laurel oak (*Quercus laurifolia*), overcup oak (*Quercus lyrata*), swamp chestnut oak (*Quercus michauxii*), water oak (*Quercus nigra*), cherrybark oak (*Quercus pagoda*), willow oak (*Quercus phellos*), and either bald cypress or pond cypress (*Taxodium ascendens*).

5.3.1.1 Coastal Plain Small Stream Swamp

Coastal Plain Small Stream Swamp community will be replanted on approximately 10.3 acres around East Prong Brice Creek and the Oates Branch. These replanting areas are located on Dorovan and Masontown/Muckalee soil series found within MUs 5 and 6. No clearing or replanting is proposed for the majority of Coastal Plain Small Stream Swamp in these MUs as well as on fluvial-based Bayboro soil series found within MUs 2A, 2B, 3, and 4A. This community type is associated with small stream areas and organic or fluvial soils. Target vegetation within this community include bald cypress, swamp tupelo, green ash, laurel oak, swamp chestnut oak, pond pine, and river birch.

5.3.1.2 Nonriverine Wet Hardwood Forest (type a)

Nonriverine Wet Hardwood Forest (type a) community will be replanted on approximately 100.9 acres of the Pantego soil series found in MUs 10B, 12A, 12B, and 13A. No clearing or replanting is proposed for the existing Nonriverine Wet Hardwood Forest found in the remainder of these MUs as well as MUs 4A, 4B, 8, 9, and 14. Target vegetation within this community includes swamp chestnut oak, laurel oak, cherrybark oak, water oak, willow oak, overcup oak, and swamp tupelo.

5.3.1.3 Nonriverine Wet Hardwood Forest (type b)

Nonriverine Wet Hardwood Forest (type b) community will be replanted on selected areas of the Bayboro, Leaf, and Pantego soil series. Approximately 342.1 acres will be replanted in MUs 2B, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10B, and 11. No clearing or replanting is proposed for the existing Nonriverine Wet Hardwood Forest with pond pine component in the remainder of these MUs as well as MUs 2A, 4A, 4B, 9, 10A, 13A, and 13B. Target vegetation within this community includes pond pine, swamp chestnut oak, laurel oak, cherrybark oak, water oak, willow oak, overcup oak, and swamp tupelo. The pond pine component of this community will be planted in higher relative densities along selected zones anticipated to provide linkage between pine-dominated areas to provide future habitat for the federally endangered RCW.

5.3.1.4 Nonriverine Swamp Forest

Nonriverine Swamp Forest community on the CWMB is associated with Croatan series, which is an organic soil not associated with any stream channels. Replanting will be conducted on approximately 11.4 acres in MU 14, which is a former impoundment area previously subjected to re-grading activities. No clearing or replanting is proposed for Nonriverine Swamp Forest

present in MUs 8, 9, 10A, 10C, and 12A. Target vegetation within this community includes bald cypress, swamp tupelo, Atlantic white cedar, pond pine, and green ash.

5.3.1.5 Bay Forest

Bay Forest community on the CWMB is associated with Croatan series, which is an organic soil not associated with any stream channels. No clearing or replanting of Bay Forest restoration areas is justified due to the maturity of the existing Bay Forest. Bay forest is present in MUs 4A, 4B, 8, 9, 10A, 10C, 13A, 13B, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18.

5.3.1.6 Pond Pine Woodland

Pond Pine Woodland community is associated with the Leon and Murville soil series; approximately 89.3 acres will be replanted in MUs 12A, 12B, 13A, 13B, and 16. No clearing or replanting is proposed for Pond Pine Woodland in the remainder of these MUs as well as MUs 1 and 15. Target vegetation for this community includes pond pine, loblolly bay, Atlantic white cedar, and loblolly pine. Mature Pond Pine Woodland can serve as habitat for the federally endangered RCW.

5.3.1.7 Wet Pine Flats

Wet Pine Flats community is associated with the Leon, Pantego, and Rains soil series; approximately 117.2 acres will be replanted in MUs 5, 10B, 10C, 11, 12A, 12B, 13B, and 16. No clearing or replanting is proposed for Wet Pine Flats in the remainder of these MUs as well as MUs 1, 2A, 6, 15, 17, and 18. Target vegetation for this community includes longleaf pine, loblolly pine, and pond pine.

5.3.1.8 Mesic Pine Flats

The Mesic Pine Flats community is associated with the nonhydric soils within the CWMB, the Goldsboro and Lynchburg series, as well as selected areas of Leon soils where hydrology is not thought to be restorable. These nonhydric soils are limited in area and scattered throughout the northern portion of the CWMB. The minor amount of nonhydric soil pockets scattered on the CWMB were evaluated for reforestation efforts targeting the nonjurisdictional Mesic Pine Flats community type; selected areas containing degraded vegetation have been targeted for revegetation. The areas targeted for Mesic Pine Flats replanting are relatively small and surrounded by larger areas being cleared and replanted with a similar mix of species (see Wet Pine Flats). Mesic Pine Flats community will be replanted on up to 3.3 acres in MUs 10B, 10C, 11, 12A, 12B, and 13B. No clearing or replanting is proposed for Mesic Pine Flats in the remainder of these MUs as well as MUs 2A, 2B, 5, and 16. Target vegetation for this community includes longleaf pine and loblolly pine, with longleaf pine concentrated in the core of the nonhydric soil areas and loblolly pine placed in the transition zone grading into adjacent areas.

5.3.2 Site Preparation

Areas which are currently targeted for vegetative restoration are those areas which have been previously subjected to silvicultural clearing and currently contain few, if any, tree sized stems. Efforts were made to preserve tree-sized stems of target species within these areas. Figure 5-13 depicts the areas cleared for replanting. These areas generally contained shrubby species

of varying densities. Clearing methods and timing were dependent on the availability of contractors to conduct the work and weather constraints.

Two clearing methods were proposed. The first clearing method targeted a former impoundment located in MU14. This area contained herbaceous vegetation interspersed with large mounds that are currently vegetated with woody species. Site preparation for this regimen included mowing the herbaceous vegetation and applying herbicide; the mounds were left intact. This area was targeted for planting prior to the beginning of the 2002 growing season. The second method is targeted for the remaining areas within the Phase I and Phase II areas slated for re-vegetation. These areas were proposed to be subjected to drum chop treatment. Existing trees of target species within clearing areas were proposed to be left intact. Planting of these areas would occur in the appropriate season, depending on scheduled completion date of each respective phase and the availability of planting stock. The Phase I replanting areas were targeted for planting prior to the beginning of the 2002 growing season and the Phase II replanting areas were targeted for planting prior to the beginning of the 2003 growing season.

5.3.3 Planting

Planting is proposed to be conducted on 8-ft centers, resulting in the establishment of approximately 680 stems per acre. The vegetation planting will result in the initial establishment of approximately 456,000 stems within approximately 675 acres across the CWMB. Actual numbers will be dependent on availability of appropriate planting stock at the time of planting; plantings will meet or exceed target densities required for demonstrating success (see Section 7.2.2).

Table 5-1 contains a list of target restoration communities with specific species mixes. Species mixes are such that no single species, other than pond pine, comprises more than 11 percent of the total species composition across the entire CWMB. Pond pine, which is a dominant in many of the pre-disturbance natural communities found in the region, constitutes approximately 20 percent of the total plantings.

Responsibility for planting specifications, species acquisition, timing of planting, and planting oversight will be assumed by NCDOT Roadside Environmental Unit.

Table 5-2. Planting Regimen for the Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank. Totals include actual plantings in Phase I as well as projected plantings for Phase II.

	Target Vegetation Community							
	Coastal Plain Small Stream Swamp	Nonriverine Wet Hardwood Forest, type a	Nonriverine Wet Hardwood Forest, type b	Nonriverine Swamp Forest	Pond Pine Woodland	Wet Pine Flats	Mesic Pine Flats	TOTAL
	Acres Planted within each Target Community							
Target Area, Phase I	0	60.6	0	11.4	89.3	61.0	2.2	224.5
Total Area, Phase II	10.3	40.3	342.1	0	0	56.2	1.1	450.0
Total Area	10.3	100.9	342.1	11.4	89.3	117.2	3.3	674.5

Species	Number of Stems Planted (percent of total for each target community in parentheses)							
River Birch	701 (10)							701
Atlantic White Cedar				*	*			*
Green Ash	701 (10)			900 (11)				1,601
Loblolly Bay					*			*
Swamp Tupelo	1,754 (25)	10,414 (15)	34,941 (15)	1,700 (22)				48,809
Longleaf Pine						19,386 (24)	2,249 (100)	21,635
Pond Pine	701 (10)		23,294 (10)	1,700 (22)	37,300 (67)	27,473 (34)		90,468
Loblolly Pine					18,700 (33)	33,686 (42)		52,386
Laurel Oak	701 (10)	10,414 (15)	34,941 (15)					46,056
Overcup Oak		12,314 (18)	34,941 (15)					47,255
Swamp Chestnut Oak	701 (10)	10,314 (15)	34,941 (15)					45,956
Water Oak		6,942 (10)	23,294 (10)					30,236
Cherrybark Oak		8,514 (12)	23,294 (10)					31,808
Willow Oak		10, 514 (15)	23,294 (10)					33,808
Bald Cypess	1,754 (25)			3,500 (45)				5,254
Total	7,013	69,426	232,940	7,800	56,000	80,545	2,249	455,973

* may be planted if planting stock available

6.0 IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE

The CWMB is proposed for implementation in two phases, corresponding to the 1469.3-acre Phase I area and the 2565.3-acre Phase II area depicted in Figure 3-1. Phase I includes MUs 12A through 18. Phase II includes MUs 1 through 11. MUs are depicted in Figures 5-12 and 5-13.

Site preparation for the Phase I area began in Fall 2000, with appropriate areas replanted prior to the beginning of the 2002 growing season. Hydrologic modifications to Phase I began in 2001 and were completed prior to the beginning of the 2002 growing season. The 5-year monitoring period for Phase I will begin with the 2002 growing season.

Site preparation for the Phase II area began in Summer 2001. Unavailability of adequate planting stock in late 2001 prevented replanting prior to hydrologic modifications; however, appropriate areas are expected to be planted prior to March 2003. Hydrologic modifications began as Phase I implementation was nearing completion and Phase II is expected to be completed prior to the beginning of the 2003 growing season. The 5-year monitoring period for Phase II is expected to begin with the 2003 growing season or after completion of plantings and hydrologic modifications.

This schedule is based on current projections and is subject to revision. The projected credit release schedule is provided in Section 8.0.

7.0 MONITORING PLAN

Mitigation value at the CWMB is being gained primarily through hydrologic restoration and hydrologic enhancement. Limited clearing and replanting will be conducted in recent clear-cuts and early successional areas. The monitoring plan for the CWMB will include a direct hydrologic comparison between relatively undisturbed reference wetlands and wetland restoration/enhancement areas of the CWMB. The wetland hydrology restoration and enhancement success criteria will be based upon a comparative analysis between designated reference wetlands and the wetland mitigation site. Monitoring of wetland restoration and enhancement efforts will be performed until success criteria are fulfilled or 5 years, whichever is longer.

7.1 Hydrology

7.1.1 Hydrology Monitoring

Surficial monitoring wells were placed on the CWMB and within ten reference wetland sites along the CWMB periphery and nearby USFS property during 1998 and 1999. Locations of existing monitoring well stations are depicted on Figure 7-1. Additional wells will be placed on the CWMB and at reference sites following implementation to provide adequate coverage for documenting hydrologic restoration and enhancement. Additional wells to be installed on the CWMB to document hydrologic success will be placed in transects representative of the various soil types and mitigation treatments. Locations of all monitoring wells will be provided with the annual monitoring reports.

7.1.2 Hydrology Success Criteria

Hydrologic success criteria will include both of the following:

- inundation or saturation within 12 inches of the surface for at least 12.5 percent of the growing season for mineral soils and 25 percent of the growing season for organic soils and riverine restoration/enhancement areas, and

- the hydroperiod for restoration areas shall be within 50 percent of reference saturation or inundation depth, duration, and frequency for the first three years and shall be within 20 percent for years four and five.

If the 50 percent and 20 percent goals are not attained, a site visit will be conducted by the MBRT to determine the viability of the site.

7.2 Vegetation

7.2.1 Vegetation Monitoring

After planting has been completed in winter or early spring, an initial evaluation will be performed to verify planting methods and to verify initial composition and density. Supplemental planting and additional site modifications will be implemented, if necessary.

During the first year, vegetation will receive cursory, visual evaluation on a periodic basis to ascertain the degree of overtopping of planted elements by nuisance species. Subsequently, quantitative sampling of vegetation will be performed between August 1 and November 30 each growing season. Vegetative monitoring shall be performed for five years or until the success criteria have been met, whichever is longer.

The size and location of sample plots will conform to standards followed by the NCDOT Roadside Environmental Unit for mitigation sites. Vegetation monitoring plots will be approximately 50 ft x 50 ft, or 0.05 acre. Plots will be established within each replanted area at a density of approximately 1 plot per 12.5 acres. Plot locations will be established by NCDOT following site implementation and provided in the annual monitoring reports. Plot data will be averaged over the specific vegetative community type that is being planted.

7.2.2 Vegetation Success Criteria

Performance criteria will be met if sample plots demonstrate that specific tree survival goals are met annually. For each of the first three complete years of monitoring, 320 characteristic trees per acre must have survived such that at the end of three years, 320 three-year old characteristic trees per acre have survived in the planted areas. In years four and five, 288 and 260 characteristic trees per acre, respectively, must have survived on the site, such that at the end of year five, the site contains 260 characteristic trees five years of age. No quantitative sampling requirements are proposed for herb and shrub assemblages as part of the vegetative success criteria.

Characteristic tree species are those within the reference ecosystems as well as acceptable species considered natural components of the target community types as described in Schafale and Weakley (1990). Naturally recruited trees will not be counted towards the survival or density criteria.

Specific stand planting diversity and species representation (relative proportion) will be determined by target community type. Although not targeted for planting, species such as sweetbay (*Magnolia virginiana*), swamp red bay, and red maple may be anticipated in many of the target communities and would be acceptable for communities in which they are described as components in Schafale and Weakley (1990).

In existing forested areas where hydrologic restoration and enhancement is the goal, and no plantings are undertaken, no quantitative sampling is proposed. As part of the annual monitoring reports, however, the general condition of existing forest vegetation will be discussed. The general condition will be based on non-quantitative observations made during scheduled hydrology monitoring visits as well as site visits to monitor planted areas. General observations will note general condition, including apparent large-scale mortality, storm damage, colonization by invasive species, or any other noteworthy changes in apparent species composition or canopy density. If such changes are documented in the annual monitoring reports, a quantitative survey may be required by MBRT to determine if remedial action is necessary.

7.3 Soils

Since the majority of the CWMB has been documented as containing soils formed under hydric conditions, successful restoration or enhancement of hydrology to these applicable areas shall be considered successful attainment of the hydric soil criteria. No specific soil monitoring is proposed.

7.4 Report Submittal

An as-built report for each Phase of the CWMB, including plan drawings, initial species compositions by community type, and monitoring/sample plot locations will be provided within 90 days of completion of Phase implementation. A discussion of the planting design, including densities and numbers of each species planted, will also be included in the as-built report.

Subsequently, reports will be submitted yearly to the MBRT following each assessment. Submitted reports will document the sample transect locations, along with photographs which illustrate site conditions in reference and mitigation wetlands. Surficial well data will be summarized in tabular format. The duration of wetland hydroperiods during the growing season will also be calculated within each community restoration type and reference area. The survival and density of planted tree stock will be reported. A visual estimate and photographic evidence of the relative cover of shrub and herb species will be generated.

7.5 Contingency

In the event that vegetation or hydrology success criteria are not fulfilled, a mechanism for contingency will be implemented. For vegetation contingency, replanting and extending the monitoring period will be implemented if community restoration does not fulfill minimum species density and distribution requirements. Hydrologic contingency will require consultation with hydrologists and MBRT in the event that predicted wetland hydrology restoration or enhancement is not achieved during the monitoring period. Recommendations for contingency to establish wetland hydrology will be implemented and monitored until the hydrology success criteria are achieved.

8.0 MITIGATION CREDIT AND RELEASE SCHEDULE

8.1 Mitigation Credits

Mitigation credit production on the CWMB will be achieved through restoration, enhancement, and preservation of wetland functions through mitigative measures:

- Restoration credit will be produced by restoring jurisdictional hydrology to hydric soils currently lacking jurisdictional hydroperiods as well as attaining suitable goals compared to reference conditions (see Section 7.1.2); suitable vegetative cover will also be restored in appropriate areas (see Section 7.2.2).

- Enhancement credit will be produced by increasing hydroperiods in existing degraded jurisdictional wetlands to levels approaching historic conditions; criteria for determining which areas are expected to be hydrologically enhanced are based on on-site hydrology monitoring, reference site monitoring, predictive modeling, and published data (see Sections 4.1 and 7.1.2). Suitable vegetative cover will be restored in appropriate areas of hydrologic enhancement.

- Preservation credit will be generated from existing jurisdictional wetlands for which no significant hydrologic enhancement is demonstrated or vegetative enhancement is undertaken.

- No credit will be generated for nonhydric soils or roads maintained on the CWMB following implementation. Nonjurisdictional hydric soil areas not achieving jurisdictional hydrology following site implementation will not generate credit; predictive modeling has been used to estimate the location and extent of these areas.

Table 8-1 presents the mitigation components for the CWMB. These areas are depicted in Figure 8-1.

Table 8-1. Mitigation Components for the CWMB.

CWMB Component		Phase I (acres)	Phase II (acres)	Total (acres)
Nonriverine Areas	Restoration	311.6	1123.6	1435.2
	Enhancement	1026.9	956.9	1983.8
	Preservation	108.0	253.0	361.0
Riverine Areas	Restoration	0	49.6	49.6
	Enhancement	0	91.6	91.6
	Preservation	0	37.8	37.8
Non-credit Areas	Non-restorable	18.9	27.1	46.0
	Nonhydric Soil	3.9	25.7	29.6
Total		1469.3	2565.3	4034.6

Approximately 1531 acres of hydric soils on the CWMB lack jurisdictional hydrology. Of this, approximately 50 acres are areas that were historically under riverine influence and approximately 1481 acres are nonriverine areas.

Approximately 2075 acres of the 2391 acres of existing jurisdictional wetlands are expected to experience hydrologic enhancement through prolonged near-surface hydroperiods. Of this 2075 acres, approximately 92 acres are areas that were historically under riverine influence and approximately 1984 acres are nonriverine areas. No hydrologic enhancement (as defined in Section 7.1.2) is predicted to be achieved for approximately 38 acres of riverine wetlands and 361 acres of nonriverine wetlands; these areas are considered preservation.

Of the 1481 acres of nonjurisdictional nonriverine areas, approximately 46 acres are predicted to not achieve jurisdictional hydrology following site implementation. These non-restorable areas include the roads to remain on the CWMB following implementation and narrow zones approximately 16.4 ft (5 meters according to model) along each side of these roads where jurisdictional delineations currently show a zone of drainage. These predicted non-restorable areas also include two additional areas in slightly wider zones of Leon soils adjacent to roads. Nonhydric soils, which will not generate credit, total approximately 30 acres.

Mitigation credit for the CWMB has been based on the following ratios provided by the MBRT following a June 1, 2000 meeting:

Restoration (R) = 1:1
Enhancement (E) = 2:1
Creation (C) = 3:1
Preservation (P) = 5:1

This method results in separate restoration, enhancement, creation, and preservation credits. The enhancement, creation, and preservation credit ratios are understood to be based on use with accompanying restoration credits.

Table 8-2 presents the mitigation credits predicted to be available in the CWMB upon successful implementation of the mitigation plan. Riverine and nonriverine wetland credits have been calculated separately, as have the different mitigation types. The two CWMB implementation phases have also been treated separately. Credits have been rounded off to the nearest 0.1 unit.

Table 8-2. Credits Generated at the CWMB.

	Nonriverine Wetland Credits			Riverine Wetland Credits			Total Phase Credits
	R	E	P	R	E	P	
Phase I	311.6	513.4	21.6	0	0	0	846.6
Phase II	1123.6	478.4	50.6	49.6	45.8	7.6	1755.6
Bank Total	1435.2	991.8	72.2	49.6	45.8	7.6	2602.2

Based on the acreage of the various mitigation components as presented in Table 8-1, the 1435.2 acres of non-riverine wetland restoration, 1983.8 acres of non-riverine wetland enhancement, and 361.0 acres of non-riverine wetland preservation will yield 2499.2 non-riverine wetland credits using the specific ratios provided above.

The 49.6 acres of riverine wetland restoration, 91.6 acres of riverine wetland enhancement, and 37.8 acres of riverine wetland preservation will yield 103.0 riverine wetland credits.

The 4035-acre CWMB will contain a variety of wetland types spanning a spectrum of hydrologic conditions from frequently flooded riverine wetlands to seasonally saturated nonriverine wetlands. Wetland types acceptable for debiting at the CWMB will include most non-tidal, freshwater wetland types commonly encountered within the lower Coastal Plain of North Carolina.

Mitigation credits will be used for unavoidable in-kind wetland losses associated with projects in the CWMB service area (see Section 9.0). Nonriverine credits will be used for nonriverine wetland impacts and riverine credits will only be used for riverine wetland impacts.

8.2 Mitigation Release Schedule

Table 8-3 presents the proposed schedule for release of credits. The credit release schedule accounts for the proposed two-phased approach to the implementation schedule for the CWMB. The actual dates for credit release may vary and will depend on when specific milestones are reached. Final release of the remaining credits will be contingent on demonstration of successful attainment of hydrology and vegetation goals. Actual credits available will be determined by the amount of successful hydrological restoration and enhancement achieved, as well as successful vegetative restoration in replanted areas.

Table 8-4 provides a timetable for anticipated available credits. This timetable includes both Phase I and Phase II credits on the schedule presented in Table 8-3. Actual credits available will be determined by the amount of successful hydrological restoration and enhancement achieved, as well as successful vegetative restoration in replanted areas.

Table 8-3. Proposed Credit Release Schedule.

Date (Approx.)	Milestone Reached	Phased Release			
		Phase I		Phase II	
		Release	Cumulative	Release	Cumulative
April 2002	Execution of MBI, Approval of the Final Mitigation Plan, Recordation of the Preservation Mechanism	15%	15%	15%	15%
January 2003	First Year Monitoring Report (Phase I)	10%	25%	0%	15%
January 2004	Second Year Monitoring Report (Phase I); First Year Monitoring Report (Phase II)	10%	35%	10%	25%
January 2005	Third Year Monitoring Report (Phase I); Second Year Monitoring Report (Phase II)	10%	45%	10%	35%
January 2006	Fourth Year Monitoring Report (Phase I); Third Year Monitoring Report (Phase II)	15%	60%	10%	45%
January 2007	Fifth Year Monitoring Report (Phase I); Fourth Year Monitoring Report (Phase II)	15%	75%	15%	60%
January 2008	Fifth Year Monitoring Report (Phase II)	0%	75%	15%	75%
January 2008	Final Credit Release (Upon Final Approval of MBRT)	25%	100%	25%	100%

Table 8-4. Anticipated Availability of Wetland Credits.

Date (Approx.)	Nonriverine Wetland Credits						Riverine Wetland Credits					
	Release			Cumulative			Release			Cumulative		
	R	E	P	R	E	P	R	E	P	R	E	P
April 2002	215.2	148.8	72.2	215.2	148.8	72.2	7.4	6.9	7.6	7.4	6.9	7.6
January 2003	31.2	51.4	0	246.4	200.2	72.2	0	0	0	7.4	6.9	7.6
January 2004	143.6	99.1	0	390.0	299.3	72.2	5.0	4.5	0	12.4	11.4	7.6
January 2005	143.6	99.1	0	533.6	398.4	72.2	5.0	4.6	0	17.4	16.0	7.6
January 2006	159.1	124.8	0	692.7	523.2	72.2	5.0	4.6	0	22.4	20.6	7.6
January 2007	215.2	148.8	0	907.9	672.0	72.2	7.4	6.9	0	29.8	27.5	7.6
January 2008	527.3	319.8	0	1435.2	991.8	72.2	19.8	18.3	0	49.6	45.8	7.6
Total	2499.2						103.0					

9.0 GEOGRAPHIC SERVICE AREA

The geographic service area (Figure 9-1) for the CWMB is Hydrologic Cataloging Unit 03020204 (corresponding to DWQ sub-basins 03-04-10 and 03-04-11). This service area includes the lower portion of the Neuse River Drainage Basin including the Trent River watershed. Counties included within this service area include most of the southern and central portions of Craven County and northern Jones County, as well as portions of northern Carteret County, southern and western Pamlico County, northern Onslow County, and southern Lenoir County.

For projects located outside this service area, but still within the lower portion of the Neuse River Drainage Basin, use of the CWMB may be considered by the MBRT on a case-by-case basis.

The CWMB is proposed for use in providing in-kind compensatory mitigation for unavoidable wetland impacts occurring on NCDOT projects for which no on-site, in-kind mitigation is available. Proposed debiting wetlands will be within the proposed service area and will consist of the same types proposed for restoration, enhancement, and preservation at the CWMB.

The following NCDOT projects are wholly contained within the geographic service area and are expected to utilize the CWMB:

- **T.I.P. No. B-2531** US 17-NC 55, Bridge #28 Over Neuse River, Craven County.
- **T.I.P. No. R-1015** US 70, Havelock Bypass, North of Pine Grove to North of Carteret County Line, Craven County.

Portions of the following NCDOT projects are also located within the geographic service area for the CWMB and the CWMB may be utilized to fulfill at least part of the mitigation requirements for these projects:

- **T.I.P. No. R-2001** NC 11, NC 241 in Pink Hill to Jacksons Store, Lenoir County.
- **T.I.P. No. R-2235** US 258, NC 24 Near Richlands to US 70 at Kinston, Onslow-Jones-Lenoir Counties.
- **T.I.P. No. R-2301A** US 17, New Bern Bypass, US 17 South of New Bern to US 70, Craven County.
- **T.I.P. No. R-2514** US 17, Multi-lanes North of Jacksonville to Multi-lanes South of New Bern, Onslow-Jones Counties.
- **T.I.P. No. R-2539** NC 55, US 17 at Bridgeton to NC 304 in Bayboro, Craven-Pamlico Counties.
- **T.I.P. No. R-3403** US 17, Mills Street in Bridgeton to SR 1438, Craven County.

This list is included for preliminary consideration and is not a complete or final accounting of all eligible projects. Service area, availability of credits, debiting wetland type, and approval from the MBRT will determine which projects will be eligible to utilize the CWMB.

10.0 FINAL DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY

NCDOT will remain responsible for the CWMB during site implementation and monitoring. The USFS will be the ultimate recipient of the CWMB for inclusion and management as part of the Croatan National Forest (CNF). A Memorandum of Understanding among the NCDOT, Forest Service, and COE will establish and record agreed-upon policies and procedures to govern the implementation, monitoring, and management of the CWMB upon final disposition.

The wetlands mitigation plan developed for the CWMB is compatible with the proposed Croatan National Forest Land & Resource Management Plan (USDA 1999). The CWMB is located mostly within the CNF Management Area 7, with the southernmost portion of CWMB Phase I located within CNF Management Area 2. Several components of the CWMB mitigation plan complement specific goals of the USFS Management Plan. Included among these are the protection of the East Prong Brice Creek watershed, restoring hydrologic function and sustaining aquatic systems, restoration/enhancement/preservation of the natural wetland communities (including hardwood/cypress wetlands), providing RCW habitat linkage, enhancing black bear habitat, providing unfragmented hardwood wetlands for interior Neotropical migratory bird habitat, and restoring hardwoods on suitable sites.

Long-term management of the CWMB may include land uses and practices that are compatible with the mitigation objectives of wetland restoration, enhancement, and preservation incorporating restoration of natural vegetation community structure. Management activities and long-term land uses on the CWMB may include the following:

- No hydrologic alterations, ditching, or new roads will be permitted. Roads left remaining on the CWMB should be kept closed to general traffic to reduce the possibility of off-road traffic damaging hydrologic and hydraulic control structures. These remaining roads may be maintained to provide access for fire control operations provided that hydrologic and hydraulic control structures are not impaired.

- Managing for the presence of large hardwood trees, bald cypress, or other desirable target species within each community type is required to provide optimal habitat for species typical of mature growth wetland forests. After implementation and achievement of target vegetation success criteria, covenants will stipulate that there is to be no forest clear-cutting. Cutting of trees will be limited to the following two circumstances: 1) non-target tree species may be cut for the purposes of promoting recruitment and survival of target tree species and/or to reduce non-target tree species densities; and 2) cutting will be allowed to remove diseased trees in an attempt to protect the rest of CWMB or the surrounding USFS land. As part of long-term natural community management, selective management may be practiced in non-pine dominated natural communities provided selective management does not lower per-acre stem counts below a target density of 6 non-pine trees per acre greater than 15 inches dbh (within each acre of mitigation area). In addition, densities of hardwoods greater than 15 inches dbh will maintained at or greater than 30 ft^2 of basal area per acre (for each acre of land) to provide adequate foraging potential for mast-consuming wildlife (Yoakum *et al.* 1980, USDA 1999). For pine-dominated natural communities, management may be used according to accepted methods for improving or restoring selected areas for RCW use.

- Dead and dying trees, snags, and logs will be left on-site to provide foraging habitat as well as to provide cavity formation for cavity-nesting species, unless diseased trees pose a threat to the rest of CWMB or surrounding USFS land as previously noted. Trees or snags constituting safety hazards may be removed.

- A long-term fire management program may be implemented, as necessary, to facilitate steady state natural community development, improve wildlife habitat, and promote endangered species habitat, provided such use of fire management does not convert the intended natural wetland community structure to other than the type intended by the mitigation plan.

- Wildlife harvesting activities in mitigation areas may be permitted following final release of the site, provided hunting activities do not conflict with the mitigation objectives of the CWMB, and based on recommendations from the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission (WRC) or other responsible wildlife management agency.

Additional management activities and land uses may be permitted at the discretion of the MBRT; these activities and land uses will be stipulated prior to the final disposition of the CWMB.

11.0 FINANCIAL ASSURANCES

NCDOT, the Bank Sponsor, has fee simple ownership of the 4035-acre CWMB. The NCDOT wetland mitigation process is funded as part of each construction project. This may be done with either State or Federal funds. NCDOT is financially supported through state and federal actions as authorized by legislation. This authorization includes a portion of the taxes collected from the sale of gasoline. NCDOT anticipates no difficulty in meeting its obligations for funding of wetland mitigation banks as specified by law, rule, or regulation.

12.0 ACCOUNTING PROCEDURES

Mitigation credits will be generated through successful implementation of the CWMB. The total available credits at the CWMB will be determined by the acreage of successful wetlands restoration and enhancement.

Monitoring results and subsequent reports will be the vehicle by which successful achievement of mitigation goals will be demonstrated. The Bank Sponsor, in consultation with the MBRT, will determine when performance standards have been met. If performance standards are not met, then the Bank Sponsor will perform any and all remedial activities to the satisfaction of the MBRT. Credits will be released according to the schedule approved by the MBRT.

As determined under applicable provisions of the MBI, typically two credits will be debited from the CWMB to offset each acre of wetland impact authorized by Section 404 permits. One of those credits must be a restoration credit; the remaining credit can be made up of any combination of restoration, enhancement, or preservation credits. As such, restoration credits will be tracked separately from enhancement and preservation credits.

The Bank Sponsor will submit a written notification to the MBRT at the time of each transaction within the Bank. In addition, an accounting schedule (ledger) will be submitted to the MBRT on an annual basis. This accounting schedule will be certified by the Bank Sponsor prior to submission to the MBRT. A sample accounting schedule is included as Appendix C.

13.0 REFERENCES

Amoroso, J.L. 1999. Natural Heritage Program List of the Rare Plant Species of North Carolina. North Carolina Natural Heritage Program, Division of Parks and Recreation, N.C. Department of Environment, Health and Natural Resources, Raleigh. 85 pp.

Belcher, H.W. and G.E. Merva. 1987. Results of DRAINMOD verification study for Zeigenfuss soil and Michigan climate. ASAE Paper No. 87-2554. ASAE, St..Joseph, MI 49085.

Brown, Philip M., et al. 1985. Geologic Map of North Carolina, North Carolina Department of Natural Resources and Community Development, 1-500,000 scale.

Department of the Army (DOA). 1987. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual. Tech. Rpt. Y-87-1. Waterways Experiment Station, Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg, Miss. 100 pp.

Division of Environmental Management (DEM). 1993a. Classification and Water Quality Standards Assigned to the Waters of the Neuse River Basin. North Carolina Department of Environment, Health, and Natural Resources (DEHNR), DEM, Water Quality Section; Raleigh.

Division of Environmental Management (DEM). 1993b. Neuse River Basinwide Water Quality Management Plan. North Carolina DEHNR, Water Quality Section; Raleigh.

Division of Environmental Management (DEM). 1996. Draft Basinwide Assessment Report Support Document: Neuse River Basin. North Carolina DEHNR, Water Quality Section; Raleigh. 402 pp.

Eddy Engineering, P.C. (EEPC). 1998. Preliminary Hydrologic and Hydraulic Analysis: Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank, Phase I. 26 pp, Appendices.

Eddy Engineering, P.C. (EEPC). 2000. Conceptual Design Report: Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank. 75 pp, Appendices.

Environmental Services, Inc. (ESI). 1997. Preliminary Site Assessment: Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank. Report to NCDOT. 22 pp, Appendices.

Environmental Services, Inc. (ESI). 1998. Summary Report for Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank Phase I: Preliminary Data Collection. Report to NCDOT. 14 pp, Appendices.

Environmental Services, Inc. (ESI). 1999a. Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank Preliminary Subsurface Investigation and Hydrogeological Assessment. Report to NCDOT. 13 pp, Appendices.

Environmental Services, Inc. (ESI). 1999b. An Archaeological Reconnaissance Survey for the Proposed Croatan Mitigation Bank. Report to NCDOT. 8 pp.

Environmental Services, Inc. (ESI). 2000a. Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank Subsurface Investigation and Hydrogeological Assessment. Report to NCDOT. 38 pp, Appendices.

Environmental Services, Inc. (ESI). 2000b. Summary Report for Jurisdictional Delineation: Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank. 605 pp.

Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). 1987. Habitat Management Guidelines for the Bald Eagle in the Southeast Region. U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service. 8 pp.

Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). 1993. West Indian Manatee: *Trichechus manatus* [Linnaeus]. **In**: Endangered and Threatened Species of the Southeastern United States (The Red Book). U.S. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Southeastern Region, Atlanta, GA. 6 pp.

Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). 1994. Sensitive Joint-vetch Recovery Plan. Technical/Agency Draft. September 1994.

Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). 2001. Endangered, Threatened, and Candidate Species and Federal Species of Concern, by County, in North Carolina (April 12, 2001). U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Asheville Field Office. 51 pp.

Fouss, J.L., R.L. Bengtson, and C.E. Carter. 1987. Simulating subsurface drainage in the lower Mississippi Valley with DRAINMOD. Transactions of the ASAE 30(6):1679-1688.

Gayle, G., R.W. Skaggs, and C.E. Carter. 1985. Evaluation of a water management model for a Louisiana sugar cane field. Jour. of Am. Soc. of Sugar Cane Technologists, 4:18 -28.

Hamel, P.B. 1992. Land Manager's Guide to the Birds of the South. The Nature Conservancy, Southeastern Region, Chapel Hill, NC. 437 pp.

Henry, V.G. 1989. Guidelines for Preparation of Biological Assessments and Evaluations for the Red-cockaded Woodpecker. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Southeast Region, Atlanta, GA. 13 pp.

Hooper, R.G., A.F. Robinson, Jr., and J.A. Jackson. 1980. The Red-cockaded Woodpecker: Notes on Life History and Management. U.S. Department of Agriculture, FOrest Service, Southeastern Area; Atlanta, GA. 8 pp.

LeGrand, H.E., Jr., S.P. Hall, and J.T. Finnegan. 2001. Natural Heritage Program List of the Rare Animal Species of North Carolina. North Carolina Natural Heritage Program, Division of Parks and Recreation, N.C. Department of Environment, Health and Natural Resources, Raleigh. 90 pp.

Leonard, S.W. 1985. Status Report on Aeschenomene virginica in North Carolina. Unpublished report to the Nature Conservancy, Boston, MA. 6+pp.

Martof, B.S., W.M. Palmer, J.R. Bailey, and J.R. Harrison III. 1980. Amphibians and Reptiles of the Carolinas and Virginia. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC. 264 pp.

Potter, E.F., J.F. Parnell, and R.P. Teulings. 1980. Birds of the Carolinas. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC. 408 pp.

Radford, A. E., H.E. Ahles, and C.R. Bell. 1968. Manual of the Vascular Flora of The Carolinas. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC. 408 pp.

Rogers, J.S. 1985. Water management model evaluation for shallow sandy soils. Transactions of the ASAE 28 (3), pp 785-790.

Rosgen, D. 1996. Applied River Geomorphology. Printed Media Companies, Minneapolis Minnesota.

Schafale, M.P. and A.S. Weakley. 1990. Classification of Natural Communites of North Carolina: Third Approximation. North Carolina Natural Heritage Program, Division of Parks and Recreation; DEHNR; Raleigh. 325 pp.

Skaggs, R.W., 1982. Field evaluation of a water management simulation model. Transactions of the ASAE 25 (3), pp 666-674.

Skaggs, R.W., N.R. Fausey, and B.H. Nolte. 1981. Water management evaluation for North Central Ohio. Transactions of the ASAE 24 (4), pp 922-928.

Skaggs, R.W., J.W. Gilliam, and R.0. Evans. 1991. A computer simulation study of pocosin hydrology. Wetlands (11), pp 399-416.

Skaggs, R.W., et al. 1993. Methods for Evaluating Wetland Hydrology. ASAE meeting presentation Paper No. 921590. 21 p.

Susanto, R.H., J. Feyen, W. Dierickx, and G. Wyseure. 1987. The use of simulation models to evaluate the performance of subsurface drainage systems. Proc. of Third International Drainage Workshop, Ohio State Univ., pp. A67 - A76.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). 1989. Soil Survey of Craven County, North Carolina. USDA, Soil Conservation Service. 157 pp, Figures.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). 1999. Croatan National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, Revision #1. USDA Forest Service.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 1994a. Havelock Quadrangle, North Carolina 7.5 Minute Series (Topography).

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 1994b. Catfish Lake Quadrangle, North Carolina 7.5 Minute Series (Topography).

Yoakum, J., D.P. Dasmann, H.R. Sanderson, et al. 1980. Habitat Improvement Techniques. Pp. 329-403 in S.D. Schemintiz (Editor). Wildlife Management Techniques Manual, 4th ed., rev. The Wildlife Society, Washington, D.C. 686 pp.



Environmental Services, Inc.

Location Map
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Figure:	1-1
Project:	R-1015WM
Date:	April 2002

ER98006.10/locat.cdr



Environmental Services, Inc.

Topography
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Figure:	3-1
Project:	R-1015WM
Date:	April 2002

ER98006.10/topography.cdr

ER00041.10/ soil_final.dgn



Environmental Services, Inc.

Soil Map
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Drawn By: PJS	Figure: 3-2
Checked By: KWM	Project: R-1015WM
Scale: As Shown	Date: April 2002



Environmental Services, Inc.

Existing Vegetation
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Figure:	3-3
Project:	R-1015WM
Date:	April 2002

ER00041.10/Jurisdictional_delineation.dgn



Environmental Services, Inc.

Jurisdictional Delineation
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Drawn By: PJS	Figure: 3-4
Checked By: KWM	Project: R-1015WM
Scale: As Shown	Date: April 2002

File: 98-proj/014-2/Drawings/Site Map.dwg



Environmental Services, Inc. Raleigh, North Carolina	Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank Craven County, NC	DOMINANT CHANNEL REACHES AND NATURAL DRAINAGE FEATURES
EDDY ENGINEERING, P.C. 4428 LOUISBURG ROAD SUITE 200 RALEIGH, NC 27616 (919) 954-1202 FAX (919) 954-1204	Project No. 98014-2	April 2002 Figure 5-1



Plan View



Section View



Profile View

PROPOSED POINT DITCH PLUGS &
SURFACE WATER DIVERSION

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC. Raleigh, North Carolina	CROATAN WETLAND MITIGATION BANK Craven County, NC	PROPOSED POINT DITCH PLUGS & SURFACE WATER DIVERSIONS
EDDY ENGINEERING, P.C. 4420 LOUISBURG ROAD SUITE 200 RALEIGH, NC 27616 (919) 954-1082 FAX (919) 954-1084	Project No. 98014-2	April 2002 Figure 5-2

\1998\014\drawings\conceptual design figures.dwg JLE







PROPOSED REACH DITCH PLUGS & SURFACE WATER DIVERSIONS

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC. Raleigh, North Carolina	CROATAN WETLAND MITIGATION BANK Craven County, NC	PROPOSED REACH DITCH PLUGS & SURFACE WATER DIVERSIONS
EDDY ENGINEERING, P.C. 4420 LOUISBURG ROAD SUITE 200 RALEIGH, NC 27616 (919) 954-1002 FAX (919) 954-1004	Project No. 98014-2	April 2002 Figure 5-3

\1998\014\drawings\conceptual design figures.dwg JLE

File: 98-proj/014-2/Drawings/Site Map.dwg



Note: All Site Channels to be either "Reach" or "Point" Plugged. Indentified Channels to be "Reach" Plugged. Other Specific Location to Identified during Final Design.

Environmental Services, Inc. Raleigh, North Carolina EDDY ENGINEERING, P.C.	Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank Craven County, NC	PROPOSED SITE LAYOUT – POINT & REACH DITCH PLUG & SURFACE WATER DIVERSIONS
	Project No. 98014–2	April 2002 Figure 5–4

File: 98-proj/014-2/Drawings/Site Map.dwg



Environmental Services, Inc. Raleigh, North Carolina EDDY ENGINEERING, P.C.	Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank Craven County, NC	PROPOSED SITE LAYOUT – ROAD REMOVALS
	Project No. 98014–2	April 2002 Figure 5–5



TYPICAL DITCH FILLING AND ROAD REMOVAL

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC. Raleigh, North Carolina	CROATAN WETLAND MITIGATION BANK Craven County, NC	TYPICAL DITCH FILLING AND ROAD REMOVAL
EDDY ENGINEERING, P.C. 4428 LOUISBURG ROAD SUITE 200 RALEIGH, NC 27616 (919) 954-1302 FAX (919) 954-1304	Project No. 98014-2	April 2002 Figure 5-6

\1998\014\drawings\conceptual design figures.dwg JLE



TYPICAL DITCH FILLING AND ROAD STABILIZATION

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC. Raleigh, North Carolina	CROATAN WETLAND MITIGATION BANK Craven County, NC	TYPICAL DITCH FILLING AND ROAD STABILIZATION
EDDY ENGINEERING, P.C. 4420 LOUISBURG ROAD SUITE 200 RALEIGH, NC 27616 (919) 954-1002 FAX (919) 954-1004	Project No. 98014-2	April 2002 Figure 5-7

\1998\014\drawings\conceptual design figures.dwg JLE

File: 98-proj/014-2/Drawings/Site Map.dwg



Environmental Services, Inc. Raleigh, North Carolina	Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank Craven County, NC	PROPOSED SITE LAYOUT – PERMANENT ROAD CROSSING LOCATIONS
EDDY ENGINEERING, P.C. 4428 LOUISBURG ROAD SUITE 200 RALEIGH, NC 27616 (919) 954-1302 FAX (919) 954-1304	Project No. 98014–2	April 2002 Figure 5–8



PROFILE VIEW

LOWER ROAD ELEVATION AND STABILIZE ROAD SURFACE AT NATURAL DRAINAGE FEATURE

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC. Raleigh, North Carolina	CROATAN WETLAND MITIGATION BANK Craven County, NC	LOWER ROAD ELEV. AND STABILIZE ROAD SURFACE AT NATURAL DRAINAGE FEATURE
EDDY ENGINEERING, P.C. 4600 LOUISBURG ROAD SUITE 300 RALEIGH, NC 27616 (919) 954-1302 FAX (919) 954-1304	Project No. 98014-2	April 2002 Figure 5-9

\1998\014\drawings\conceptual design figures.dwg JLE



SECTION VIEW

LOWER ROAD ELEVATION AND STABILIZE ROAD SURFACE AT NATURAL DRAINAGE FEATURE

ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC. Raleigh, North Carolina	CROATAN WETLAND MITIGATION BANK Craven County, NC	LOWER ROAD ELEV. AND STABILIZE ROAD SURFACE AT NATURAL DRAINAGE FEATURE
EDDY ENGINEERING, P.C. 4428 LOUISBURG ROAD SUITE 200 RALEIGH, NC 27616 (919) 954-1982 FAX (919) 954-1994	Project No. 98014-2	April 2002 Figure 5-10

\1998\014\drawings\conceptual design figures.dwg JLE

PROPOSED TREATMENT FLOW CHART



1A1. Fill in Ditches with Road Material.
1A2. Remove Fill Material to Allow for Natural Surface Water Flow Along Drainage Feature.
1A3. Scarify with Deep Rippers in Direction Transverse to Ditch/Road or Parallel to Proposed Flow.
1A4. Install Surface Water Diversions Depending on Site Conditions.

1B1. Fill in Ditches with Road Material.
1B2. Scarify with Deep Rippers in Direction Transverse to Ditch/Road or Parallel to Proposed Flow.
1B3. Install Surface Water Diversions Depending on Site Conditions.

2A1. Lower Road Elevation and Stabilize Road Surface Course.
2A2. Fill Ditches.
2A3. Install Conveyance Measures, Pipes, and Fords.
2A4. Install Aggregate Subsurface Drains.

2B1. Stabilize Road Surface Course and Raise Road Elevation.
2B2. Fill Ditches.

Note: In Cases Where Surface Flow is Perpendicular to Existing Channel Flow, Point Filling to be Used.

Environmental Services, Inc. Raleigh, North Carolina	Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank Craven County, NC	PROPOSED TREATMENT FLOW CHART
EDDY ENGINEERING, P.C. 4600 LOUISBURG ROAD SUITE 200 RALEIGH, NC 27616 (919) 954-1002 FAX (919) 954-1004	Project No. 98014-2	April 2002 Figure 5-11

File: 98-proj/014-2/Drawings/Site Mapping

ER00041.10/ soil_final.dgn



Environmental Services, Inc.

Target Communities
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Drawn By: PJS	Figure: 5-12
Checked By: KWM	Project: R-1015WM
Scale: As Shown	Date: April 2002

ER00041.10/clearing_planting_areas.dgn



Environmental Services, Inc.

Clearing and Planting Areas
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Drawn By: PJS	Figure: 5-13
Checked By: KWM	Project: R-1015WM
Scale: As Shown	Date: April 2002

ER00041.10 /Hydro_monitoring.dgn



Environmental Services, Inc.

Pre-implementation Hydrologic Monitoring Sites
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Drawn By: PJS	Figure: 7-1
Checked By: KWM	Project: R-1015WM
Scale: As Shown	Date: April 2002



Environmental Services, Inc.

Mitigation Components
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Drawn By: PJS	Figure: 8-1
Checked By: KWM	Project: R-1015WM
Scale: As Shown	Date: April 2002



Figure:	9-1
Project:	R-1015WM
Date:	April 2002

Geographic Service Area
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Environmental Services, Inc.

Appendix A

Historical Aerial Photographs

Property Boundary

0 0.25 0.50 Mi

0 0.25 0.50 Km

Source: NCDOT Photogrammetry, 1997

Environmental Services, Inc.

Current Aerial Photo
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Figure:	A-1
Project:	R-1015WM
Date:	April 2002



Environmental Services, Inc.

Historical Aerial Photograph: 1981
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Figure:	A-2
Project:	R-1015WM
Date:	April 2002



Environmental Services, Inc.

Historical Aerial Photograph: 1970
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Figure:	A-3
Project:	R-1015WM
Date:	April 2002

Environmental Services, Inc.

Historical Aerial Photograph: 1964
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Figure:	A-4
Project:	R-1015WM
Date:	April 2002





Approximate Property Boundary

0 0.25 0.50 Mi

0 0.25 0.50 Km

Source: USDA, 1958
Uncorrected Photography



Environmental Services, Inc.

Historical Aerial Photograph: 1958
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Figure:	A-5
Project:	R-1015WM
Date:	April 2002





Environmental Services, Inc.

Historical Aerial Photograph: 1949
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina

Figure:	A-6
Project:	R-1015WM
Date:	April 2002

Appendix B

Wildlife Documented on the CWMB

Fish Documented on the CWMB 1997-2001

Common Name	Scientific Name	Notes
American eel	*Anguilla rostrata*	Ditches
Yellow bullhead	*Ameirus natalis*	Oates Branch and ditches
Redfin pickerel	*Esox americanus*	Oates Branch and ditches
Eastern mudminnow	*Umbra pygmaea*	Oates Branch and ditches
Pirate perch	*Aphredoderus sayanus*	Oates Branch and ditches
Swampfish	*Chologaster cornuta*	Oates Branch
Mud sunfish	*Acantharchus pomotis*	Ditches
Flier	*Centrarchus macropterus*	Oates Branch
Yellow perch	*Perca flavescens*	Long Lake
Darter sp.	*Etheostoma* sp.	Long Lake

Amphibians Documented on the CWMB 1997-2001

Common Name	Scientific Name	Notes
Southern toad	*Bufo terrestris*	
Southern cricket frog	*Acris gryllus*	
Cope's gray treefrog	*Hyla chrysoscelis*	
Green treefrog	*Hyla cinerea*	
Pine woods treefrog	*Hyla femoralis*	
Squirrel treefrog	*Hyla squirella*	
Little grass frog	*Limnaoedus ocularis*	
Spring peeper	*Pseudacris crucifer*	
Green frog	*Rana clamitans*	
Southern leopard frog	*Rana utricularia*	
Carpenter frog	*Rana virgatipes*	

Reptiles Documented on the CWMB 1997-2001

Common Name	Scientific Name	Notes
American alligator	*Alligator mississippiensis*	
Common snapping turtle	*Chelydra serpentina*	
Eastern mud turtle	*Kinosternon subrubrum*	
Florida cooter	*Chrysemys floridana*	
Yellowbelly turtle	*Trachemys scripta*	
Spotted turtle	*Clemmys guttata*	
Eastern box turtle	*Terrepene carolina*	
Carolina anole	*Anolis carolinensis*	
Skink sp.	*Eumeces* sp.	
Broadhead skink	*Eumeces laticeps*	
Ground skink	*Scincella lateralis*	
Six-lined racerunner	*Cnemidophorus sexlineatus*	
Glass lizard sp.	*Ophisaurus* sp.	

(continues)

Reptiles (concluded)

Common Name	Scientific Name	Notes
Black racer	*Coluber constrictor*	
Corn snake	*Elaphe guttata*	
Rat snake	*Elaphe obsoleta*	
Rainbow snake	*Farancia abacura*	
Eastern hognose snake	*Heterodon platyrhinos*	
Eastern kingsnake	*Lampropeltis getulus*	
Redbelly watersnake	*Nerodia erythrogaster*	
Banded watersnake	*Nerodia fasciata*	
Brown watersnake	*Nerodia taxispilota*	
Rough green snake	*Opheodrys aestivus*	
Copperhead	*Agkistrodon contortrix*	
Cottonmouth	*Agkistrodon piscivorus*	
Timber rattlesnake	*Crotalus horridus*	

Mammals Documented on the CWMB 1997-2001

Common Name	Scientific Name	Notes
Virginia opossum	*Didelphis virginiana*	
Red bat	*Lasiurus borealis*	
March rabbit	*Sylvilagus palustris*	
Eastern cottontail	*Sylvilagus floridanus*	
Gray squirrel	*Sciurus carolinensis*	
Beaver	*Castor canadensis*	
Muskrat	*Ondatra zibethicus*	
Gray fox	*Urocyon cinereoargenteus*	
Black bear	*Ursus americanus*	
Raccoon	*Procyon lotor*	
Bobcat	*Felis rufus*	
White-tailed deer	*Odocoileus virginianus*	

Birds Documented on the CWMB 1997-2001

Common Name	Scientific Name	Notes
Pied-billed grebe	*Podilymbus podiceps*	
Double-crested cormorant	*Phalacrocorax auritus*	
Anhinga	*Anhinga anhinga*	
Great blue heron	*Ardea herodias*	
Green heron	*Butorides virescens*	
American bittern	*Botaurus lentiginosus*	
Mallard	*Anas platyrhynchos*	
Wood duck	*Aix sponsa*	
Ring-necked duck	*Aythya collaris*	
Ruddy duck	*Oxyura jamaicensis*	

(continues)

Birds (continued)

Common Name	Scientific Name	Notes
Turkey vulture	*Cathartes aura*	
Red-tailed hawk	*Buteo jamaicensis*	
Red-shouldered hawk	*Buteo lineatus*	
Broad-winged hawk	*Buteo platypterus*	present 6/00
Bald eagle	*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*	@Long Lake 12/99-6/00
Northern harrier	*Circus cyaneus*	
Osprey	*Pandion haliaetus*	
Northern bobwhite	*Colinus virginianus*	
Wild turkey	*Meleagris gallopavo*	
American woodcock	*Scolopax minor*	
Common snipe	*Gallinago gallinago*	
Mourning dove	*Zenaida macroura*	
Yellow-billed cuckoo	*Coccyzus americanus*	
Eastern screech-owl	*Otus asio*	
Great horned owl	*Bubo virginianus*	
Barred owl	*Strix varia*	
Chuck-will's widow	*Caprimulgus carolinensis*	
Common nighthawk	*Chordeiles minor*	
Ruby-throated hummingbird	*Archilochus colubris*	
Northern flicker	*Colaptes auratus*	
Pileated woodpecker	*Dryocopus pileatus*	
Red-bellied woodpecker	*Melanerpes carolinus*	
Red-headed woodpecker	*Melanerpes erythrocephalus*	
Hairy woodpecker	*Picoides villosus*	
Downy woodpecker	*Picoides pubescens*	
Eastern kingbird	*Tyrannus tyrannus*	
Great crested flycatcher	*Myiarchus crinitus*	
Eastern phoebe	*Sayornis phoebe*	
Acadian flycatcher	*Empidonax virescens*	
Eastern wood-pewee	*Contopus virens*	
Blue jay	*Cyanocitta cristata*	
Common crow	*Corvus brachyrhynchos*	
Fish crow	*Corvus ossifragus*	
Carolina chickadee	*Poecile carolinensis*	
Tufted titmouse	*Baeolophus bicolor*	
White-breasted nuthatch	*Sitta carolinensis*	
Brown-headed nuthatch	*Sitta pusilla*	
Carolina wren	*Thryothorus ludovicianus*	
Northern mockingbird	*Mimus polyglottos*	
Gray catbird	*Dumatella carolinensis*	
Brown thrasher	*Toxostoma rufum*	
American robin	*Turdus migratorius*	
Wood thrush	*Hylocichla mustelina*	
Hermit thrush	*Catharus guttatus*	
Veery	*Catharus fuscescens*	migrant present 5/16/00
Eastern bluebird	*Sialia sialis*	
Blue-gray gnatcatcher	*Polioptila carulea*	
White-eyed vireo	*Vireo griseus*	
Yellow-throated vireo	*Vireo flavifrons*	
Red-eyed vireo	*Vireo olivaceus*	

(continues)

Birds (concluded)

Common Name	Scientific Name	Notes
Northern parula	*Parula americana*	
Black-and-white warbler	*Mniotilta varia*	
Prothonotary warbler	*Protonotaria citrea*	
Swainson's warbler	*Limnothlypis swainsonii*	
Black-throated blue warbler	*Dendroica caerulescens*	migrant present 9/7/00
Black-throated green warbler	*Dendroica virens*	
Yellow-rumped warbler	*Dendroica coronata*	
Yellow-throated warbler	*Dendroica dominica*	
Pine warbler	*Dendroica pinus*	
Prairie warbler	*Dendroica discolor*	
Ovenbird	*Seiurus aurocapillus*	
Kentucky warbler	*Oporornis formosus*	
Common yellowthroat	*Geothlypis trichas*	
Yellow-breasted chat	*Icteria virens*	
Hooded warbler	*Wilsonia citrina*	
American redstart	*Setophaga ruticilla*	
Bobolink	*Dolichonyx oryzivorus*	migrant 9/7/00
Red-winged blackbird	*Agelaius phoeniceus*	
Orchard oriole	*Icterus spurius*	
Common grackle	*Quiscalus quiscula*	
Brown-headed cowbird	*Molothrus ater*	
Summer tanager	*Piranga rubra*	
Northern cardinal	*Cardinalis cardinalis*	
Blue grosbeak	*Guiraca caerulea*	
Indigo bunting	*Passerina cyanea*	
American goldfinch	*Carduelis tristis*	
Eastern towhee	*Pipilo erythrophthalmus*	
Chipping sparrow	*Spizella passerina*	
Field sparrow	*Spizella pusilla*	
Swamp sparrow	*Melospiza georgiana*	
Song sparrow	*Melospiza melodia*	
White-throated sparrow	*Zonotrichia albicollis*	

Appendix C

Account Ledger

Account Ledger
Croatan Wetland Mitigation Bank
Craven County, North Carolina
Credit Based

Date	Notes	Type	Nonriverine Wetland Credits				Riverine Wetland Credits				Total Withdrawal	Total Balance
			Deposit	Withdrawal	Balance	In-kind (Y/N)	Deposit	Withdrawal	Balance	In-kind (Y/N)		
	1	Rest										
		Enh										
		Pres										
	2	Rest										
		Enh										
		Pres										
	3	Rest										
		Enh										
		Pres										
	4	Rest										
		Enh										
		Pres										
	5	Rest										
		Enh										
		Pres										
	6	Pres										
		Rest										
		Enh										

Notes (documentation of authorization for deposits, authorization for debits)
1)
2)
3)
4)
5)
6)