## FINAL ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT BOLD RUN

## STREAM AND BUFFER RESTORATION WAKE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA (EEP Project Number 439)

Monitoring Year 5 of 5 (2011)



Submitted to: North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources Ecosystem Enhancement Program Raleigh, North Carolina



August 2011

## FINAL ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT BOLD RUN

## STREAM AND BUFFER RESTORATION WAKE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA (EEP Project Number 439)

Monitoring Year 5 of 5 (2011)



Submitted to: North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources Ecosystem Enhancement Program Raleigh, North Carolina

> Prepared by: Axiom Environmental, Inc. 218 Snow Avenue Raleigh, North Carolina 27603

Design Firm: KCI Associates of North Carolina, PA 4601 Six Forks Road Raleigh, NC 27609





August 2011

## **Table of Contents**

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY/PROJECT ABSTRACT	ii
2.0 METHODOLOGY	1
2.1 Vegetation Assessment	1
2.2 Stream Assessment	1
3.0 REFERENCES	1

## **List of Figures**

Figure 1.	Site Location	Appendix A
Figure 2.	Monitoring Plan View	Appendix A
Figure 3.	Current Conditions Plan View	Appendix A

## List of Tables

Table 1.	Site Restoration Structures and Objectives	Appendix B
Table 2.	Project Activity and Reporting History	Appendix B
Table 3.	Project Contacts Table	Appendix B
Table 4.	Project Attribute Table	Appendix B
Table 5.	Vegetation Plot Mitigation Success Summary Table	Appendix C
Table 6.	Vegetation Metadata Table	Appendix C
Table 7.	Total and Planted Stems by Plot and Species	Appendix C
Table 8.	Qualitative Visual Stability Assessment	Appendix D
Table 9.	Verification of Bankfull Events	Appendix D

### Appendices

## APPENDIX A. FIGURES AND PLAN VIEWS

- Figure 1. Site Location
- Figure 2. Monitoring Plan View
- Figure 3. Current Conditions Plan View
- APPENDIX B. GENERAL PROJECT TABLES
  - Table 1. Site Restoration Structures and Objectives
  - Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History
  - Table 3. Project Contacts Table
  - Table 4. Project Attributes Table

## APPENDIX C. VEGETATION ASSESSMENT DATA

- Table 5. Vegetation Plot Mitigation Success Summary
- Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos
- CVS Summary Data Tables
  - Table 6. Vegetation Metadata Table
  - Table 7. Total and Planted Stems by Plot and Species

## APPENDIX D. STREAM ASSESSMENT DATA

**Fixed-Station Photos** 

- Table 8. Qualitative Visual Stability Assessment
- Table 9. Verification of Bankfull Events
- Cross-section Plots and Tables
- Longitudinal Profile Plots
- Pebble Count Plots

Axiom Environmental, Inc.

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY/PROJECT ABSTRACT

The Bold Run Stream and Buffer Restoration Site (Site) is located five miles northwest of the Town of Wake Forest on Bold Hill Road, approximately 1.5 miles east of the intersection with Mangum Dairy Road in Wake County. The Site is located within United States Geological Survey Hydrologic Unit 03020201065010 (North Carolina Division of Water Quality Subbasin 03-04-08) of the Neuse River Basin. The Site was identified to assist the North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program in meeting stream and buffer restoration goals. Primary activities at the Site included stream restoration and riparian buffer restoration by stabilizing stream banks, installing in-stream structures, adjusting stream plan form, and replanting riparian areas with native vegetation. Project restoration efforts provided 640 Stream Mitigation Units, 14.9 Buffer Mitigation Units, and 14.7 Nutrient Offset Credit. This project was instituted prior to October 11, 2007 and therefore is eligible for riparian buffer restoration credit up to 200 feet from the top of bank of all perennial and intermittent waterways within the Site. This report summarizes data for year 5 (2011) monitoring.

The primary components of the restoration project included the following.

- Construct a stable, riffle-pool stream channel capable of moving sediments supplied by the watershed so the channel neither aggrades nor degrades.
- Stabilize stream banks, install in-stream structures, adjust stream planform, and replant riparian areas with native vegetation.
- Improve water quality and reduce lateral erosion and bed degradation of stream channels by establishment of riparian vegetation.
- Enhance aquatic and terrestrial wildlife habitat through improvements to stream water quality including improved oxygen levels, reduced sediments and nutrients, and varied stream bed features.

Success criteria dictate that an average density of 320 stems per acre must be surviving after five monitoring years in accordance with North Carolina Division of Water Quality Administrative Code 15A NCAC 02B.0242 (Neuse River Basin, Mitigation Program for Protection and Maintenance of Existing Riparian Buffers) (NCDWQ 2007). Based on the number of stems counted, average densities were measured at 648 planted stems per acre surviving in year 5 (2011). The dominant species identified at the Site were planted stems of green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), oak species (*Quercus* spp.), and elm species (*Ulmus* spp.). In addition, each individual plot met success criteria based on planted stems alone with the exception of Plot 14, which had 283 planted stems per acre. However, when counting appropriate natural recruit species stems such as box elder (*Acer negundo*) and green ashe this plot was well-above success criteria with 850 total stems per acre.

Success criteria for stream restoration reaches should show little to no change from the as-built channel over the five-year monitoring period. Year 5 (2011) monitoring measurements indicate that there have been minimal changes in both the longitudinal profile and cross-sections as compared to as-built data. In addition, a total of seven bankfull event were documented to occur over the five year monitoring period with at least one event occurring in each monitoring year.

In summary, overall the Site has met mitigation success criteria for stream, buffer, and nutrient offset for the entire five-year monitoring period, and is anticipated to be closed out in the Spring of 2012. Summary information and data related to the occurrence of items such as beaver or encroachment and statistics related to performance of various project and monitoring elements can be found in table and figures within this report's appendices. Narrative background and supporting information formerly found in these reports can be found in the mitigation and restoration plan documents available on EEPs website. All raw data supporting the tables and figures in the appendices is available from EEP upon request.

## 2.0 METHODOLOGY

## 2.1 Vegetation Assessment

Following Site construction, fifteen plots (10-meters square) were established and monumented with metal fence posts at all plot corners and PVC at each plot origin. Five plots are located in the streamside riparian buffer planting zone and ten plots are located within the remaining buffer area. Plots were surveyed in June 2010 for the year 4 (2010) monitoring season. Sampling was conducted as outlined in the *CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.0* (Lee et al. 2006) (http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/methods.htm); results are included in Appendix C. The taxonomic standard for vegetation used for this document was *Flora of the Carolinas, Virginia, Georgia, and Surrounding Areas* (Weakley 2007). The locations of vegetation monitoring plots are depicted on Figure 2 in Appendix A.

## 2.2 Stream Assessment

Five permanent cross-sections were established after construction was completed. Measurements of each cross-section include points at all breaks in slope including top of bank, bankfull, and thalweg. Riffle cross-sections are classified using the Applied Fluvial Morphology (Rosgen 1996) stream classification system. Longitudinal profile measurements of the entire Site restoration reaches include thalweg and water surface; with each measurement taken at the head of facets (i.e. riffle, run, pool, and glide) in addition to the maximum pool depth. Visual assessment of in-stream structures was conducted to determine if failure has occurred. Failure of a structure may be indicated by collapse of the structure, undermining of the structure, abandonment of the channel around the structure, and/or stream flow beneath the structure.

## **3.0 REFERENCES**

- Lee, Michael T., R.K. Peet, S.D. Roberts, and T.R. Wentworth. 2006. CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.0. (online). Available: http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/methods.htm
- North Carolina Division of Water Quality (NCDWQ). 2007. Redbook, Surface Waters and Wetlands Standards. North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources, Division of Water Quality. Raleigh, North Carolina.
- Rosgen, D. 1996. Applied River Morphology. Wildland Hydrology (Publisher). Pagosa Springs, Colorado.
- Weakley, Alan S. 2007. Flora of the Carolinas, Virginia, Georgia, and Surrounding Areas (online). Available: http://www.herbarium.unc.edu/WeakleysFlora.pdf [February 1, 2008]. University of North Carolina Herbarium, North Carolina Botanical Garden, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

## APPENDIX A

## FIGURES AND PLAN VIEWS

Figure 1. Site Location

Figure 2. Monitoring Plan View

Figure 3. Current Conditions Plan View





NORTHING	EASTING
831477.30	2120576.84
831463.10	2120605.34
831433.44	2120590.84
831448.33	2120561.39
831147.63	2120307.85
831114.72	2120306.17
831118.41	2120273.86
831159.80	2120277.98
831629.35	2120277.54
831602.71	2120298.24
831583.56	2120271.75
831609.01	2120251.28
831636.97	2120788.53
831621.65	2120815.67
831593.37	2120799.71
831609.09	2120769.69
831996.48	2120784.37
831979.80	2120817.15
831952.65	2120799.07
831966.75	2120769.69
832341.97	2120658.90
832309.92	2120681.60
832296.51	2120652.76
832322.25	2120632.55
832171.07	2120359.42
832147.09	2120366.83
832125.57	2120366.83
832144.28	2120340.27
831873.35	2120195.95
831893.48	2120221.92
831865.44	2120242.78
831846.92	2120215.30
831851.69	2120584.90
831836.83	2120620.00
831808.82	2120602.25
831821.30	2120572.14

NOTES/REVISIONS

Project:

## Bold Run **Restoration Site**

Project No. 439 Year 4 (2010) Monitoring Report Wake County North Carolina

Title:

Monitoring Plan View

Scale: As Shown

FIGURE NO.

Date: Mar 2010

Project No.:

08-001

2



## APPENDIX B

## GENERAL PROJECT TABLES

Table 1. Site Restoration Structures and Objectives

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History

Table 3. Project Contacts Table

 Table 4.
 Project Attributes Table

# Table 1. Site Restoration Structures and ObjectivesBold Run Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 439)

Restoratio ID	on Segment/ Reach	Existing Linear Footage/Acres		Restoration Type/Approach*	Designed Linear Footage/Acreage	Mitigation Ratio	Mitigation Units	Stationing	Comment
1:1 Stream	n Restoration				640	1:1	640		
0:1 Stream Restoration Lacking 50-foot Buffers **			Res	storation/	469	0:1**	0		
0:1 Stream Utility Eas	n Restoration within sement **		P	4 & F2	519	0:1**	0		
Riparian B	Buffer Restoration	0	Re	storation	14.9	1:1	14.9		
Nutrient O	offset Buffer	0	Re	storation	14.7	1:1	14.7		
Mitigation	n Unit Summations								
Stream Riparian Wetland		Nonripari Wetland	ian 1	Total W	etland	Ripari	an Buffer	Nutri	ent Offset
640	0	0		0		64	9,039	64	40,327

\*P2=Priority 2, P4=Priority 4

\*\*Awaiting guidance for asset reduction.

## Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting HistoryBold Run Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 439)

	Data Collection	Actual Completion
Activity or Report	Completion	or Delivery
Restoration Plan	November 2005	February 2006
Final Design – Construction Plans	NA	July 2006
Construction	NA	February 2007
Temporary Seed Mix Applied to Entire Project Area	NA	February 2007
Permanent Seed Mix Applied to Entire Project Area	NA	February 2007
Tree Planting	NA	February 2007
Mitigation Plan/As-builts (Year 0 Monitoring-Baseline)	March 2007	March 2007
Year 1 Monitoring (2007)	October 2007	January 2008
Year 2 Monitoring (2008)	September 2008	October 2008
Year 3 Monitoring (2009)	June 2009	July 2009
Year 4 Monitoring (2010)	July 2010	September 2010
Year 5 Monitoring (2011)	June 2011	August 2011

 Table 3. Project Contacts Table

 Bold Run Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 439)

Bold Run Restoration Site (EEI Troject Runbe								
Designer, Monitoring Year 0 Performer,	KCI Associates of NC							
Monitoring Year 1 (2007) Performer	Landmark Center II, Suite 220							
	4601 Six Forks Road							
	Raleigh, North Carolina 27609							
	April Davis and Adam Spiller (919) 783-9214							
Construction and Seeding Contractor	Vaughn Contracting, Inc.							
	PO Box 796							
	Wadesboro, North Carolina 28170							
	Don Vaughn (704) 694-6450							
Planting Contractor and Nursery Stock Supplier	Bruton Nurseries and Landscapes							
	PO Box 1197							
	Freemont, North Carolina 27830							
	Kelly Bruton (919) 524-5304							
Seed Mix Source	Evergreen Seed Company							
	(919)567-1333							
Year 2-5 (2008-2011) Monitoring Performer	Axiom Environmental, Inc.							
	218 Snow Avenue							
	Raleigh, NC 27603							
	Grant Lewis (919) 215-1693							

# Table 4. Project Attribute TableBold Run Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 439)

Project County	Wake County, North Carolina
Drainage Area	1.6 square miles
Drainage impervious cover estimate (%)	< 1 percent
Stream Order	Second
Physiographic Region	Piedmont
Ecoregion	Northern Outer Piedmont
Rosgen Classification of As-built	C4-type
Dominant Soil Types	Chewacla, Chewacla variant, Chewacla-Riverview
Reference Site ID	Richland Creek
USGS HUC	Site-03020201065010
	Reference-03020201070060
NCDWQ Subbasin	Site-03-04-08
	Reference-03-04-02
NCDWQ Classification for Project	WS-IV, NSW, CA (Stream Index # 27-13-(0.1))
Any portion of any project segment 303d listed?	No
Any portion of any project segment upstream of a	No
303d listed segment?	INO
Reasons for 303d listing or stressor	Not Applicable
% of project easement fenced	100 percent

## APPENDIX C

## VEGETATION ASSESSMENT DATA

Table 5. Vegetation Plot Mitigation Success Summary

Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos

CVS Summary Data Tables

Table 6. Vegetation Metadata Table

Table 7. Total and Planted Stems by Plot and Species

Vegetation Plot ID	Vegetation Survival Threshold Met?	Tract Mean
1	Yes	
2	Yes	
3	Yes	
4	Yes	
5	Yes	
6	Yes	
7	Yes	
8	Yes	93%
9	Yes	
10	Yes	
11	Yes	
12	Yes	
13	Yes	
14	No*	
15	Yes	

Table 5.	<b>Vegetation Plot M</b>	litigation Succes	s Summary Table
<b>Bold Ru</b>	n Restoration Site (	(EEP Project N	umber 439)

\*This plot was one stem shy of meeting success criteria when counting planted stems alone; however, when including naturally recruited stems of box elder (*Acer negundo*) and green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*) this plot was well-above success criteria.

Bold Run Restoration Site Year 5 (2011) Annual Monitoring Vegetation Plot Photos (taken June 14, 2011)



Bold Run (final) EEP Project Number 439 Wake County, North Carolina

Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Monitoring Year 5 of 5 (2011) August 2011 Appendices

### Bold Run Restoration Site Year 5 (2011) Annual Monitoring Vegetation Plot Photos (taken June 14, 2011), continued



Bold Run (final) EEP Project Number 439 Wake County, North Carolina Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Monitoring Year 5 of 5 (2011) August 2011 Appendices

Dolu Run Restoration Site (1	
Report Prepared By	Corri Faquin
Date Prepared	6/17/2011 14:07
database name	Axiom-EEP-2011-B.mdb
database location	C:\Axiom\Business\CVS
computer name	CORRI-PC
file size	40574976
DESCRIPTION OF WORKSHEE	TS IN THIS DOCUMENT
Metadata	Description of database file, the report worksheets, and a summary of project(s) and project data.
Proj, planted	Each project is listed with its PLANTED stems per acre, for each year. This excludes live stakes.
	Each project is listed with its TOTAL stems per acre, for each year. This includes live stakes, all planted stems,
Proj, total stems	and all natural/volunteer stems.
Plots	List of plots surveyed with location and summary data (live stems, dead stems, missing, etc.).
Vigor	Frequency distribution of vigor classes for stems for all plots.
Vigor by Spp	Frequency distribution of vigor classes listed by species.
Damage	List of most frequent damage classes with number of occurrences and percent of total stems impacted by each.
Damage by Spp	Damage values tallied by type for each species.
Damage by Plot	Damage values tallied by type for each plot.
	A matrix of the count of total living stems of each species (planted and natural volunteers combined) for each
ALL Stems by Plot and spp	plot; dead and missing stems are excluded.
PROJECT SUMMARY	
Project Code	BR
project Name	Bold Run
Description	Bold Run Stream and Buffer Mitigation Site
River Basin	Neuse
length(ft)	
stream-to-edge width (ft)	
area (sq m)	
<b>Required Plots (calculated)</b>	
Sampled Plots	15

# Table 6. Vegetation Metadata TableBold Run Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 439)

			Current Plot Data (MY5 2011)																																				
			E43	39-01-0001	E439-	-01-0002	E4	39-01-00	003	E439	9-01-0004	E439-0	01-0005	E4	39-01-0	006	E439-01-	0007	E43	9-01-000	08	E439-	01-0009	E	439-01-00	10	E439-01-001			E439-01-0012			E439-01-0013			E439-01-0014			1-0015
Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	PnoLS	P-all T	PnoLS P	-all T	PnoLS	P-all	Т	PnoLS I	P-all T	PnoLS P-a	all T	PnoLS	6 P-all	Т	PnoLS P-all	т	PnoLS	P-all T	P	noLS P-	all T	PnoL	S P-all	r P	10LS P-	all T	P	PnoLS P	-all T	P	noLS P-al	ΙT	PnoLS	P-all 1	P	noLS P-a	III T
Acer negundo	boxelder	Tree	1	1	1											1		2						12		2								2	. 1	1	10		
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree										2																											
Baccharis halimifolia	eastern baccharis	Shrub Tree					1		29																														
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree			1	1	1			2	2	2 4	4	4																									
Celtis laevigata	sugarberry	Shrub Tree																				2	2	2								2	3	3 3	1	1	1		
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub		1	1												:	2 2																					
Diospyros virginiana	common persimmon	Tree																																					
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	4	4	4 8	8	8 3	3	3	10	10 10	) 6	6	6		2	8	8 68	1	1	1								15	9	9	15		1			5		3
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																				3	3	3															
Juniperus virginiana	eastern redcedar	Tree																																					
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree			3		2		2		4	1																											
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree	1	1	2 1	1	1		2	1	1	2			2 2	2			1	1	1				3 3	3													
Pinus	pine	Tree																																					
Pinus taeda	loblolly pine	Tree			5							2		1												1			2										
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	4	4	4 4	4	6 6	6	24	1	1 3	3 4	4	4																									
Prunus serotina	black cherry	Shrub Tree																														1							
Quercus	oak	Shrub Tree																																					
Quercus lyrata	overcup oak	Tree																				6	6	6									5	5 5	3	3	3		
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree	2	2	2							2	2	2 (	56	6									1 1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1							
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree												1	2 2	2			6	6	6				3 3	3	7	7	7	2	2	2	1	1 1				4	4 4
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree												3	3 3	3						3	3	3	5 5	5	3	3	3	8	8	8			2	2	2	5	5 5
Rhus copallinum	flameleaf sumac	Shrub Tree																																					
Salix	willow	Shrub Tree																																					
Salix nigra	black willow	Tree		1	1			5	5		5	5		1																									
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub Tree		6	6	1	1																																
Sambucus canadensis	Common Elderberry	Shrub Tree								3	3	3																											
Ulmus	elm	Tree					1	. 1	3								2	2 2																					
Ulmus alata	winged elm	Tree					5	5	7	13	13 13	3 16	16	16	77	7																							
Ulmus americana	American elm	Tree	7	7	7 5	5	5 1	. 1	3	1	1	L 1	1	9																1	1	1							
Ulmus rubra	slippery elm	Tree																																					
Unknown		unknown																																					
		Stem count	: 19	27 3	6 19	20	25 16	21	78	31	36 4	7 33	33	43 20	20	23	10 1	2 74	8	8	8	14	14	26 1	2 12	15	12	12	29	21	21	30	9	9 12	7	7	21	9	9 12
		size (ares)		1		1		1			1		1		1		1	-		1			1		1			1			1		1			1			1
		size (ACRES)		0.02	(	0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.02			0.02			0.02		(	).02		0.02		(	).02			0.02		0.0	)2		0.02		0	.02								
		Species count	6	9 1	1 5	6	8 5	6	9	7	8 1	L 6	6	8 !	5 5	7	2	3 4	3	3	3	4	4	5	4 4	6	3	3	5	5	5	7	3	3 5	4	4	5	2	2 3
Totals		Stems per ACRE	768.9	1093 145	7 768.9 8	309.4 10	12 647.5	849.8	3157	1255	1457 1902	2 <b>1335</b> 1	335 17	40 809.4	4 809.4	930.8	404.7 485.0	6 2995	323.7	323.7 3	323.7	566.6 5	66.6 10	52 485.	6 485.6	607 4	85.6 4	85.6 1	1174	849.8	849.8 1	1214	364.2 364	1.2 485.6	283.3	283.3	849.8	364.2 36	4.2 485.6
		Stem count	19	26 3	0 19	20	24 16	21	49	28	33 42	33	33	42 20	20	23	10 10	0 72	8	8	8	14	14	26 1	2 12	14	12	12	27	21	21	30	9	9 12	7	7	21	9	9 12
		size (ares)		1		1		1		20	1		1		1		1			1			1		1			1			1		1	5		1		5	1
		size (ACRES)		0.02	(	0.02		0.02			0.02	0	.02	1	0.02		0 02	,		0.02		ſ	).02		0.02		(	.02			0.02		0.0	12		0.02		0	.02
Riparian Buffer Success		Species count	6	8	9 5	6	7 5	6	8	6	7 0	9 6	6	7	5 5	7	2	2 3	3	3	3	4	4	5	4 4	5	3	3	4	5	5	7	3	3 5	4	4	5	2	2 3
Criteria		Stems per ACRE	768.9	1052 121	4 768.9 8	309.4 971	.2 647.5	849.8	1983	1133	1335 170	<b>1335</b> 1	335 17	00 809.4	4 809.4	930.8	404.7 404.	7 2914	323.7	323.7	323.7	566.6 5	66.6 10	52 485	6 485.6	566.6	85.6 4	85.6 1	1093	849.8	349.8 1	1214	364.2 364	1.2 485.6	283.3	283.3	849.8	364.2 36	4.2 485.6
*Bolded hardwood tree so	ecies are counted towar	rd rinarian buffe	r succes	s criteria																																			

Table 7. Total and Planted Stems by Plot and Species EEP Project Code 439. Project Name: Bold Run Creek (G)

Color for Density

PnoLS = Planted exclusing livestakes P-all = All planted stems including livestakes T = All planted and natural recruit stems including livestakes Total includes natural recruit stems

Exceeds requirements by 10% Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10% Fails to meet requirements, by less than 10% Fails to meet requirements by more than 10%

### Table 7. Total and Planted Stems by Plot and Species (continued) EEP Project Code 439. Project Name: Bold Run Creek (G)

										An	nual M	eans								
				MY5 (2011)		М	Y4 (201	0)	М	Y3 (200	9)	M	Y2 (200	)8)	M	Y1 (200	7)	M	YO (2007	7)
Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	PnoLS	P-all	т	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	r
Acer negundo	boxelder	Tree	2	2	30	1	1	53	1	1	1			3						
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree			2			5												
Baccharis halimifolia	eastern baccharis	Shrub Tree			30			2						1						
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree	7	7	7	5	5	6	3	3	3	3	3	7	3	3	3	7	7	7
Celtis laevigata	sugarberry	Shrub Tree	6	6	8	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	7	7	7			
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub		3	3		3	3		3	3		5	5	2	5	5	2	6	6
Diospyros virginiana	common persimmon	Tree						1												
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	49	49	141	46	46	133	45	45	45	45	45	56	33	33	33	34	34	34
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2			
Juniperus virginiana	eastern redcedar	Tree						1												
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree			11			13						3						
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree	9	9	13	8	8	11	8	8	8	8	8	10	5	5	5			
Pinus	pine	Tree												9						
Pinus taeda	loblolly pine	Tree			11			12												
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	19	19	41	16	16	46	16	16	16	16	16	30	18	18	18	19	19	19
Prunus serotina	black cherry	Shrub Tree			1			2						1						
Quercus	oak	Shrub Tree													2	2	2	7	7	7
Quercus lyrata	overcup oak	Tree	14	14	14	14	14	14	17	17	17	18	18	18	21	21	21			
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree	14	14	14	14	14	14	13	13	13	13	13	13	12	12	12	1	1	1
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree	25	25	25	26	26	26	25	25	25	25	25	25	22	22	22			
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree	29	29	29	30	30	30	28	28	28	28	28	28	33	33	33	1	1	1
Rhus copallinum	flameleaf sumac	Shrub Tree						2												
Salix	willow	Shrub Tree																	8	8
Salix nigra	black willow	Tree		11	12		11	11		12	12		9	9		7	7			
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub Tree		7	7		8	8		7	7		8	8		7	7			
Sambucus canadensis	Common Elderberry	Shrub Tree	3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		3	3
Ulmus	elm	Tree	3	3	5	2	2	88				1	1	4						
Ulmus alata	winged elm	Tree	41	41	43			1												
Ulmus americana	American elm	Tree	16	16	26	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1						
Ulmus rubra	slippery elm	Tree							1	1	1	1	1	1						
Unknown		unknown													4	4	4	105	112	112
		Stem count	240	261	479	173	195	493	168	190	190	169	191	242	164	182	182	176	198	198
		size (ares)		15			15			15			15	-		15			15	
		size (ACRES)		0.37			0.37			0.37			0.37			0.37			0.37	
		Species count	15	18	23	14	17	26	14	17	17	14	17	22	13	16	16	8	10	10
Totals		Stems per ACRE	647.5	704.15302	1292	466.7	526.1	1330	453.2	512.6	512.6	455.9	515.3	652.9	442.5	491	491	474.8	534.2	534.2
		Stem count	237	255	432	172	191	472	167	186	186	168	185	226	158	172	172	69	77	77
		size (ares)		1	-		1			1			1			1			1	
		size (ACRES)		0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02	
Riparian Buffer Success		Species count	14	16	19	13	15	20	13	15	15	13	15	18	11	13	13	6	7	7
Criteria		Stems per ACRE	639	688	1165	464	515	1273	451	502	502	453	499	610	426	464	464	186	208	208

\*Bolded hardwood tree species are counted toward riparian buffer success criteria. Color for Density

ProLS = Planted exclusing livestakes P-all = All planted stems including livestakes T = All planted and natural recruit stems including livestakes Total includes natural recruit stems

Exceeds requirements by 10% Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10% Fails to meet requirements, by less than 10% Fails to meet requirements by more than 10%

## APPENDIX D

## STREAM ASSESSMENT DATA

**Fixed-Station Photos** 

Table 8. Qualitative Visual Stability Assessment

Table 9. Verification of Bankfull Events

Cross-section Plots and Tables

Longitudinal Profile Plots

Pebble Count Plots

Bold Run Restoration Site Fixed-Station Photographs taken June 21, 2011















Bold Run (final) EEP Project Number 439 Wake County, North Carolina

Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Monitoring Year 5 of 5 (2011) August 2011 Appendices Bold Run Restoration Site Fixed-Station Photographs taken June 2010 (continued)













Bold Run (final) EEP Project Number 439 Wake County, North Carolina

Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Monitoring Year 5 of 5 (2011) August 2011 Appendices Bold Run Restoration Site Fixed-Station Photographs taken June 21, 2011 (continued)



Axiom Environmental, Inc.

## Table 8. Qualitative Visual Stability Assessment

## Bold Run Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 439)

Feature Category	Metric (per As-built and reference baselines)	(# Stable) Number Performing as Intended	Total Number per As-built	Total Number / feet in unstable state	% Perform. in Stable Condition	Feature Perform. Mean or Total
A. Riffles	1. Present?	21	21	N/A	100%	
	2. Armor stable (e.g. no displacement)?	21	21	N/A	100%	
	3. Facet grade appears stable?	21	21	N/A	100%	
	4. Minimal evidence of embedding/fining?	21	21	N/A	100%	
	5. Length appropriate?	21	21	N/A	100%	100%
B. Pools	1. Present? (e.g. no severe aggradation)	15	15	N/A	100%	
	2. Sufficiently deep (Dmax pool:Mean Bkf > 2.2?)	13	15	N/A	86.7%	
	3. Length appropriate?	15	15	N/A	100%	95.6%
C. Thalweg	1. Upstream of meander bend centering?	14	14	N/A	100%	
	2. Downstream of meander centering?	14	14	N/A	100%	100%
D. Meanders	1. Outer bend in state of limited/controlled erosion?	14	14	N/A	100%	
	2. Of those eroding, # w/ concomitant point bar formation?	0	0	N/A		
	3. Apparent Rc within spec?	14	14	N/A	100%	
	4. Sufficient floodplain access and relief?	14	14	N/A	100%	100%
E. Bed General	1.General channel bed aggradation areas (bar formation)	N/A	N/A	0	100%	
	2. Channel bed degradation - areas of increasing down cutting or head cutting?	N/A	N/A	1/20	99%	99.5%
F. Bank	1. Actively eroding, wasting, or slumping bank	N/A	N/A	1/30	98%	98%
G. Vanes	1. Free of back or arm scour?	8	8	N/A	100%	
	2. Height appropriate?	8	8	N/A	100%	
	3. Angle and geometry appear appropriate?	8	8	N/A	100%	
	4. Free of piping or other structural failures?	8	8	N/A	100%	100%
H. Wads /	1. Free of scour?	6	6	N/A	100%	
Boulders	2. Footing stable?	6	6	N/A	100%	100%

## Table 9. Verification of Bankfull Events

Date of DataDate of OccurrenceCollectionDate of Occurrence		Method	Photo (if available)
November 19, 2007         Between 8/31/2007           and 11/19/2007		Crest Gauge	
October 8, 2008	August 28, 2008	Total of 3.48 inches* of rain reported to fall over 2 days (August 27 – 28, 2008) as well as crest gauge readings at the Site	
February 9, 2009	Between 10/8/2008 and 2/9/2009	Crest Gauge	
June 19, 2009	Between June 15- 17, 2009	<ul> <li>1.43 inches of rain fall between June 4-5, 2009, followed by</li> <li>0.5 inches of rain fall between June 9-10, 2009, followed by</li> <li>an additional 2.24 inches of rain fall between June 14-17,</li> <li>2009* as well as crest gauge readings at the Site</li> </ul>	Event Photos 1-2 (see below)
March 16, 2010	November 11, 2009	3.44 inches of rain fall between November 10-12, 2009*	
February 17, 2010	February 5, 2010	Visual observations of overbank event including wrack lines and sediment deposition resulting from a 1.36 inch* rainfall event on February 5, 2010 that occurred after numerous rainfall events, within the 3 weeks prior, that totaled 3.52 inches.	Event Photo 3 (see below)
June 21, 2011	June 10, 2011	Visual observations of overbank event including wrack lines and sediment deposition resulting from a 1.74 inch* rainfall event on June 10, 2011	

### **Bold Run Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 439)**

\* Reported at KNCWAKEF1 Weather Station on Welcome Drive in Wake Forest.



Axiom Environmental, Inc.



Axiom Environmental, Inc.

River Basin:	Neuse	
Watershed:	Bold Run, MY-05	
XS ID	XS - 1, Riffle, 14+25	
Drainage Area (sq mi):	1.6	
Date:	2/9/2011	
Field Crew:	Dean, Perkinson	

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	278.4
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	32.3
Bankfull Width:	20.1
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	281.6
Flood Prone Width:	>80
Max Depth at Bankfull:	3.2
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	1.6
W / D Ratio:	12.5
Entrenchment Ratio:	>4
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0



Stream Type	E4



Station	Elevation
0.00	280.09
13.58	280.42
17.10	280.08
23.59	278.52
32.86	278.77
35.11	278.35
36.52	277.59
37.45	277.13
38.01	276.23
38.61	275.52
38.94	275.26
39.67	275.15
41.03	275.48
42.57	275.89
43.84	276.08
45.28	276.00
46.26	276.38
48.19	276.97
49.47	277.40
53.06	278.40
57.07	278.41
64.19	278.60
68.74	279.87
74.63	279.58
83.23	280.11

River Basin:	Neuse	
Watershed:	Bold Run, MY-05	
XS ID	XS - 2, Pool, 17+25	
Drainage Area (sq mi):	1.6	
Date:	2/9/2011	
Field Crew:	Dean, Perkinson	

Station	Elevation	
-4.18	274.20	
-4.08	278.47	
4.08	278.47	
9.14	276.73	
16.86	276.78	
18.77	276.48	
20.12	275.55	
22.49	274.73	
22.65	274.60	
23.04	274.22	
23.42	273.92	
23.76	273.79	
24.40	273.55	
25.37	273.37	
26.24	273.51	
27.69	274.16	
29.31	274.20	
30.95	274.72	
32.53	275.27	
33.84	276.05	
34.95	276.22	
35.58	276.34	
39.18	276.70	
44.91	276.80	
48.62	277.38	
53.73	278.84	
61.88	278.82	

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	276.4
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	29.7
Bankfull Width:	18.9
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	-
Flood Prone Width:	-
Max Depth at Bankfull:	3.0
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	1.6
W / D Ratio:	-
Entrenchment Ratio:	-
Bank Height Ratio:	-



Stream Type E4



River Basin:	Neuse
Watershed:	Bold Run, MY-05
XS ID	XS - 3, Riffle, 19+20
Drainage Area (sq mi):	1.6
Date:	2/9/2011
Field Crew:	Dean, Perkinson

Station	Elevation	
0.00	276.61	
10.60	276.72	
13.05	276.32	
15.49	275.26	
17.93	274.86	
23.63	274.69	
27.59	274.69	
29.10	273.77	
30.74	272.81	
32.78	272.82	
34.08	272.47	
35.19	271.74	
36.00	271.59	
37.61	271.39	
38.54	271.47	
39.38	271.56	
40.00	271.95	
40.27	272.11	
41.18	272.48	
42.08	272.96	
43.07	273.69	
44.12	274.30	
45.48	274.47	
51.78	274.63	
57.49	275.06	
61.44	276.44	
63.62	276.51	
68.68	276.62	
74.63	276.74	

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	274.7
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	28.5
Bankfull Width:	19.3
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	278.0
Flood Prone Width:	>74
Max Depth at Bankfull:	3.3
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	1.5
W / D Ratio:	13.1
Entrenchment Ratio:	>3
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0



Stream Type E4



River Basin:	Neuse
Watershed:	Bold Run, MY-05
XS ID	XS - 4, Riffle, 20+95
Drainage Area (sq mi):	1.6
Date:	2/9/2011
Field Crew:	Dean, Perkinson

Station	Elevation	
-1.3	275.4	
9.6	275.5	
14.6	274.1	
18.4	273.8	
23.8	274.1	
24.7	273.9	
26.2	273.0	
28.4	271.9	
29.8	270.8	
30.9	270.7	
33.7	270.9	
35.0	270.9	
35.9	270.9	
36.6	271.8	
38.4	272.6	
40.9	273.7	
44.4	273.9	
52.3	273.9	
57.9	275.6	
73.0	276.0	

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	273.7
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	30.6
Bankfull Width:	16.3
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	276.7
Flood Prone Width:	>70
Max Depth at Bankfull:	3.0
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	1.9
W / D Ratio:	8.7
Entrenchment Ratio:	>4
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0



Stream Type E4



River Basin:	Neuse
Watershed:	Bold Run, MY-05
XS ID	XS - 5, Pool, 24+15
Drainage Area (sq mi):	1.6
Date:	2/9/2011
Field Crew:	Dean, Perkinson

Station	Elevation
-1.7	274.4
3.1	274.4
12.0	271.6
18.0	271.4
23.3	269.8
29.4	269.5
33.0	269.4
34.5	269.1
35.4	268.2
38.8	268.2
40.4	268.0
42.0	267.6
44.2	266.7
45.1	266.7
46.5	268.2
49.2	267.2
50.1	269.4
51.5	271.3
57.3	271.2
61.7	271.5
66.3	273.1
77.7	273.4

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	271.3
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	80.9
Bankfull Width:	33.8
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	-
Flood Prone Width:	-
Max Depth at Bankfull:	4.9
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	2.4
W / D Ratio:	-
Entrenchment Ratio:	-
Bank Height Ratio:	-



Stream Type E4 Neuse River Basin, Bold Run, MY-05, XS - 5, Pool, 24+15 276 274 Elevation (feet) 525 (feet) ---Bankfull ---- Flood Prone Area As-Built 3/7/07 **-** MY-01 9/11/07 268 → MY-02 8/15/08 MY-03 7/14/09 266 • MY-4 6/21/10 40 Station (feet) 10 20 30 0 50 60 MY-05 2/9/11

Longitudinal Profile **Bold Run Creek** EEP Project Number 439 MY-05 Stations 10+00 - 18+00



Longitudinal Profile Bold Run Creek EEP Project Number 439 MY-05 Stations 18+00 - 26+30



Weighted Pebble Cou	unt														
Percent Riffle:	100		Percent	Run:											
Percent Pool:			Percent G	ilide:			Pebble Co	unt,							
Material	Size Range	e (mm)	Total #												
silt/clay	0	0.062	0.0	# #											
very fine sand	0.062	0.13	0.0	# #				_							
fine sand	0.13	0.25	0.0	# #		Note	Bold Run	2011 - XS	1						
medium sand	0.25	0.5	0.0	# #			-								
coarse sand	0.5	1	0.0	# #	4000/				Pel	oble Count,					
very coarse sand	1	2	0.0	# #	100%										
very fine gravel	2	4	0.0	# #	90%										
fine gravel	4	6	0.0	# #	000/										
fine gravel	6	8	0.0	# #	00%										
medium gravel	8	11	7.7	# #	70%										
medium gravel	11	16	0.0	# #	60%										
coarse grave	16	22	7.7	# #	- 0070										
coarse gravel	22	32	3.8	##	%07 ਬੁੱ										
very coarse gravel	32	45	1.1	##	F 40%										
very coarse grave	45	04	3.8	##	ine.										
small coople	04	90	30.0	# # # #	i⊑ 30%										
	90	120	20.9	##	9 8 20%										
very large cobble	120	256	0.0	##	ero										
small boulder	256	362	0.0	# #	<u> </u>					<b>*</b>					
small boulder	362	512	0.0	# #	0%						<b>* • • •</b>		<u><u></u></u>	<b>──♦</b> ── <b>♦</b>	
medium boulder	512	1024	0.0	# #	(	0.01	0.1		1	10		100	100	00	10000
large boulder	1024	20/18	0.0	# #		Darticlo Si	70 (mm)	_							
very large boulder	20/18	4096	0.0	# #		r ai licle Si		<b>—∎—</b> Cun	nulative Perce	ent 🔶 Per	rcent Item	–_≜– Riffle	→ Pool ·	—*— Run —	<ul> <li>Glide</li> </ul>
hedrock	2040	4030	0.0	# #		Size ne	ercent less th	an (mm)			Percer	nt hy substr	ate tyne		
Dedrock	Woid	hted Count:	100	<i>"</i>	D16	D35			D05	silt/clay	sand	dravel		boulder	bedrock
Tru	ue Total Par	ticle Count:	52		23.359	67.07	79.2	121	155	0%	0%	31%	69%	0%	0%

Weighted Pebble Cou	unt														
Percent Riffle:			Percent	Run:											
Percent Pool:	100		Percent G	ilide:			Pebble Co	unt,							
Material	Size Range	e (mm)	Total #												
silt/clay	0	0.062	11.9	# #											
very fine sand	0.062	0.13	0.0	# #				_							
fine sand	0.13	0.25	3.4	# #		Note	: Bold Run	2011 - XS	2						
medium sand	0.25	0.5	0.0	# #											
coarse sand	0.5	1	0.0	# #	4000/				Pel	oble Count,					
very coarse sand	1	2	0.0	# #	100%										
very fine gravel	2	4	0.0	# #	90%										
fine gravel	4	6	0.0	# #	000/							¥			
fine gravel	6	8	0.0	# #	00%										
medium gravel	8	11	5.1	# #	70%	-					/				
medium gravel	11	16	0.0	# #	60%										
coarse gravel	16	22	10.2	# #	- 00 %						<b>f</b>				
coarse grave	22	32	27.1	##	ਅ02 ਯੂ										
very coarse gravel	32	45	8.5	##	F 40%										
very coarse gravel	45	64	16.9	##	hei										
small cobble	64	90	10.2	##	፲ 30%						/ •				
medium cobbie	90	128	1.7	##	<u><u> </u></u>										
large cobble	128	256	5.1	##	ero -			_ <del></del>				•			
small boulder	256	200	0.0	##	<u> </u>						• •				
small boulder	200	512	0.0	# #	0%				····•	• • • •	<b>* • • •</b>		è-è-èè	<b>──♦</b> ── <b>♦</b>	
sinali boulder	512	1024	0.0	# # # #	(	01	0.1		1	10		100	100	00	10000
	1004	1024	0.0	<del>н</del> н ц ц			· ()		•						
large boulder	1024	2048	0.0	##		Particle S	ize (mm)	<b>—∎—</b> Cur	nulative Perce	ent 🔶 Pei	rcent Item	– Riffle	→ Pool -		<ul> <li>Glide</li> </ul>
very large boulder	2048	4096	0.0	##		0.		( )		1					
bedrock			0.0	#		Size pe	ercent less th	nan (mm)			Percer	nt by substra	ate type		T
_	Weigl	hted Count:	100	4	D16	D35	D50	D84	D95	silt/clay	sand	gravel	cobble	boulder	bedrock
Tru	<u>ue Total Par</u>	ticle Count:	59		8.383	23.41	28.8	66	129	12%	3%	68%	17%	0%	0%

Weighted Pebble Cou	int														
Percent Riffle:	100		Percent	Run:											
Percent Pool:			Percent G	lide:			Pebble Co	unt,							
Material	Size Range	e (mm)	Total #												
silt/clay	0	0.062	0.0	# #											
very fine sand	0.062	0.13	0.0	# #				_							
fine sand	0.13	0.25	0.0	# #		Note	: Bold Run	<u>2011 - XS</u>	3						
medium sand	0.25	0.5	0.0	# #				•							
coarse sand	0.5	1	6.0	# #	4000/				Pel	oble Count,					
very coarse sand	1	2	0.0	# #	100%										
very fine gravel	2	4	0.0	# #	90%										
fine gravel	4	6	0.0	# #	000/										
fine gravel	6	8	0.0	# #	00%							Ţ			
medium gravel	8	11	4.0	# #	70%							/			
medium gravel	11	16	0.0	# #	60%										
coarse gravel	16	22	16.0	# #	00%							1			
coarse gravel	22	32	10.0	# #	<u>%05 م</u>										
very coarse gravel	32	45	8.0	# #							1				
very coarse gravel	45	64	10.0	# #	e 40%										
small cobble	64	90	26.0	# #	i 30%										
medium cobble	90	128	16.0	# #	sook ent						1				
large cobble	128	180	4.0	# #	0 20%						<b>/</b>	•			
very large cobble	180	256	0.0	# #	<u>ل</u> 10%							•			
small boulder	256	362	0.0	##	0%							•			
small boulder	362	512	0.0	# #	070	0.04	0.1		4	10	••••	100	100		10000
medium boulder	512	1024	0.0	# #		0.01	0.1		1	10		100	100	00	10000
large boulder	1024	2048	0.0	# #		Particle S	ize (mm)	Cun	nulative Perce	ent 🔶 Pe	rcent Item		- Pool -		<ul> <li>Glide</li> </ul>
very large boulder	2048	4096	0.0	# #											
bedrock			0.0	#		Size percent less than (mm) Percent by substrate type									
	Weigl	hted Count:	100		D16	D35	D50	D84	D95	silt/clay	sand	gravel	cobble	boulder	bedrock
Tru	ie Total Par	ticle Count:	50		18.029	30.82	55.6	98	125	0%	6%	48%	46%	0%	0%

Weighted Pebble Cou	ınt														
Percent Riffle:	100		Percent	Run:											
Percent Pool:			Percent G	ilide:			Pebble Co	unt,							
Material	Size Range	e (mm)	Total #												
silt/clay	0	0.062	0.0	# #											
very fine sand	0.062	0.13	0.0	# #				_							
fine sand	0.13	0.25	2.0	# #		Note	Bold Run	2011 - XS	4						
medium sand	0.25	0.5	0.0	# #				-							
coarse sand	0.5	1	4.0	# #	4000/				Pel	oble Count,					
very coarse sand	1	2	0.0	# #	100%										
very fine gravel	2	4	0.0	# #	90%							/			
fine gravel	4	6	0.0	# #	000/										
fine gravel	6	8	0.0	# #	00%										
medium gravel	8	11	6.0	# #	70%										
medium gravel	11	16	0.0	# #	60%										
coarse gravel	16	22	0.0	# #	00%										
coarse gravel	22	32	20.0	# #	ष्ट्र 50%						/				
very coarse gravel	32	45	8.0	# #											
very coarse gravel	45	64	22.0	# #	e 40%										
small cobble	64	90	20.0	# #	iĒ 30%										
medium cobble	90	128	12.0	# #	ent 20%							•			
large cobble	128	180	4.0	# #	0 20%										
very large cobble	180	256	2.0	##	<u>10%</u> م						-22	•			
small boulder	256	362	0.0	##	0%							•			
small boulder	362	512	0.0	# #	070	0.01	0.1	• •	1	10	••••	100	100		10000
medium boulder	512	1024	0.0	# #		0.01	0.1		l	10		100	100	00	10000
large boulder	1024	2048	0.0	# #		Particle S	ize (mm)	Cum	nulative Perce	ent 🔶 Pe	rcent Item		→ Pool -		<ul> <li>Glide</li> </ul>
very large boulder	2048	4096	0.0	# #						ú.					
bedrock			0.0	#	Size percent less than (mm) Percent by substrate type										
	Weig	hted Count:	100		D16	D35	D50	D84	D95	silt/clay	sand	gravel	cobble	boulder	bedrock
Tru	ie Total Par	ticle Count:	50		23.712	36.36	52.8	95	139	0%	6%	56%	38%	0%	0%

Weighted Pebble Cou	unt														
Percent Riffle:			Percent	Run:											
Percent Pool:	100		Percent G	ilide:			Pebble Co	unt,							
Material	Size Range	e (mm)	Total #												
silt/clay	0	0.062	18.0	# #											
very fine sand	0.062	0.13	10.0	# #				_							
fine sand	0.13	0.25	24.0	# #		Note:	Bold Run	2011 - XS (	5						
medium sand	0.25	0.5	4.0	# #			-								
coarse sand	0.5	1	12.0	# #	4000/				Pet	ble Count,					
very coarse sand	1	2	0.0	# #	100%										
very fine gravel	2	4	0.0	# #	90%										
fine gravel	4	6	0.0	# #	000/										
fine gravel	6	8	0.0	# #	00%						1				
medium gravel	8	11	0.0	# #	70%						4				
medium gravel	11	16	0.0	# #	60%										
coarse grave	16	22	10.0	# #	- 00 /0										
coarse grave	22	32	10.0	##	,000 ਯੂ										
very coarse gravel	32	45	6.0	##	Ë 40%										
very coarse grave	45	64	6.0	##	ie ie			/							
small cobble	64	90	0.0	##	년 30%		× ×								
	90	128	0.0	##	<u><u></u> 8 20%</u>			•							
vorv large cobble	120	256	0.0	##	e e										
small boulder	256	362	0.0	##	<u> </u>		•					•			
small boulder	362	512	0.0	<i></i>	0%				• •		<b>* * * *</b>	• • • • •		┝──╈─┴╈	
medium boulder	512	1024	0.0	# #	(	0.01	0.1		1	10		100	100	00	10000
large boulder	1024	2048	0.0	<i></i>		Darticla Si	70 (mm)	_							
verv large boulder	2048	4096	0.0	# #				Cum	ulative Perce	nt 🕈 Pe	rcent Item -	≜ Rittle	- Pool -		← Glide
bedrock	2040	-1000	0.0	#		Size ne	rcent less th	an (mm)			Percer	nt by substra	ate type		
	Weiał	nted Count <sup>.</sup>	100	1 1	D16	D35	D50	D84	D95	silt/clav	sand	gravel	cobble	boulder	bedrock
Tru	ue Total Par	ticle Count:	50		#N/A	0.15	0.2	28	48	18%	50%	32%	0%	0%	0%