Chapel Creek Stream Restoration Project Orange County, North Carolina EEP Project #77



MY-01 Monitoring Report - Final Data Collected: September 2009 Submitted: December 1, 2009



Prepared for: North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources Ecosystem Enhancement Program Parker Lincoln Building 2728 Capital Boulevard, Suite 1H-103 Raleigh, NC 27606

Chapel Creek Stream Restoration EEP Project #77 Chapel Hill, North Carolina Orange County

MY-01 Monitoring Report - Final Prepared By:



Ward Consulting Engineers, P.C. Project Manager: Becky Ward, P.E. 8386 Six Forks Road, Suite 101 Raleigh, NC 27615-5088 Ph: 919-870-0526 Fax: 919-870-5359

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary	. 1
II.	Methodology	. 2
A	. Vegetation Methodologies	. 2
В	Stream Methodologies	. 2
III.	References	. 3

APPENDICES

Appendix A. General Figures and Plan Views	4
Figure 1A. Vicinity Map	5
Figure 2. Consolidated Current Condition Plan View	6
Appendix B. General Projects Tables	7
Table 1. Project Restoration Components	8
Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History	8
Table 3. Project Contacts Table	9
Table 4. Project Attribute Table	10
Appendix C. Vegetation Assessment Data	. 11
Photo 1. Vegetation Plot 1	12
Photo 2. Vegetation Plot 2	12
Photo 3. Vegetation Plot 3	13
Photo 4. Vegetation Plot 4	13
Table 5. Stem Count Total and Planted by Plot and Species	.14
Appendix D. Stream Assessment Data	. 15
Photo 5. Looking downstream at XS-1	16
Photo 6. Looking downstream at XS-2	16
Photo 7. Looking downstream at XS-3	17
Photo 8. Looking downstream at XS-4	.17
Photo 9. Looking downstream at XS-5	18
Table 6. Visual Morphological Stability Assessment	. 19
Table 7. Verification of Bankfull Events	. 20
Figure 3. Cross-Section 1	21
Figure 4. Cross-Section 2	22
Figure 5. Cross-Section 3	23
Figure 6. Cross-Section 4	. 24
Figure 7. Cross-Section 5	. 25
Figure 8. Longitudinal Profile	. 26
Figure 9. Pebble Count Plots – XS-1	. 27
Figure 10. Pebble Count Plots – XS-2	. 28
Figure 11. Pebble Count Plots – XS-4	. 29
Figure 12. Pebble Count Plots – XS-5	. 29

I. Executive Summary

The North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program (EEP) has completed a stream restoration project along approximately 1,350 linear feet of Chapel Creek, located on University of North Carolina property in Chapel Hill, Orange County, North Carolina. The project is located in the Morgan Creek Local Watershed planning area, within the 14-digit HUC 03030002060080. The drainage area for Chapel Creek is approximately 0.42 square miles at the downstream limit of the project where a drainage channel through the A.E. Finley Golf Course flows into Chapel Creek. The land use in the watershed consists of University of North Carolina facilities, single family residential, elementary schools, roadways, and forested land. The Morgan Creek LWP noted water quality degradation and impaired biological community in the watershed and identified major watershed stressors as: streambank erosion, excess stormwater runoff, and disturbed riparian buffers. The goals of the restoration project are to improve water quality in Chapel Creek and the Cape Fear river basin by:

- Channel restoration of pattern, profile, and dimension for approximately 960 linear feet of Chapel Creek.
- Channel enhancement/stabilization for approximately 330 feet with a Priority Two restoration approach, bankfull bench and stream bank repairs.
- Restore reach to a stable stream channel, capable of transporting flows and sediment load efficiently.
- Improve aquatic habitat by planting trees along the banks in the cleared section to increase shade and adding more sinuosity to create more pool and riffle sections.
- Reduce sediment inputs to the stream from bank erosion by re-vegetating the banks.

The new CVS-EEP protocol was not administered for monitoring year one. Four vegetation monitoring plots were monitored and only planted stems were counted to monitor success criteria. Currently, 769 planted stems per acre are succeeding within the conservation easement. The success criteria of the planted woody species are the survival of 320 stems/acre after monitoring year three (MY3). A mortality rate of ten percent will be allowed after MY4 (288 stems/acre), with another ten percent mortality rate allowed after MY5 requiring a minimum of 260 stems/acre. Herbaceous species such as dog fennel (*Eupatorium capillifolium*), horseweed (*Erigeron canadensis*), tickseed (*Bidens* sp.), seedbox (*Ludwigia* sp.), smartweed (*Persicaria* sp.), common rush (*Juncus* sp.), sedges (*Carex* sp.), and various grasses, are present throughout the conservation easement. Woody species observed that were not planted include easterm red cedar (*Juniperus virginiana*), loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*), silverling (*Baccharis halimifolia*), sycamore (*Platanus occidentalis*), green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), tulip poplar (*Liriodendron tulipifera*), sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), hickory (*Carya* sp.), hazelnut (*Corylus americana*), willow oak (*Quercus phellos*), black willow (*Salix nigra*), and tag alder (*Alnus serrulata*).

Invasive exotics observed include Japanese honeysuckle (*Lonicera japonica*), Japanese stiltgrass (*Microstegium vimineum*), autumn olive (*Elaeagnus umbellata*), multiflora rose (*Rosa multiflora*), and Chinese privet (*Ligustrum sinense*). According to the NC Native Plant Society all of these species are classified as Rank 1 "Severe Threat" species which is defined as exotic plant species that have invasive characteristics and spread readily into native plant communities,

displacing native vegetation. Although these species have been given this rank, the functionality of the project is not expected to be impaired significantly. The vegetation problem areas consist of invasive exotic species present within the conservation easement. See Table - for vegetation problem area descriptions and figure – for their locations. See section - of Appendix - for representative photos of the vegetation problem areas observed within the conservation easement of Chapel Creek.

The channel and banks of the restoration project are stable when compared to MY-00. There are not any negligible changes in pattern, profile or dimension between the monitoring years. The riffle pebble counts are trending slightly finer, but this is to be expected as the larger substrate in constructed riffles picks up some sediment deposition. A few problem areas were noted in the banks, but these do not appear to be further degrading and will likely continue to stabilize as vegetation is established.

Summary information/data related to the occurrence of items and statistics related to performance of various project and monitoring elements, can be found in the tables and figures in the report appendices. Narrative background and supporting information formally found in these reports can be found in the mitigation and restoration plan documents available on EEP's website. All raw data supporting the tables and figures in the appendices is available from EEP upon request.

II. Methodology

Methodologies follow EEP monitoring report template Version 1.2.1 (06/01/09) and guidelines (Lee et al 2008). Photos were taken with a digital camera. A Trimble Geo XT handheld unit with sub-meter accuracy was used to collect vegetation monitoring plot origins, and problem area locations. Cross sectional and longitudinal surveys were conducted using total station survey equipment. Data was entered into AutoCAD Civil3D to obtain dimensions of the cross sections and parameters applicable to the longitudinal profile. Reports were then generated to display summaries of the stream survey.

A. Vegetation Methodologies

A total of four 100m² vegetation monitoring plots were established during as built data collection. VP1, VP3, and VP4 are 20m x 5m plots and VP2 is a 10m x 10m plot. Planted stems within each plot were identified and counted to determine the number of stems/acre. Data collected for these plots are in Appendix C. The CVS-EEP protocol was not implemented for this project

B. Stream Methodologies

Stream profile and cross-sections were surveyed using total station equipment and methods. The survey data was plotted using AutoCAD Civil3D. The longitudinal profile was generated using the MY-02 alignment. Cross sectional data was extracted based on a linear alignment between the end pins.

III. References

Miller, James H. 2003. <u>Nonnative invasive plants of southern forests: a field guide for</u> <u>identification and control.</u> Gen. Tech. Rep. SRS–62. Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 93 p.

Weakley, Alan (2006). *Flora of the Carolinas, Virginia, Georgia, and Surrounding Areas*. http://www.herbarium.unc.edu/flora.htm.

Appendix A. General Figures and Plan Views





Appendix B. General Projects Tables

		1									
Table 1. Project Restoration Components Chapel Creek Stream Restoration-Project No. 77											
Project Segment Reach I.D.	Existing Feet	Mitigation Type	Approach	Linear Feet	Mitigation Ratio	Mitigation Units	Stationing	Comments			
Reach I	957	Restoration	Priority 1	961	1	961	0+00 to 9+94	Includes 900 If of channel relocation			
Reach II	356	Enhancement II	Priority 3	330	1.5	220	9+94 to 13+50	Instream Structure and Vegetated Buffers			
Mitigation Unit Summations											
Stream (If)	Ripari	Riparian Wetland (Ac)		Nonriparian Wetland (Ac)		Total Wetland(Ac)		Comment			
1181	1181 0				(0	1.2				

Table 1. Project Restoration Components

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting HistoryChapel Creek Stream Restoration-Project No. 77								
Activity or Reporting	Data Collection Complete	Actual Completion Date						
Restoration Plan		Aug-06						
Final Design – Construction Plans		Jun-07						
Construction		Jul-08						
Temporary S&E mix applied to entire project area		Jul-08						
Permanent seed mix applied to enitre project area		Jul-08						
Repairs to stream due to damages from storm events		Mar-09						
Temporary S&E mix applied to area disturbed by repairs		Mar-09						
Permanent seed mix applied to area disturbed by repairs		Mar-09						
Containerized and B&B plantings for entire reach		Mar-09						
Mitigation Plan / As-built (Year 0 Monitoring – baseline)	Mar-09	Mar-09						
Year 1 Monitoring	Sept-09	Nov-09						
Year 2 Monitoring								
Year 3 Monitoring								
Year 4 Monitoring								
Year 5 Monitoring								
Year 5+ Monitoring								

Table 3. Project Contacts Table

Table 3. Project Contacts Table							
Chapel Creek St	ream Restoration - Project No. 77						
Designer	Ward Consulting Engineers, P.C.						
	8386 Six Forks Road Suite 101						
	Raleigh, NC 27615-5088						
Primary project design POC	Becky Ward 919-870-0526						
Construction Contractor	River Works, Inc.						
	800 Regency Parkway, Suite 200						
	Cary, NC 27518						
Construction contractor POC	Will Pederson 919-459-9001						
Survey Contractor	Level Cross Surveying, PLLC (all surveying)						
	668 Marsh County Lane						
	Randleman, NC 27317						
Survey contractor POC	Sherie Willard 336-495-1713						
Planting Contractor	River Works, Inc.						
	800 Regency Parkway, Suite 200						
	Cary, NC 27518						
Planting contractor POC	Will Pederson 919-459-9001						
Seeding Contractor	River Works, Inc.						
	800 Regency Parkway, Suite 200						
	Cary, NC 27518						
Contractor point of contact	Will Pederson 919-459-9001						
Seed Mix Sources	Green Resource 336-855-6363						
Nursery Stock Suppliers	Mellow Marsh Farm, Inc. 919-742-1200						
	Cure Nursery 919-542-6186						
Monitoring Performers	Ward Consulting Engineers, P.C.						
	8386 Six Forks Road Suite 101						
	Raleigh, NC 27615-5088						
Stream Monitoring POC	Robert Langager 919-870-0526						
Vegetation Monitoring POC	Chris Sheats - The Catena Group - 919-732-1300						

Table 4.	Project	Attribute	Table
----------	---------	-----------	-------

Table 4. Project Background Table Chapel Creek Stream Restoration Site-Project No. 77							
Project County	Orange						
Drainage Area	0.42 square miles						
Drainage impervious surface cover estimate (%)	< 5%						
Stream Order	2						
Physiographic Region	Piedmont (Triassic Basin)						
Ecoregion	Central Piedmont						
Rosgen Classification of As-Built	C4						
Cowardin Classification	Riverine						
Dominant Soil Types	Chewacla						
Reference Site ID	Cabin Branch						
USGS HUC for Project	03030002						
USGS HUC for Reference	03020201						
NCDWQ Sub-basin for Project	03-06-06						
NCDWQ Sub-basin for Reference Reach	03-04-01						
NCDWQ Classification for Project	WS-IV;NSW						
NCDWQ Classification for Reference	WS-IV;NSW						
Is any portion of any project segment 303D listed?	No						
Is any portion of any project segment upstream of a 303D listed segment?	Yes						
Reasons for 303D listing or stressor	Standard Violation						
% of project easement fenced	0%						

Appendix C. Vegetation Assessment Data

Vegetation Monitoring Plots Photos



Photo 1. Vegetation Plot 1



Photo 2. Vegetation Plot 2

Chapel Creek Stream Restoration NCEEP Project number: 77 Ward Consulting Engineers, P.C. Year 1 Monitoring Report-FINAL Year 1 of 5 December 2009



Photo 3. Vegetation Plot 3



Photo 4. Vegetation Plot 4

Chapel Creek Stream Restoration NCEEP Project number: 77 Ward Consulting Engineers, P.C.

Scientific Name	Common Nama		Plo	Tatal			
Scientific Name	Common Name	1	2	3	4		
Magnolia virginiana	Sweetbay Magnolia	3				3	
Rosa palustris	Swamp Rose	5				5	
Rhododendron viscosum	Swamp Azalea					0	
Viburnum cassinoides	Northern Wild Raisin					0	
Hibiscus moscheutos	Eastern Rose Mallow	2				2	
Vaccinium corymbosum	Highbush Blueberry	1				1	
Diospyros virginiana	American Persimmon	1	3	3		7	
Lindera benzoin	Spicebush			5	2	7	
Quercus nigra	Water Oak		1		2	3	
Carpinus caroliniana	Ironwood				3	3	
Betula nigra	River Birch		2	5	6	13	
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	Green Ash		4	2	5	11	
Platanus occidentalis	Sycamore		3			3	
Calycanthus floridus	Sweet-shrub			1	3	4	
Hamamelis virgniniana	Witch-hazel					0	
Viburnum dentatum	Mapleleaf Viburnum	1	2	4		7	
Viburnum nudum	Possumhaw					0	
Cornus amomum	Silky Dogwood			4		4	
Xanthorhiza simplicissima	Brook-feather			2		2	
Cephalanthus occidentalis	Buttonbush			1		1	
		13	15	27	21	76	

Total

Table 5. Stem Count Total and Planted by Plot and Species

Appendix D. Stream Assessment Data

Stream Station Photos



Photo 5. Looking downstream at XS-1



Photo 6. Looking downstream at XS-2

Chapel Creek Stream Restoration NCEEP Project number: 77 Ward Consulting Engineers, P.C.



Photo 7. Looking downstream at XS-3



Photo 8. Looking downstream at XS-4



Photo 9. Looking downstream at XS-5

Table 6. Visual Morphological Stability Assessment											
Chapel Creek Stream Restoration-Project N0. 77											
	Reach 1 (Restor	ration): (961	feet)								
		(# Stable)	T (1	Total	0/	F (
		Number Performing	1 otal number	Number / feet in	% Perform	Perform					
Feature		as	per	unstable	in Stable	Mean or					
Category	Metric (per As-built and reference baselines)	Intended	As-built	state	Condition	Total					
A.	1. Present?	18	18	NA	100%						
Riffles	2. Armor stable (e.g.no displacement?)	18	18	NA	100%						
	3. Facet grade appears stable?	17	18	NA	94%						
	4. Minimal evidence of embedding/fining?	18	18	NA	100%						
	5. Length appropriate?	17	18	NA	94%	98%					
B. Pools	1. Present? (e.g. not subject to severe aggrad. Or migrat.?)	17	17	NA	100%						
	2. Sufficiently deep (Max. Pool D:Mean Bkf>1.6?)	17	17	NA	100%						
	3. Length appropriate?	17	17	NA	100%	100%					
C. Thalweg	1. Upstream of meander bend (run/inflection) centering?	18	18	NA	100%						
	2. Downstream of meander (glide/inflection) centering?	18	18	NA	100%	100%					
D. Meanders	1. Outer bend in state of limited/controlled erosion?	12	17	NA	71%						
	2. Of those eroding, # w/concomitant point bar formation?	1	5	NA	20%						
	3. Apparent Rc within spec?	17	17	NA	100%						
	4. Sufficient floodplain access and relief?	17	17	NA	100%	73%					
E. Bed	1. General channel bed aggradation areas (bar formation)	NA	NA	0	100%						
General	2. Channel bed degradation-areas of increasing downcutting of head cutting?	NA	NA	0	100%	100%					
F. Bank	1. Actively eroding, wasting, or slumping bank?	NA	NA	7/70	96%	96%					
G.	1. Free of back or arm scour?	8	8	NA	100%						
Cross	2. Height appropriate?	8	8	NA	100%						
sills,	3. Angle and geometry appear appropriate?	8	8	NA	100%						
single wing vanes	4. Free of piping or other structural failures?	8	8	NA	100%	100%					
H.	1. Free of scour?	1	1	NA	100%						
Wads/ Boulders	2. Footing stable?	1	1	NA	100%	100%					

Table 6. Visual Morphological Stability Assessment

Table 7. Verification of Bankfull Events Chanel Creek Stream Restoration-Project No. 77									
	SICCK Stream Restor								
Date of Data Collection	Date of Occurrence	Method	Photo #						
September 2008	August 27, 2008	4.25 inches of rain.	N/A						
September 2008	September 6, 2008	Tropical Storm Hanna: 4.8 inches of rain in 8 hours.	N/A						

Table 7. Verification of Bankfull Events

								Fig	jure 3.	Cross Section 1
Project:	Chapel Cre	ek		10/0	Sun	nmary (ban	kfull)		10/5	
Cross Sectio	on: Cross Secti	ion 1	A (DI	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	
Feature Station:	Rime 3±27		A (Br	F) 30.6 (F) 10.0	29.2					
Date:	9/17/09		Max	2.4	2.3					A STREAM CONTRACTOR OF
Crew:	RL,BW,SV,	RW	Mear	d 1.5	1.5					
			W/D	12.9	12.6					
Station	MY0-2008	Station	MY1-2009	oc Station	MY3-2010	Notos	Station	MY4-2011 Elevation	Notoc	
0	266.3 CS1LP	0.00	266.32 CS1L	P	Lievation	NULES	Station	Lievation	NULES	
0.64	266.18	18.18	265.11							
17.02	265.02	29.77	265.02							
44.5	265.04	44.34	265.24							
60.68	265.73 266.20 PKE	61.77	265.73							
86.28	264.74	78.71	266.05							
89.1	264.37	82.59	266.26 BKF							
89.64	264.12	84.02	265.61							
91.09	264.07	86.10	264.76							
92.6	263.89 1 W	88.63	264.47							
95.18	264.28	91.09	264.06							
96.67	264.35	92.55	263.95 TW							
99.42	265.03	94.36	264.05							
102.61	266.48 BKF	95.80	264.36							
122.07	267.18	98.88	264.98							
129.16	267.75	102.19	266.45 BKF							
162.74	269.39	111.02	266.62							
169.8	269.71 CS1RP	125.08	267.42							
		155.50	268.91							
		169.83	269.68 CS1F	Р						Photo of XS-1, looking in the downstream direction
								Cross	Section	1 Station 3+27 Riffle
271 -										
269 -										
000										
(Fee										
vation (Fee										
Elevation (Fee										
- 267 - 267 - 266 - 266 - 267 - 266							•		-	
267 - 267 - 266 - 265 - 264 -							•			
267 - 266 - 265 - 264 - 263 -		20		, 40		6	•		80	
267 - 266 - 265 - 264 - 263 - 263 -		20		, 40		,	•		80	100 120 140 160 180 Station (Feet)







Figure 8. Chapel Creek MY-01 Longitudinal Profile

Figure 9. Pebble Count-Cross Section 1											
Project:	Chapel Creek	, Chapel Hill, I	NC			Date:	9/17/2009)			
Location:	CS-1										
				Particle	Counts						
Inches	Particle	Millimeter		Riffles	Pools	Total No.	Item %	% Cumulative			
	Silt/Clay	< 0.062	S/C	0	0	0	0%	0%			
	Very Fine	.062125	S	0	0	0	0%	0%			
	Fine	.12525	Α	0	0	0	0%	0%			
	Medium	.2550	N	0	0	0	0%	0%			
	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	D	2	0	2	2%	2%			
.0408	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0	S	1	0	1	1%	3%			
.0816	Very Fine	2.0 - 4.0		0	0	0	0%	3%			
.1622	Fine	4.0 - 5.7	G	0	0	0	0%	3%			
.2231	Fine	5.7 - 8.0	R	1	0	1	1%	4%			
.3144	Medium	8.0 - 11.3	A	0	0	0	0%	4%			
.4463	Medium	11.3 - 16.0	V	0	0	0	0%	4%			
.6389	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	E	2	0	2	2%	6%			
.89 - 1.26	Coarse	22.6 - 32.0	L	9	0	9	9%	14%			
1.26 - 1.77	Very Coarse	32.0 - 45.0	S	18	0	18	17%	32%			
1.77 - 2.5	Very Coarse	45.0 - 64.0		34	0	34	33%	64%			
2.5 - 3.5	Small	64 - 90	С	22	0	22	21%	86%			
3.5 - 5.0	Small	90 - 128	0	8	0	8	8%	93%			
5.0 - 7.1	Large	128 - 180	В	4	0	4	4%	97%			
7.1 - 10.1	Large	180 - 256	L	2	0	2	2%	99%			
10.1 - 14.3	Small	256 - 362	В	1	0	1	1%	100%			
14.3 - 20	Small	362 - 512	Ŀ	0	0	0	0%	100%			
20 - 40	Medium	512 - 1024	D	0	0	0	0%	100%			
40 - 80	Lrg- Very Lrg	1024 - 2048	R	0	0	0	0%	100%			
	Bedrock		BDRK	0	0	0	0%	100%			
			Totals	104	0	104	100%	100%			

d16	d35	d50	d84	d95
33.2	46.9	55.6	88.1	151.4

Figure 10. Pebble Count-Cross Section 2									
Project:	Chapel Creek	, Chapel Hill, I	NC			Date:	9/17/2009)	
Location:	CS-2								
Particle Counts									
Inches	Particle	Millimeter		Riffles	Pools	Total No.	Item %	% Cumulative	
	Silt/Clay	< 0.062	S/C	0	0	0	0%	0%	
	Very Fine	.062125	S	0	0	0	0%	0%	
	Fine	.12525	Α	0	0	0	0%	0%	
	Medium	.2550	N	1	0	1	1%	1%	
	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	D	6	0	6	6%	7%	
.0408	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0	S	6	0	6	6%	13%	
.0816	Very Fine	2.0 - 4.0		0	0	0	0%	13%	
.1622	Fine	4.0 - 5.7	G	0	0	0	0%	13%	
.2231	Fine	5.7 - 8.0	R	0	0	0	0%	13%	
.3144	Medium	8.0 - 11.3	Α	0	0	0	0%	13%	
.4463	Medium	11.3 - 16.0	V	0	0	0	0%	13%	
.6389	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	::::E::::	3	0	3	3%	16%	
.89 - 1.26	Coarse	22.6 - 32.0	L	2	0	2	2%	17%	
1.26 - 1.77	Very Coarse	32.0 - 45.0	S	18	0	18	17%	35%	
1.77 - 2.5	Very Coarse	45.0 - 64.0		29	0	29	28%	63%	
2.5 - 3.5	Small	64 - 90	С	25	0	25	24%	87%	
3.5 - 5.0	Small	90 - 128	O	6	0	6	6%	93%	
5.0 - 7.1	Large	128 - 180	В	3	0	3	3%	96%	
7.1 - 10.1	Large	180 - 256	L	2	0	2	2%	98%	
10.1 - 14.3	Small	256 - 362	В	1	0	1	1%	99%	
14.3 - 20	Small	362 - 512	L	0	0	0	0%	99%	
20 - 40	Medium	512 - 1024	D	1	0	1	1%	100%	
40 - 80	Lrg- Very Lrg	1024 - 2048	R	0	0	0	0%	100%	
	Bedrock		BDRK	0	0	0	0%	100%	
			Totals	103	0	103	100%	100%	

d16	d35	d50	d84	d95
24.4	45.0	55.2	86.4	160.1

Figure 11. Pebble Count-Cross Section 4										
Project:	Chapel Creek	, Chapel Hill, I	NC			Date:	9/17/2009)		
Location:	CS-4									
	Particle Counts									
Inches	Particle	Millimeter		Riffles	Pools	Total No.	Item %	% Cumulative		
	Silt/Clay	< 0.062	S/C	0	0	0	0%	0%		
	Very Fine	.062125	S	0	0	0	0%	0%		
	Fine	.12525	Α	0	0	0	0%	0%		
	Medium	.2550	N	2	0	2	2%	2%		
	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	D	1	0	1	1%	3%		
.0408	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0	S	0	0	0	0%	3%		
.0816	Very Fine	2.0 - 4.0		0	0	0	0%	3%		
.1622	Fine	4.0 - 5.7	G	0	0	0	0%	3%		
.2231	Fine	5.7 - 8.0	R	0	0	0	0%	3%		
.3144	Medium	8.0 - 11.3	Α	0	0	0	0%	3%		
.4463	Medium	11.3 - 16.0	V	0	0	0	0%	3%		
.6389	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	E	0	0	0	0%	3%		
.89 - 1.26	Coarse	22.6 - 32.0	L	2	0	2	2%	5%		
1.26 - 1.77	Very Coarse	32.0 - 45.0	S	8	0	8	8%	13%		
1.77 - 2.5	Very Coarse	45.0 - 64.0		37	0	37	37%	50%		
2.5 - 3.5	Small	64 - 90	С	31	0	31	31%	80%		
3.5 - 5.0	Small	90 - 128	0	8	0	8	8%	88%		
5.0 - 7.1	Large	128 - 180	В	4	0	4	4%	92%		
7.1 - 10.1	Large	180 - 256	· · · · · · · .	6	0	6	6%	98%		
10.1 - 14.3	Small	256 - 362	В	1	0	1	1%	99%		
14.3 - 20	Small	362 - 512	L	1	0	1	1%	100%		
20 - 40	Medium	512 - 1024	D	0	0	0	0%	100%		
40 - 80	Lrg- Very Lrg	1024 - 2048	R	0	0	0	0%	100%		
	Bedrock		BDRK	0	0	0	0%	100%		
			Totals	101	0	101	100%	100%		

d16	d35	d50	d84	d95
46.6	56.5	64.4	108.2	217.4

Figure 12. Pebble Count-Cross Section 5										
Project:	Chapel Creek	, Chapel Hill, I	NC			Date:	9/17/2009)		
Location:	CS-5									
	Particle Counts									
Inches	Particle	Millimeter		Riffles	Pools	Total No.	Item %	% Cumulative		
	Silt/Clay	< 0.062	S/C	0	0	0	0%	0%		
	Very Fine	.062125	S	0	0	0	0%	0%		
	Fine	.12525	Α	0	0	0	0%	0%		
	Medium	.2550	N	7	0	7	7%	7%		
	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	D	13	0	13	13%	19%		
.0408	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0	S	11	0	11	11%	30%		
.0816	Very Fine	2.0 - 4.0		0	0	0	0%	30%		
.1622	Fine	4.0 - 5.7	G	1	0	1	1%	31%		
.2231	Fine	5.7 - 8.0	R	1	0	1	1%	32%		
.3144	Medium	8.0 - 11.3	Α	1	0	1	1%	33%		
.4463	Medium	11.3 - 16.0	V	8	0	8	8%	41%		
.6389	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	:E	9	0	9	9%	50%		
.89 - 1.26	Coarse	22.6 - 32.0	L	18	0	18	17%	67%		
1.26 - 1.77	Very Coarse	32.0 - 45.0	S	8	0	8	8%	75%		
1.77 - 2.5	Very Coarse	45.0 - 64.0		13	0	13	13%	87%		
2.5 - 3.5	Small	64 - 90	С	6	0	6	6%	93%		
3.5 - 5.0	Small	90 - 128	0	3	0	3	3%	96%		
5.0 - 7.1	Large	128 - 180	В	3	0	3	3%	99%		
7.1 - 10.1	Large	180 - 256	L	1	0	1	1%	100%		
10.1 - 14.3	Small	256 - 362	В	0	0	0	0%	100%		
14.3 - 20	Small	362 - 512	L	0	0	0	0%	100%		
20 - 40	Medium	512 - 1024	D	0	0	0	0%	100%		
40 - 80	Lrg- Very Lrg	1024 - 2048	R	0	0	0	0%	100%		
	Bedrock		BDRK	0	0	0	0%	100%		
			Totals	103	0	103	100%	100%		

d16	d35	d50	d84	d95
0.9	12.3	22.3	58.9	113.4

