BEAVERDAM CREEK STREAM RESTORATION PROJECT ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT FOR 2006-2007 (YEAR 1)

Project Number: D05016-1



Submitted to:



NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program 2728 Capital Blvd, Suite 1H 103 Raleigh, NC 27604

December, 2007

Prepared for: River Works, Inc.



8000 Regency Parkway Suite 200 Cary, NC 27511 Prepared by: Baker Engineering



1447 South Tryon St., Ste. 200 Charlotte, NC 28203

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITL	E PAGE	
TABL	E OF CONTENTS	i
EXEC	CUTIVE SUMMARY	1
1.0	PROJECT BACKGROUND	2
1.1 1.2 1.3	Project Location Mitigation Goals and Objectives Project Description and Restoration Approach	2
1.4 1.5	Project History and Background Project Plan	4 8
2.0	VEGETATION MONITORING	8
2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 2.5 2.6 2.7	Soil Data Description of Species and Monitoring Protocol Vegetation Success Criteria Results of Vegetative Monitoring Vegetation Observations Vegetation Problem Areas Vegetation Photos	9 9 10 12 12
2.7 3.0	Vegetation Photos STREAM MONITORING	
3.1 3.2 3.3 3.4 3.5 3.6 3.7	Description of Stream Monitoring Stream Restoration Success Criteria Bankfull Discharge Monitoring Results Stream Monitoring Data and Photos Stream Stability Assessment Cross-section, Longitudinal Profile, and Bed Material Analysis Monitoring Results Areas of Concern	12 13 13 14 14 15
4.0	HYDROLOGY	16
5.0	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	17
6.0	WILDLIFE OBSERVATIONS	17
7.0	REFERENCES	17

APPENDICES

- APPENDIX A Project Photo Log
- APPENDIX B Stream Monitoring Data
- APPENDIX C As-built Plan Sheets
- APPENDIX D Baseline Stream Summary for Restoration Reaches
- APPENDIX E Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary Year 1 Monitoring

LIST OF TABLES

- **Table 1.**Project Mitigation Approach
- **Table 2.**Project Activity and Reporting History
- **Table 3.**Project Contact Table
- Table 4.Project Background
- Table 5.Soil Data for Project
- **Table 6.**Tree Species Planted
- **Table 7.**Year 1 Stem Counts for Each Species Arranged by Plot
- **Table 8.**Verification of Bankfull Events
- **Table 9.**Categorical Stream Feature Visual Stability Assessment
- **Table 10.**Comparison of Historic Rainfall to Observed Rainfall
- **Table 11.**Hydrologic Monitoring Results for Year 1

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 1.Site Vicinity Map
- Figure 2. Site Topographic Map
- Figure 3. Restoration Summary Map
- Figure 4. Stage Recorder Locations
- Figure 5. Historic Average vs. Observed Rainfall

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Annual Report details the monitoring activities during the 2007 growing season on the Beaverdam Creek Stream Restoration Site ("Site"). Construction of the Site, including planting of trees, was completed in March 2007. In order to document project success, twenty-four vegetation monitoring plots, eighteen permanent cross-sections, 9,576 linear feet (LF) of longitudinal profile survey, one rain gage, and two automated stage recorders were installed and assessed across the restoration Site. The 2007 data represents results from the first year of vegetation and hydrologic monitoring for streams.

Prior to restoration, stream and buffer functions on the Site were historically impaired as a result of heavy land timbering and subsequently farmed aggressively. Recently some areas have been reforested within the project site, but it has continued to be actively farmed and grazed or converted to medium density residential developments. After construction was finalized the project restored or enhanced 13,203 linear feet (LF) of channelized stream on two unnamed tributaries of Beaverdam Creek: UT1 and UT2, and preserved an additional 1,641 LF of Beaverdam Creek and 962 LF of UT2 to total 15,806 LF of restored, enhanced, or preserved stream.

Weather station data from the for NRCS National Climate and Water Center (Charlotte WSO AP WETS Station in Mecklenburg County – NC 1690) and the USGS Water Data for North Carolina (USGS 35090308100454 Withers Cove in Mecklenburg County, NC) were used to document precipitation amounts. For the 2007 growing season, March 2007 through October 2007 rainfall was recorded as below normal for greater than 87% of the time.

Twenty-four monitoring plots that are 10 meter by 10 meters or 0.025 of an acre in size were used to assess survivability of the woody vegetation planted on Site. They are randomly located to represent the different zones within the project. The vegetation monitoring indicated a survivability range of 440 stems per acre to 1000 stems per acre with an overall average of 572 stems per acre. Overall, the Site is on track for meeting the initial vegetation survival criteria of 320 stems per acre surviving after the third growing season and the final success criteria of 260 trees per acre by the end of year five.

In general, dimension, pattern, profile and in-stream structures remained stable during the first growing season. Minor bed scour was noted in a few isolated areas along UT1. These areas are the result of the large storm event that occurred shortly after construction was completed. One bankfull event was documented during the month of February.

1.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The Beaverdam Creek site is located within the extraterritorial jurisdiction (ETJ) of the City of Charlotte, Mecklenburg County, and lies within the Catawba River Basin (Figure 1). The site lies within North Carolina Department of Water Quality (NCDWQ) sub-basin 03-08-34 and U.S. Geologic Survey (USGS) hydrologic unit 03050101170040. The recent land use of the site consists of agriculture and medium density residential development.

The project involved the restoration, enhancement, and preservation of 15,806 LF of stream along Beaverdam Creek (the mainstem) and two unnamed tributaries (UT 1 and UT2).

1.1 Project Location

The Beaverdam Creek sited is located approximately 3 miles southwest of the Charlotte-Douglas International Airport. The site extends from the newly constructed Interstate 485 corridor to Brown's Cove of Lake Wylie, an impounded reservoir on the Catawba River. The site can be accessed from Dixie River Road (UT1 to the north and UT2 to the south) 1.5 miles northeast of the intersection with Steele Creek Road. See Figures 1 and 2 for an overview of the project site.

1.2 Mitigation Goals and Objectives

The specific goals for the Beaverdam Creek Restoration Project were as follows:

- Preserve/Restore/Enhance 15,806 LF of stream channel.
- Create geomorphically stable stream channel and floodplain conditions along UT1, UT2 and their associated tributaries within the Beaverdam Creek watershed.
- Improve the local hydrology through increased groundwater recharge, groundwater storage, and hydrologic connectivity between the channel and the adjacent floodplain.
- Improve water quality in the Beaverdam Creek watershed by increasing dissolved oxygen concentrations and reducing nutrient and sediment loads.
- Improve aquatic and riparian terrestrial habitat through improved hydraulic and biologic diversity.

1.3 Project Description and Restoration Approach

For analysis and design purposes, Beaverdam Creek and the two unnamed tributaries (UT1 and UT2) were subdivided into 15 individual reaches based on their hydrologic and geomorphic characteristics. The mainstem of Beaverdam Creek consists of only 1 of the 15 design reaches, where only preservation and no restoration activities were proposed. The remaining 14 reaches exist within UT1 (8 reaches) and UT2 (6 reaches). Among these 14 reaches, 12 were scheduled for restoration, the upstream reach of UT1 was scheduled for enhancement and the downstream reach of UT2 was scheduled for preservation. All reach locations are shown in Figure 3. The following describes the site's preconstruction conditions.

The project constraints on UT1 began at I-485 flowing from the northeast direction. UT1 was divided into 5 reaches starting in the upstream with Reach 1 and continuing downstream to Reach 5 and changing designation at tributary confluences or at significant grade breaks. The three tributary confluences were included within the design parameters on UT1 and were identified as UT1B, UT1C, and UT1D from the upstream confluence and continuing downstream.

UT2 watershed abuts the UT1 watershed to the south, is bordered by Dixie River Road, and is generally flows in the southwest direction. The mainstem of UT2 was divided into four reaches starting upstream at Reach 1 and continuing downstream to Reach 4. One tributary confluence, UT2A, was included within the design parameters of UT2. Reach UT2A, upstream of station 10+00, consisted only of a non-







disturbance area (not for credit). The downstream section of UT2A, from a headcut at station 10+00 to its confluence at the terminus of Reach 2, was 1138 LF with a channel slope of 1.4 percent.

Preservation was proposed for reaches within the project area that were currently in stable, functioning condition and did not warrant restoration. The two reaches proposed for preservation were along the mainstem of Beaverdam and the downstream section of UT2. The reach along the mainstem of Beaverdam Creek proposed for preservation had reach length of 1,641 LF. It began at the confluence with UT1 and extended downstream to the confluence of UT2. The reach along the mainstem of UT2 proposed for preservation had a length of 962 LF. It began immediately downstream of UT2 Reach 4 and ended at its confluence with the mainstem of Beaverdam Creek.

Throughout most of UT1, the restoration approach identified the existing evolutionary process and established a naturally successional stable C/E-type stream channel. Additionally, soil bioengineering, structural reinforcement, and revetments were applied to promote stability immediately following construction when the stream was most vulnerable. Given the wide floodplain, relatively flat slopes, generally stable nature of the soil, and favorable growing conditions at the site, this restoration approach was an achievable goal. Removal of the majority of invasive species and planting of native vegetative species throughout the existing riparian buffer complemented the channel restoration and promoted climax successional habitat.

Similar to UT1, the restoration approach throughout UT2 entailed establishing a successional C/E-type stream channel while maintaining the ability to accommodate subsequent natural channel evolution towards an E-type channel, as warranted by future influences to the discharge and sediment regime. This was accomplished through application of a Priority 1 design throughout with short segments of Priority 2 design to tie into the incised channels.

<u> </u>	Beaverdam Creek Restoration Site: Project No. D05016-1											
Project Segment or Reach ID	Existing Footage/Acre age	Mitigation Type *	Approach**	Linear Footage or Acreage	Mitigation Ratio	Mitigation Units	Stationing	Comment				
UT1 (Reach 1)	542	E	EI	567	1.5:1	378	10+00 - 15+67	Low slope, minimal meander and floodplain benching.				
UT1 (Reach 2-5)	5796	R	P1	6,310	1:1	6,310	15+67 - 78+77	The beginning of channel utilizes the existing wide, flat floodplain then narrows through the valley and straightens through the Duke Power easement and connects into the mainstem of Beaverdam through a wide, flat floodplain.				
UT1B	743	R	P2	778	1:1	778	10+00 - 17+78	The valley is pinched so floodplain grading will create adequate benching.				
UT1C	744	R	P1	624	1:1	624		Step-pool design dominated by log drops. The valley is narrow resulting minimal meander.				
UT1D	323	R	P1	338	1:1	338	10+00 - 13+38	The channel will have the appropriate belt width throughout the ample floodplain. A series of drop structures at the end of the reach will tie into UT1.				
UT2	3130	R	P1	3,448	1:1	3,448	10+00 - 44+48	Increase sinuosity, pool development, and reestablish connection with the floodplain and construct in channel step-pools in areas where the valley is confined and steep.				
UT2A	886	R	P1	1,138	1:1	1,138	10+00 - 21+38	A step-pool channel will be constructed in the areas where the valley is confined and steep. Transition connections constructed between the constructed channel and the existing channels.				
Beaverdam Creek	1641	P		1,641	1:5	328	-	enamer and the existing enamers.				
UT2	962	P		962	1:5	192	-	-				
Total lir	near ft of c	hannel res	stored or	15,806								
Mitigation U	J nit Summ	ation for S	Streams:	13,534								
* R = R	lestoration		**	P1 = Priori	ty I							
$\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}$	hancemer	nt		P2 = Priori	ty II							
$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}$	reservation			P3 = Priori	ty III							
				EI = Enhan	cement I							

Table 1. Project Mitigation Approach

1.4 Project History and Background

The chronology of the Beaverdam Creek Restoration Project is presented in Table 2. The contact information for all designers, contractors, and relevant suppliers is presented in Table 3. Relevant project background information is presented in Table 4.

Beaverdam Creek Restoration Site: Project No. D05016-1										
Activity or Report	Scheduled Completion	Data Collection Complete	Actual Completion or Delivery							
Restoration Plan Prepared	Nov-05	N/A								
Restoration Plan Amended	Dec-05	N/A								
Restoration Plan Approved	Dec-05	N/A								
Final Design – (at least 90% complete)	Dec-05	N/A								
Construction Begins	May-06	N/A	Jun-06							
Temporary S&E mix applied to entire project area	N/A	N/A	Jan-07							
Permanent seed mix applied to entire project area	Mar-06	N/A	Jan-07							
Planting of live stakes	Nov-06	N/A	Jan-07							
Planting of bare root trees	Nov-06	N/A	Jan-07							
Survey of As-built conditions (Year 0 Monitoring- baseline)	Jan-07	Mar-07	Apr-07							
Repair work										
Year 1 Monitoring	Dec-07	Nov-07	Dec-07							
Year 2 Monitoring	Dec-08	Unknown	Unknown							
Year 3 Monitoring	Dec-09	Unknown	Unknown							
Year 4 Monitoring	Dec-10	Unknown	Unknown							
Year 5 Monitoring	Dec-11	Unknown	Unknown							

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History

Table 3. Project Contact

Beaverdam Creek Resto	pration Site: Project No. D05016-1
Full Service Delivery Contractor	
Riverworks	8000 Regency Parkway, Suite 200
KIVEIWOIKS	Cary, NC 27518
	Contact:
	Will Pedersen, Tel. 919-459-9001
Designer	
Baker Engineering	8000 Regency Parkway, Suite 200
Daker Engineering	Cary, NC 27518
	Contact:
	Kevin Tweedy, Tel 919-463-5488

Table 3	Project	Contact
---------	---------	---------

Beaverdam Creek Restoration Site: Project No. D05016-1								
Construction Contractor								
Riverworks	8000 Regency Parkway, Suite 200							
KIVEI WOIKS	Cary, NC 27518							
	Contact:							
	Will Pedersen, Tel. 919-459-9001							
Planting Contractor								
Riverworks	8000 Regency Parkway, Suite 200							
KIVEI WOIKS	Cary, NC 27518							
	Contact:							
	Will Pedersen, Tel. 919-459-9001							
Seeding Contractor								
Riverworks	8000 Regency Parkway, Suite 200							
KIVEI WOIKS	Cary, NC 27518							
	Contact:							
	Will Pedersen, Tel. 919-459-9001							
Seed Mix Sources	Mellow Marsh Farm, 919-742-1200							
Nursery Stock Suppliers	Mellow Marsh Farm, 919-742-1200							
	International Paper, 1-888-888-7159							
Monitoring Performers								
Baker Engineering	1447 S. Tryon Street, Suite 200							
Dakei Engineering	Charlotte, NC 28203							
Stream Monitoring Point of Contact:	Ian Eckardt, Tel.704-334-4454							
Vegetation Monitoring Point of								
Contact:	Ian Eckardt, Tel. 704-334-4454							

Table 4. Project Background

Beaverdam Creek Restoration Site: Project No. D05016-1									
Project County:	Mecklenburg County, NC								
Drainage Area:									
UT1 (Reach 1)	0.70 mi ²								
UT1 (Reach 2-5)	1.73 mi ²								
UT1B	0.34 mi^2								
UT1C	0.15mi ²								
UT1D	0.16 mi^2								
UT2	0.3 mi^2								
UT2A	0.1 mi ²								
Estimated Drainage % Impervious Cover:									
UT1 (Reach 1)	15%								
UT1 (Reach 2-5)	12%								
UT1B	10%								
UT1C	5%								
UT1D	21%								
UT2	4%								
UT2A	2%								

mont hern Outer Piedmont
hern Outer Piedmont
rine, Upper Perennial,
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
vel
DaD, CeD2, PaE
PaE, CeD2
PaE, CeD2
CeD2
cer Creek, UT to Spencer
k, McDowell Park, Latta
tation, McClintock Creek
Nair & Stockwood), UT to
horn, UT to Lake Jeanette,
o Big Lost Cove
0101170040
8-34
0.51
0.51

Table 4. Project Background Table

1.5 Project Plan

Plans depicting the as-built conditions of the major project elements, location of permanent monitoring cross-sections, and locations of permanent vegetation monitoring plots are presented in Appendix C of this report.

2.0 VEGETATION MONITORING

2.1 Soil Data

The soil data for the Site is presented in Table 5.

Beaver	Beaverdam Creek Restoration Site: Project No. D05016-1											
% Clay on Series Max Depth (in) Surface K T												
Cecil Sandy Clay Loam (CeD2)	80	20-35	0.28	5	0.5-1							
Monacan Loam (MO)	80	7-27	0.43	5	2-3							
Davidson sandy clay loam (DaD)	75	20-35	0.28	5	0.5-2							
Pacolet sandy loam (PaE)	62	8-20	0.2	5	0.5-2							
Pacolet sandy loam (PaF)	62	8-20	0.2	5	0.5-2							

Table 5. Soil Data for Project

NRCS, USDA. Official Soil Series Descriptions (http://soils.usda.gov/soils/technical/classification/osd/index.html)

General taxonomy of soils:

<u>Cecil:</u> The Cecil series consists of well-drained soils with moderate permeability on and near floodplains. They formed in residuum weathered felsic igneous and metamorphic rock, such as granite. Slopes range from 8 to 15 percent.

<u>Monacan</u>: Soils of the Monacan series are deep, moderately well and somewhat poorly drained with moderate permeability. They formed in recent alluvial sediments of the Piedmont and Coastal Plain. Slopes are commonly less than 2 percent.

<u>Pacolet:</u> The Pacolet series consists of very deep, well drained, moderately permeable soils that formed in material weathered mostly from acid crystalline rocks of the Piedmont uplands. Slopes commonly are 15 to 25 percent but range up to 2 to 60 percent.

<u>Davidson:</u> The Davidson series consists of very deep, well drained moderately permeable soils that formed in materials weathered from dark colored rocks high in ferromagnesian minerals. These soils are on gently sloping to moderately steep uplands in the Piedmont. Slopes are commonly 2 to 15 percent but range up to 25 percent.

2.2 Description of Species and Monitoring Protocol

The Site was planted in bottomland hardwood forest species in early – mid March of 2007. There were twenty-four vegetation-monitoring plots established throughout the planting areas. The following tree species were planted in the restoration area:

	Beaverdam Creek Restoration Site: Project No. D05016-1											
ID	Scientific Name	Common Name	FAC Status									
1	Alnus serrulata	Tag Alder	FACW+									
2	Asimina triloba	Paw paw	FAC									
3	Cercis canadensis	Redbud	FACU									
4	Celtis laevigata	Sugarberry	FACW									
5	Cephalanthus occidentalis	Buttonbush	OBL									
6	Cornus amomum	Silky Dogwood	FACW+									
7	Cornus florida	Flowering Dogwood	FACU									
8	Diospyros virginiana	Persimmon	FAC									
9	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	Green Ash	FACW									
10	Juglan nigra	Black Walnut	FACU									
11	Liriodendron tulipiferra	Tulip poplar	FACW									
12	Platanus occidentalis	Sycamore	FACW-									
13	Nyssa sylvatica	Blackgum	FAC									
14	Quercus michauxii	Swamp chestnut oak	FACW-									
15	Quercus phellos	Willow oak	FACW-									
16	Quercus rubra	Red oak	FACU									
17	Sambucus candensis	Elderberry	FACW-									
18	Viburnum dentatum	Arrow-wood viburnum	FAC									

 Table 6. Tree Species Planted in the Beaverdam Restoration Area

 Beaverdam Creek Restoration Site: Project No. D05016-1

(Radford, et al., 1968 and Resource Management Group, Inc., 1999)

The following monitoring protocol was designed to predict vegetative survivability. Twenty-four plots were established throughout the Beaverdam Creek Site. The number of sites was based on the species/area curve method and their location was based on EEP monitoring guidance. The size of individual quadrants was 100 square meters for woody tree species, 25 square meters for shrubs, and 1 square meter for herbaceous vegetation. The locations of the vegetation plots are shown on the as-built plan sheets in Appendix C.

Individual quadrant data provided includes density and coverage quantities. Relative values were calculated, and importance values were determined. Individual seedlings were marked to ensure that they can be found in succeeding monitoring years. Mortality was determined from the difference between the previous year's living, planted seedlings and the current year's living, planted seedlings.

2.3 Vegetation Success Criteria

The interim measure of vegetative success for the Site will be the survival of at least 320 3-year old planted trees per acre at the end of year three of the monitoring period. The final vegetative success

criteria will be the survival of 260 5-year old planted trees per acre at the end of year five of the monitoring period.

2.4 Results of Vegetative Monitoring

The following tables present stem counts for each of the monitoring plots. Each planted tree species is identified down the left column, and each plot is identified across the top row. The numbers on the top row correlate to the ID column of the table. Trees are flagged in the field on an as-needed basis before the flags degrade. Flags are utilized, because they will not interfere with the growth of the tree. Volunteer species are also flagged during this process.

During the initial counts of species totals during the as-built monitoring report, some tree species were unidentifiable (no buds or leafs) and documented as *Unknown Quercus* in the stem plot counts or were labeled incorrectly. During Year 1 vegetative monitoring, three of the four *Unknown Quercus* have been identified as *Quercus michauxii* and updated in the Year 1 vegetative totals in Table 7. In addition, tree species that were labeled incorrectly have been updated and coded within Table 7 to represent the correction.

The average stem count per acre for Year 1 Monitoring was 572. The range of stem counts throughout the 24 vegetative monitoring plots was from 440 - 1000. The current survivability rate for Year 1 is 91.5%. The data reflects that the overall site is on trajectory for meeting the minimum success interim criteria of 320 trees per acre by the end of year three and the final success criteria of 260 trees per acre by the end of year five.

No volunteer species were noted in any of the Site's vegetation plots, or were too small to verify. If any woody volunteer species are observed in subsequent monitoring years they will be flagged and added to the overall stems per acre assessment of the Site.

								Bea	averda	am Cr	eek R	estora	tion S	ite : P	roject	t No. I	00501	6-1								·	·
												Plo	ots												Initial	Year 1	% Survival
		1					1		UT1	1					1						UT2				Totals	Totals	
Tree Species	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	1	2	3	4	5	6	7			
Alnus serrulata									2																2	2	100.0
Asimina tuiloba								4	5		4	4	1												21	18	85.7
Cercis canadensis									1						1		1								3	3	100.0
Celtis laevigata	1													2											6	3	50.0
Cephalanthus occidentalis									1																1	1	100.0
Cornus amomum																									1	0	0.0
Cornus florida					1												2								2	3	150.0
Diospyros virginiana		1													1								1		3	3	100.0
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	4			4	7	1	6	1			1	3	3	3	6	5		3	13		2	8	5	1	77	76	98.7
Juglan nigra	1	2	1	1		4	1	2		8	1	3	2			1						1			31	28	90.3
Liriodendron tulipiferra	1		1	1	1	1	3			2		4		2	1	1	2	3		1	2	1		2	36	29	80.6
Platanus occidentalis		2		2	4	5	2	7		3				1		1	1	2		7	7		1	1	54	46	85.2
Nyssa sylvatica	4	1	2	4		1		1				1	7		3	3	5	3		3	2		8	2	55	50	90.9
Quercus michauxii	1	4	7	2			2	7			1	2	3	3	2	1	4	5			3	7	2	1	55	57	103.6
Quercus phellos	1	1	2	1	1		1	3		1	4		1			3		1							20	20	100.0
Quercus rubra														1											1	1	100.0
Sambucus candensis																									1	0	0.0
Vibernum dentatum									2																2	2	100.0
Unknown Quercus													1												4	1	25.0
Stems/plot	13	11	13	15	14	12	15	25	11	14	11	17	18	12	14	15	15	17	13	11	16	17	17	7	375	343	91.5
Stems/acre	520	440	520	600	560	480	600	1000	440	560	440	680	720	480	560	600	600	680	520	440	640	680	680	280	572	average	
		Tree	# 3-16	6 was 1	mislab	eled a	s Lirio	us occi dendro	n tulip	ifera i	n As-b	uilt In	itial C														

Table 7. Year 1 Stem Counts for Each Species Arranged by Plot

Tree # 7-10 was mislabeled as Asimina tuiloba in As-built Initial Counts

Tree # 7-2, -3, -4 were mislabeled as Fraxinus pennsylvanica in As-built Initial Counts

Tree # 14-5, -8, -10 were mislabeled as unknown in As-built Initial Counts

Tree # 7-21 was labeled as Liriodendron tulipifera in the field but was not added in the As-built Initial Counts

2.5 Vegetation Observations

Just following construction of the site, a 3.5-inch precipitation event occurred and caused minor bank destabilization and required various sections of UT1 to be reseeded. At this time, channel degradation that was caused by the storm event was repaired. During repair of the channel, large equipment accessed the site. Additional live stakes were replanted along the channel where needed for restabilization.

During the Year 1 Monitoring site visit the stream-side vegetation was noted as being successfully reestablished. In addition, the annual herbaceous plant *Bidens frondosa (tickseed sunflower)* intended as a nurse crop, to discourage aggressive weeds while the permanent seedlings become established, has been successful throughout the Site (USDA, 2007). See Project ID photos in Appendix A.

2.6 Vegetation Problem Areas

At this time, there seem to be no invasive species problem areas throughout the project site. However, though none seem to be posing any problems, invasive species can very quickly affect the survivability of the planted stems the weedy species should be maintained aggressively to prevent any major mortality issue.

2.7 Vegetation Photos

Photos of the project showing the on-site vegetation are included in Appendix A of this report.

3.0 STREAM MONITORING

3.1 Description of Stream Monitoring

To document the stated success criteria, the following monitoring program was instituted following construction completion on the Beaverdam Creek Restoration Project:

Bankfull Events: The occurrence of bankfull events within the monitoring period was documented by the use of two automated stage recorders. The University of North Carolina (UNCC) installed and monitored the readings from both stage recorders. Gauging station BD2 was installed on UT1 and gauging station BD3 was installed on UT2. Each data logger recorded the watermark at 15 minute intervals at each Site and was checked at each Site visit to determine if a bankfull event had occurred. Data from stage recorder BD1 was used when BD2 was out of order during the monitoring year. Documentation photos of the bankfull events were not available from UNCC. Figure 4 shows the locations of the stage recorders.

Cross-Sections: Two permanent cross-sections were installed per 1,000 linear feet of stream restoration work, with one located at a riffle cross-section and one located at a pool cross-section. Twenty-four total cross-sections were established. Each cross-section was marked on both banks with permanent pins to establish the exact transect used. A common benchmark was used for cross-sectional survey included points measured at all breaks in slope, including top of bank, bankfull, inner berm, edge of water, and thalweg, if the features are present. Riffle cross-sections were classified using the Rosgen stream classification system (Rosgen, 1994). Permanent cross-sections for 2007 (Year 1) were surveyed in October 2007.

Longitudinal Profiles: A representative longitudinal profile was surveyed for 2007 (Year 1). The initial 3000 linear feet of profile was collected for the mainstem reaches of UT1and UT2. The entire lengths of UT1B, UT1C, UT1C, and UT2A were also surveyed. Measurements included thalweg, water surface, bankfull, and top of low bank. Each of these measurements was taken at the head of each feature (e.g.,



riffle, pool, glide). In addition, maximum pool depth was recorded. All survey was tied to a single permanent benchmark.

Bed Material Analysis: Pebble counts were conducted for the permanent cross-sections (100 counts per cross-section) on the project reaches. Pebble count data were plotted on a semi-log graph and are included in Appendix B.

Photo Reference Stations: Photographs were used to visually document restoration success. Fifty-one (51) reference stations were established to document conditions at the constructed grade control structures across the Site. These photos are provided in Appendix A. The GPS coordinates of each photo station were noted as additional reference to ensure the same photo location was used throughout the monitoring period. These stations are included in the As-built Plan Sheets in Appendix C. Reference photos were taken once per year.

Each streambank was photographed at each permanent cross-section photo station. For each streambank photo, the photo view line followed a survey tape placed across the channel, perpendicular to flow (representing the cross-section line). The photograph was framed so that the survey tape is centered in the photo (appears as a vertical line at the center of the photograph), keeping the channel water surface line horizontal and near the lower edge of the frame. These photos are presented along with the cross-section monitoring data in Appendix B.

3.2 Stream Restoration Success Criteria

The approved Mitigation Plan requires the following criteria be met to achieve stream restoration success:

- *Bankfull Events*: Two bankfull flow events must be documented within the five-year monitoring period. The two bankfull events must occur in separate years.
- *Cross-Sections:* There should be little change in as-built cross-sections. If changes to channel cross-section take place, they should be minor changes representing an increase in stability (e.g., settling, vegetative changes, deposition along the banks, or decrease in width/depth ratio).
- *Longitudinal Profiles:* The longitudinal profiles should show that the bedform features are remaining stable (not aggrading or degrading). The pools should remain deep with flat water surface slopes and the riffles should remain steeper and shallower than the pools.
- Bed Material Analysis: Pebble counts should indicate maintenance of bed material.
- *Photo Reference Stations*: Photographs will be used to subjectively evaluate channel aggradation or degradation, bank erosion, success of riparian vegetation and effectiveness of erosion control measures. Photos should indicate the absence of developing bars within the channel, no excessive bank erosion or increase in channel depth over time, and maturation of riparian vegetation.

3.3 Bankfull Discharge Monitoring Results

On-site data loggers documented the occurrence of one bankfull flow event during the first year (2007) of the post-construction monitoring period (Table 8). During the bankfull occurrence data logger BD2 was inoperable, so BD1 on Beaverdam Creek, upstream of the confluence with UT1, was used to document the bankfull event. UNCC inspection of the Site revealed visual evidence of out-of-bank flow, confirming the data logger reading. The largest stream flow documented by the data loggers during Year 1 monitoring were a stage height of 2.75 feet for BD1 and 0.84 feet for BD3.

Bea	Beaverdam Creek Restoration Site: Project No. D05016-1												
Station Number	Date of Data Collection	Date of Occurence of Bankfull Event	Method of Data Collection	Gage Height (feet)									
BD1	N/A	2/13/2007	Datalogger	2.75									
BD3	N/A	2/14/2007	Datalogger	0.84									

Table 8. Verification of Bankfull Events

BD2 was out of order on the date of the bankfull event

3.4 Stream Monitoring Data and Photos

A photo log of the project showing each of the fifty-one (51) permanent photo locations is included in Appendix A of this report. Survey data and photos from each permanent cross-section are included in Appendix B of this report.

3.5 Stream Stability Assessment

Table 9 presents a summary of the results obtained from the visual inspection of in-stream structures performed during Year 1 of post-construction monitoring. The percentages noted are a general overall field evaluation of how the features were performing after the repair work had been completed at the time of the last photo point survey on November 21, 2007. These percentages are solely based on the field evaluator's visual assessment at the time of the site visit.

Visual observations of the various structures throughout Year 1 growing season indicated that structures were functioning as designed and holding their elevation grade. Root wads placed on the outside of meander bends provided bank stability and in-stream cover for fish and other aquatic organisms. Cover logs placed in meander pool areas allowed scour to keep pools deep and provide cover for fish.

The result of a large storm event that produced 3.5 inches of rain on the project site shortly after construction was completed resulted in a few minor scour areas along UT1. Scour was evident immediately underneath a few cover log and log vane structures resulting in a minor decrease in performance. This was observed at stations 41+50, 53+80, 56+00, 56+50, and 63+90. In addition, isolated pockets of bed scour, resulting in a performance score of 99%, were also observed at stations 50+15, 56+00, 56+50, and 63+90. All of the areas of scour are minor and should not result in any future problems with stream stability.

Beaverdam Creek Restoration Site : Project No. D05016-1							
Feature	Performance Percentage						
	Initial	MY-01	MY-02	MY-03	MY-04	MY-05	
Riffles	100%	100%					
Pools	100%	100%					
Thalweg	100%	100%					
Meanders	100%	100%					
Bed General	100%	99%					
Vanes / J Hooks etc.	100%	97%					
Wads and Boulders	100%	100%					

Table 9. Categ	gorical Stream F	eature Visual	Stability	Assessment
----------------	------------------	---------------	-----------	------------

3.6 Cross-section, Longitudinal Profile, and Bed Material Analysis Monitoring Results

Cross Sections

Year 1 cross-section monitoring data for stream stability was collected during October 2007 and compared to as-built conditions (collected March 2007).

The twenty four permanent cross-sections along the restored channels (twelve located across riffles and twelve across pools) were re-surveyed to document stream dimension at the end of the first monitoring year (Year 1). Cross-sections are provided in Appendix B, and data from the cross-sections are summarized in Appendix E. The cross-sections show that there has been minor adjustment to stream dimension within the last year.

A few cross-sections show point bar formation along UT1 and include cross-sections 3, 10, 11, and 13, which are located across pools found at the apex of a meander bend. Flow through a meander bend possesses higher conveyance velocity along its boundary with the outer bank of the bend, and lower flow velocity along its boundary with the bend's inner bank. As flow reduces, its sediment transport capacity also reduces, causing flow to drop some of its transported sediment as it slows down. Point bar formation along the inside of a meander bend indicates flow velocity vectors occurring as designed, and is therefore expected. Cross-section 10 has slightly aggraded along the outside bank of a meander. This channel geometry reflects a plug of sediment deposited during the large storm event that occurred shortly after construction was completed. Drought conditions haven't allowed flow to correct channel geometry in this meander bend.

Longitudinal Profiles

The Year 1 longitudinal profile was conducted during November 2007. The initial 3,000 LF of channel was surveyed along the mainstem of UT1 and UT2. The entire lengths of UT1B, UT1C, UT1D, and UT2A were also collected. The longitudinal profile is included in Appendix B. A summary of parameters measured are provided in Appendix D. Please note that this summary represents only the portion of project that was surveyed.

The representative longitudinal profiles along the restored channels were resurveyed to document stream profile at the end of monitoring Year 1. Drought conditions resulted in little to no water within the restored channels and therefore profile data such as riffle slopes and pool-to-pool spacing could not be calculated. Sinuosity for all restored reaches has remained the same and there's been no measurable change in stream pattern. Though there was some minor areas of bed scour, as mentioned in Section 3.5 of this report, none of the areas need to be addressed, at this time, nor should result any future problems. Inspections of these areas will be performed in subsequent monitoring periods.

Bed Material Analysis

Year 1 bed material samples were collected at each permanent cross-section during October 2007. The pebble count data were plotted on a semi-log graph and will be compared with future monitoring data. Data should indicate a relative coarsening of the riffles (or maintenance of a coarse bed in constructed riffles) and a relative fining in the pools. All pebble count data are provided in Appendix B.

3.7 Areas of Concern

Adjacent to the Site's property boundaries are new residential developments under construction. During Year 1 Monitoring, several Best Management Practices (BMPs) were noted as areas of concern within and immediately outside the conservation easement along UT2 and UT2A of the Restoration Project. The BMPs consist of both temporary and permanent detention ponds which are discharging stormwater into the Project Site, and a retaining wall. Locations of the BMPs are shown on the as-built plans included in Appendix C.

Currently, none of the BMPs are causing any significant degradation of the restored channels; however, discharge from the BMP adjacent to Station 20+00 along UT2 has caused some minor headcutting below the riffle at the log sill. See Appendix A for photo documentation of the BMP structure and the in-stream impact.

Monitoring of these areas of concern will continue throughout the Project's monitoring period and will be discussed accordingly.

4.0 HYDROLOGY

Rainfall data were collected to document the hydrologic conditions throughout the project area in the 2007 growing season. Since no rain gauges were installed within the project boundaries, monthly rainfall totals were calculated from data downloaded from the Withers Cove USGS gauge 35090308100454 in Mecklenburg County, NC. Historical rainfall data were collected from the Charlotte WSO AP WETS Station in Mecklenburg County (NC 1690) using NRCS National Water and Climate Data Center website. Hydrologic monitoring results are shown in Table 10 and Figure 5.

Beaverdam Creek Restoration Site: EEP Contract No. D05016-1						
Month	Average (in.)	30% (in.)	70% (in.)	Observed 2007 Precipitation (in.)		
January	4.00	3.21	5.15	3.25		
February	3.55	2.34	4.42	1.88		
March	4.39	3.01	5.54	3.93		
April	2.95	1.98	3.73	3.51		
May	3.66	2.33	4.29	0.61		
June	3.42	2.43	4.68	3.18		
July	3.79	2.49	4.76	1.72		
August	3.72	2.34	4.57	0.56		
September	3.83	2.00	4.68	1.11		
October	3.66	1.80	4.49	0.41 ^A		
November	3.36	2.51	4.24	-		
December	3.18	2.11	3.81	-		
Total Rainfall	43.51	28.55	54.36	20.16*		

Table 10. Comparison of Historic Rainfall to Observed Rainfall

(USDA, 2003 and USGS, 2007)

^A Monthly rainfall data was calculated based on rainfall data from 10/1/07 - 10/23/07 using the nearest USGS rain gauge data (USGS 35090308100454 Withers Cove in Mecklenburg County) to the project site. (USGS, 2007)

*Total Observed Rainfall does not include data from October 23 – 31, November, nor December of 2007.





5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Vegetation Monitoring. Vegetation monitoring efforts have calculated the range of stems per acre for each plot to be from 440 to 1000 stems per acre on the 24 vegetation plots. The average number of stems per acre is 572, which is a survival rate of greater than 91%, based on the initial planting count of 625 stems per acre. Assuming that preventative methods will be used to maintain the invasive exotics, vegetation survivability should remain excellent on the Site and vegetative success criteria will be met.

Stream Monitoring. The total length of stream channel restored and/or preserved on the Site was 15,806 linear feet. This entire length was inspected during Year 1 of the monitoring period (2007) to assess stream performance. Based on the data collected, all riffles, pools, and other constructed features along the restored channel are stable and functioning as designed. Minor bed scour was noted at isolated pockets along UT1. The lack of major problem areas along the length of the restored channels after the occurrence of a stream flow event larger than bankfull discharge further supports functionality of the design. It is expected that stability and in-stream habitat of the system will improve in the coming years as permanent vegetation becomes more established.

6.0 WILDLIFE OBSERVATIONS

Observations of deer and raccoon tracks are common on the Site. During certain times of the year, frogs, turtles, turkey, and fish have also been periodically observed.

7.0 **REFERENCES**

Radford, Albert E., Harry E. Ahles, and C. Ritchie Bell. 1968. Manual of the Vascular Flora of the Carolinas. The University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, NC.

Resource Management Group, Inc. 1999. National List of Plant Species That Occur in Wetlands. Dickinson Press, Inc., Grand Rapids, MI..

Rosgen, D.L. 1994. A Classification of Natural Rivers. Catena 22:169-199.

Rosgen, D.L. 1996. Applied River Morphology. Pagosa Springs, CO: Wildland Hydrology Books.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2006. Soil Series Descriptions. <u>http://soils.usda.gov/soils/technical/classification/osd/index.html</u>

USDA, NRCS. 2003. Climate Information for Mecklenburg County in the State of North Carolina (1971-2000). TAPS Station : CHARLOTTE WSO AP, NC1690 <u>ftp://ftp.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/support/climate/taps/nc/37119.txt</u>

USDA, NRCS. 2007. The PLANTS Database (<u>http://plants.usda.gov</u>, 28 November 2007). National Plant Data Center, Baton Rouge, LA 70874-4490 USA.

U.S. Geological Service (USGS). 2007. Real-Time Data for North Carolina - Precipitation USGS Water-Data Site Information for North Carolina. USGS 35090308100454 Withers Cove in Mecklenburg County, NC. Retrieved on 2007-10-25 12:30:56 EDT http://waterdata.usgs.gov/nc/nwis/current/?type=precip&group_key=county_cd

APPENDIX A

Photo Log



UT1 – PID 1







UT1 – PID 3



UT1 – PID 4



UT1 – PID 5



UT1 – PID 6



UT1 – PID 7



UT1 – PID 8



UT1 – PID 9



UT1 – PID 10



UT1 – PID 11







UT1 – PID 13



UT1 – PID 14



UT1 – PID 15



UT1 – PID 16



UT1 – PID 17



UT1 – PID 18



UT1 – PID 19



UT1 – PID 20



UT1 – PID 21



UT1 – PID 22



UT1 – PID 23

PHOTO LOG – UT1B, UT1C, & UT1D



UT1B – PID 1



UT1B – PID 2



UT1B – PID 3



UT1B – PID 4



UT1B – PID 5



UT1C – PID 6

PHOTO LOG – UT1B, UT1C, & UT1D



UT1C – PID 7



UTIC – PID 8



UT1C – PID 9



UT1D – PID 10



UT1D – PID 11



UT1D – PID 12

PHOTO LOG – UT2 & UT2A



UT2 – PID 1



UT2 – PID 2



UT2 – PID 3



UT2 – PID 5



UT2 – PID 4



UT2 – PID 6

PHOTO LOG – UT2 & UT2A



UT2 – PID 7



UT2 – PID 8



UT2 – PID 9



UT2 – PID 10



UT2 – PID 11



UT2 – PID 12

PHOTO LOG – UT2 & UT2A



UT2A – PID 1



UT2A – PID 2



UT2A – PID 3



UT2A – PID 4

VEG PLOT PHOTOS – UT1 & UT1B – UT1D



UT1 – Veg Plot 1







UT1 – Veg Plot 3



UT1 – Veg Plot 4



UT1 – Veg Plot 5



UT1 – Veg Plot 6
VEG PLOT PHOTOS – UT1 & UT1B – UT1D



UT1 – Veg Plot 7



UT1 – Veg Plot 8



UT1 – Veg Plot 9



UT1 – Veg Plot 10



UT1 – Veg Plot 11



UT1 – Veg Plot 12

VEG PLOT PHOTOS – UT1 & UT1B – UT1D



UT1 – Veg Plot 13



UT1 – Veg Plot 14



UT1B – Veg Plot 15



UT1C – Veg Plot 16



UT1D – Veg Plot 17

VEG PLOT PHOTOS – UT2 & UT2A



UT2A – Veg Plot 1



UT2A – Veg Plot 2



UT2 – Veg Plot 3



UT2 – Veg Plot 4



UT2 – Veg Plot 5



UT2 – Veg Plot 6

VEG PLOT PHOTOS – UT2 & UT2A





AREA OF CONCERN PHOTOS

PHOTO LOG - UT2 at STATION 20+00



Detention Pond – Adjacent to UT2 at STA 20+00



Beginning headcut below riffle at STA 20+00 on UT2

APPENDIX B

STREAM MONITORING DATA









	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring
REACH/LOCATION:	UT1 X1-Pool (Reach 1)
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Summary			Distribution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Pool	Class %	% Cum		Plot Size (mm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	100	100%	100%		0.063
	Very Fine	.063125			100%		0.125
S	Fine	.12525			100%		0.25
Α	Medium	.2550			100%		0.50
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0			100%		1.0
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			100%		2.0
SS BBA	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			100%		2.8
00000X	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			100%		4.0
000000	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			100%		5.6
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			100%		8.0
ACA ACOS	Medium	8.0 - 11.0			100%		11.3
EP20	Medium	11.0 - 16.0			100%		16.0
Ogg L Roo	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6			100%		22.6
609 [VB	Coarse	22.6 - 32			100%		32
	Very Coarse	32 - 45			100%		45
	Very Coarse	45 - 64			100%		64
OQS	Small	64 - 90			100%		90
COBBLE	Small	90 - 128			100%		128
	Large	128 - 180			100%		180
000	Large	180 - 256			100%		256
20	Small	256 - 362			100%		362
	Small	362 - 512			100%		512
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%	1 [1024
\sim	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%		2048
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%		5000
		Total	100	100%			

Largest particles:

(riffle)



	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring
REACH/LOCATION:	UT1 X2-Riffle (Reach 1)
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Sum	mary	Distribution	I
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Riffle	Class %	% Cum	Plot Size (mn	n)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	10	10%	10%	0.063	
	Very Fine	.063125			10%	0.125	-
S	Fine	.12525			10%	0.25	
Α	Medium	.2550			10%	0.50	
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0			10%	1.0	
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			10%	2.0	
86 8 564	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			10%	2.8	
000000	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			10%	4.0	
0000000	Fine	4.0 - 5.6	1	1%	11%	5.6	
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			11%	8.0	
AC 4000	Medium	8.0 - 11.0			11%	11.3	
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0	1	1%	12%	16.0	
OC L	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6			12%	22.6	
669 68	Coarse	22.6 - 32	10	10%	22%	32	
00000000	Very Coarse	32 - 45	32	32%	54%	45	
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	25	25%	79%	64	
OQQ	Small	64 - 90	12	12%	91%	90	
	Small	90 - 128	9	9%	100%	128	
COBBLE	Large	128 - 180			100%	180	
000	Large	180 - 256			100%	256	
$\langle \rangle$	Small	256 - 362			100%	362	
	Small	362 - 512			100%	512	
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%	1024	
\rightarrow	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%	2048	
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%	5000	_
		Total	100	100%			

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT1 (Reach 1) X2 Riffle

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring
REACH/LOCATION:	UT1B X3-Pool
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Summary			Distribution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Pool	Class %	% Cum		Plot Size (mm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	37	37%	37%		0.063
	Very Fine	.063125	3	3%	40%		0.125
S	Fine	.12525	29	29%	69%		0.25
A	Medium	.2550	20	20%	89%		0.50
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	11	11%	100%		1.0
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			100%		2.0
SS BBA	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			100%		2.8
00000X	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			100%		4.0
0000000	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			100%		5.6
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			100%		8.0
ACA ACOS	Medium	8.0 - 11.0			100%		11.3
EP20	Medium	11.0 - 16.0			100%		16.0
Ogg L ROO	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6			100%		22.6
603 [06-	Coarse	22.6 - 32			100%		32
	Very Coarse	32 - 45			100%		45
	Very Coarse	45 - 64			100%		64
OQQ	Small	64 - 90			100%		90
	Small	90 - 128			100%		128
	Large	128 - 180			100%		180
000	Large	180 - 256			100%		256
2	Small	256 - 362			100%		362
	Small	362 - 512			100%		512
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%		1024
$\bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc$	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%		2048
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%		5000
		Total	100	100%			

Largest particles:

(pool)



Beaverdam Creek UT1B

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring
REACH/LOCATION:	UT1B X4-Riffle
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Summary		Distribution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Riffle	Class %	% Cum	Plot Size (mm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	77	77%	77%	0.063
	Very Fine	.063125			77%	0.125
S	Fine	.12525	11	11%	88%	0.25
A	Medium	.2550	11	11%	99%	0.50
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	1	1%	100%	1.0
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			100%	2.0
88886 A	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			100%	2.8
00000X	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			100%	4.0
	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			100%	5.6
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			100%	8.0
AC 405	Medium	8.0 - 11.0			100%	11.3
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0			100%	16.0
OOJL CO	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6			100%	22.6
609 198-	Coarse	22.6 - 32			100%	32
	Very Coarse	32 - 45			100%	45
	Very Coarse	45 - 64			100%	64
OQQ	Small	64 - 90			100%	90
	Small	90 - 128			100%	128
	Large	128 - 180			100%	180
000	Large	180 - 256			100%	256
2	Small	256 - 362			100%	362
BOULDER	Small	362 - 512			100%	512
	Medium	512 - 1024			100%	1024
\sim	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%	2048
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%	5000
		Total	100	100%		

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT1B

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring
REACH/LOCATION:	UT1 X5-Riffle (Reach 2-5)
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Sum	mary	Distribution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Riffle	Class %	% Cum	Plot Size (mm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	5	5%	5%	0.063
	Very Fine	.063125			5%	0.125
S	Fine	.12525			5%	0.25
Α	Medium	.2550			5%	0.50
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	2	2%	7%	1.0
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0	1	1%	8%	2.0
86 8 564	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8	2	2%	10%	2.8
000000	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0	1	1%	11%	4.0
0000000	Fine	4.0 - 5.6	1	1%	12%	5.6
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0	1	1%	13%	8.0
AC 4000	Medium	8.0 - 11.0	1	1%	14%	11.3
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0	1	1%	15%	16.0
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6			15%	22.6
661 68-	Coarse	22.6 - 32	9	9%	24%	32
	Very Coarse	32 - 45	26	26%	50%	45
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	21	21%	71%	64
OQQ	Small	64 - 90	15	15%	86%	90
	Small	90 - 128	10	10%	96%	128
	Large	128 - 180	4	4%	100%	180
000	Large	180 - 256			100%	256
\mathcal{O}	Small	256 - 362			100%	362
	Small	362 - 512			100%	512
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%	1024
$\wedge \rightarrow$	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%	2048
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%	5000
		Total	100	100%		

Size (mm) 0.063).125 0.25 0.50 1.0 2.0 2.8 4.0 5.6 8.0 11.3 16.0 22.6 32 45 64 90 128 180 256 362 512 1024 2048 5000

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT1 (Reaches 2-5) X5 Riffle

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring
REACH/LOCATION:	UT1 X6-Pool (Reach 2-5)
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Summary			Distribution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Pool	Class %	% Cum		Plot Size (mm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	35	35%	35%		0.063
	Very Fine	.063125	4	4%	39%		0.125
S	Fine	.12525	16	16%	55%		0.25
A	Medium	.2550	34	34%	89%		0.50
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	10	10%	99%		1.0
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			99%		2.0
88884	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			99%		2.8
00000X	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			99%		4.0
0000000	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			99%		5.6
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			99%		8.0
ACA ACOS	Medium	8.0 - 11.0			99%		11.3
E P20	Medium	11.0 - 16.0			99%		16.0
Ogge Roo	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6			99%		22.6
609 <u>(</u> 05	Coarse	22.6 - 32	1	1%	100%		32
	Very Coarse	32 - 45			100%		45
	Very Coarse	45 - 64			100%		64
ONS	Small	64 - 90			100%		90
COBBLE	Small	90 - 128			100%		128
	Large	128 - 180			100%		180
000	Large	180 - 256			100%		256
20	Small	256 - 362			100%		362
	Small	362 - 512			100%		512
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%	1 [1024
\sim	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%		2048
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%		5000
		Total	100	100%			

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT1 (Reaches 2-5)

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring
REACH/LOCATION:	UT1C X7-Riffle
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Summary		Distribution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Riffle	Class %	% Cum	Plot Size (mm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	10	10%	10%	0.063
	Very Fine	.063125			10%	0.125
S	Fine	.12525	1	1%	11%	0.25
Α	Medium	.2550			11%	0.50
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0			11%	1.0
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			11%	2.0
8888A	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			11%	2.8
00000X	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			11%	4.0
00 A 85	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			11%	5.6
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			11%	8.0
AC A COS	Medium	8.0 - 11.0			11%	11.3
EP20	Medium	11.0 - 16.0			11%	16.0
001 L ROO	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6			11%	22.6
609 KB	Coarse	22.6 - 32	10	10%	21%	32
	Very Coarse	32 - 45	31	31%	52%	45
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	19	19%	71%	64
OQS	Small	64 - 90	23	23%	94%	90
	Small	90 - 128	3	3%	97%	128
	Large	128 - 180	3	3%	100%	180
$\overline{000}$	Large	180 - 256			100%	256
2	Small	256 - 362			100%	362
	Small	362 - 512			100%	512
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%	1024
\sim	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%	2048
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%	5000
		Total	100	100%		

(riffle)

Largest particles:

Beaverdam Creek, EEP Contract No. D05016-1, River Works, Inc.

December 2007, Monitoring Year 1 - Draft



Beaverdam Creek UT1C X7 Riffle Pebble Count Particle Size Distribution

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring
REACH/LOCATION:	UT1C X-8 Pool
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Sum	mary	Distril
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Pool	Class %	% Cum	Plot Siz
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	72	72%	72%	0.0
	Very Fine	.063125			72%	0.1
S	Fine	.12525	13	13%	85%	0.:
Α	Medium	.2550	10	10%	95%	0.:
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0			95%	1
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			95%	2
26888 K	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			95%	2
No of ot	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			95%	4
0000000	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			95%	5
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			95%	8
AC 4000	Medium	8.0 - 11.0			95%	11
EP20	Medium	11.0 - 16.0			95%	16
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	2	2%	97%	22
669 100-	Coarse	22.6 - 32	1	1%	98%	3
000000000000000000000000000000000000000	Very Coarse	32 - 45	1	1%	99%	4
	Very Coarse	45 - 64			99%	6
OQ	Small	64 - 90	1	1%	100%	9
	Small	90 - 128			100%	12
	Large	128 - 180			100%	18
000	Large	180 - 256			100%	25
$\left< \right>$	Small	256 - 362			100%	36
	Small	362 - 512			100%	51
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%	10
\rightarrow	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%	20
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%	50
		Total	100	100%		

ribution ize (mm) .063 .125).25).50 1.0 2.0 2.8 4.0 5.6 8.0 1.3 6.0 22.6 32 45 64 90 128 180 256 362 512 024 048 000

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT1C X8 Pool

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring
REACH/LOCATION:	UT1 X-9 Riffle (Reach 2-5)
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Sum	mary		Distribution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Riffle	Class %	% Cum	Р	lot Size (mm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	10	10%	10%		0.063
	Very Fine	.063125			10%		0.125
S	Fine	.12525	2	2%	12%		0.25
A	Medium	.2550			12%		0.50
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	5	5%	17%		1.0
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			17%		2.0
88 8 84	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			17%		2.8
000000	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			17%		4.0
Q 4 4 8 8	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			17%		5.6
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			17%		8.0
	Medium	8.0 - 11.0			17%		11.3
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0	2	2%	19%		16.0
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	3	3%	22%		22.6
609_68-	Coarse	22.6 - 32	15	15%	37%		32
0000000	Very Coarse	32 - 45	31	31%	68%		45
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	13	13%	81%		64
$\cap Q^{c}$	Small	64 - 90	7	7%	88%		90
	Small	90 - 128	9	9%	97%		128
	Large	128 - 180	1	1%	98%		180
000	Large	180 - 256	2	2%	100%		256
$\langle \rangle$	Small	256 - 362			100%		362
	Small	362 - 512			100%		512
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%		1024
$\langle \rangle \rangle$	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%		2048
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%		5000
		Total	100	100%			

ize (mm) 063 125 .25 .50 .0 2.0 2.8 1.0 5.6 3.0 1.3 6.0 2.6 32 45 64 90 28 80 256 62 512 024 048 000

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT1 (Reaches 2-5) X9 Riffle Pebble Count Particle Size Distribution

		BUCK PROJECT NO.	108528
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam (Creek 1st Year Monitoring	
REACH/LOCATION:	UT1 X-10 Pc	ool (Reach 2-5)	
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007		
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE		
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE		

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Summary		Distribution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Pool	Class %	% Cum	Plot Size (mm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	64	64%	64%	0.063
	Very Fine	.063125	5	5%	69%	0.125
S	Fine	.12525	8	8%	77%	0.25
Α	Medium	.2550	4	4%	81%	0.50
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	7	7%	88%	1.0
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			88%	2.0
86888 A	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			88%	2.8
00000X	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			88%	4.0
Q 4 8 8	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			88%	5.6
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			88%	8.0
AC 405	Medium	8.0 - 11.0	1	1%	89%	11.3
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0	2	2%	91%	16.0
OOJL CO	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	1	1%	92%	22.6
609 KB	Coarse	22.6 - 32	3	3%	95%	32
	Very Coarse	32 - 45	4	4%	99%	45
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	1	1%	100%	64
OQS	Small	64 - 90			100%	90
	Small	90 - 128			100%	128
	Large	128 - 180			100%	180
000	Large	180 - 256			100%	256
\mathcal{O}	Small	256 - 362			100%	362
\square	Small	362 - 512			100%	512
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%	1024
$\gamma \rightarrow$	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%	2048
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%	5000
		Total	100	100%		

ize (mm) .063 .125).25).50 1.0 2.0 2.8 4.0 5.6 8.0 1.3 6.0 22.6 32 45 64 90 128 180 256 362 512 024 048 000

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT1 (Reaches 2-5)

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring
REACH/LOCATION:	UT1-D X-11 Pool
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Sum	mary		Distribution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Pool	Class %	% Cum		Plot Size (mm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	61	61%	61%		0.063
	Very Fine	.063125	6	6%	67%		0.125
S	Fine	.12525	22	22%	89%		0.25
A	Medium	.2550			89%		0.50
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0			89%		1.0
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			89%		2.0
88884	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			89%		2.8
00000X	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			89%		4.0
0000000	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			89%		5.6
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0	1	1%	90%		8.0
AC \$ 600	Medium	8.0 - 11.0	3	3%	93%		11.3
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0	1	1%	94%		16.0
OCT L CO	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	4	4%	98%		22.6
609 [08-	Coarse	22.6 - 32	1	1%	99%		32
	Very Coarse	32 - 45	1	1%	100%		45
	Very Coarse	45 - 64			100%		64
OQC	Small	64 - 90			100%		90
	Small	90 - 128			100%		128
	Large	128 - 180			100%		180
000	Large	180 - 256			100%		256
20	Small	256 - 362			100%		362
	Small	362 - 512			100%		512
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%	1	1024
\sim	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%		2048
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%		5000
		Total	100	100%			

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT1D X11 Pool

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring
REACH/LOCATION:	UT1-D X-12 Riffle
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Summary		Distribution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Riffle	Class %	% Cum	Plot Size (mm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	2	2%	2%	0.063
	Very Fine	.063125			2%	0.125
S	Fine	.12525	3	3%	5%	0.25
Α	Medium	.2550			5%	0.50
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0			5%	1.0
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			5%	2.0
8888A	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			5%	2.8
00000X	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0	1	1%	6%	4.0
000000	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			6%	5.6
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			6%	8.0
ACA ACOS	Medium	8.0 - 11.0			6%	11.3
EP20	Medium	11.0 - 16.0	1	1%	7%	16.0
001 L ROO	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	1	1%	8%	22.6
609 KB	Coarse	22.6 - 32	8	8%	16%	32
	Very Coarse	32 - 45	37	37%	53%	45
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	22	22%	75%	64
OQ	Small	64 - 90	11	11%	86%	90
	Small	90 - 128	11	11%	97%	128
	Large	128 - 180	3	3%	100%	180
000	Large	180 - 256			100%	256
2	Small	256 - 362			100%	362
	Small	362 - 512			100%	512
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%	1024
\sim	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%	2048
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%	5000
		Total	100	100%		

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT1D X12 Riffle Pebble Count Particle Size Distribution

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528				
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring				
REACH/LOCATION:	UT1 X-13 Pool (Reach 2-5)				
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007				
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE				
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE				

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Sum	mary		Distribution	
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Pool	Class %	% Cum		Plot Size (mm)	
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	24	24%	24%		0.063	
S	Very Fine	.063125			24%		0.125	
	Fine	.12525	17	17%	41%	1	0.25	
Α	Medium	.2550	31	31%	72%		0.50	
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	20	20%	92%		1.0	
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0	1	1%	93%		2.0	
	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			93%	-	2.8	
	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			93%		4.0	
	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			93%		5.6	
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			93%		8.0	
AC 4000	Medium	8.0 - 11.0	1	1%	94%		11.3	
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0			94%		16.0	
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	1	1%	95%		22.6	
669 68	Coarse	22.6 - 32	4	4%	99%		32	
	Very Coarse	32 - 45	1	1%	100%		45	
	Very Coarse	45 - 64			100%		64	
OQQ	Small	64 - 90			100%		90	
	Small	90 - 128			100%		128	
	Large	128 - 180			100%		180	
$\tilde{0}00$	Large	180 - 256			100%		256	
$\left< \right>$	Small	256 - 362			100%		362	
	Small	362 - 512			100%		512	
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%		1024	
\rightarrow	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%		2048	
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%		5000	
		Total	100	100%				

ize (mm) 063 .125 .25 .50 1.0 2.0 2.8 1.0 5.6 8.0 1.3 6.0 22.6 32 45 64 90 128 180 256 362 512 024 048 000

Largest particles:

(riffle)


Beaverdam Creek UT1 (Reaches 2-5)

PEBBLE COUNT DATA SHEET: RIFFLE 100-COUNT

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528				
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring				
REACH/LOCATION:	UT1 X-14 Riffle (Reach 2-5)				
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007				
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE				
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE				

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Sum	mary	Distr	ibution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Riffle	Class %	% Cum	Plot S	ize (mm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	10	10%	10%	0.	.063
	Very Fine	.063125			10%	0.	.125
S	Fine	.12525	12	12%	22%	0).25
Α	Medium	.2550	12	12%	34%	0).50
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0	2	2%	36%		1.0
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			36%	:	2.0
86 8 564	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			36%	:	2.8
000000	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			36%	4	4.0
00000000	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			36%	ł	5.6
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0	2	2%	38%	8	8.0
A 005	Medium	8.0 - 11.0			38%	1	1.3
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0	2	2%	40%	1	6.0
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	4	4%	44%	2	2.6
609 100-	Coarse	22.6 - 32	8	8%	52%		32
	Very Coarse	32 - 45	14	14%	66%		45
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	16	16%	82%		64
OQQ	Small	64 - 90	8	8%	90%		90
	Small	90 - 128	10	10%	100%	1	128
	Large	128 - 180			100%	1	180
000	Large	180 - 256			100%	2	256
$\langle \rangle$	Small	256 - 362			100%	3	362
	Small	362 - 512			100%	5	512
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%	1	024
$\land \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \$	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%	2	048
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%	5	000
		Total	100	100%			

ize (mm) .063 .125).25).50 1.0 2.0 2.8 4.0 5.6 8.0 1.3 6.0 22.6 32 45 64 90 128 180 256 362 512 024 048 000

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT1 (Reaches 2-5) X14 Riffle

(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank

Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank

Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank





(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank

Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank

Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank

Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank

Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)





Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank

Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank

Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)





Looking at the Right Bank

Looking	at	the	Left	Bank
---------	----	-----	------	------

	Stream				Max BKF					
Feature	Туре	BKF Area	BKF Width	BKF Depth	Depth	W/D	BH Ratio	ER	BKF Elev	TOB Elev
Pool		20.9	15.32	1.36	2.45	11.25	1	4.9	589.83	589.83



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank

Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank



Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)





Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank

Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank

Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank

Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank



Looking at the Right Bank







PEBBLE COUNT DATA SHEET: RIFFLE 100-COUNT

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528				
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring				
REACH/LOCATION:	UT2A X1-Riffle				
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007				
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE				
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE				

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Sum	mary	Distribu	ution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Riffle	Class %	% Cum	Plot Size	: (mm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	3	3%	3%	0.06	3
	Very Fine	.063125			3%	0.12	:5
S	Fine	.12525			3%	0.25	5
Α	Medium	.2550			3%	0.50)
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0			3%	1.0	1
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			3%	2.0	1
26 3 54	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			3%	2.8	1
000000	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			3%	4.0	1
00000000	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			3%	5.6	;
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			3%	8.0	1
A 005	Medium	8.0 - 11.0			3%	11.3	3
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0			3%	16.0)
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6			3%	22.6	3
603 605	Coarse	22.6 - 32	39	39%	42%	32	
	Very Coarse	32 - 45	36	36%	78%	45	
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	12	12%	90%	64	
$\cap Q^{\zeta}$	Small	64 - 90	8	8%	98%	90	
	Small	90 - 128	1	1%	99%	128	3
	Large	128 - 180	1	1%	100%	180)
$\overline{000}$	Large	180 - 256			100%	256	3
$\left< \right>$	Small	256 - 362			100%	362	2
	Small	362 - 512			100%	512	>
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%	1024	4
$\langle \rangle$	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%	204	8
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%	500	0
		Total	100	100%			

ize (mm) 063 125 .25 .50 .0 .0 2.8 1.0 5.6 3.0 1.3 6.0 2.6 32 45 64 90 28 80 256 62 512)24)48 000

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT2A X1 Riffle Pebble Count Particle Size Distribution

PEBBLE COUNT DATA SHEET: POOL 100-COUNT

		BAKER PROJECT NO.	108528			
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring				
REACH/LOCATION:	UT2A X2-Po	UT2A X2-Pool				
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007	10/15/2007				
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE					
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE					

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Summary		Distribution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Pool	Class % % Cum		Plot Size (mm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	100	100%	100%	0.063
	Very Fine	.063125			100%	0.125
S	Fine	.12525			100%	0.25
A	Medium	.2550			100%	0.50
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0			100%	1.0
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			100%	2.0
86 8 84	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			100%	2.8
00000X	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			100%	4.0
0000000	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			100%	5.6
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			100%	8.0
ACA COS	Medium	8.0 - 11.0			100%	11.3
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0			100%	16.0
OCAL ROC	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6			100%	22.6
603 [06-	Coarse	22.6 - 32			100%	32
	Very Coarse	32 - 45			100%	45
	Very Coarse	45 - 64			100%	64
OQS	Small	64 - 90			100%	90
COBBLE	Small	90 - 128			100%	128
	Large	128 - 180			100%	180
000	Large	180 - 256			100%	256
$\left \right\rangle \left \right\rangle$	Small	256 - 362			100%	362
	Small	362 - 512			100%	512
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%	1024
\rightarrow	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%	2048
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%	5000
		Total	100	100%		

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT2A

PEBBLE COUNT DATA SHEET: RIFFLE 100-COUNT

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528				
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring				
REACH/LOCATION:	UT2 X3-Riffle				
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007				
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE				
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE				

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Sum	mary	D	istribution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Riffle	Class %	% Cum	Plo	ot Size (mm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063			0%		0.063
	Very Fine	.063125			0%		0.125
S	Fine	.12525	4	4%	4%		0.25
Α	Medium	.2550	2	2%	6%		0.50
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0			6%		1.0
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			6%		2.0
868864	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			6%		2.8
00000X	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			6%		4.0
Q 4 8 8	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			6%		5.6
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			6%		8.0
AC \$ 600	Medium	8.0 - 11.0			6%		11.3
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0	2	2%	8%		16.0
OCT L CO	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	1	1%	9%		22.6
600 100-	Coarse	22.6 - 32	18	18%	27%		32
	Very Coarse	32 - 45	43	43%	70%		45
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	19	19%	89%		64
OQQ	Small	64 - 90	5	5%	94%		90
	Small	90 - 128	5	5%	99%		128
	Large	128 - 180			99%		180
000	Large	180 - 256			99%		256
2	Small	256 - 362			99%		362
	Small	362 - 512	1	1%	100%		512
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%		1024
$\gamma \rightarrow$	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%		2048
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%		5000
		Total	100	100%			

ize (mm) 063 125 .25 .50 .0 2.0 2.8 1.0 5.6 3.0 1.3 6.0 2.6 32 45 64 90 28 80 256 62 512 024 048 000

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT2 X3 Riffle Pebble Count Particle Size Distribution

PEBBLE COUNT DATA SHEET: POOL 100-COUNT

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528				
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring				
REACH/LOCATION:	UT2 X4-Pool				
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007				
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE				
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE				

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Sum	mary	Distribution	1
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Pool	Class %	% Cum	Plot Size (mr	n)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	94	94%	94%	0.063	
	Very Fine	.063125			94%	0.125	
S	Fine	.12525	5	5%	99%	0.25	
Α	Medium	.2550			99%	0.50	
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0			99%	1.0	
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			99%	2.0	
86 8 84	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			99%	2.8	_
000000	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			99%	4.0	
0000000	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			99%	5.6	
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			99%	8.0	
200 A COS	Medium	8.0 - 11.0			99%	11.3	
EP20	Medium	11.0 - 16.0			99%	16.0	
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6			99%	22.6	
669 68	Coarse	22.6 - 32			99%	32	
	Very Coarse	32 - 45			99%	45	
	Very Coarse	45 - 64			99%	64	
OQQ	Small	64 - 90	1	1%	100%	90	
	Small	90 - 128			100%	128	
	Large	128 - 180			100%	180	
$\overline{0}00$	Large	180 - 256			100%	256	
$\langle \rangle \rangle$	Small	256 - 362			100%	362	
	Small	362 - 512			100%	512	
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%	1024	
\sim	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%	2048	-
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%	5000	
		Total	100	100%			

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT2 X4 Pool

PEBBLE COUNT DATA SHEET: RIFFLE 100-COUNT

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528			
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring			
REACH/LOCATION:	UT2 X5-Riffle			
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007			
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE			
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE			

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Summary			Distribution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Riffle	Class %	% Cum		Plot Size (mm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	2	2%	2%		0.063
	Very Fine	.063125			2%		0.125
S	Fine	.12525			2%		0.25
A	Medium	.2550			2%		0.50
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0			2%		1.0
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			2%		2.0
88 8 84	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			2%		2.8
00000X	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			2%		4.0
Q 4 4 8 8	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			2%		5.6
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			2%		8.0
ACO2	Medium	8.0 - 11.0			2%		11.3
	Medium	11.0 - 16.0			2%		16.0
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6	4	4%	6%		22.6
2001_005	Coarse	22.6 - 32	17	17%	23%		32
0000000	Very Coarse	32 - 45	57	57%	80%		45
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	9	9%	89%		64
$\cap Q^{c}$	Small	64 - 90	5	5%	94%		90
	Small	90 - 128	1	1%	95%		128
	Large	128 - 180	5	5%	100%		180
000	Large	180 - 256			100%		256
20	Small	256 - 362			100%		362
	Small	362 - 512			100%		512
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%		1024
$\Delta \rightarrow$	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%		2048
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%		5000
		Total	100	100%			

ize (mm) 063 .125 .25 .50 1.0 2.0 2.8 1.0 5.6 8.0 1.3 6.0 22.6 32 45 64 90 128 180 256 362 512 024 048 000

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT2 X5 Riffle Pebble Count Particle Size Distribution

PEBBLE COUNT DATA SHEET: POOL 100-COUNT

	BAKER PROJECT NO. 108528		
SITE OR PROJECT:	Beaverdam Creek 1st Year Monitoring		
REACH/LOCATION:	UT2 X6-Pool		
DATE COLLECTED:	10/15/2007		
FIELD COLLECTION BY:	RR/IE		
DATA ENTRY BY:	IE		

			PARTICLE CLASS COUNT	Summary		Distributio	Distribution
MATERIAL	PARTICLE	SIZE (mm)	Pool	Class %	% Cum	Plot Size (m	າm)
SILT/CLAY	Silt / Clay	< .063	88	88%	88%	0.063	
	Very Fine	.063125			88%	0.125	
S	Fine	.12525	2	2%	90%	0.25	
A	Medium	.2550			90%	0.50	
N D	Coarse	.50 - 1.0			90%	1.0	
	Very Coarse	1.0 - 2.0			90%	2.0	
	Very Fine	2.0 - 2.8			90%	2.8	
	Very Fine	2.8 - 4.0			90%	4.0	
0000000	Fine	4.0 - 5.6			90%	5.6	
	Fine	5.6 - 8.0			90%	8.0	
	Medium	8.0 - 11.0	2	2%	92%	11.3	
EP20	Medium	11.0 - 16.0			92%	16.0	
	Coarse	16.0 - 22.6			92%	22.6	
661 68-	Coarse	22.6 - 32	1	1%	93%	32	
00000000	Very Coarse	32 - 45	3	3%	96%	45	
	Very Coarse	45 - 64	2	2%	98%	64	
$\bigcap Q^{\zeta}$	Small	64 - 90			98%	90	
	Small	90 - 128	1	1%	99%	128	
COBBLE	Large	128 - 180	1	1%	100%	180	
000	Large	180 - 256			100%	256	
$\langle \rangle$	Small	256 - 362			100%	362	_
	Small	362 - 512			100%	512	
BOULDER	Medium	512 - 1024			100%	1024	
\rightarrow	Large-Very Large	1024 - 2048			100%	2048	
BEDROCK	Bedrock	> 2048			100%	5000	
		Total	100	100%			

ize (mm) 063 .125 .25 .50 1.0 2.0 2.8 1.0 5.6 8.0 1.3 6.0 22.6 32 45 64 90 128 180 256 362 512 024 048 000

Largest particles:

(riffle)



Beaverdam Creek UT2 X6 Pool

(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank



Looking at the Right Bank


(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank

Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank

Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank



Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank



Looking at the Right Bank



(Year 1 Monitoring Data - collected October 2007)



Looking at the Left Bank



Looking at the Right Bank



APPENDIX C

AS-BUILT PLAN SHEETS





CONVENTIONAL SYMBOLS

- ----- DESIGN THALWEG

10+00

- AS-BUILT THALWEG

ōp Ar

KLT Approved by WAH Date 10/11/2007

PROJECT ENGINE

Baker

Baker Engineering WV, Inc. 1447 South Tryon Street Suite 200 Charlotte, NC 28003 Phone: 704.334.4454 Fax: 704.334.4492

LEGEND	

BEAVERDAM CREEK AS-BUILT WITH BMPS

































20 20 40 IIIIIIII SCALE (FT) BEAVERDAM CREEK AS-BUILT WITH BMPS UT1 SITE PLAN	PROJECT REFERENCE NO. SHEET NO. 108528 PROJECT ENGINEER KLT APPROVED BY WAH DATE 10/11/2007 10/11/2007







20 20 40 1111111 SCALE (FT) BEAVERDAM CREEK AS-BUILT WITH BMPS UT1-D SITE PLAN	PROJECT REFERENCE NO. SHEET NO. 108528 PROJECT ENGINEER KLT KLT MAH DATE 10/11/2007 Mark Sult Ford State Sult Sult State Sta



















APPENDIX D

BASELINE STREAM SUMMARY FOR RESTORATION REACHES
	Beaverdar	n Creek Re	estoration S	ite - UT1 (1	Reach 1)				
Parameter		Design			As-built		N	IY-1 (2007)	
Dimension - Riffle	Min	Mean	Max	Min	Mean	Max	Min	Mean	Max
Bankfull Width (ft)		14.6			12.5			13.1	
Floodprone Width (ft)		45.0			74.6			74.6	
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)		1.5			1.4			1.4	
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)		2.1			2.0			2.1	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft2)		21.0			18.0			18.8	
Width/Depth Ratio		10.0			8.7			9.2	
Entrenchment Ratio		3.1			6.0			5.7	
Bank Height Ratio		1.0			1.0			1.0	
Bankfull Velocity (fps)		3.5							
Pattern									
Channel Beltwidth (ft)		0							
Radius of Curvature (ft)	0		15						
Meander Wavelength (ft)	0		29						
Meander Width Ratio		0							
Profile									
Riffle Length (ft)									
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0067		0.009						
Pool Length (ft)									
Pool Spacing (ft)		43.8							
Substrate and Transport Parameters									
d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95							25/3	6 / 42 / 75 /	105
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/f2									
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m2									
Additional Reach Parameters									
Channel length (ft)			555			567			568
Drainage Area (SM)			0.7			0.7			0.7
Rosgen Classification		Bc						С	
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)		75							
Sinuosity		1.02						1.05	
BF slope (ft/ft)									

	Beave	erdam Cree	ek Restorat	ion Site - U	T1 (Reach	2-5)			
Parameter		Design			As-built			MY-1 (200	7)
Dimension - Riffle	Min	Mean	Max	Min	Mean	Max	Min	Mean	Max
Bankfull Width (ft)	16.8		20.0	15.4		23.0	15.2		26.9
Floodprone Width (ft)		100.0		74.9		80.7	74.9		80.7
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	1.7		2.0	1.7		2.1	1.5		2.2
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	2.4		2.9	2.5		4.1	2.3		4.1
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	28.0		40.0	25.6		26.8	23.8		59.7
Width/Depth Ratio	9.8		10.1	9.2		13.9	9.6		14.6
Entrenchment Ratio	5.0		6.0	3.4		4.9	2.9		4.9
Bank Height Ratio		1.0			1.0			1.0	
Bankfull Velocity (fps)	3.1		3.8						
Pattern									
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	84		100						
Radius of Curvature (ft)	34		60						
Meander Wavelength (ft)	134		200						
Meander Width Ratio	2		10						
Profile									
Riffle Length (ft)									
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0048		0.012						
Pool Length (ft)									
Pool Spacing (ft)	101		120						
Substrate and Transport Parameters									
d16/d35/d50/d84/d95							0.17-25 / 0.	.75-37 / 30-45 /	70-85 / 110-120
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/f2									
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m2									
Additional Reach Parameters									
Channel length (ft)			6155			5897			3021
Drainage Area (SM)	0.7		1.75	0.7		1.75	0.7		1.75
Rosgen Classification		C/E						С	
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)	105		155						
Sinuosity	1.1		1.2					1.3	
BF slope (ft/ft)	0.002		0.006						

	Beav	erdam Cr	eek Restor	ation Site	e - UT1B				
Parameter		Design			As-built			MY-1 (200	17)
Dimension - Riffle	Min	Mean	Max	Min	Mean	Max	Min	Mean	Max
Bankfull Width (ft)		10.4			11.1			11.8	
Floodprone Width (ft)		100.0			75.0			75.0	
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)		1.1			1.4			1.4	
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)		1.4			2.3			2.3	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft2)		11.0			15.3			16.5	
Width/Depth Ratio		9.7			8.0			8.5	
Entrenchment Ratio		9.6			6.8			6.3	
Bank Height Ratio		1.0			1.0			1.0	
Bankfull Velocity (fps)		4.0							
Pattern									
Channel Beltwidth (ft)		52							
Radius of Curvature (ft)	21		31						
Meander Wavelength (ft)	83		104						
Meander Width Ratio		5							
Profile									
Riffle Length (ft)									
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0104		0.0138						
Pool Length (ft)									
Pool Spacing (ft)		52							
Substrate and Transport Parameters									
d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95							< 0.063	/ <0.063 / <0.0	063 / 0.2 / 0.4
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/f2									
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m2									
Additional Reach Parameters									
Channel length (ft)			790			778			775
Drainage Area (SM)			0.34			0.34			0.34
Rosgen Classification		C/E			С			С	
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)		45							
Sinuosity		1.15			1.1			1.1	
BF slope (ft/ft)		0.003			0.013				

	Beav	erdam Cre	eek Restora	tion Site - V	UT1C				
Parameter		Design			As-built			MY-1 (2007))
Dimension - Riffle	Min	Mean	Max	Min	Mean	Max	Min	Mean	Max
Bankfull Width (ft)		11.2			11.0			12.0	
Floodprone Width (ft)		100.0			70.2			70.6	
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)		0.8			0.7			0.7	
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)		0.9			1.0			1.1	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft2)		8.0			7.8			8.8	
Width/Depth Ratio		14.8			15.6			16.5	
Entrenchment Ratio		8.9			6.4			5.9	
Bank Height Ratio		1.0			1.0			1.0	
Bankfull Velocity (fps)		3.2							
Pattern									
Channel Beltwidth (ft)									
Radius of Curvature (ft)									
Meander Wavelength (ft)									
Meander Width Ratio									
Profile									
Riffle Length (ft)									
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0191		0.0265						
Pool Length (ft)									
Pool Spacing (ft)		44.8							
Substrate and Transport Parameters									
d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95							26 /	37 / 42 / 75 /	100
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/f2									
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m2									
Additional Reach Parameters									
Channel length (ft)			628			616			615
Drainage Area (SM)			0.15			0.15			0.15
Rosgen Classification		В			С			С	
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)		27							
Sinuosity		1.05			1.1			1.1	
BF slope (ft/ft)		0.017			0.013				

	Beav	verdam Cre	ek Restora	tion Site - I	UT1D				
Parameter		Design			As-built			MY-1 (2007))
Dimension - Riffle	Min	Mean	Max	Min	Mean	Max	Min	Mean	Max
Bankfull Width (ft)		10.4			11.4			12.7	
Floodprone Width (ft)		100.0			75.5			75.5	
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)		0.9			0.8			0.7	
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)		1.2			1.2			1.1	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft2)		10.0			9.0			9.2	
Width/Depth Ratio		11.2			14.4			17.5	
Entrenchment Ratio		9.6			6.6			6.0	
Bank Height Ratio		1.0			1.0			1.0	
Bankfull Velocity (fps)		2.9							
Pattern									
Channel Beltwidth (ft)		52							
Radius of Curvature (ft)	21		31						
Meander Wavelength (ft)	83		104						
Meander Width Ratio	8		10						
Profile									
Riffle Length (ft)									
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)									
Pool Length (ft)									
Pool Spacing (ft)		52							
Substrate and Transport Parameters									
d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95							32 /	38 / 43 / 85 /	120
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/f2									
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m2									
Additional Reach Parameters									
Channel length (ft)			352			338			334
Drainage Area (SM)			0.16			0.16			0.16
Rosgen Classification		C/E			С			С	
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)		28							
Sinuosity		1.15			1.2			1.2	
BF slope (ft/ft)		0.007			0.014				

	Beaver	dam Creel	k Restorati	on Site - U	U T2				
Parameter		Design			As-built			MY-1 (2007)
Dimension - Riffle	Min	Mean	Max	Min	Mean	Max	Min	Mean	Max
Bankfull Width (ft)	10.2		15.6	16.8		16.9	16.1		16.6
Floodprone Width (ft)	30.0		80	39.9		39.9	39.9		39.9
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	0.92		1.5	0.7		1.4	0.7		1.4
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	1.3		2.3	1.1		2.1	1.1		1.9
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	9.9		23.9	12.2		23.4	10.9		22.6
Width/Depth Ratio	10.2		12.6	12.1		23.4	12.2		23.9
Entrenchment Ratio	2.8		5.9	2.4		2.4	2.4		2.5
Bank Height Ratio		1.0			1.0		1		1.0
Bankfull Velocity (fps)	4.7		5.4						
Pattern									
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	20		75						
Radius of Curvature (ft)	23		100						
Meander Wavelength (ft)	100		300						
Meander Width Ratio	9.6		27.8						
Profile									
Riffle Length (ft)									
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0122		0.0279						
Pool Length (ft)									
Pool Spacing (ft)	40		105						
Substrate and Transport Parameters									
d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95							26-27 /	35 / 39-39 / 5	3-59 / 95
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/f2									
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m2									
Additional Reach Parameters									
Channel length (ft)			3290			3293			3142
Drainage Area (SM)	0.1		0.3	0.1		0.3	0.1		0.3
Rosgen Classification		С			С			С	
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)	48		120						
Sinuosity	1.03		1.21		1.3			1.3	
BF slope (ft/ft)	0.008		0.019		0.0138				

	Beav	verdam Cre	ek Restora	tion Site - V	UT2A				
Parameter		Design			As-built			MY-1 (2007))
Dimension - Riffle	Min	Mean	Max	Min	Mean	Max	Min	Mean	Max
Bankfull Width (ft)		15.6			13.3			12.2	
Floodprone Width (ft)		80.0			39.8			39.8	
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)		1.0			0.8			0.8	
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)		1.4			1.2			1.1	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft2)		10.2			10.6			9.6	
Width/Depth Ratio		10.2			16.6			15.5	
Entrenchment Ratio		5.9			3.0			3.3	
Bank Height Ratio		1.0			1.0			1	
Bankfull Velocity (fps)		5.1							
Pattern									
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	40		55						
Radius of Curvature (ft)	24		30						
Meander Wavelength (ft)	100		120						
Meander Width Ratio	9.8		11.8						
Profile									
Riffle Length (ft)									
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.02		0.0273						
Pool Length (ft)									
Pool Spacing (ft)		57							
Substrate and Transport Parameters									
d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95							26 /	/ 30 / 35 / 53 /	78
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/f2									
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m2									
Additional Reach Parameters									
Channel length (ft)			1099			1131			1121
Drainage Area (SM)			0.1			0.1			0.1
Rosgen Classification		C/E			С			С	
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)		51							
Sinuosity		1.21			1.25			1.22	
BF slope (ft/ft)		0.012			0.015				

APPENDIX E

MORHOLOGY AND HYDRAULIC MONITORING SUMMARY – YEAR 1

			Beaverda	n Creel	k Restora	tion Site : Pro	ject No	o. D050	16-1						
			R	each: E	Beaverdan	n Creek UT1 (Reach	1)							
		Cross S	ection 1			Cross Section	n 2								
I. Cross-Section Parameters		Po	ool			Riffle									
	MY1	MY2	MY3 MY4	MY5	MY1	MY2 MY3	MY4	MY5							
Dimension															
BF Width (ft)	22.1				13.1										
Floodprone Width (ft)	75.1				74.6										
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	33.1				18.8										
BF Mean Depth (ft)	1.5				1.4										
BF Max Depth (ft)	3.1				2.1										
Width/Depth Ratio	14.8				9.2										
Entrenchment Ratio	3.4				5.7										
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	25.1				16.0										
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	1.3				1.2										
-	1.5				1.2										
Substrate	0.062				10										
d50 (mm)	< 0.063				42										
d84 (mm)	< 0.063				75		1			r					
II. Reachwide Parameters	Min	MY-1 (200 Max)6) Med	Min	MY-2 (2 Max	2007) Med	Min	MY-3 (Max	2008) Med	Min	MY-4 (2 Max	009) Med	Min	MY-5 (2 Max	0010) Med
Pattern	IVIIII	Max	Meu	IVIIII	Iviax	Med	WIIII	Iviax	Meu	IVIIII	WIAX	Meu	IVIIII	Wax	Meu
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	-	-	-												
Radius of Curvature (ft)	-	-	-												
Meander Wavelength (ft)	-	-	-												
Meander Width Ratio	-	-	-												
Profile															
Riffle length (ft)	-	-	-												
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	-	-	-												
Pool Length (ft)	-	-	-												
Pool Spacing (ft)	-	-	-												
Additional Reach Parameters															
Valley Length (ft)	540	-	-												
Channel Length (ft)	568	-	-												
Sinuosity	1.1	-	-												
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	-	-	-												
BF Slope (ft/ft)	-	-	-												
Rosgen Classification	С	-	-												

			Be	averda	m Creek l	Restoration S	ite : Project	No. D05010	5-1						
				Rea	ach: Beav	erdam Creek	UT1 (Reach	nes 2-5)							
		Cross Se	ection 5			Cross Sectio	n 6		Cross S	Section	n 9		Cross Secti	on 10	
I. Cross-Section Parameters		Rif	fle			Pool			Ri	ffle			Pool		
	MY1	MY2 I	MY3 MY4	MY5	MY1	MY2 MY3	MY4 MY	5 MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4 MY5	MY1	MY2 MY	Y3 MY4	MY5
Dimension															
BF Width (ft)	15.2				23.5			17.8				22.2			
Floodprone Width (ft)	74.9				75.0			75.09				74.9			
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	23.8				41.1			29.26				44.8			
BF Mean Depth (ft)	1.6				1.8			1.64				2.0			
BF Max Depth (ft)	2.3				3.5			2.65				3.3			
Width/Depth Ratio	9.7				13.4			10.83				11.0			
Entrenchment Ratio	4.9				3.2			4.22				3.4			
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	18.3				27.0			21.1				26.3			
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	1.3				1.5			1.4				1.7			
Substrate	1.5				1.5			1.4				1./			
	45				0.2			26				.0.062			
d50 (mm)	45				0.2			36				< 0.063			
d84 (mm)	85			-	0.45			72	T			0.7			
II. Reachwide Parameters		MY-1 (20	-		MY-2 (-	Y-3 (2008)			MY-4 (200	-		-5 (2010	
De the series	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min May	a Me	d	Min	Max	Med	Min Ma	ax I	Med
Pattern Channel Beltwidth (ft)															
Radius of Curvature (ft)		_													
Meander Wavelength (ft)	-	-	-												
Meander Width Ratio	-	-	-												
Profile															
Riffle length (ft)	-	-	-												
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	-	-	-												
Pool Length (ft)	-	-	-												
Pool Spacing (ft)	-	-	-												
Additional Reach Parameters															
Valley Length (ft)	2370	_	_												
Channel Length (ft)	3021	-	-												
Sinuosity	1.3	-	-												
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	-	-	-												
BF Slope (ft/ft)	-	-	-												
Rosgen Classification	С	-	-												

		Beaverda	m Creek	Restoration Site : Project N	o. D05016	5-1		
		Reach	Beaverd	am Creek UT1 (Reaches 2-	5) cont'd			
I. Cross-Section Parameters	MY1	Cross Section 13 Pool MY2 MY3 MY4 MY5	MY1	Cross Section 14 Riffle MY2 MY3 MY4 MY5	MY1	Cross Section 15 Riffle MY2 MY3 MY4 MY5	MY1	Cross Section 16 Pool MY2 MY3 MY4 MY5
Dimension								
BF Width (ft)	30.0		19.1		26.9		20.9	
Floodprone Width (ft)	90.9		75.2		77.9		52.1	
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	71.7		37.9		59.7		36.8	
BF Mean Depth (ft)	2.4		2.0		2.2		1.8	
BF Max Depth (ft)	5.3		3.1		4.1		3.4	
Width/Depth Ratio	12.6		9.6		12.1		11.8	
Entrenchment Ratio	3.0		3.9		2.9		2.5	
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	34.8		23.1		31.3		24.4	
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	101.6		81.4		86.0		59.0	
Substrate								
d50 (mm)	0.3		30		-		-	
d84 (mm)	0.8		70		-		-	
		Reach	: Beaverd	am Creek UT1 (Reaches 2-	5) cont'd			
		Cross Section 17		Cross Section 18				
I. Cross-Section Parameters		Pool		Riffle				
	MY1	MY2 MY3 MY4 MY5	MY1	MY2 MY3 MY4 MY5				
Dimension								
BF Width (ft)	27.0		22.5					
Floodprone Width (ft)	67.2		80.7					
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	33.2		34.7					
BF Mean Depth (ft)	1.2		1.5					
BF Max Depth (ft)	2.5		2.7					
Width/Depth Ratio	21.9		14.6					
Entrenchment Ratio	2.5		3.6					
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	29.5		25.6					
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	72.3		86.0					
Substrate								
d50 (mm)	-		-					
d84 (mm)	-		-					

		F	Beaverdam	ı Creek	Restorati	on Site : Proj	ect No	. D050	16-1						
				Reac	h: Beaver	dam Creek U'	Г1В								
		Cross Sec	ction 3			Cross Section	4								
I. Cross-Section Parameters		Poo	1			Riffle									
	MY1	MY2 M	IY3 MY4	MY5	MY1	MY2 MY3	MY4	MY5							
Dimension															
BF Width (ft)	15.3				11.8										
Floodprone Width (ft)	75.1				75.0										
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	16.4				16.5										
BF Mean Depth (ft)	1.1				1.4										
BF Max Depth (ft)	2.3				2.3										
Width/Depth Ratio	14.3				8.5										
Entrenchment Ratio	4.9				6.3										
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	17.5				14.6										
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.9				1.1										
Substrate	0.7				1.1										
d50 (mm)	0.16				< 0.063										
d30 (mm) d84 (mm)	0.10				0.2										
		AY-1 (200	6)		MY-2 (2	2007)		MY-3	(2008)	۱	4Y-4 (2	000)	N	IY-5 (2	0010)
II. Reachwide Parameters	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	(2008) Med	Min	Max	Med		Max	Med
Pattern	wiin	Max	Med	WIIII	Max	Wied	IVIIII	WIUX	Med	wiin	WIUX	Mea	wiin	WIUX	Med
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	-	-	-												
Radius of Curvature (ft)	-	-	-												
Meander Wavelength (ft)	-	-	-												
Meander Width Ratio	-	-	-												
Profile															
Riffle length (ft)	-	-	-												
Riffle Slope (ft/ft) Pool Length (ft)	-	-	-												
Pool Spacing (ft)	-	-	-												
Additional Reach Parameters															
Valley Length (ft)	680	-	-												
Channel Length (ft)	775	-	-												
Sinuosity	1.1	-	-												
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	-	-	-												
BF Slope (ft/ft) Rosgen Classification	- C	-	-												
Kusgen Ciassification	U	-	-												

			Beave	rdam (Creek I	Restorati	on Site : Pro	ject N	o. D050	16-1						
					Reach	: Beavero	dam Creek U	JT1C								
		Cros	ss Secti	on 7			Cross Secti	on 8								
I. Cross-Section Parameters			Riffle				Pool									
	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY1	MY2 MY3	3 MY	4 MY5	1						
Dimension																
BF Width (ft)	12.0					13.6										
Floodprone Width (ft)	70.6					75.0										
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	8.8					31.6										
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.7					2.3										
BF Max Depth (ft)						3.2										
Width/Depth Ratio						5.9										
Entrenchment Ratio						5.5										
Wetted Perimeter (ft)						18.2										
Hydraulic Radius (ft)						1.7										
	0.7					1.7										
Substrate	40					.0.062										
d50 (mm)						< 0.063										
d84 (mm)						0.23										
II. Reachwide Parameters			(2006)			MY-2 (_	MY-3 (IY-4 (2			Y-5 (2	,
Pattern	Min	Max	М	ed	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med
Channel Beltwidth (ft)																
Radius of Curvature (ft)	_	-		_												
Meander Wavelength (ft)	-	-		-												
Meander Width Ratio	-	-		-												
Profile																
Riffle length (ft)	-	-		-												
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)		-		-												
Pool Length (ft)		-		-												
Pool Spacing (ft)	-	-		-												
Additional Reach Parameters																
Valley Length (ft)	544	-		_												
Channel Length (ft)	615	-		-										1		
Sinuosity		-		-												
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)		-		-												
BF Slope (ft/ft)		-		-												
Rosgen Classification	С	-		-												

		I	Beaverda	am Cree	k Rest	orati	ion Sit	e : Pr	oject N	No. D05	016-1					
				Rea	ch: Be	aver	dam (Creek	UT1D							
	Cross Section 11						Cross	s Section	on 12							
I. Cross-Section Parameters	Pool							Riffle								
	MY1	MY2	MY3 I	MY4 M	Y5 M	Y1 1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5						
Dimension																
BF Width (ft)	15.3				12	2.7										
Floodprone Width (ft)	75.7				7	5.5										
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	20.9				9	.2										
BF Mean Depth (ft)	1.4				C	.7										
BF Max Depth (ft)	2.5				1	.1										
Width/Depth Ratio	11.3					7.5										
Entrenchment Ratio	3.4					.0										
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	18.0					4.1										
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	1.2					.7										
Substrate	1.2				Ŭ	• •										
d50 (mm)	<0.063					13										
d84 (mm)						35										
		MY-1 ((2006)				(2007)			MY-3 (2008)	1	MY-4	(2009)	ЛҮ-5 (2	20010)
II. Reachwide Parameters	Min	Max	(2000) Med	d M		I 2 (2007) Iax Med		ed	Min	Max			Min Max Med		Min Max Med	
Pattern																
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	-	-	-													
Radius of Curvature (ft)	-	-	-													
Meander Wavelength (ft)	-	-	-													
Meander Width Ratio	-	-	-													
Profile Biffle length (ft)																
Riffle length (ft) Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	-	-	-													
Pool Length (ft)	_	_	-													
Pool Spacing (ft)	-	-	-													
1 0 ()																
Additional Reach Parameters																
Valley Length (ft)	300	-	-													
Channel Length (ft)	334	-	-													
Sinuosity Water Surface Slave (fr/fa)	1.1	-	-													
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft) BF Slope (ft/ft)	-	-	-													
Rosgen Classification	C	-	-													

			Bea	verdan	n Cree	k Resto	ration	Site : I	Project	No. D	05016-1						
Reach: Beaverdam Creek UT2A																	
	Cross Section 1						Cross	s Secti	on 2								
I. Cross-Section Parameters	Riffle							Pool									
	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5							
Dimension																	
BF Width (ft)	12.2					20.1											
Floodprone Width (ft)	39.8					40.0											
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	9.6					20.4											
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.8					1.0											
BF Max Depth (ft)	1.1					1.9											
Width/Depth Ratio	15.5					19.8											
Entrenchment Ratio	3.3					2.0											
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	13.7					22.1											
Hydraulic Radius (ft)	0.7					0.9											
Substrate																	
d50 (mm)	35					< 0.063											
d84 (mm)	53					< 0.063											
	MY-1 (2006)					MY-2 (2007) MY-3 ((2008) MY-4 (2009)			MY-5 (20010)			
II. Reachwide Parameters	Min	Max		led	Min	Max	. ,			Min Max Med		Min Max Med			Min Max Med		
Pattern																	
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	-	-		-													
Radius of Curvature (ft)	-	-		-													
Meander Wavelength (ft)	-	-		-													
Meander Width Ratio Profile	-	-		-													
Riffle length (ft)	_	_		_													
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	-	-		-													
Pool Length (ft)	-	-		-													
Pool Spacing (ft)	-	-		-													
Additional Reach Parameters	020																
Valley Length (ft) Channel Length (ft)	920 1121	-		-													
Sinuosity	1.2	-		_													
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	-	-		-													
BF Slope (ft/ft)	-	-		-													
Rosgen Classification	С	-		-													

			Beave	rdam (Creek R	estorat	ion Sit	e : Pro	ject N	o. D05(016-1										
					Reach:	Beave	rdam (Creek 1	UT2												
		Cros	s Section 3			s Sectio		Cros	Cross Section 6												
I. Cross-Section Parameters Riffle						Pool						Riffle			Pool						
	MY1	MY2	MY3 MY4	MY5	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY1	MY	2 N	1Y3 I	MY4	MY5	
Dimension																					
BF Width (ft)	16.1				20.9					16.6					14.0						
Floodprone Width (ft)	40.0				40.1					39.9					28.0						
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)	10.9				25.8					22.6					23.2						
BF Mean Depth (ft)	0.7				1.2					1.4					1.7						
BF Max Depth (ft)					2.5					1.9					2.6						
Width/Depth Ratio					16.9					12.2					8.5						
Entrenchment Ratio					1.9					2.4					2.0						
Wetted Perimeter (ft)					23.4					19.4					17.3						
Hydraulic Radius (ft)					1.1					1.2					1.3						
Substrate	010									1.2					110						
d50 (mm)	39				< 0.063					38					< 0.063						
d84 (mm)					< 0.063					59					< 0.063						
		MY-1 ((2006)		MY-2				MY-3	(2008)			MY-4	(2000		1	М	Y-5 (2	2010)	
II. Reachwide Parameters	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max		led	Min	Max	(2000) M	ed	Min	Max		Med	Min		Max		, Ied	
Pattern																					
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	-	-	-																		
Radius of Curvature (ft)	-	-	-																		
Meander Wavelength (ft)	-	-	-																		
Meander Width Ratio	-	-	-																		
Profile Difficult and (f)																					
Riffle length (ft) Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	-	-	-																		
Pool Length (ft)	-	-	-																		
Pool Spacing (ft)	-	-	-																		
1 0 ()																					
Additional Reach Parameters																					
Valley Length (ft)		-	-																		
Channel Length (ft)	3142	-	-													1					
Sinuosity	1.3	-	-																		
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft) BF Slope (ft/ft)		-	-																		
Rosgen Classification	- C	-	-													1					