Little Bugaboo Creek Stream Restoration 2006 Monitoring Report Monitoring Year Two

Ecosystem Enhancement Program Project Number 00056



Submitted to:

Prepared by:

Project Designed by:

NCDENR-Ecosystem Enhancement Program 1652 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1652

URS Corporation – North Carolina 1600 Perimeter Park Drive, Suite 400 Morrisville, NC 27560

EarthTech of NC, Inc. 701 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 475 Raleigh, NC 27607

Submitted: January 19, 2007



1.0	EXE	CUTIVE SUMMARY/PROJECT ABSTRACT	. 1
2.0	PRO	JECT BACKGROUND	.3
	2.1 2.2 2.3 2.4 2.5	PROJECT OBJECTIVES PROJECT STRUCTURE, MITIGATION TYPE, AND APPROACH LOCATION AND SETTING PROJECT HISTORY AND BACKGROUND MONITORING PLAN VIEW	. 3 . 3 . 5
3.0	PRO	JECT CONDITION AND MONITORING RESULTS 1	14
	3.1 3.2	VEGETATION ASSESSMENT. 1 3.1.1 Vegetative Problem Areas 1 3.1.2 Vegetative Problem Areas Plan View 1 STREAM ASSESSMENT. 1 3.2.1 Procedural Items. 1 3.2.1.1 Morphometric Criteria. 1 3.2.1.2 Hydrologic Criteria. 1 3.2.1.3 Bank Stability Assessment 1 3.2.2 Stream Problem Areas 1 3.2.3 Fixed Photo Station Photos 1 3.2.4 Stability Assessment 1 3.2.5 Quantitative Measures Tables (Morphology and Hydrology) 1	14 14 15 15 15 16 16 17 17
4.0		HODOLOGY SECTION	
	4.1 4.2	STREAM METHODOLOGY	26
5.0	REF	ERENCES2	28
FIGU Figur Figur Figur Figur TAB	re 2. re 3. re 4. re 5.	Project Vicinity Monitoring Plan View	3 III 16
Table		Project Mitigation Structure and Objectives Table	.5
Table Table Table Table Table	e III. e IV. e Va.	Project Activity and Reporting History Project Contact Table Project Background Table Categorical Stream Feature Visual Stability Assessment – Unnamed Tributary	.6 .6 7 7
		Creek1'	/

Table VIa.	Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary – Unnamed	
	Tributary	18
Table VIb.	Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary – Little Bugaboo	
	Creek	20
Table VIIa.	Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary –	
	Unnamed Tributary	22
Table VIIb.	Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary –	
	Unnamed Tributary	23
Table VIIc.	Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary –	
	Little Bugaboo Creek	24
Table VIId.	Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary –	
	Little Bugaboo Creek	25
Table A1.	Vegetation Metadata	Appendix A-I
Table A2.	Vegetation Vigor by Species	Appendix A-I
Table A3.	Vegetation Damage by Species	Appendix A-I
Table A4.	Vegetation Damage by Plot	Appendix A-I
Table A5.	Stem Count by Plot and Species	Appendix A-I
Table A6a.	Vegetative Problem Area Table – Unnamed Tributary	Appendix A-I
Table A6b.	Vegetative Problem Area Table – Little Bugaboo Creek	Appendix A-I
Table B1a.	Stream Problem Areas Table – Unnamed Tributary	Appendix B-II
Table B1b.	Stream Problem Areas Table – Little Bugaboo Creek	Appendix B-II
Table B2a.	Visual Morphological Stability Assessment – Unnamed Tributary	Appendix B-V
Table B2b.	Visual Morphological Stability Assessment - Little Bugaboo Creek	Appendix B-V

APPENDICES

Vegetation Ra	iv Data
I.	Vegetation Survey Data Tables
II.	Vegetative Problem Area Photos
III.	Vegetative Problem Areas Plan View
IV.	Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos
Geom	orphic Raw Data
I.	Stream Problem Areas Plan View
II.	Stream Problem Areas Data Tables
III.	Representative Stream Problem Areas Photos
IV.	Stream Photo Station Photos
V.	Visual Morphological Stability Assessment
VI.	Cross Section Photos and Annual Overlays of Plots
VII.	Annual Overlay of Longitudinal Plot
VIII.	Pebble Count Frequency Distribution Plots
	I. II. IV. V. Geom I. II. II. IV. V. V. VI. VII.

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY/PROJECT ABSTRACT

URS Corporation (URS) was retained by the North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program (EEP) to conduct stream monitoring at the Little Bugaboo Creek stream restoration project, located in Wilkes County, North Carolina. The stream monitoring effort conducted by URS in October 2006 represents Monitoring Year 2 for this project. Prior to the monitoring effort, URS received a digital As-Built drawing for the project site from EEP. In addition, URS received a As-Built/Monitoring Year 1 Report prepared by EarthTech (EarthTech 2005), aand a Year 1 Monitoring Report prepared by EcoLogic Associates, P.C (EcoLogic 2006).

The Ecosystem Enhancement Program (EEP), formerly the Wetlands Restoration Program (WRP) identified Little Bugaboo Creek and an Unnamed Tributary to Little Bugaboo Creek as potential stream restoration sites in 2002. The existing channels were actively eroding due to unlimited cattle access and lack of streamside vegetation. The design used a Priority Level II restoration approach. Little Bugaboo Creek and the Unnamed Tributary were designed as type C channels. A total of 6,230 linear feet of stream channel was restored.

Prior to restoration, the pastures adjacent to the channel consisted of fescue with sparse trees along drainages. The banks along much of the reach were vertical and supported little to no vegetation. The main channel was classified as a type F stream because the channel was downcutting and was eroding its banks to establish a floodplain at a lower elevation.

The Priority II restoration involved increasing the existing length and providing a floodplain. Cross vanes and rootwads were incorporated for aquatic habitat enhancement and bed and bank stability. A 50-foot riparian buffer was planted on both sides of the restored stream channel.

The Little Bugaboo Creek restoration site is in overall poor condition. The site is characterized by severe bank erosion, accelerated channel widening, and associated aggradation. While some of the rock structures are functioning properly and providing crucial grade control, many of them are failing. These problems may be due to any number of reasons, and likely a combination of several factors. Because the problems with the site are not isolated, but are systemic, it is suspected that there were problems with the original design and/or construction of the project. The channel dimensions as well as the structures may have been designed or built incorrectly. The failure of the vegetation has likely contributed to the excessive bank erosion. The bed features are in fair condition, with many riffles and pools; however the placement of the features is often inappropriate, with riffles located in meander bends and pools located in straight reaches.

In comparison with the cross section data from the 2005 As-built/Year 1 Monitoring Report (EarthTech, June 2005), the channel dimensions appear smaller and more narrow. Cross sectional area, bankfull width, and width to depth ratios have decreased, while entrenchment ratios have increased. However, field observations show that in many areas not captured by the cross sections, the channel size is increasing laterally due to mass wasting of banks. Both the mainstem of Little Bugaboo Creek and the Unnamed Tributary were classified as C channels on the As-built, but have both transitioned to E channels according to the 2006 monitoring. This classification was based on the narrower width to depth ratios of the riffle cross sections (< 10) as well as field observations that the stream has steep banks and is not building or maintaining point bars typical of C channels.

Of course, all of the cross section parameters are based on the selected bankfull elevation, which can be especially problematic in newly restored or very unstable stream systems. There are often no bankfull indicators in newly restored streams, as they may not have experienced enough (or any) bankfull events to form reliable indicators. Deposition on the floodplain or other evidence of flow may be present, but without hydrologic data there is no way to know if these flows correspond to a bankfull event or a greater-than-bankfull event. In restored streams, it is presumed that the channel was designed and built so

that the top of bank equals bankfull, and the top of bank is often the only reliable indicator of bankfull elevation. In the case of Little Bugaboo Creek, it is suspected that the channel is oversized and the top of bank is higher than bankfull, but because of the recent construction and repair work, as well as actively eroding banks, it is impossible to discern another reliable bankfull indicator. Therefore, in most instances URS placed the bankfull elevation at the top of bank.

Vegetation survival at the site is also poor. According to the 2005 As-built/Year 1 Monitoring Report, five of the vegetation plots were significantly disturbed due to repair activities along Little Bugaboo Creek. The plots disturbed by channel repairs were replanted, but planting appear to be concentrated close to the channel, leaving much of the upper floodplain/upland void of woody vegetation. The 2005 Year One Monitoring Report (EcoLogic 2006) found insufficient stems to fulfill USACE requirements. Herbaceous grasses and herbs dominated much of the buffer area during the 2006 Year Two monitoring event. Common species include wiregrass (*Aristida* spp.), dogfennel (*Eupatorium capillifolium*), goldenrod (*Solidago* spp.), and bluestem (*Andropogon* spp.). URS recommends testing site soils, fertilizing where necessary based on soil tests, and replanting stems in areas unlikely to meet survivability requirements for mitigation credit.

2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND

2.1 **PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

The main objective of the restoration project was to construct a stable meander geometry, modify the channel cross sections, and establish a floodplain at the existing stream elevation, thus restoring a stable dimension, pattern, and profile. Specific project objectives included the following:

- 1. Restore 4,276 linear feet of Little Bugaboo Creek and 1,954 linear feet of an Unnamed Tributary to Little Bugaboo Creek.
- 2. Provide a stable stream channel that neither aggrades nor degrades while maintaining its dimension, pattern, and profile with the capacity to transport its watershed's water and sediment load.
- 3. Improve water quality and reduce further property loss by stabilizing eroding stream banks.
- 4. Reconnect the stream to its floodplain or establish a new floodplain at a lower elevation.
- 5. Improve aquatic habitat with the use of natural material stabilization structures such as root wads, rock vanes, woody debris and a riparian buffer.
- 6. Provide aesthetic value, wildlife habitat and a bank stability through the creation or enhancement of a riparian zone.

2.2 PROJECT STRUCTURE, MITIGATION TYPE, AND APPROACH

Prior to restoration, the pastures adjacent to the channel consisted of fescue with sparse trees along drainages. The banks along much of the reach were vertical and supported little to no vegetation. The main channel was classified as a type F stream because the channel was downcutting and was eroding its banks to establish a floodplain at a lower elevation.

The Priority II restoration involved increasing the existing stream length and providing a floodplain. Cross vanes and rootwads were incorporated for aquatic habitat enhancement and bed and bank stability. A 50-foot riparian buffer was planted using native vegetation. Cattle were fenced from the riparian area. Little Bugaboo Creek and the Unnamed Tributary were designed as type C channels. A total of 6,230 linear feet of stream channel was restored.

2.3 LOCATION AND SETTING

Little Bugaboo Creek is located on agricultural land approximately seven miles east-northeast of North Wilkesboro, just northwest of the town of Ronda in Wilkes County, North Carolina (Figure 1). The headwaters of the project originate approximately three miles to the north-northwest of the restoration site. From the headwaters, Little Bugaboo Creek flows for approximately four miles before its confluence with Big Bugaboo Creek. An Unnamed Tributary to Little Bugaboo Creek enters Little Bugaboo Creek at the end of the project site. The headwaters of the Unnamed Tributary originate approximately 1.6 miles from the restoration site. From its headwaters, the Unnamed Tributary flows for approximately 2.5 miles before the confluence with Little Bugaboo Creek.

To travel to the site from Raleigh, take I-40 West towards Greensboro. Merge onto US-421 North via Exit 188 toward Yadkinville/Wilkesboro Take the Clingman Road/Somers Road Exit - Exit 272 toward NC-268. Make a right onto NC-268 and then a right onto Old Traphill Road. Old Traphill Road joins Hoots Road.

The project is contained within the property of five landowners. The project reach is bound to the north by Tharpe Road and to the south by Hoots Road.



2.4 PROJECT HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

The Little Bugaboo Creek Stream Restoration project was designed by EarthTech and constructed in the fall and winter of 2003 to 2004. The Mitigation and As-built Plan were completed in June 2005. Year One Monitoring was conducted by EcoLogic in the winter of 2006. The estimated restoration length was 6,230 linear feet. This length includes 4,276 feet of Little Bugaboo Creek and 1,954 feet of an Unnamed Tributary to Little Bugaboo Creek.

Historically, a mill and dam were located approximately 150 feet below the confluence of Little Bugaboo Creek and the Unnamed Tributary. The mill dam backed up water within approximately half of the project reach. Both streams had incised down to bedrock through the alluvial sediments of the historic pond. The dam was removed near the beginning of the 20th Century.

Land use throughout the restoration site is agricultural. The primary use is cattle production and the spreading of chicken litter. Fences within the project area did not restrict cattle access to streams and drainages in the area. Cattle access to the stream and riparian areas resulted in streambank erosion prior to restoration. Continual grazing limited the ability of vegetation to reestablish itself along the majority of the reach. Additional degradation resulted from historic channelization of both reaches.

Table I. Project Mitigation Structure and Objectives Table Little Bugaboo Creek EEP Project Number 00056											
Project Segment or Reach ID	Project Segment or Reach ID Existing Feet* Mitigation Type Approach Footage Mitigation Mitigation Ratio* Stationing**										
Unnamed Tributary	1,954	R	PII	1,925			0+00 to 19+54				
Little Bugaboo Creek	Little 4,276 R PII 4,232 0+00 to 42+76 Bugaboo 0										

* Existing Feet, Mitigation Ratios, and Units not provided in previous report

** Stationing follows the Year One Monitoring Report (EcoLogic 2006)

R= Restoration	P1= Priority I	EI= Enhancement I	PII= Priority II
EII= Enhancement II	PIII= Priority III	S= Stabilization	SS= Stream Bank Stabilization

Table II. Project Activity and Reporting HistoryLittle Bugaboo CreekEEP Project Number 00056							
Activity or Report	Scheduled Completion	Data Collection Complete	Actual Completion or Delivery				
Restoration Plan	2002	Unknown	2002				
Construction	2003	Unknown	2003/2004				
Permanent seed mix applied	2004	Unknown	2004				
Live stakes and woody plants	2004	Unknown	2004				
Final Walk Through	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown				
As-Built Report/Mitigation Plan	2004	Unknown	June 2005				
Year 1 Monitoring	Fall 2005	Unknown	June 2006				
Year 2 Monitoring	Fall 2006	November 2006	December 2006				
Year 3 Monitoring							
Year 4 Monitoring							
Year 5 Monitoring							
Year + Monitoring							

Table III. Project Contact Table					
Little Bugaboo Creek EEP Project Number 00056					
-	701 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 475				
	Raleigh, NC 27607				
Primary project design POC	Bill Jenkins PE, RLA 919-854-6228				
Construction Contractor	Dixie Grading and Equipment Company				
	5228 W US HWY 421				
	Wilkesboro, NC 28697				
Construction contractor POC	Randall Miles 336-973-7281				
Planting Contractor	Carolina Environmental				
	PO Box 1905				
	Mt. Airy, NC 27030				
Planting contractor POC	Joanne Chetham 336-320-3849				
Seeding Contractor	Carolina Environmental				
	PO Box 1905				
	Mt. Airy, NC 27030				
Seeding contractor POC	Joanne Chetham 336-320-3849				
Seed Mix Sources					
	Unknown				
Nursery Stock Suppliers					
	Unknown				
2004 Monitoring Performers	Earth Tech of North Carolina				
-	701 Corporate Center Drive, Suite 475				
	Raleigh NC 27607				
Stream Monitoring POC – Ron Johnson	919-854-6210				
Vegetation Monitoring POC – Jane Almon	919-854-7745				
¥					

2005 Monitoring Performers	EcoLogic Associates, P.C.		
	4321-A S. Elm-Eugene St.		
	Greensboro, NC 27406		
Stream Monitoring POC – Kyle Hoover	336-355-1108		
Vegetation Monitoring POC – Moni Bates	336-335-1108		
2006 Monitoring Performers	URS Corporation – North Carolina		
	1600 Perimeter Park Drive, Suite 400		
	Morrisville, NC 27560		
	919-461-1100		
Monitoring POC – Kathleen McKeithan	919-461-1597		

Table IV. Project Background Table Little Bugaboo Creek						
EEP Project Number 00056						
Project County	Wilkes County					
Drainage Area Little Bugaboo	3.45 square miles					
Unnamed Tributary	1.4 square miles					
Drainage impervious cover estimate (%)	2					
Stream Order Little Bugaboo	3 rd					
Unnamed Tributary	3 rd					
Physiographic Region	Piedmont/Foothills					
Ecoregion	Northern Inner Piedmont (45e)					
Rosgen Classification of As-Built	С					
Dominant soil types	Chewacla and Rion					
Reference site ID	Basin Creek					
USGS HUC for Project	03040101					
USGS HUC for Reference	05050001					
NCDWQ Sub-basin for Project and Reference	03-07-01 – Project					
NCDWQ classification for Project and Reference	C – Project					
Any portion of any project segment 303d listed?	No					
Any portion of any project segment upstream of a 303d						
listed segment?	No					
Reasons for 303d listing or stressor	NA					
% of project easement fenced	Approximately 80% - no cattle in upper reach					

2.5 MONITORING PLAN VIEW

See Figure 2. Monitoring Plan View.

Veg Plots			Photo Points		
ID	Northing	Easting	ID	Northing	Easting
9	915332	1414444	655	917481.3	1416889
8	915589.8	1414222	657	917200.1	1416993
10	915207.1	1414512	670	916874.1	141693
11	915122.6	1414617	673	916737.4	1416889
12	915063	1414755	676	916563.6	141697
13	915037.7	1414879	679	916406.3	1416998
14	915070.8	1414991	681	916355.9	1416999
15	915031.9	1415095	687	916153	1417029
17	915339.3	1415648	693	915956.5	1417054
16	915271.5	1415568	745	915923.2	1416982
18	915487.6	1415860	741	915860	1417048
21	915760.4	1416504	703	915544.2	141423
19	915884.5	1416806	706	915232.6	1414449
21	915822.1	1416922	718	915308.9	1415522
7	916335	1417003	723	915407.5	1415713
6	916548.7	1416925	728	915606.3	1416020
5	916744.3	1416905	661	917038.5	1416952
4	916948.1	1416931	667	916938.3	141687
2	917144.6	1416954			
3	917273.8	1416986			
1	917346.9	1416918			















3.0 PROJECT CONDITION AND MONITORING RESULTS

3.1 VEGETATION ASSESSMENT

3.1.1 Vegetative Problem Areas

No Vegetative Problem Areas were identified during Year 1 Monitoring. Notes provided on the Vegetative Problem Areas Plan View were as follows:

- 1. No significant vegetation problems were noted on the intact banks or in the easement corridor, though eroded banks will obviously need replanting when stream repairs are made.
- 2. Vegetation problems were assessed without an as-built species list or planting plan, thus species survival and mortality rates could not be evaluated.
- 3. Scattered but widespread occurrences of emerging Chinese privet and multiflora rose were noted throughout the corridor, which will become problematic if not treated. Adjacent areas are infested with Chinese privet, so this will likely be a recurring management challenge.

Twenty-two Vegetative Problem Areas were found at the Little Bugaboo site during the 2006 Year 2 monitoring. Major issues included bare banks as a result of erosion and scour and poor survivability. Herbaceous grasses and herbs dominated much of the buffer area during the 2006 Year Two monitoring event. Thick mats of herbaceous vegetation were observed. Common species include wiregrass (*Aristida* spp.), dogfennel (*Eupatorium capillifolium*), goldenrod (*Solidago* spp.), and bluestem (*Andropogon* spp.). It is likely that the presence and density of the above-mentioned native herbs is to blame for size and survivability issues. The small planted stems are not successfully competing for space, light, and nutrients. The Vegetative Problem Areas Tables are located in Appendix A-I. Vegetative Problem Area

3.1.2 Vegetative Problem Areas Plan View

The Vegetative Problem Areas Plan View is located in Appendix A-III.

3.2 STREAM ASSESSMENT

3.2.1 Procedural Items

3.2.1.1 Morphometric Criteria

Dimension and profile were sampled at a rate per the 2003 USACE Stream Mitigation Guidelines as follows:

Dimension: Six permanent cross sections were surveyed. Two are located on the Unnamed Tributary (one riffle and one pool) and four are located on Little Bugaboo Creek (two riffles and two pools). At the instruction of the EEP Project Manager, URS surveyed the cross-sections established by EcoLogic for the Year 1 Monitoring Report. The cross-section numbers and locations do not correspond to the As-Built cross-sections established by EarthTech. The survey includes points measured at all breaks in slope, including top of bank, bankfull, and thalweg.

Profile: A longitudinal profile survey was performed on the entire project reach (6,157 linear feet). 4,232 linear feet were surveyed on Little Bugaboo Creek and 1,925 linear feet were surveyed on the Unnamed Tributary. Survey points include measurements taken in the thalweg at the beginning of each stream feature such as riffle, run, glide, and pool, as well as the maximum pool depth, bankfull, and top of bank.

3.2.1.2 Hydrologic Criteria

No crest gages are installed at this site to document bankfull events. Therefore, potential occurrence was extrapolated based on USGS stream gage discharge data for the Roaring River near Roaring River, NC (USGS 2006). The USGS gage plot is shown below (Figure 4). The gage is located less than five miles from the project site and has a drainage area of 128 square miles. An estimate of the number of bankfull events in 2006 was made by comparing the stream discharges from the USGS data in cubic feet per second (cfs) against the bankfull discharge estimated from the drainage area on the Rural Piedmont Regional Curve. According to the regional curve, a bankfull event occurs on a stream with a 128 square mile drainage area when the discharge is about 2,500 cfs. This discharge was not exceeded in the past year, indicating that the Roaring River has not had a bankfull event this year (as of November 7, 2006). Little Bugaboo Creek is in close proximity to the Roaring River. Therefore, it is likely that the project site did not experience a bankfull event in 2006.





3.2.1.3 Bank Stability Assessments

A detailed BEHI and NBS assessment was not required for the Little Bugaboo Creek Stream Restoration site during this monitoring year. According to the 2006 Monitoring Guidelines (EEP 2006), an assessment is required during year 5, post construction only.

3.2.2 Stream Problem Areas

There were 35 Stream Problem Areas identified on Little Bugaboo Creek in 2005. In 2006, 40 Stream Problem Areas were identified. There were 24 Stream Problem Areas identified on the Unnamed Tributary in 2005. In 2006, 25 Stream Problem Areas were identified. The Stream Problem Areas Plan View, tables, and photographs are located in Appendices B-I, B-II, and B-III respectively.

Field observations show that in many areas, not captured by the cross sections, the channel size is increasing laterally. Bank erosion in the form of mass wasting and scour was prevalent in Little Bugaboo Creek and the Unnamed Tributary. Underlying causes of erosional problems are difficult to determine at this stage since URS was not involved with the design, construction, or follow-up maintenance phases of this project. Immediate causes are attributed to easily erodible, sandy substrate that dominates the streambank soils. Insufficient vegetative protection has likely contributed to erosion problems as well. Ultimate causes for the erosion problems may be attributed to problems with the project design and/or the implementation of the design during construction activities.

Per the 2005 As-Built/Monitoring Year 1 Report provided by EarthTech, "These areas of erosion may be due to any of the following: lack of vegetation, improper installation and/or design of structures, stream design dimensionless ratios, the inner berm was not constructed according to the plans for typical cross

sections, and overland flow/drainageways entering the stream channel." URS is assuming the abovementioned problems to be the cause of many of the problem areas observed in 2006.

3.2.3 Fixed Photo Station Photos

Fixed Photo Station photos are located in Appendix B-IV. Photo Station photo 670 is missing due to camera error.

3.2.4 Stability Assessment

Table Va. Categorical Stream Feature Visual Stability Assessment (% Functioning) Unnamed Tributary Little Bugaboo Creek EEP Project Number 00056									
Feature	Initial*	MY-01**	MY-02	MY-03	MY-04	MY-05			
A. Riffle	100	N/A	96						
B. Pool	100	N/A	91						
C. Thalweg	100	N/A	100						
D. Meanders	100	N/A	67						
E. Bed General	100	N/A	100						
F. Bank Condition	F. Bank Condition 100 N/A 91								
G. Vanes / J Hooks	G. Vanes / J Hooks 100 N/A 95								
H. Wads and Boulders	100	N/A	89						

* It is assumed that all were 100 percent functional upon completion of construction.

**No stability data are presented in previous report.

Table Vb. Ca	tegorical Stre	Little Bu Little Bu	igaboo Creel igaboo Creel	K K	nt (% Functio	oning)
	T •4• 14	V	t Number 00	1	N/IN / 0.4	N/N/ 07
Feature	Initial*	MY-01**	MY-02	MY-03	MY-04	MY-05
A. Riffle	100	N/A	92			
B. Pool	100	N/A	87			
C. Thalweg	100	N/A	88			
D. Meanders	100	N/A	67			
E. Bed General	100	N/A	98			
F. Bank Condition			86			
G. Vanes / J Hooks	100	N/A	82			
H. Wads and Boulders	100	N/A	75			

* It is assumed that all were 100 percent functional upon completion of construction.

**No stability data are presented in previous report.

3.2.5 Quantitative Measures Tables (Morphology and Hydrology)

			Tal	ole VIa.	Baseli	ne Morr	ohology	and Hy	draulic	Summa	ary – Un	named	Tributa	ary				
						_			boo Cre		-			-				
				r				¥	lumber				r			1		
Parameter	USG	S Gage	Data	0	ional C			e-Existi	0	Proje	ect Refe			Design	ļ		As-buil	t
			1		Interva			Conditio			Stream				1			1
Dimension	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
BF Width (ft)				7.5	30	16.5	17.5	18	17.75	29.5	36.9	33.2			18	14.8	31	18.6
Floodprone Width (ft)				-					38			329	-		170	61	75	68.0
BF Cross				13	50	26	21.2	21.9	21.55	64.9	71.9	68.4			27	22.1	34.4	30.9
Sectional Area (ft ²)																		
BF Mean Depth (ft)				1.0	2.6	1.8	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.9	2.2	2.05			1.5	1.1	2.3	1.4
BF Max							2.2	2.3	2.25	3	3.2	3.1			2.1	2.64	3.8	3.1
Depth (ft)																		
Width/Depth							14.4	14.8	14.6	13.4	19.4	16.4			12	11.2	17.2	14.2
Ratio																		
Entrenchment							1.8	2.5	2.15			8.9			9.4	3.47	3.8	3.6
Ratio																		
Bank Height							1.9	4.5	2.8	1.0	1.0	1.0						
Ratio																		
Wetted							19.9	20.4	20.15	33.3	41.3	37.3			21	19.4	33.2	21.3
Perimeter (ft)																		
Hydraulic radius (ft)							1.07	1.07	1.07	1.95	1.74	1.84			1.29	1.0	1.8	1.2
Pattern																		
Channel Beltwidth (ft)							26	74	50	59	75	67				40	131	59.5
Radius of							27	98	62.5	40.1	69.3	54.7	1.8	3.7	2.8			
Curvature (ft)																		
Meander Wavelength (ft)							87	355	221			350	129	224	176.5	130	204	175
Meander Width Ratio							4.9	19.9	12.4			10.5	9	12	10.5	7.01	11.00	9.43

			Tal	ole VIa.	Baseli	ne Morp					ary – Ur	nnamed	Tributa	nry				
								0	boo Cre lumber									
				1				I UJECI I	uiiidei	00030						1		
				0	ional C			·e-Existi			ect Refe							
Parameter		S Gage			Interva			Conditio			Stream			Design			As-buil	-
Dimension	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
Profile																		
Riffle Length (ft)										10	245	127.5				22	28	25
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)												0.02			0.02	0.00	0.20	0.10
Pool Length (ft)										8	32	20				47	94	70.5
Pool Spacing (ft)							33	176	104.5	271	334	302.5	64	166	115.0	121	127	124
Substrate																		
d50 (mm)									5			58				0.5	5.7	3.1
d84 (mm)									23			180				8	32	20
Additional																		
Reach																		
Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)																		1603
Channel Length (ft)																		1954
Sinuosity									1.2						1.3			1.2
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)									0.01			0.014			0.01			0.01
BF Slope (ft/ft)																		0.01
Rosgen Classification									C and F			C4			C and F			С

			Exhibit	Table V	Ib. Ba	seline M	lorphol	ogy and	Hydrau	ılic Sun	nmary –	- Little H	Bugabo	o Creek				
									boo Cre		J		8					
							EEP P	roject N	lumber	00056								
Parameter	USG	S Gage	Data	Reg	ional C	urve	Pr	e-Existi	ing	Proje	ect Refe	rence		Design			As-buil	t
					Interva	1	-	Conditio	n		Stream							
Dimension	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
BF Width (ft)				12	40	23	26	35.5	30.75	20	21.5	20.75			25.8	20.3	44	28.8
Floodprone Width (ft)				-					90			130			255	87.5	100	100
BF Cross				27	100	51	54	87.7	70.85	40.9	42.8	41.85			55.7	53.9	67.5	60.1
Sectional Area (ft ²)																		
BF Mean Depth (ft)				1.5	3.3	2.4	1.9	2.9	2.4	2	2	2			2.15	1.4	3.2	2.2
BF Max							2.7	4.1	3.4	2.5	2.7	2.6			3.5	3.6	4.6	4.1
Depth (ft)																		
Width/Depth							8.8	17.4	13.1	9.8	10.8	10.3			12	12	32.6	12.6
Ratio																		
Entrenchment Ratio									2.7			65			9.9	3.1	3.5	3.3
Bank Height Ratio							1.9	4.5	2.8	1.0	1.0	1.0						
Wetted							29.8	41.3	35.55	24	25.5	24.75			30.1	32.7	46.8	33.3
Perimeter (ft)																		
Hydraulic radius (ft)							1.812	2.123	1.993	1.704	1.678	1.691			1.850	1.3	2.0	1.9
Pattern																		
Channel Beltwidth (ft)							36	140	88	31	44	37.5	NA	NA	NA	63	122	92.5
Radius of							62	234	148	42	63	52.5	72.9	102.9	87.9	60	110	85
Curvature (ft)																		
Meander Wavelength (ft)							133	590	361.5	185	260	222.5	196	366	281	206	366	286
Meander Width Ratio							4.4	19.3	11.85	8.9	12.6	10.75	6.5	12.2	9.35	7.2	12.7	9.9

]	Exhibit	Table V	/Ib. Ba	seline M	Litt	le Buga	Hydrau boo Cre lumber	ek	nmary –	- Little I	Bugaboo	o Creek				
Parameter		S Gage	Data)	ional C Interva		(e-Existi Conditio	n	,	ect Refe Stream	l		Design			As-buil	-
Dimension	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
Profile																		
Riffle Length (ft)										23	78	50.5				3	91	47
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)										0.02	0.02	0.02			0.01	0.00	0.20	0.10
Pool Length (ft)										8	32	20				47	94	70.5
Pool Spacing (ft)							57	287	172	98	180	139	106	217	161.5	121	127	124
Substrate																		
d50 (mm)									0.25			3				0.25	11.3	5.8
d84 (mm)									23			50				1	64	32.5
Additional																		
Reach																		
Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)																		3420
Channel Length (ft)																		4276
Sinuosity									1.3			1.1			1.2			1.3
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)									0.00			0.01			0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01
BF Slope (ft/ft)																0.00	0.01	0.00
Rosgen Classification									Bc, C, E, F			E4			С			С

Exhil	bit Tabl		Ŭ Lit EEP I	nnamed ttle Bug Project	l Tribu gaboo C Numbe	tary reek	Monito 6	ring Sui	nmary			
Parameter			Cross S Pa		l					Section ffle	2	
Dimension	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+
BF Width (ft)	23.5	13.8					18.8	17.4				
Floodprone Width (ft)	52	>42.7					32.4	>81.0				
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)	38.3	23.3					30.7	30.5				
BF Mean Depth	1.6	1.7					1.6	1.8				
BF Max Depth	3.8	3.5					3.2	3.2				
Width/Depth Ratio	14.4	8.2					11.5	9.9				
Entrenchment Ratio	2.2	>3.1					1.7	>4.7				
Bank Height Ratio		1.0						1.0				
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	25.7	17.5					20.7	19.6				
Hydraulic radius (ft)	1.5	1.3					1.5	1.6				
Substrate												
d50 (mm)	0.2	12					23.4	22				
d84 (mm)	0.7	68					51.3	68				

			Exhit	oit Table	VIIb. N	Iorpholo	gy and l	Hydraul	ic Monito	ring Su	mmary -	- Unnam	ed Trib	utary]
						-			boo Cree		·			·				
Parameter		MY1			MY2		EEP I	Project N MY3	Number 0	0056	MY4		1	MY5			MY+	
Pattern	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
Tuttern					111111	Witculi	101111	IVIUX	Witculi		IVIUX	Witculi	101111	Witax	Witcuit	101111	111111	Witculi
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	25	132	47															
Radius of Curvature (ft)	20	92	48.5															
Meander Wavelength (ft)	75	230	100															
Meander Width Ratio	3.9	12.2	5.3															
Profile																		
Riffle Length (ft)	12.3	36.9	22	3	70	28												
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.001	0.058	0.024	0.006	0.067	0.021												
Pool Length (ft)	15.8	66.8	32.2	15	43	28												
Pool Spacing (ft)	15.8	130.2	56.1	31	196	95												
Additional Reach Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)			1585			1585												
Channel Length (ft)			2013			1925												
Sinuosity			1.3			1.2												
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)			1.11															
BF Slope (ft/ft)			0.011			0.011												
Rosgen Classification			B/C			E4												

		Cro	oss Se Ru	ction		oit Ta	ble VI	E	Littl Littl EP Pr coss S	le Bug le Bug oject	gaboo gaboo Num	lydrau Creeł Creeł ber 00	Z Z			ection				Cro	oss Se Riff		6	
Parameter		(N		(kiffle				(MY1	Pool)													
Dimension	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY^+	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+
BF Width (ft)	27.1	19.3					20.6	14.0					31.3	27.3					17.8	13.3				
Floodprone Width (ft)	91.3	91					68.8	49.3					52.8	>50					39	45.0				
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)	63.2	45.7					34	21.6					47	31					20.6	23.1				
BF Mean Depth	2.3	2.4					1.7	1.5					1.5	1.1					1.2	1.7				
BF Max Depth	4.7	4.2					3.7	2.6					5	4.4					2.4	2.5				
Width/Depth Ratio	11.6	8.2					12.5	9.1					20.8	24.1					15.5	7.7				
Entrenchment Ratio	3.4	4.7					3.3	3.5					1.7	>1.8					2.2	3.4				
Bank Height Ratio		1.0						1.0						1.4						1.0				
Wetted Perimeter (ft)	30	21.8					22.9	15.8					36.2	32.4					19.3	14.8				
Hydraulic radius (ft)	2.1	2.1					1.5	1.4					1.3	1.0					1.1	1.6				
Substrate																								
d50 (mm)	4.71	6					0.29	13					0.29	0.94					21.13	48				
d84 (mm)	14.72	64					2.33	59					2	48					54.5	130				

			Exhib	oit Table	VIId. Mo	orphology	and Hy	draulic I	Monitorir	ng Sum	mary – l	Little Bug	zaboo C	reek				
							Little	e Bugabo	oo Creek	-	J		.					
		N / N 74					EEP Pro	<u>v</u>	mber 000	56			1			1		
Parameter		MY1	3.6		MY2	1	2.4	MY3	1.1	3.4	MY4		3.41	MY5			MY+	
Pattern	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean	Min	Max	Mean
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	16	115	70															
Radius of Curvature (ft)	42	121	72															
Meander Wavelength (ft)	105	210	163															
Meander Width Ratio	3.8	11.6	7.4															
Profile																		
Riffle Length (ft)	13.8	48.5	29.1	10.0	128.0	55												
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.007	0.034	0.015	0.002	0.026	0.012												
Pool Length (ft)	9.23	94.6	44.5	16.0	131.0	45												
Pool Spacing (ft)	16.2	175.3	80.5	43.0	347.0	120												
Additional Reach Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)			2975			2975												
Channel Length (ft)			4293			4232												
Sinuosity			1.4			1.4												
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)			0.57			0.55												
BF Slope (ft/ft)			0.53			0.56												
Rosgen Classification			В			E4												

Appendix A (Click here)

APPENDIX A

VEGETATION RAW DATA

Table A1. Vegetation Metadata

Report Prepared By	Susan Shelingoski
Date Prepared	1/15/2007 13:09
database name	CVS_EEP_DataEntry_v202.mdb
database location	P:\Jobs3\31825348_Monitoring
DESCRIPTION OF WORKSHEETS	IN THIS DOCUMENT
Metadata	This worksheet, which is a summary of the project and the project data.
Plots	List of plots surveyed.
Vigor	Frequency distribution of vigor classes.
Vigor by Spp	Frequency distribution of vigor classes listed by species.
Damage	List of most frequent damage classes with number of occurrences and percent of total stems impacted by each.
Damage by Spp	Damage values tallied by type for each species.
Damage by Plot	Damage values tallied by type for each plot.
Stem Count by Plot and Spp	Count of living stems of each species for each plot; dead and missing stems are excluded.
PROJECT SUMMARY	
Project Code	56
project Name	Little Bugaboo Creek
Description	Stream Restoration
length (ft)	
stream-to-edge width (ft)	
area (sq m)	
Required Plots (calculated)	
Sampled Plots	14

Table A2. Vegetation Vigor by Species

	Species	4	3	2	1	0	Missing
	EMPTY_MODULE: This module has no species in it, but was						
	sampled.						
	Alnus serrulata	13					
	Aronia arbutifolia		2				
	Betula nigra	3					
	Callicarpa americana	4		1			
	Cornus racemosa	18					
	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	24	1	2			
	Nyssa sylvatica	8	3	1			
	Pinus virginiana						
	Quercus alba	8	2				
	Rhus glabra	10					
	Salix nigra	3					
	Sambucus canadensis	13	1				
	Rhus copallinum	2					
	llex opaca		1				
	Liriodendron tulipifera	2					
	Platanus occidentalis	52	3				
	Prunus	7	2				
	Acer negundo	10	1	1			
	Acer rubrum						
TOT:	20	177	16	5			

Table A3. Vegetation Damage by Species

		All	
	One size	Damage	(no
	Species	Categories	damage)
	Acer negundo	15	15
	Acer rubrum	2	2
	Alnus serrulata	15	15
	Aronia arbutifolia	2	2
	Betula nigra	4	4
	Callicarpa americana	5	5
	Cornus racemosa	19	19
	EMPTY_MODULE: This module has no species in it, but was		
	sampled.	3	3
	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	27	27
	llex opaca	1	1
	Liriodendron tulipifera	2	2
	Nyssa sylvatica	13	13
	Pinus virginiana	1	1
	Platanus occidentalis	60	60
	Prunus	9	9
	Quercus alba	11	11
	Rhus copallinum	6	6
	Rhus glabra	10	10
	Salix nigra	3	3
	Sambucus canadensis	14	14
TOT:	20	222	222

Table A4. Vegetation Damage by Plot

No damage was recorded within the plots.

Table A5. Stem Count by Plot and Species

	Species	Total Stems	# plots	avg# stems	plot 056- 01- 0001	plot 056- 01- 0002	plot 056- 01- 0004	plot 056- 01- 0006	plot 056- 01- 0007	plot 056- 01- 0008	plot 056- 01- 0011	plot 056- 01- 0012	plot 056- 01- 0013	plot 056- 01- 0014	plot 056- 01- 0015	plot 056- 01- 0016	plot 056- 01- 0019	plot 056- 01- 0021
	Acer negundo	12	1	12														12
	Alnus serrulata	13	7	1.86	4	1			3		1		2	1			1	
	Aronia arbutifolia	2	1	2														2
	Betula nigra	3	3	1							1		1					1
	Callicarpa americana	5	4	1.25	2	1						1					1	
	Cornus racemosa	18	3	6		16						1	1					
	Fraxinus pennsylvanica	27	10	2.7		6	4	2	2		2	1	3	1			1	5
	llex opaca	1	1	1						1								
	Liriodendron tulipifera	2	2	1				1										1
	Nyssa sylvatica	12	6	2		3		4			1			1			2	1
	Platanus occidentalis	55	13	4.23	13	8	1	4	7	3	4	1		4	1	2	1	6
	Prunus	9	5	1.8				1				3		1	3			1
	Quercus alba	10	4	2.5	6	1					2		1					
	Rhus copallinum	2	2	1										1	1			
	Rhus glabra	10	4	2.5		5	1				3	1						
	Salix nigra	3	1	3					3									
	Sambucus canadensis	14	4	3.5		3	2				7							2
TOT:	17	198	17		25	44	8	12	15	4	21	8	8	9	5	2	6	31

Exhibit Table A6a. Vegetative Problem Areas – Unnamed Tributary Little Bugaboo Creek EEP Project Number 00056								
Feature #	Feature/Issue	Station #/Range	Probable Cause	Photo #				
UTVPA1	Bare bank	0+15	Scour	UTVPA1				
UTVPA2	Bare bank	1+90	Scour	UTVPA2				
UTVPA3	Bare bank	8+00	Scour	UTVPA3				
UTVPA4	Bare bank	14+60	Scour	UTVPA4				
UTVPA5	Bare bank	15+05	Scour	UTVPA5				
UTVPA6	Exotic population	16+00	Chinese privet	UTVPA6				
UTVPA7	Exotic population	18+80	Chinese privet	UTVPA7				
UTVPA8	Bare bank	20+00	Scour	UTVPA8				

Exhibit Table A6b. Vegetative Problem Areas – Little Bugaboo Creek Little Bugaboo Creek EEP Project Number 00056							
Feature #	Feature/Issue	Station #/Range	Probable Cause	Photo #			
VPA1	Poor survivability	0+00 to 5+60	Thick herbaceous vegetation	VPA1			
VPA2	Bare bank	3+30	Bank erosion	VPA2			
VPA3	Bare bank	14+80	Bank erosion	VPA3			
VPA4	Bare bank	11+00	Scour	VPA4			
VPA5	Bare bank	14+00	Scour	VPA5			
VPA6	Bare floodplain	15+00	Aggradation	VPA6			
VPA7	Bare bank	22+80	Scour	VPA7			
VPA8	Bare bank	25+00	Scour	VPA8			
VPA9	Bare bank	26+00	Scour	VPA9			
VPA10	Bare bank	30+00	Scour	VPA10			
VPA11	Bare bank	37+20	Scour	VPA11			
VPA12	Bare bank	38+00	Scour	VPA12			
VPA13	Bare bank	40+60	Beaver damage	VPA13			
VPA14	Bare bank	41+60	Scour	VPA14			

UNNAMED TRIBUTARY



UTVPA1 facing left bank



UTVPA3 facing right bank



UTVPA5 facing right bank



UTVPA2 facing left bank



UTVPA4 facing right bank



UTVPA6 facing left bank, upstream
APPENDIX A-II. VEGETATIVE PROBLEM AREA PHOTOS Photos taken 10/9/06 and 10/10/06



UTVPA7 facing left bank, downstream

LITTLE BUGABOO CREEK



UTVPA8 facing upstream



VPA1 on left bank, facing downstream



VPA3 facing left bank



VPA2 facing left bank



VPA4 facing left bank, upstream

APPENDIX A-II. VEGETATIVE PROBLEM AREA PHOTOS Photos taken 10/9/06 and 10/10/06



VPA5 facing left bank



VPA6 on right bank



VPA7 facing left bank



VPA8 facing left bank



VPA9 facing left bank



VPA10 facing left bank

APPENDIX A-II. VEGETATIVE PROBLEM AREA PHOTOS Photos taken 10/9/06 and 10/10/06



VPA11 facing right bank



VPA12 facing left bank



VPA13 on right bank



VPA14 facing left bank

	Little Bugaboo Creek 00056				
		Station			
Feature #	Feature/Issue	#/Range	Probable Cause		
UTVPA1	Bare bank	0+15	Scour		
UTVPA2	Bare bank	1+90	Scour		
UTVPA3	Bare bank	8+00	Scour		
UTVPA4	Bare bank	14+60	Scour		
UTVPA5	Bare bank	15+05	Scour		
UTVPA6	Exotic population	16+00	Chinese privet		
UTVPA7	Exotic population	18+80	Chinese privet		
UTVPA8	Bare bank	20+00	Scour		

Ve	Vegetative Problem Areas - Little Bugaboo Creek							
Little Bugaboo Creek 00056								
		Station						
Feature #	Feature/Issue	#/Range	Probable Cause					
VPA1	Poor survivability	0+00 to	Thick herbaceous					
		5+60	vegetation					
VPA2	Bare bank	3+30	Bank erosion					
VPA3	Bare bank	14+80	Bank erosion					
VPA4	Bare bank	11+00	Scour					
VPA5	Bare bank	14+00	Scour					
VPA6	Bare floodplain	15+00	Aggradation					
VPA7	Bare bank	22+80	Scour					
VPA8	Bare bank	25+00	Scour					
VPA9	Bare bank	26+00	Scour					
VPA10	Bare bank	30+00	Scour					
VPA11	Bare bank	37+20	Scour					
VPA12	Bare bank	38+00	Scour					
VPA13	Bare bank	40+60	Beaver damage					
VPA14	Bare bank	41+60	Scour					











VP2



VP4



VP6



VP8



VP11



VP12



VP13



VP14



VP15



VP16



VP19



VP21

Appendix B (Click here)

APPENDIX B

GEOMORPHIC RAW DATA

		Stream Problem Are	boo Creek 00056	ou creek	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Stream Problem A	
2005	2006	Little Buga	1000 CI CER 00050		2005	2006	Little Bug	aboo C
Feature #	Feature #	Feature/Issue	Station #/Range	Probable Cause	Feature #	Feature #	Feature/Issue	Stati
699	PA1	Bank erosion/scour	1+20	Improper design and/or construction	656	UTPA1	Bank erosion/scour	0+85
700	PA2	Bank erosion/scour	1+60	Improper design and/or construction	659	UTPA2	Bank erosion/scour	5+35
701	PA3	Bank erosion/scour	1+80	Improper design and/or construction		UTPA3	Structure degradation	5+95
N/A	PA4	Bank erosion	3+10	Root wad failure	660	UTPA4	ě	6+10
702	PA5	Bank erosion/scour	3+70	Improper design and/or construction	662	-	Structure degradation	
704	PA6	Structure degradation	5+00	Improper design and/or construction	663-664	UTPA5	Bank erosion/scour	6+50
705	PA7	Bank erosion/scour	7+50	Improper design and/or construction	665	UTPA6	Bank erosion/scour	7+15
707	PA8	Structure degradation	8+45	Improper design and/or construction	666	UTPA7	Structure degradation	7+25
709	PA9	Structure failure	9+20	Erosion behind arm	N/A	UTPA8	Structure failure	7+40
711	PA10	Bank erosion/scour	11+00	Improper design and/or construction	668	UTPA9	Bank erosion/scour	7+55
710	PA11	Channel failure	10+60 to 11+00	Improper design and/or construction	669	UTPA10	Bank erosion/scour	8+00
712	PA12	Bank erosion/scour	14+00	Improper design and/or construction	671	UTPA11	Bank erosion/scour	8+25
N/A	PA13	Structure failure	14+50	Erosion behind arm	672	UTPA12	Structure degradation	9+35
N/A	PA14	Bar formation	16+15	Aggradation	674	UTPA13	Bank erosion/scour	11+0
714	PA15	Bank erosion/scour	16+50	Improper design and/or construction	675	UTPA14	Bank erosion/scour	11+7
715	PA16	Structure degradation	17+80	Mass wasting	677	UTPA15	Bank erosion/scour	12+4
N/A	PA17	Structure failure	19+90	Bank erosion	678	UTPA16	Bank erosion/scour	12+6
716	PA18	Bank erosion/scour	21+00	Overland flow	N/A	UTPA17	Bank erosion/scour	13+3
717	PA19	Bank erosion/scour	21+10	Improper design and/or construction	680	UTPA18	Structure degradation	14+5
719	PA20	Bank erosion/scour	22+70	Improper design and/or construction	682	UTPA19	Bank erosion/scour	15+1
N/A	PA21	Bank failure	23+10	Piping	684-685	UTPA20	Bank erosion/scour	16+4
721	PA22	Bank erosion/scour	24+00	Improper design and/or construction	688	UTPA21	Structure degradation	16+6
722	PA23	Structure degradation	24+50	Bank erosion	689	UTPA22	Bank erosion/scour	17+5
N/A	PA24	Structure degradation	24+90	Piping behind wads	690	UTPA23	Bank erosion/scour	18+1
725	PA25	Bank erosion/scour	25+00	Improper design and/or construction	090 N/A	UTPA24	Debris jam	18+5
724	PA26	Bank erosion/scour	25+10	Improper design and/or construction	N/A	UTPA25	Bank erosion/scour	19+2
726	PA27	Structure degradation	26+75	Improper design and/or construction	IN/A	UTFA25	Balik closioli/scoul	19+2
N/A	PA28	Bank failure	28+00	Improper design and/or construction				
727	PA29	Bank erosion/scour	28+20	Improper design and/or construction				
730	PA30	Bank erosion/scour	31+10	Improper design and/or construction				
732	PA31	Bank erosion/scour	35+00	Improper design and/or construction				
735	PA32	Bank erosion/scour	35+10	Improper design and/or construction				
736	PA33	Bank erosion/scour	37+30	Improper design and/or construction				
N/A	PA34	Bank erosion/scour	39+90	Structure placement				
N/A	PA35	Bank erosion/scour	41+00	Improper design and/or construction				
737	PA36	Bank erosion/scour	41+30	Improper design and/or construction				
738	PA37	Structure degradation	41+60	Improper design and/or construction				
739	PA38	Bank erosion/scour	42+00	Improper design and/or construction				
740	PA39	Bank erosion/scour	42+30	Improper design and/or construction				
742	PA40	Structure degradation	42+76	Improper design and/or construction				

Section 3

SS

ັບ

5+00

PA7

(PA8

0+00

	Little Bugaboo Creek 00056							
2005 Feature #	2006 Feature #	Feature/Issue	Station #/Range	Probable Cause				
56	UTPA1	Bank erosion/scour	0+85	Improper design and/or construction				
59	UTPA2	Bank erosion/scour	5+35	Improper design and/or construction				
60	UTPA3	Structure degradation	5+95	Improper design and/or construction				
62	UTPA4	Structure degradation	6+10	Improper design and/or construction				
63-664	UTPA5	Bank erosion/scour	6+50	Improper design and/or construction				
65	UTPA6	Bank erosion/scour	7+15	Improper design and/or constructio				
66	UTPA7	Structure degradation	7+25	Improper design and/or constructio				
J/A	UTPA8	Structure failure	7+40	Improper design and/or constructio				
68	UTPA9	Bank erosion/scour	7+55	Improper design and/or constructio				
69	UTPA10	Bank erosion/scour	8+00	Improper design and/or constructio				
71	UTPA11	Bank erosion/scour	8+25	Improper design and/or construction				
72	UTPA12	Structure degradation	9+35	Improper design and/or construction				
574	UTPA13	Bank erosion/scour	11+00	Improper design and/or construction				
75	UTPA14	Bank erosion/scour	11+75	Improper design and/or construction				
77	UTPA15	Bank erosion/scour	12+40	Improper design and/or construction				
78	UTPA16	Bank erosion/scour	12+60	Improper design and/or construction				
J/A	UTPA17	Bank erosion/scour	13+30	Improper design and/or construction				
80	UTPA18	Structure degradation	14+50	Improper design and/or construction				
82	UTPA19	Bank erosion/scour	15+10	Improper design and/or construction				
84-685	UTPA20	Bank erosion/scour	16+40	Improper design and/or construction				
88	UTPA21	Structure degradation	16+60	Improper design and/or construction				
i89	UTPA22	Bank erosion/scour	17+50	Improper design and/or construction				
i90	UTPA23	Bank erosion/scour	18+15	Improper design and/or constructio				
J/A	UTPA24	Debris jam	18+50	Debris jam				
J/A	UTPA25	Bank erosion/scour	19+20	Improper design and/or constructio				





UTPA17

UTPA18

UTPA20

250 0



UTPA1

0+00



1,000 Feet 500

Prepared By:

URS Corporation - North Carolina 1600 Perimeter Park Drive Suite 400 Morrisville, NC 27560 Phone: 919-461-1100 Fax: 919-461-1415



Prepared For: NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program



Project:

Little Bugaboo Creek Stream Restoration Wilkes County, NC

Monitoring Year:

2 (2006)

Project Number:

00056

Date:

January 2007

Legend



As-built Centerline

----- As-built Streambank

Figure 5 Stream **Problem Areas** Plan View

	Exhibit Table B1a. Stream Problem Areas – Unnamed Tributary Little Bugaboo Creek EEP Project Number 00056						
Feature #	Feature/Issue	Station # /Range	Probable Cause	Photo #			
UTPA1	Bank erosion/scour	0+85	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA1			
UTPA2	Bank erosion/scour	5+35	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA2			
UTPA3	Structure degradation	5+95	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA3			
UTPA4	Structure degradation	6+10	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA4			
UTPA5	Bank erosion/scour	6+50	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA5			
UTPA6	Bank erosion/scour	7+15	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA6			
UTPA7	Structure degradation	7+25	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA7			
UTPA8	Structure failure	7+40	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA8			
UTPA9	Bank erosion/scour	7+55	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA9			
UTPA10	Bank erosion/scour	8+00	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA10			
UTPA11	Bank erosion/scour	8+25	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA11			
UTPA12	Structure degradation	9+35	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA12			
UTPA13	Bank erosion/scour	11+00	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA13			
UTPA14	Bank erosion/scour	11+75	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA14			
UTPA15	Bank erosion/scour	12+40	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA15			
UTPA16	Bank erosion/scour	12+60	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA16			
UTPA17	Bank erosion/scour	13+30	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA17			
UTPA18	Structure degradation	14+50	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA18			
UTPA19	Bank erosion/scour	15+10	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA19			
UTPA20	Bank erosion/scour	16+40	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA20			
UTPA21	Structure degradation	16+60	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA21			
UTPA22	Bank erosion/scour	17+50	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA22			
UTPA23	Bank erosion/scour	18+15	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA23			
UTPA24	Debris jam	18+50	Debris jam	UTPA24			
UTPA25	Bank erosion/scour	19+20	Improper design and/or construction	UTPA25			

Exhibit Table B1b. Stream Problem Areas – Little Bugaboo Creek Little Bugaboo Creek							
EEP Project Number 00056							
Feature #	Feature/Issue	Station # /Range	Probable Cause	Photo #			
PA1	Bank erosion/scour	1+20	Improper design and/or construction	PA1			
PA2	Bank erosion/scour	1+60	Improper design and/or construction	PA2			
PA3	Bank erosion/scour	1+80	Improper design and/or construction	PA3			
PA4	Bank erosion	3+10	Root wad failure	PA4			
PA5	Bank erosion/scour	3+70	Improper design and/or construction	PA5			
PA6	Structure degradation	5+00	Improper design and/or construction	PA6			
PA7	Bank erosion/scour	7+50	Improper design and/or construction	PA7			
PA8	Structure degradation	8+45	Improper design and/or construction	PA8			
PA9	Structure failure	9+20	Erosion behind arm	PA9			
PA10	Bank erosion/scour	11+00	Improper design and/or construction	PA11			
PA11	Channel failure	10+60 to 11+00	Improper design and/or construction	PA10			
PA12	Bank erosion/scour	14+00	Improper design and/or construction	PA12			
PA13	Structure failure	14+50	Erosion behind arm	PA13			
PA14	Bar formation	16+15	Aggradation	PA14			
PA15	Bank erosion/scour	16+50	Improper design and/or construction	PA15			
PA16	Structure degradation	17+80	Mass wasting	PA16			
PA17	Structure failure	19+90	Bank erosion	PA17			
PA18	Bank erosion/scour	21+00	Overland flow	PA18			
PA19	Bank erosion/scour	21+10	Improper design and/or construction	PA19			
PA20	Bank erosion/scour	22+70	Improper design and/or construction	PA20			
PA21	Bank failure	23+10	Piping	PA21			
PA22	Bank erosion/scour	24+00	Improper design and/or construction	PA22			
PA23	Structure degradation	24+50	Bank erosion	PA23			
PA24	Structure degradation	24+90	Piping behind wads	PA24			
PA25	Bank erosion/scour	25+00	Improper design and/or construction	PA25			
PA26	Bank erosion/scour	25+10	Improper design and/or construction	PA26			
PA27	Structure degradation	26+75	Improper design and/or construction	PA27			
PA28	Bank failure	28+00	Improper design and/or construction	PA28			
PA29	Bank erosion/scour	28+20	Improper design and/or construction	PA29			
PA30	Bank erosion/scour	31+10	Improper design and/or construction	PA30			
PA31	Bank erosion/scour	35+00	Improper design and/or construction	PA31			
PA32	Bank erosion/scour	35+10	Improper design and/or construction	PA32			
PA33	Bank erosion/scour	37+30	Improper design and/or construction	PA33			
PA34	Bank erosion/scour	39+90	Structure placement	PA34			
PA35	Bank erosion/scour	41+00	Improper design and/or construction	PA35			
PA36	Bank erosion/scour	41+30	Improper design and/or construction	PA36			
PA37	Structure degradation	41+60	Improper design and/or construction	PA37			
PA38	Bank erosion/scour	42+00	Improper design and/or construction	PA38			
PA39	Bank erosion/scour	42+30	Improper design and/or construction	PA39			
PA40	Structure degradation	42+76	Improper design and/or construction	PA40			

UNNAMED TRIBUTARY



UTPA1 facing right bank



UTPA3 facing downstream



UTPA5 facing downstream



UTPA2 facing downstream



UTPA4 facing upstream



UTPA6 facing right bank



UTPA7 facing right bank



UTPA9 facing upstream



UTPA11 facing right bank



UTPA8 facing upstream



UTPA10 facing right bank, downstream



UTPA12 facing upstream



UTPA13 facing downstream



UTPA15 facing right bank



UTPA17 facing downstream



UTPA14 facing downstream



UTPA16 facing downstream



UTPA18 facing upstream



UTPA19 facing left bank



UTPA21 facing downstream, right bank



UTPA20 facing right bank



UTPA22 facing upstream



UTPA23 facing upstream



UTPA24 facing downstream



UTPA25 facing downstream

LITTLE BUGABOO CREEK



PA1 facing right bank



PA3 facing downstream, left bank



PA2 facing upstream



PA4 facing left bank



PA5 facing downstream



PA6 facing left bank



PA7 facing right bank



PA8 facing right bank



PA9 facing downstream



PA10 facing upstream



PA11 facing downstream



PA12 facing downstream



PA13 facing downstream



PA14 facing upstream



PA15 facing downstream



PA16 facing left bank



PA17 facing left bank



PA19 facing right bank



PA18 facing right bank



PA20 facing left bank



PA21 facing right bank



PA22 facing left bank



PA23 facing downstream from left bank



PA25 facing left bank



PA24 facing left bank



PA26 facing upstream



PA27 facing left bank



PA28 facing upstream



PA29 facing downstream



PA30 facing downstream



PA31 facing left bank



PA32 facing upstream



PA33 facing right bank



PA34 facing downstream



PA35 facing downstream



PA37 facing upstream at junction with UT



PA36 facing junction with UT



PA38 facing right bank



PA39 facing downstream



PA40 facing upstream

UNNAMED TRIBUTARY



P655



P661



P657



P667



P673



P676

APPENDIX B-IV. STREAM PHOTO STATION PHOTOS Photos taken 11/9/06 and 11/10/06



P679



P687



P741



P681



P693



P745

LITTLE BUGABOO CREEK



P703



P718



P728



P706



P723

APPENDIX B-V. VISUAL MORPHOLOGICAL STABILITY ASSESSMENT

	Exhibit Table B2a. Visual Morphologi Unnamed Tributa Little Bugaboo Cro EEP Project Number	eek	ssment			
Feature Category	Metric (per As-built and reference baselines)	(# stable) Number performing as Intended	Total number per As-built	Total number/feet in unstable state	% perform in stable condition	Feature perform. Mean or total
A. Riffles*	Present?	20	12	0	100	
	Armor stable (no displacement)?	20	12	0	100	
	Facet grade appears stable?	20	12	0	100	
	Minimal evidence of embedding/fining?	20	12	0	100	
	Length appropriate?	16	12	4	80	
						96
B. Pools**	Present (not subject to severe aggrad. or migration)?	22	30	0	100	
	Sufficiently deep (max pool D:mean Bkf >1.6)	19	30	3	86	
	Length appropriate?	19	30	3	86	
						91
C. Thalweg	Upstream of meander bend (run/inflection) centering?	9	9	0	100	
-	Downstream of meander (glide/inflection) centering?	9	9	0	100	
						100
D. Meanders	Outer bend in state of limited/controlled erosion?	3	9	6	33	
	Of those eroding, # w/concomitant point bar formation?	3	9	6	33	
	Apparent Rc within spec?	9	9	0	100	
	Sufficient floodplain access and relief?	9	9	0	100	
					100 100 100 100 100 80 100 86 86 100 100 33 33 100	67
E. Bed General	General channel bed aggradation areas (bar formation)	1925	1925	0	100	
	Channel bed degradation-areas of increasing downcutting/headcutting?	1925	1925	0	100	
						100
F. Bank	Actively eroding, wasting, or slumping bank	1925	1925	170/1925	91	
						91
Vanes***	Free of back or arm scour?	12	16	3	80	
	Height appropriate?	15	16	0	100	
	Angle and geometry appear appropriate?	15	16	0	100	
	Free of piping or other structural failures?	15	16	0	100	
						95
Wads/ Boulders	Free of scour?	14	18	4	78	
	Footing stable?	18	18	0	100	
						89

* 12 riffles were reported in the As-built report. Twenty were observed during 2006 monitoring
** 30 pools were reported in the As-built report. Twenty-two were observed during 2006 monitoring.
*** 16 vanes were reported in the As-built report. Fifteen were observed during 2006 monitoring.

Exhibit Table B2b. Visual Morphological Stability Assessment Little Bugaboo Creek Little Bugaboo Creek EEP Project Number 00056							
Feature Category	Metric (per As-built and reference baselines)	(# stable) Number performing as Intended	Total number per As-built	Total number/feet in unstable state	% perform in stable condition	Feature perform. Mean or total	
A. Riffles*	Present?	25	27	0	100		
	Armor stable (no displacement)?	25	27	0	100		
	Facet grade appears stable?	25	27	0	100		
	Minimal evidence of embedding/fining?	25	27	0	100		
	Length appropriate?	15	27	10	60		
						92	
B. Pools**	Present (not subject to severe aggrad. or migration)?	36	49	0	100		
	Sufficiently deep (max pool D:mean Bkf >1.6)	29	49	7	80		
	Length appropriate?	29	49	7	80		
					80	87	
C. Thalweg	Upstream of meander bend (run/inflection) centering?	12	12	0	100		
C	Downstream of meander (glide/inflection) centering?	9	12	3	75		
					75	88	
D. Meanders	Outer bend in state of limited/controlled erosion?	3	12	9	25		
	Of those eroding, # w/concomitant point bar formation?	5	12	7	42		
	Apparent Rc within spec?	12	12	12	100		
	Sufficient floodplain access and relief?	12	12	12	100		
					100 100 100 100 60 100 80 80 100 75 25 42 100	67	
E. Bed General	General channel bed aggradation areas (bar formation)	4276	4276	0	100		
	Channel bed degradation-areas of increasing downcutting/headcutting?	4076	4276	4/200	95		
						98	
F. Bank	Actively eroding, wasting, or slumping bank	4276	4276	600/4276			
						86	
G. Vanes	Free of back or arm scour?	12	19	7	63		
	Height appropriate?	19	19	0			
	Angle and geometry appear appropriate?	19	19	0			
	Free of piping or other structural failures?	12	19	7	63		
						82	
H. Wads/ Boulders	Free of scour?	17	26	9	65		
	Footing stable?	22	26	4	85		
						75	

* 27 riffles were reported in the As-built report. Twenty-five were observed during 2006 monitoring
** 49 pools were reported in the As-built report. Thirty-six were observed during 2006 monitoring.
*** 49 thalwegs and meanders were reported in the As-built report. Fifteen were observed during 2006 monitoring.

Two cross sections were not able to be located during 2006 monitoring. In instances where cross sections were not located, URS re-established the cross sections. Data from these cross sections are not comparable to data reported in 2005 monitoring reports. The re-establishment of pins effectively relocates the cross sections.

URS has plotted these data on the same graph for reference only. The data and/or graph should not be used to interpret channel change. Such cross sections include:

- Little Bugaboo Creek, cross section 3
- Little Bugaboo Creek, cross section 4

UNNAMED TRIBUTARY

As-Built and MY1 cross section data were not provided.



XS1 facing left bank



XS2 facing left bank



XS1 facing right bank



XS2 facing right bank





LITTLE BUGABOO CREEK



XS3 facing left bank



XS3 facing right bank



XS4 facing left bank



XS5 facing left bank



XS4 facing right bank



XS5 facing right bank


XS6 facing left bank



XS6 facing right bank









UNNAMED TRIBUTARY

As-Built and MY1 longitudinal data were not provided.



2000

LITTLE BUGABOO CREEK





Structures ----- Linear (bankfull)

4500



UNNAMED TRIBUTARY

1) Individual Pebble Count

Two individual samples may be entered below. Select sample type for each.

Bed Surface Material	▼ Size Range (mm)	Count		Bed	d Surface	e Pebble	e Cou	int, UT to L	ittle Bugat	ooo Creek					
silt/clay		13	Э										nulative % -	# of par	ticles
	0.062 - 0.125										L				
fine sand	0.125 - 0.25	4	k												
medium sand	0.25 - 0.5				4000/	silt/cla	ay ,	sanc		gravel	, cobbl	e,	boulder	20	
coarse sand		24			100% -									30	
very coarse sand					90% -										
very fine grave			3							+				- 25	
fine grave		5	Э	c	80% -										
fine grave			- I	ha	70% -					/					
medium grave		2		ert										- 20	h
medium grave		9		percent finer than	60% -						<mark>i</mark>				number of
coarse grave		8		ut.	50% -									- 15	ro
coarse grave		7		90	50 /0					مسر					þ
very coarse grave		3		bei	40% -					/	<u> </u>				arti
very coarse grave		8			30% -									+ 10	particles
small cobble		6			30% -										õ
medium cobble		3			20% -										
large cobble		5					- L							- 5	
very large cobble		1			10% -										
small boulder		2			0% -									0	
small boulder						01		0.1	1	10	100		1000	10000	
medium boulder					0.	01		0.1	•				1000	10000	
	1024 - 2048									particle size (mm)				
very large boulder	1														
tot	al particle count:	100	}												
	r					Size (n				Distribution			Гуре		
						D16	0.21		me			silt/clay	13%		
clay hardpar	L					D35	0.84	ŀ	dispersi			sand	28%		
detritus/wood	L L					D50	12		skewne	ss -0.32		gravel	42%		
artificia						D65	22					cobble	15%		
	total count:	100				D84	68					boulder	2%		
						D95	160								
Note:															

1) Individual Pebble Count

Two individual samples may be entered below. Select sample type for each.



LITTLE BUGABOO CREEK

	ange (mm	Count		Riff	le Surfa	ce Pebb	ole Co	ount, Littl	e Bugal	boo Creel	ĸ					
	- 0.062	12)										cun	nulative % -	——# of par	ticle
very fine sand 0.062	- 0.125															
fine sand 0.125		19	<													
medium sand 0.25		6			100%	silt/cl	ay _I	Sa	and	I.	gravel	l cop	ble	boulder	20	
coarse sand 0.5		7			100%										20	
,	- 2				90%	-						مر			- 18	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	- 4	2	3		000/							/			10	
fine gravel 4	- 6	4	э	c	80%							1			+ 16	
J	- 8	2	-1	percent finer than	70%											⊐
	- 11	3		er t												Ш
	- 16	8		fine	60%	-	1								+ 12	number
•	- 22	3		Ţ	50%											rot
	- 32	4		e S	5070											p
· · · ·	- 45	10		bei	40%	_									- 8	particles
	- 64	4			200/						1					cle
	- 90	7			30%										- 6	ö
	- 128	2			20%	-									- 4	
<u> </u>	- 180	2									l titl		1			
	- 256	2			10%	-									- 2	
	- 362	3			0%										0	
	- 512					.01		0.1	1		10	100		1000	10000	
	- 1024				Ľ	1.01		0.1	1		10	100		1000	10000	
large boulder 1024										part	icle size (mm	ı)				
very large boulder 2048	- 4096															
total partie	cle count:	100														
						Size (ı				Size Distr	ibution		_	Туре		
bedrock						D16	0.1	4	_	mean	3.0		silt/clay	12%		
clay hardpan						D35	0.4	1	di	spersion	26.8		sand	32%		
detritus/wood						D50	6		s	kewness	-0.19		gravel	40%		
artificial						D65	20	1					cobble	13%		
to	tal count:	100				D84	64						boulder	3%		
						D95	18									

Bed Surface Material S silt/clay very fine sand 0	▼ ize Range (mm) 0 - 0.062	Count	÷	Bed	Surfac	e Pebbl	e Cou	unt, Li	ttle Bugabo	o Creek			cumulativ	e % ——#	of part	icles
fine sand 0 medium sand coarse sand very coarse sand very fine gravel fine gravel medium gravel coarse gravel very coarse gravel very coarse gravel very coarse gravel very coarse gravel small cobble large cobble small boulder small boulder	$\begin{array}{c} .125 & - 0.25 \\ 0.25 & - 0.5 \\ 0.5 & - 1 \\ 1 & - 2 \\ 2 & - 4 \\ 4 & - 6 \\ 6 & - 8 \\ 8 & - 11 \\ 11 & - 16 \\ 16 & - 22 \\ 22 & - 32 \\ 32 & - 45 \\ 45 & - 64 \\ 64 & - 90 \\ 90 & - 128 \\ 128 & - 180 \\ 180 & - 256 \\ 256 & - 362 \\ 362 & - 512 \\ 512 & - 1024 \\ \end{array}$	9 11 9 4 5 5 16 8 7 7 4 4 4 5 5 1	K 3 3 1	percent finer than	100% 90% 80% 70% 60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10% 0%		ay	0.1	sand		gravel		boul		18 16 14 12 10 8 6 4 2 0000	number of particles
very large boulder	2048 - 4096 particle count: 	100				Size (r D16 D35 D50 D65 D84 D95	mm) 0.78 6.7 13 20 59 140		dis	Size Dist mean persion ewness		silt/cl sa gra cobl bould	nd 20% vel 65% ble 15%	6 6		

		Count	e	Bed	Surfac	e Pebbl	e Cou	nt, Little	e Bugal	ooo Cree	k		→ cun	nulative % -	— # of par	rticle
medium sand 0		1				silt/cl	av.	s	and		gravel	, cobbl	le .	boulder		
coarse sand	0.5 - 1	31			100%				ana		giuvoi			bouldor	35	
very coarse sand	1 - 2				90%											
very fine gravel	2 - 4		3												+ 30	
fine gravel	4 - 6	3	э	_	80%	-					1					
fine gravel	6 - 8	5	- I	har	70%										- 25	Ξ
medium gravel	8 - 11	5		ert												n
medium gravel	11 - 16	2		percent finer than	60%			1			1	1			- 20	number of particles
coarse gravel	16 - 22	4		ŗ	50%											- C
	22 - 32	8		rce					/						+ 15	p
very coarse gravel	32 - 45	3		be	40%	-			- /			i i i				ur a
very coarse gravel	45 - 64	5			30%										10	CIE
small cobble	64 - 90 90 - 128	3			50 /0										+ 10	S
	90 - 128	5 1			20%	-						1				
	128 - 180	3			10%						11.1				+ 5	
	256 - 362	3			10 /6						111,11	111				
	362 - 512				0%						<u>₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽₽</u>	┛┛┛		1	0	
	512 - 1024				0	.01		0.1		1	10	100		1000	10000	
large boulder 10										na	rticle size (mm)					
very large boulder 20										μa						
	article count:	100														
iotai p	article count.	100				Size (r	nm)			Siza Die	stribution		-	Туре		
bedrock	Г					D16	0.21		_	mean			silt/clay	0%		
clay hardpan	L-					D35	0.67		ć	dispersion			sand	53%		
detritus/wood						D50	0.94			skewness			gravel	35%		
artificial						D50 D65	10	-		5110 1000	0.04		cobble	12%		
	total count:	100				D03 D84	48						boulder	0%		
		100				D95	120						Sourcol	070		

Material Size Rang			Bec	d Surfac	e Pebbl	e Coi	int, Little B	ugaboo Cr	eek					
silt/clay 0 - 0		_ *									cum	nulative % -	— # of pai	ticle
very fine sand 0.062 - 0		_												
fine sand 0.125 - 0		_												
medium sand 0.25 - 0		_		100%	silt/cl	ay _	san	d	gravel	cobbl	e	boulder	18	
coarse sand 0.5 - 1	16	_		100 /0										
very coarse sand 1 - 2		_		90%									+ 16	
very fine gravel 2 - 4		_ *		80%						+-1				
fine gravel 4 - 6	-	*	⊆	00%									+ 14	
fine gravel 6 - 8		_ *	tha	70%									10	ב
medium gravel 8 - 1		_	percent finer than	600/									+ 12	number of particle
medium gravel 11 - 1		_	fin	60%									- 10	oer
coarse gravel 16 - 2		_	ent	50%						_/				q
coarse gravel 22 - 3 very coarse gravel 32 - 4		-	ST0										- 8	pa
		-	be	40%										
very coarse gravel 45 - 6 small cobble 64 - 9		-		30%									- 6	les
medium cobble 90 - 1		-								1111			- 4	0,
large cobble 128 - 1		-		20%									+ 4	
very large cobble 180 - 2		-		10%									- 2	
small boulder 256 - 3		-												
small boulder 362 - 5	-	-		0%				- I	─── ──	╶┛┛┛			0	
medium boulder 512 - 1		-		0	.01		0.1	1	10	100		1000	10000	
large boulder 1024 - 2		-							particle size (mm))				
very large boulder 2048 - 4		-)				
total particle		=												
					Size (ı	mm)		Sizol	Distribution		г	Гуре		
bedrock		-			D16	0.8	3	me			silt/clay	0%		
clay hardpan		-			D10 D35	12		dispersi			sincialy	19%		
detritus/wood		-			D35 D50	48		skewne				41%		
artificial		-			D50 D65	48 79		skewne	55 -0.44		gravel cobble	41% 38%		
	 count: 100	-			D65 D84	130					boulder	38% 2%		
lotar	count: 100				D84 D95	130					boulder	∠70		