UT to Clark Creek at Cato Farms Stream Restoration Annual Monitoring Report

Monitoring Year: 2005 Measurement Year: 1 As-built Date: 2004 NCEEP Project Number: 072



Delivered to: NCDENR-Ecosystem Enhancement Program 1619 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1619

Prepared by: Biological & Agricultural Engineering, North Carolina State University Campus Box 7625 Raleigh, NC 27695

Project Designed By: CH2M Hill

Submitted: January, 2006



UT CLARK CREEK at CATO FARMS STREAM RESTORATION 2005 MONITORING REPORT

CONDUCTED FOR THE NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES



Table of Contents

Title	Page		
Tabl	Page 1		
I.	Executive Su	ummary / Project Abstract	Page 3
II.	Project Back	ground	Page 3
	1. Struc	cture and Objectives	Page 3
	2. Proje	ect Location	Page 4
	3. Proje	ect History and Background	Page 5
	4. Mon	Page 7	
III.	Project Cond	lition and Monitoring Results	Page 13
	A. Vegetatio	on Assessment	Page 13
	1.	Soil Data	Page 14
	2.	Problem Areas Table Summary	Page 14
	3.	Stem Counts	Page 15
	B. Stream A	Page 15	
	1.	Problem Areas Table Summary	Page 17
	2.	Quantitative Morphology	Page 18
IV.	Methodology	y Section	Page 16

TABLES

Table I.	Project Structure Table	Page 3
Table II.	Project Objectives Table	Page 3
Table III.	Project Activity and Reporting History	Page 5
Table IV.	Project Contact Table	Page 5
Table V.	Project Background Table	Page 6
Table VI.	Preliminary Soil Data	Page 14
Table VII.	Vegetative Problem Areas	Page 14
Table VIII.	Stem Counts for Each Species Arranged by Plot	Page 15
Table IX.	Stream Problem Areas	Page 17
Table X.	Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic Summary	Page 18
Table XI.	Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary	Page 19

Appendix A Vegetation Raw Data

- 1. Vegetation Photo Log
- 2. Vegetation Problem Area Photos
- 3. Vegetation Survey Data Tables

Appendix B Geomorphologic Raw Data

- 1. Problem Areas Plan View (Stream and Vegetation)
- 2. Monitoring Plan View Overlain Design Plans
- 3. Project Photo Log
- 4. Stream Problem Area Photos
- 5. Cross section and Pebble Count Plots and Raw Data Tables
- 6. Longitudinal Plots and Raw Data Tables
- 7. Bedform Comparison Summary Table

I. <u>Executive Summary/Project Abstract</u>

The channel has remained fairly stable since construction. Erosional areas exist but remain localized. Most stream bank problems are related to poor establishment of vegetation. The channel bed does not appear to have aggraded or downcut since construction, although bedform has shifted throughout most of the project. Planform remains consistent with design conditions.

Vegetation within the riparian buffer of this stream is mostly successful, with a few small problematic patches. The banks were mostly well-covered with vegetation. Four areas were identified as problem locations but appear to be localized.

Planted trees and shrubs are doing well throughout the buffer. Extrapolation from the eight plots resulted in an overall average of 718 planted woody stems per acre for this restoration site.

II. <u>Project Background</u>

Project background information can be obtained from the as-built monitoring report prepared by CH2M Hill dated 2004.

Table I and II list project structure and objectives. Figure 1 shows a map with detailed directions to the project site. Activities and reporting history for the project are listed in Table III. Table IV lists project contacts and Table V list background information for the project.

Table I. Project Structure			
Project Number and Name: 072 (UT to Clark Creek at Cato Farms)			
Segment/Reach ID Linear Feet or Acreage			
UT to Clark Creek at Cato Farms	2500 linear feet		

Table II. Project Objectives Table							
Project 2	Project Number and Name: 072 (UT to Clark Creek at Cato Farms)						
Segment/Reach ID	Segment/Reach ID Objectives Linear Feet or Comment Acreage						
Cato Farms	Full Restoration	2,000 linear feet	Priority 1 Approach				
Cato Farms	Full Restoration	500 linear feet	Priority 3 Approach				
Cato Farms	Buffer Restoration	2.9 Acres	Buffer Replanting				

Figure 1. Project Location



Directions from I-85 and I-77 intersection:

Follow I-77 North to Huntersville Exit 23(Gilead Road – SR 2136. Follow Gilead Road East towards Huntersville for 0.85 miles. Go straight and Gilead Road becomes Huntersville-Concord Road (SR 2448). Follow Huntersville-Concord Road for approximately 2.0 miles. At the low point in the road is where UT to Clark Creek Crosses Huntersville-Concord Road. Project begins about 1000 feet downstream of road culvert. Currently (2005) there is a subdivision being built on the west side of the creek. Access is through the construction site.

Contact EEP project manager for access and landowner notification instructions.

Table III. Project Activity and Reporting History							
Project Number and Name: 072 (U	Project Number and Name: 072 (UT to Clark Creek at Cato Farms)						
Activity or Report	Calendar Year of Completion or Planned Completion	Actual Completion Date					
Restoration Plan							
Mitigation Plan							
Construction							
Temporary S&E mix applied to entire project							
area							
As-Built report							
Permanent seed mix applied to reach							
Structural maintenance (Bank repair and							
revegetation)							
Initial – Year 1 monitoring	June-05	June-05					
Year 2 Monitoring	June-06						
Year 3 Monitoring	June-07						
Year 4 Monitoring	June-08						
Year 5 Monitoring	June-09						

Table IV. Project Contact Table				
Project Number and	Name: 072 (UT to Clark Creek at Cato Farms)			
DesignerCH2M Hill, Inc. 4824 Parkway Plaza Boulevard Suite 200, Charlotte, NC 28217				
Primary project design POC	(704) 329-0072			
Construction Contractor Construction contractor POC				
Planting Contractor Planting contractor POC				
Seeding Contractor Planting contractor point of contact				
Seed Mix Sources	N/A			
Nursery Stock Suppliers	N/A			
Monitoring Performers	Biological & Agricultural Engineering North Carolina State University Campus Box 7625 Raleigh, NC 27695			
Stream Monitoring POC	Dan Clinton (919) 515-6771			
Vegetation Monitoring POC	Dan Clinton (919) 515-6771			

Table V. Project Background Table					
Project Number and Name: 072 (UT to Clark Creek at Cato Farms)					
Project County	Mecklenburg				
Drainage Area	?? sq miles				
Drainage impervious cover estimate (%)	Estimated at <5%				
Stream Order	1st order				
Physiographic Region	Piedmont				
Ecoregion	Southern Outer Piedmont (45b)				
Rosgen Classification of As-built	E-Stream Type Stat 0+00 to 20+00 B-Stream Type 20+00 to End				
Cowardin Classification	N/A				
Dominant soil types	N/A				
Reference site ID	N/A				
USGS HUC for Project and Reference	3040105				
NCDWQ Sub-basin for Project and Reference	11-129-5-(0.3) - Clark Creek Listed				
NCDWQ classification for Project and Reference	С				
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	N/A				
% of project easement fenced	100%				

Figure 2. Watershed Map See mitigation or as-built plan for watershed map.



	= 20 [°] 10 20	AXO MATCH SHEE	H LINE STA 4+25 T 2		
SHEET NO. P DRAWING NO.	DATE 0 PROJECT NO. FILENAME C	UT to CLARK CREEK CATO FARMS MECKLENBURG COUNTY, N.C.	NC STATE UNIVERSITY	1 2005 Monitoring	DAB DRC 01/06/06 Image: Image of the state
	1/06/2006 ATO.DWG	2005 MONITORING WITH DESIGN 1:20 SCALE PLAN SHEET	BIOLOGICAL & AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING Weaver Labs Campus Box 7625 North Carolina State University Raleigh, NC 27695		





			P-11	#	LINE STA 13+00 LINE STA 13+00 ET A ET A	
DRAWING NO.	FILENAME CA	DATE 01 PROJECT NO.	UT to CLARK CREEK CATO FARMS MECKLENBURG COUNTY, N.C.	NC STATE UNIVERSITY	1 2005 Monitoring	DAB DRC 08/06/06
03	ATO.DWG	/06/2006	2005 MONITORING WITH DESIGN 1:20 SCALE PLAN SHEET	BIOLOGICAL & AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING Weaver Labs Campus Box 7625 North Carolina State University Raleigh, NC 27695	NO REVISIONS	



	PHOTO STATION			
SCALE 1" = 20'		18	3+00 MATCH LINE SHEET 5	STA 17+75
DATE 0 PROJECT NO. FILENAME C. SHEET NO. PI DRAMING NO.	UT to CLARK CREEK CATO FARMS MECKLENBURG COUNTY, N.C.	NC STATE UNIVERSITY	1 2005 Monitoring	DAB DRC 01/06/06
04	5 MONITORING WITH DESIGN 1:20 SCALE PLAN SHEET	BIOLOGICAL & AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING Weaver Labs Campus Box 7625 North Carolina State University Raleigh, NC 27695		DRN CHK DATE





						Υ.	
DRAWING NO.	SHEET NO.	PROJECT NO.	DATE	UT to CLARK CREEK CATO FARMS MECKLENBURG COUNTY, N.C.	NC STATE UNIVERSITY	1 2005 Monitoring	 DAB DRC 01/06/06
	ATO.DWG		/06/2006	2005 MONITORING WITH DESIGN 1:20 SCALE PLAN SHEET	BIOLOGICAL & AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING Weaver Labs Compus Box 7625 North Carolina State University Raleigh, NC 27695		

III. Project Condition and Monitoring Results

Results of the 2005 monitoring are shown below. 2005 Monitoring was conducted in June, 2005.

A. Vegetation Assessment

Using the protocols specified in the <u>Content</u>, Format and <u>Data Requirements for EEP Monitoring</u> <u>Reports</u>, eight vegetation monitoring plots were established and surveyed within the riparian buffer of the UT to Clark Creek at Cato Farms project.

Vegetation within the riparian buffer of this stream is mostly successful, with a few small problematic patches. The banks were mostly well-covered with vegetation. Wetter herbaceous species such as *Juncus* (rushes) and *Carex* (sedges) are growing profusely in many low areas along the banks and floodplain.

Planted trees and shrubs are doing well throughout the buffer. Extrapolation from the eight plots resulted in an overall average of 718 planted woody stems per acre for this restoration site. Dogwood and willow dominate the woody stem count with shrub extrapolated density at 460 stems/acre and tree extrapolated density at 258 stems per acre.

In some areas, compacted or nutrient-poor soil resulted in bare ground. Live stakes planted in this compacted soil did not survive. Other livestakes were planted too high on the banks and have high mortality in limited patches. In most areas, live stakes, particularly silky dogwood, have thrived.

Problem areas along this project include:

- Bare Banks at Stations 18+50 to 18+80 and 21+90 to 22+30
 - Compacted soil
 - Erosion
- Bare Floodplain 16+40 to 16+60 and 21+90 to 22+30
 - Compacted soil
 - Nutrient-poor soil
- Dead Live Stakes
 - o Compacted soil
 - Planted too high on banks

In the areas of compacted soil, live stake mortality and poor herbaceous cover may result in future erosion problems. Coir matting was still protecting most of the banks, but as it decomposes, a more consistent stand of vegetation along the channel banks will be required.

Invasive species were not a significant problem on the site when monitored in 2005. However, new construction adjacent and uphill of the buffer may encourage invasion and this should be monitored in upcoming monitoring periods.

In four areas where vegetation is a concern, steps can be taken to revegetate and stabilize the ground. Where herbaceous vegetation has not become established, soil rehabilitation and the addition of temporary and permanent seeding are recommended. On the banks, replacement of missing and dead live stakes will help to provide long-term stability.

The following table summarizes vegetation and soils results for 2005 monitoring. Soil samples were collected and analyzed during the 2005 monitoring period. Vegetation problem areas are summarized below in table VII. Raw vegetation data can be found in Appendix A. Data is summarized in Table VIII below. Photos of each vegetation plot can be found in the photo log.

Table VI. Preliminary Soil Data Project Number and Name: 072 (UT to Clark Creek at Cato Farms)							
Series	Max Depth (in.)	% Clay on Surface	К	Т	OM %		
Enon (EnB)	60		0.34	4			
Helena (HeB)	64		0.37	3			
Monacan (MO)	65		0.28	4			
Wilkes (WkD)	45		0.28	2			

Table VII. Vegetative Problem Areas												
Project Number and Name: 072 (UT to Clark Creek at Cato Farms)												
Feature/Issue	Station # / Range	ion # / Range Probable Cause										
Bare Bank	18+50 to 18+80 - VPA 2	Compacted soils										
	21+90 to 22+30 - VPA 3	Poor soil preparation	VPA 2a and b, VPA 3a and b									
			VFA Sa aliu D									
Bare Floodplain	16+40 to 16+60 - VPA 1	Compacted soils	VPA 1 and VPA									
	21+90 to 22+30 - VPA 3	Poor soil preparation										
			50									
Invasive/Exotic	Minimal locations not field identified	Existing or upland seed source	No photo taken									
Populations												

	Table V	III: St	em cou	ints for	r each s	species	arrang	ed by pl	ot.		
Species	Plots								Initial	Year 1	Survival
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Totals	Totals	%
Shrubs											
Aronia arbutifolia	0	3	1	1	2	4	1	1	Unknown	13	
Cephalanthus occidentalis	3	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	Unknown	8	
Cornus amomum	0	0	2	2	10	1	12	17	Unknown	44	
Cornus sericea	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	Unknown	5	
Salix nigra	4	0	2	0	1	5	4	0	Unknown	16	
Sambucus nigra	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	Unknown	5	
Trees											
Acer negundo	1	2	2	2	2	1	4	4	Unknown	18	
Carpinus caroliniana	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Unknown	1	
Carya aquatica	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	Unknown	3	
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	Unknown	5	
Juglans nigra	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	Unknown	1	
Nyssa sylvatica	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Unknown	1	
Populus deltoides	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	Unknown	2	
Quercus alba	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	Unknown	6	
Quercus michauxii	1	3	0	2	0	4	2	2	Unknown	14	
	•								Average		
Woody stem plot totals	13	14	10	15	18	18	28	26	17.75		
Extrapolated woody stems/acre	526	567	405	607	728	728	1133	1052	718		

B. Stream Assessment

Channel banks have remained fairly stable since construction. There are 15 locations, totaling 325 feet, of the banks that currently have some degradation. Problem locations and descriptions are listed in Table IX. The majority of bank problems are related to poor establishment of vegetation.

The channel bed does not appear to have aggraded or downcut since construction. Bedform has shifted throughout most of the project. Many riffle-pool complexes are missing throughout the project. Stations 75-140, 340-355, 370-425, 510-535, 685-742, 912-930, 960-1005, 1105-1135, 1250-1265, 1460-1512, and 1880-2000 are the areas where riffle pool complexes have developed into a single complex, typically a run or pool. Several areas have a reversal in bedform as well. Stations 243-265, 314-328, 604-673, 750-890, 1012-1083, 1189-1214, 1390-1449, and 1640-1682 are the areas where complexes have reversed compared to the design bedform. Several new complexes have formed, particularly at the lower end of the project from station 2130 to the end the project. A bedform comparison table can be found in Appendix B.

Channel dimension has not changed substantially since construction. Table XI summarizes crosssection data. The raw data with graphs are included in Appendix B. There are no indications of significant downcutting or rapid aggrading at the cross-section locations.

Channel substrate was measured at riffle cross-sections or at the riffle directly downstream of the pool cross-sections in the case of cross-sections 3 through 6. A random zigzag bed pebble count was taken throughout the entire riffle. The banks were not sampled. A classification pebble count should be conducted at Year 0 and Year 5, at a minimum, for permit requirements. Interim year pebble counts should be conducted at riffle bed following methodology described above. The coarsest riffle was located at section number 5 resulting of a d50 of 0.38mm, medium sand, and a d84 of 0.86mm, very coarse sand. The finest riffle was located at section 3 resulting in a d50 of silt and a d84 of 0.31mm, medium sand. Overall, the pebble counts were fairly similar throughout the project.

Channel pattern is similar to design conditions and is summarized in Appendix B.

Overall the channel has remained stable since construction. With the exception of several localized areas of bank erosion, banks are stable. The channel bed has adjusted longitudinally but has not significantly aggraded or degraded.

Some minor bank repair work was completed shortly after construction. No specific information was supplied related to this work. Sites with observed repairs have not been successful.

Baseline morphology and Summary morphology data are located in tables X and XI, respectively.

	Table IX	. Stream Prob	lem Areas	
	Project Number and Nar	ne: 072 (UT to	Clark Creek at Cato Farms)	
Problem Number	Feature Issue	Station numbers	Suspected Cause	Photo number
PA 1	Erosion and scour behind matting	2+50 to 2+60	Lack of deep rooting vegetation	PA 1
PA 2	Minor bank slump	3+10 to3+20	Lack of deep rooting vegetation Overland flow being directed by upstream point bar	PA 2
PA 3	Rills forming along channel bank/slope Note: repair efforts failed in this area	4+00 to 4+60	Lack of deep rooting vegetation Poor soil preparation Compacted soil Sub-soil conditions (lack of nutrients)	PA 3
PA 4	Erosion and scour behind matting	5+00 to 5+10	Lack of deep rooting vegetation	PA 4
PA 5	Scour and slump along outside bank	9+25 to 9+30	Lack of deep rooting vegetation	PA 5
PA 6	Scour and slump along outside bank Note: repair efforts failed in this areadue to soil washing out around facines and facines out of water	9+95 to 10+05	Lack of deep rooting vegetation Matting on repair area not adequetly secured	PA 6
PA 7	Scour and slump along outside bank Note: repair efforts failed in this areadue to soil washing out around facines and facines out of water	10+20 to 10+65	Lack of deep rooting vegetation Matting on repair area not adequetly secured	PA 7
PA 8	Scour and slump along outside bank Note: repair efforts failed in this areadue to soil washing out around facines and facines out of water	10+95 to 11+00	Lack of deep rooting vegetation Matting on repair area not adequetly secured	PA 8
PA 9	Minor Bank Slump	15+40 to 15+50	High bank along outside bend Lack of deep rooting vegetation	PA 9
PA 10	Rills forming along channel bank/slope	15+75 to 16+25	Lack of deep rooting vegetation Poor soil preparation Compacted soil Sub-soil conditions (lack of nutrients)	PA 10
PA 11	Scour and slump along outside bank Note: repair efforts failed in this areadue to soil washing out around facines and facines out of water	16+75 to 16+90	Lack of deep rooting vegetation Matting on repair area not adequetly secured	PA 11
PA 12	Scour and slump along outside bank Note: repair efforts failed in this areadue to soil washing out around facines and facines out of water	17+50 to 17+65	Lack of deep rooting vegetation Matting on repair area not adequetly secured	PA 12
PA 13	Rills forming along channel bank/slope	18+35 to 18+85	Lack of deep rooting vegetation Poor soil preparation Compacted soil Sub-soil conditions (lack of nutrients)	PA 13
PA 14	Scour and slump along outside bank	19+20 to 19+30	Lack of deep rooting vegetation	PA 14
PA 15	Bank scour upstream of xvane Note: repaired but vegetation has not recovered	21+75 to 21+95	Lack of deep rooting vegetation	PA 15

Table X. Baseline Morphology and Hydraulic SummaryProject Number and Name:072 (UT to Clark Creek at Cato Farms)																		
Parameter USGS Gage Data			Regional Curve			Pre-Existing			Project Reference			Design			As-built		t	
		~ ~		8											-			-
Dimension	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med
BF Width (ft)	USG	S gage o	lata is				Pleas	e refer t	he the	Pleas	se refer t	he the	Pleas	se refer t	he the			
Floodprone Width (ft)	unav	ailable f	for this			Beave	r Creek	Stream	Beave	er Creek	Stream	Beave	er Creek	Stream				
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft2)		project					Mitigat	ion Plan	for Pre-	Mitig	gation Pl	an for	Mitigation Plan and					
BF Mean Depth (ft)							Exist	ing Cond	litions	Project	Referen	ce Reach	Con	struction	Plan			
BF Max Depth (ft)								Data			Data		Sheets for Design Data					
Width/Depth Ratio																		
Entrenchment Ratio																		
Wetted Perimeter(ft)																		
Hydraulic radius (ft)																		
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)																		
Substrate																		
d50 (mm)																		
d84 (mm)																		
Additional Reach Parameters																		
Valley Length (ft)																		
Channel Length (ft)																		
Sinuosity																		
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)																		
BF slope (ft/ft)																		
Rosgen Classification																		
Number of Bankfull Events																		
Extent of BF floodplain (acres)																		
*BEHI																		

Table XI. Morphology and Hydraulic Monitoring Summary																		
	Project Number and Name:																	
	Segn	nent/R	leach: l	Project	t Num	ber and	l Nam	e: 072	(UT to	o Clar	k Cree	ek at C	Cato Fa	arms)				
Parameter	Cross Section 1			Cro	ss Sect	tion 2	Cross Section 3			Cross Section 4			Cros	ss Sect	ion 5	Cros	ss Sect	ion 6
	Statio	on 21+67	7 Riffle	Statio	on 20+27	Riffle	Stati	on 15+71	l Pool	Statio	on 13+55	5 Pool	Station	11+86 P	ool	Stati	Station 8+18 Poc	
Dimension	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY0	MY1	MY2	MY0	MY1	MY2
BF Width (ft)		6.2			10.7			6.7			16.2			7			6.2	
Floodprone Width (ft) (approx)		28.1			24.8													
BF Cross Sectional Area (ft ²)		5.4			4.4			6.4			8.4			6			7.7	
BF Mean Depth (ft)		0.9			0.4													
BF Max Depth (ft)		1.7			0.7			1.9			1.6			2.1			1.9	
Width/Depth Ratio		7.2			26.2													
Entrenchment Ratio		4.5			2.3													
Wetted Perimeter(ft)																		
Hydraulic radius (ft)																		
Substrate																	0.15	
d50 (mm)		0.27			0.06			Silt			0.1			0.38			0.15	
d84 (mm)		0.5			0.31			0.19			0.23			0.86			0.55	
Parameter	M	Y - 00(2	004)	MY-01 (2005 - Upper))		MY-01 (2005 - Lower)		MY-02 (2006)			MY-03 (2007)			MY	-04 (20	008)		
		(-			(-11 //	-	X	,			,						,,,,,
Pattern	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med	Min	Max	Med
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	101111	mun	mea	10	55	15	46	61	51	101111	TTUTUA	ivieu		Inturi	mea		man	mea
Radius of Curvature (ft)				10	18	34	42	56	51									
Meander Wavelength (ft)				40	99	57	141	249	217									
Meander Width ratio				10		51	111	212	217									
Profile																		
Riffle length (ft)				8	80	13												
Riffle slope (ft/ft)				0.23%	8.00%	1.89%												
Pool length (ft)				8	118	20												
Pool spacing (ft)				15.5	215	33.5												
Additional Reach Parameters	M	Y-00 (2	004)	M	Y-01 (2	005)	MY	7-02 (20	006)	MY	-03 (20)07)	MY	7-04 (2	008)	MY	7-05 (20	009)
Valley Length (ft)									174	16								
Channel Length (ft)					2512													
Sinuosity					1.4													
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)					0.71%													
BF slope (ft/ft)					0.69%													
Rosgen Classification					E5/B5													
Number of Bankfull Events					n/a													
Extent of BF floodplain (area)					n/a													
BEHI*																		

IV. <u>Methodology Section</u>

Monitoring methods used are based on US Army Corps of Engineering and NC Division of Water Quality Guides as referenced below.

References:

USACOE (2003) Stream Mitigation Guidelines. USACOE, USEPA, NCWRC, NCDENR-DWQ

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

APPENDIX A

Vegetation Raw Data

1. Vegetation Photo Log

2. Vegetation Survey Data Tables

Note: Vegetation problem areas are shown in problem are plan view in Appendix B

APPENDIX B

Morphology Raw Data

- 1. Problem Area Plan View
- 2. Plan View of Monitoring Overlain Design Plans
- 3. Project Photo Log
- 4. Stream Problem Area Photos
- 5. Cross section and Pebble Count Plots and Raw Data Tables
- 6. Longitudinal Plots and Raw Data Tables

APPENDIX A

Vegetation Raw Data

1. Vegetation Photo Log

2. Vegetation Survey Data Tables

Note: Vegetation problem areas are shown in problem are plan view in Appendix B

UT to Clark Creek at Cato Farms

Vegetation Plot Photos



Plot 1



Plot 2



Plot 3



Plot 4



Plot 5



Plot 6



Plot 7



•Plot 8

Cato Farm 2005 Vegetation Problem Areas



VPA 1. Bare Flood Plain



VPA 2a. Bare Bank



VPA 2b, Bare Bank, photo 2



VPA 3, Bare Bank



VPA 3b. Bare Bank, photo



VPA 3c, Bare Flood Plain

VEGETATIC)N DATA -	RAW							
UT to Clark	's Creek or	n Cato Far	m						
11-Jul-05									
Plot No.	Species	Count	Р	lot N	Species	Count	Plot No.	Species	Count
1	QUMI	1		4	OUMI	2	7	OUMI	2
•	SANI	4		•	SANI			SANI	
	CEOC3	3			CEOC3	3		CEOC3	
		1				Ū			
	SACA	1			SACA	1		SACA	
		1							
		1				2			4
		1				2			4
		1							2
	QUAL	l				4		COST	2
		0				4			4
2		3				1		ARAR	1
	SANI				CBONK3			CBUNK3	
	CEOC3				FRPE	•		FRPE	
	CBUNK1				COAM	2		COAM	17
	SACA	1						PODE	
	NYSL			5	QUMI			CBUNK4	
	ACNE	2			SANI				
	CBUNK2	1			CEOC3	1	8	QUMI	2
	QUAL	1			CBUNK1			SANI	4
	COST	1			SACA			CEOC3	
	ARAR	3			NYSL			CBUNK1	
	CBUNK3	2			ACNE	2		SACA	
	FRPE	1			CBUNK2			NYSL	
					QUAL			ACNE	4
3	QUMI				COST			CBUNK2	
	SANI	2			ARAR	2		QUAL	1
	CEOC3	1			CBUNK3	1		COST	
	CBUNK1				FRPE			ARAR	1
	SACA	2			COAM	10		CBUNK3	
	NYSL				PODE	1		FRPE	3
	ACNF	2			CBUNK4	1		COAM	12
	CBUNK2	_			020			PODE	
	OUAI			6	ОЛМІ	4		CBUNK4	
	COST			•	SANI	5			1
	ARAR	1			CEOC3	~			•
	CBLINK3								
	FRPF				SACA				
	COAM	2							
	COAM	2				1			
						I			
						1			
					COST	1			
						А			
						4			
					FRPE	1			
						1			
					PUDE	1			
					CBONK4				

APPENDIX B

Morphology Raw Data

- 1. Problem Area Plan View
- 2. Plan View of Monitoring Overlain Design Plans
- 3. Project Photo Log
- 4. Stream Problem Area Photos
- 5. Cross section and Pebble Count Plots and Raw Data Tables
- 6. Longitudinal Plots and Raw Data Tables






	20	# #	HLINE STA 13+00		
DATE 01 PROJECT NO. FILENAME 0. SHEET NO. PI DRAWING NO.	UT to CLARK CREEK CATO FARMS MECKLENBURG COUNTY, N.C.	NC STATE UNIVERSITY	1 2005 Monit	oring	DAB DRC 06/06/06
//06/2006 4TO.DWG 03	2005 MONITORING WITH DESIGN 1:20 SCALE PLAN SHEET	BIOLOGICAL & AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING Weaver Labs Campus Box 7625 North Carolina State University Raleigh, NC 27695			



VCERN PHOTO	PHOTO STATION VCERN		/		Ė	
	SCALE 1" = 20'			8+00	PA-LINE ST SHEET 5	A 17+75 /00 /21/1 /21/1 /21/1 /21/1
DATE 01 PROJECT NO. FILENAME CA SHEET NO. PL DRAWING NO.	UT to CLARK CATO FA MECKLENBURG C	(CREEK RMS OUNTY, N.C.	NC STATE UNIVERSITY		2005 Monitoring	DAB DRC 01/06/06
/06/2006 \TO.DWG	2005 MONITORING 1:20 SCALE PI	WITH DESIGN LAN SHEET	BIOLOGICAL & AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING Weaver Labs Campus Box 7625 North Carolina State University Raleigh, NC 27695		REVISIONS	DRN CHK DATE





DRAWING NO.	SHEET NO. PL	PROJECT NO.	UT to CLARK CREEK CATO FARMS MECKLENBURG COUNTY, N.C.	NC STATE UNIVERSITY	1 2005 Monitoring DAB DRC 01/06/06 - - - - - - - - - - - -
	ATO.DWG	1 00/ 2000	2005 MONITORING WITH DESIG 1:20 SCALE PLAN SHEET	BIOLOGICAL & AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING Weaver Labs Compus Box 7625 North Carolina State University Raleigh, NC 27695	







N		A B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B B	P-9 4
SHEET NO. 01 MECKLENBURG C	RK CREEK ARMS COUNTY, N.C.	1 2005 Monitoring	DAB DRC 06/06/06
α 8 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000 000	G WITH DESIGN BIOLOGICAL & AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING Weaver Labs Campus Box 7625 North Carolina State University Raleigh, NC 27695	NO REVISIONS	







UT to Clark Creek at Cato Farms

2005 Photo Log



End Downstream



End Upstream



P1a



P1b



P2a



P2b



P3a



P3b



P4a



P4b



P4c



P5a



P5b



P5c



P6a



P6b



P7c



P8a



P9c







P11a



P11b



P12



P13a



P13b



P14a



P14b



P15



P16a1



P16a



P16b1



P16b



P16c1



P16c



P16d1



P16d



P16e1



P16e



P17a







P18



START down



START up

Cato Farm 2005 Problem Areas



PA1



PA2

Cato Farms 2005 Problem Area Photo Log


PA3



PA3b



PA3c



PA4



PA5



PA6



PA7



PA8



PA9



PA10



PA10b



PA11



PA12



PA13a



PA13b



PA13c



PA14



PA15



PA16a



PA16b

Cato Farm 2005 Cross Section Photos

Cato Farms 2005 Photo Log



X1u



x1d



X2u



X2d



X3u



X3d



X4u



X4d



X5u



X5d



X6u



X6d



Project Name	Cato Branch
Cross Section	X1 - Station 21+67
Feature	Riffle
Date	6/10/05
Crew	Shaffer, Clinton

			As-Built			2005		
Description	Material	Size (mm)	Pool	%	Cum %	RIffle - Bed	%	Cum %
Silt/Clay	silt/clay	0.061		0.0%	0.0%	6	12.0%	12.0%
	very fine sand	0.062		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	12.0%
	fine sand	0.125		0.0%	0.0%	9	18.0%	30.0%
Sand	medium sand	0.25		0.0%	0.0%	23	46.0%	76.0%
	course sand	0.50		0.0%	0.0%	12	24.0%	100.0%
	very course sand	1.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very fine gravel	2.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
G	fine gravel	4.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
r	fine gravel	5.7		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
9	medium gravel	8.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
a	medium gravel	11.3		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
v	course gravel	16.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
e	course gravel	22.6		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
1	very course gravel	32		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very course gravel	45		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small cobble	64		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Cabbla	medium cobble	90		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Conne	large cobble	128		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very large cobble	180		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small boulder	256		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small boulder	362		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Boulder	medium boulder	512		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	large boulder	1024		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very large boulder	2049		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Bedrock	bedrock	40096		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
TOTA	L / % of whole count		0	0.0%		50	100.0%	

	d16	d35	d50	d84	d95
As-Built	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2005	0.11	0.21	0.27	0.50	0.67



Project Name	Cato Farms									
Cross Section	X2 - Station 20+27									
Feature	Riffle									
Right Pin GPS coo	ordinate	35.4084	6 80.82085			a				-
Date Crew	6/10/2005 Dan Clinton, David	d Bidelsnach						- Dave	and the second	Colle .
		1					Colore AVA		La Martin	Free States
	2004		2005				1 Starting			82 M
<u>E4-41</u>	As-Built Survey	N-4	2005 Survey	E 1	NT-4	100	A stand of the stand of the		ALL PROPERTY OF	ham the fit
Station	Elev	Notes	Station	01 44	(YSPIN)	-	· 一个主义了。	The second	Back In The State	A DE LINE AND IN THE REAL
			0+02.5	91.04	(XS)					and Late Ave a Const
			0+05.1	90.42	(XS)	FP 🔐	and the second	A COLORED AND A COLORED AND A	Ball & Starter	The second second
			0+07.5	89.68	(XS)		Star Star Star	and and a state of the	The Carton Start	A
			0+09.6	89.68	(XS)			A STATEMAN	S AN AREAN	Sector Sector
			0+11.9	89.55	(XS)					
			0+14.3	88.97	(XS)		A CANCELLAS	See and the		
			0+15.1	88.97	(XS)			1.4. 1.5		主張的語言語
			0+16.0	89.22	(XS)			THE ALL	The second se	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
			0+17.1	89.34	(XS)	1	Creat Alexa			R. M. Land St. Co.
			0+20.0	88.87	(XS) (XS)	AL.	The Part of the Part	A Constant		
			0+22.6	89.67	(XS)		STATES VIEW	Nº No AS	NA LA	21 40 5 10 1
_			0+24.2	89.49	(XS)		-KANK MAN	MAK, SIL	The Cashing of the	APT A THE S
			0+26.1	89.48	(XS)			ALL STREET		
			0+27.3	89.85	(XS)					
			0+29.9	90.87	(XS)	- FP		Cross-Sectio	n #2 - Looking Upstream	
			0+35.6	91.13	(XSPIN)	-				
				,	(-		Bankfull Area		
								As-Built	2004	
						_	Area	N/A	4.4	
						_	Width Maar Danth	N/A	10.7	
						-	Mean Depth Max Depth	N/A N/A	0.4	
						-	w/d ratio	10/1	26.2	
							FP Width		24.8	
							ER		2.32	
						_	Stream Type		В	
						_				
				Cros	s-Section	on #2 - Rit	ffle			
					Cata	Forme				
					Cato	r ar ms				
					Station	n 20+27				
02.00	_									
92.00			Bankfull Elev	(approx.)						
91.50										
					/					
ີ ໄຊ້ 90.50	+					\				
90.00								/		
A 89 50	-					4		-		
89.00										
88.50	+	-	1	I			1	1	1	
	0	5	10	15		20	25	30	35	40
					I	Distance (feet)				
					Crew As-B	uilt Survey				

Project Name	Cato Branch
Cross Section	X2 - Station 20+27
Feature	Riffle
Date	6/10/05
Crew	Shaffer, Clinton

			As-Built			2005		
Description	Material	Size (mm)	Riffle	%	Cum %	Riffle - Bed	%	Cum %
Silt/Clay	silt/clay	0.061		0.0%	0.0%	27	50.0%	50.0%
	very fine sand	0.062		0.0%	0.0%	3	5.6%	55.6%
	fine sand	0.125		0.0%	0.0%	9	16.7%	72.2%
Sand	medium sand	0.25		0.0%	0.0%	10	18.5%	90.7%
	course sand	0.50		0.0%	0.0%	3	5.6%	96.3%
	very course sand	1.0		0.0%	0.0%	1	1.9%	98.1%
	very fine gravel	2.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	98.1%
C	fine gravel	4.0		0.0%	0.0%	1	1.9%	100.0%
G "	fine gravel	5.7		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
1	medium gravel	8.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
a	medium gravel	11.3		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
v	course gravel	16.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
e	course gravel	22.6		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
1	very course gravel	32		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very course gravel	45		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small cobble	64		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Cabbla	medium cobble	90		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Conne	large cobble	128		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very large cobble	180		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small boulder	256		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small boulder	362		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Boulder	medium boulder	512		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	large boulder	1024		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very large boulder	2049		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Bedrock	bedrock	40096		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
TOTA	L / %of whole count		0	0.0%		54	100.0%	

	d16	d35	d50	d84	d95
As-Built	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2005	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.31	0.66





Project Name	Cato Branch	
Cross Section	X3 - Station 15+71	
Feature	Pool	Riffle directly downstream of xsc
Date	6/10/05	
Crew	Shaffer, Clinton	

			As-Built			2005		
Description	Material	Size (mm)	Pool	%	Cum %	Riffle - Bed	%	Cum %
Silt/Clay	silt/clay	0.061		0.0%	0.0%	31	60.8%	60.8%
_	very fine sand	0.062		0.0%	0.0%	5	9.8%	70.6%
	fine sand	0.125		0.0%	0.0%	7	13.7%	84.3%
Sand	medium sand	0.25		0.0%	0.0%	8	15.7%	100.0%
	course sand	0.50		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very course sand	1.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very fine gravel	2.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
G	fine gravel	4.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	fine gravel	5.7		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
1	medium gravel	8.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
a	medium gravel	11.3		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
v	course gravel	16.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
e 1	course gravel	22.6		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
1	very course gravel	32		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very course gravel	45		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small cobble	64		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Cabbla	medium cobble	90		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Copple	large cobble	128		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very large cobble	180		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small boulder	256		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small boulder	362		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Boulder	medium boulder	512		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	large boulder	1024		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very large boulder	2049		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Bedrock	bedrock	40096		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
TOTA	L / %of whole count		0	0.0%		51	100.0%	

	d16	d35	d50	d84	d95
As-Built	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2005	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.19	0.32





Project Name	Cato Branch	
Cross Section	X4 - Station 13+55	
Feature	Pool	Riffle directly downstream of xsc
Date	6/10/05	
Crew	Shaffer, Clinton	

			As-Built					
Description	Material	Size (mm)	Riffle	%	Cum %	Riffle - Bed	%	Cum %
Silt/Clay	silt/clay	0.061		0.0%	0.0%	15	30.0%	30.0%
	very fine sand	0.062		0.0%	0.0%	8	16.0%	46.0%
	fine sand	0.125		0.0%	0.0%	17	34.0%	80.0%
Sand	medium sand	0.25		0.0%	0.0%	10	20.0%	100.0%
	course sand	0.50		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very course sand	1.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very fine gravel	2.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
C	fine gravel	4.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
G "	fine gravel	5.7		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
1	medium gravel	8.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
a	medium gravel	11.3		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
v	course gravel	16.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
e	course gravel	22.6		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
I	very course gravel	32		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very course gravel	45		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small cobble	64		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Cabbla	medium cobble	90		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
CODDIe	large cobble	128		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very large cobble	180		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small boulder	256		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small boulder	362		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Boulder	medium boulder	512		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	large boulder	1024		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very large boulder	2049		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Bedrock	bedrock	40096		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
TOTA	L / %of whole count		0	0.0%		50	100.0%	

	d16	d35	d50	d84	d95
As-Built	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
#REF!	0.00	0.07	0.10	0.23	0.33





Project Name	Cato Branch	
Cross Section	X5 - Station 11+86	
Feature	Pool	Riffle directly downstream of xsc
Date	6/10/05	
Crew	Shaffer, Clinton	

			As-Built			2005		
Description	Material	Size (mm)	Pool	%	Cum %	Riffle - Bed	%	Cum %
Silt/Clay	silt/clay	0.061		0.0%	0.0%	9	18.0%	18.0%
	very fine sand	0.062		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	18.0%
	fine sand	0.125		0.0%	0.0%	1	2.0%	20.0%
Sand	medium sand	0.25		0.0%	0.0%	15	30.0%	50.0%
	course sand	0.50		0.0%	0.0%	16	32.0%	82.0%
	very course sand	1.0		0.0%	0.0%	7	14.0%	96.0%
	very fine gravel	2.0		0.0%	0.0%	2	4.0%	100.0%
C	fine gravel	4.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
G	fine gravel	5.7		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
r	medium gravel	8.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
a	medium gravel	11.3		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
v	course gravel	16.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
e	course gravel	22.6		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
1	very course gravel	32		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very course gravel	45		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small cobble	64		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Cabble	medium cobble	90		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Cobble	large cobble	128		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very large cobble	180		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small boulder	256		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small boulder	362		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Boulder	medium boulder	512		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	large boulder	1024		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very large boulder	2049		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Bedrock	bedrock	40096		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
TOTA	L / %of whole count		0	0.0%		50	100.0%	

	d16	d35	d50	d84	d95
As-Built	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2005	0.00	0.28	0.38	0.86	1.45





Project Name	Cato Branch			
Cross Section	X6 - Station 8+18			
Feature	Pool	Riffle directly downstream of xsc		
Date	6/10/05			
Crew	Shaffer, Clinton			

			As-Built			2005		
Description	Material	Size (mm)	Riffle	%	Cum %	Riffle - Bed	%	Cum %
Silt/Clay	silt/clay	0.061		0.0%	0.0%	10	19.6%	19.6%
	very fine sand	0.062		0.0%	0.0%	10	19.6%	39.2%
	fine sand	0.125		0.0%	0.0%	10	19.6%	58.8%
Sand	medium sand	0.25		0.0%	0.0%	9	17.6%	76.5%
	course sand	0.50		0.0%	0.0%	8	15.7%	92.2%
	very course sand	1.0		0.0%	0.0%	3	5.9%	98.0%
	very fine gravel	2.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	98.0%
C	fine gravel	4.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	98.0%
G	fine gravel	5.7		0.0%	0.0%	1	2.0%	100.0%
1	medium gravel	8.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
a	medium gravel	11.3		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
v	course gravel	16.0		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
e	course gravel	22.6		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
1	very course gravel	32		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very course gravel	45		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small cobble	64		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Cabbla	medium cobble	90		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Conne	large cobble	128		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very large cobble	180		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small boulder	256		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	small boulder	362		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Boulder	medium boulder	512		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	large boulder	1024		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
	very large boulder	2049		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
Bedrock	bedrock	40096		0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	100.0%
TOTAI	2 / %of whole count		0	0.0%		51	100.0%	

	d16	d35	d50	d84	d95
As-Built	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
2005	0.00	0.09	0.15	0.55	1.11











Pattern Measurement						
	Design	2005	Design	2003	Design	2005
	Wavelength	Wavelength	Beltwidth	Beltwidth	Rad Of Curv	Rad Of Curv
	Wuvelengui	54	Denwidth	22.7	itud. Of Curv	13
		53		21.4		10
		45		24		13
		40		10.3		14
		51		20.8		14
		57		20.0		15
		52		20		13
		55 57		20.2		12
		51		22.2		19
		58		23.2		13
		54		21.8		12
		61		42.2		26
		62		23.2		19
		57		25.4		21
		56		43		16
		53		26.1		17
		65		26.3		17
		58		43.7		10
		55		24.6		12
		57		27.4		24
		58		39.4		12
		43		23.6		14
		61		22.1		23
		63		43.5		18
		42		24.4		11
		46		32.7		16
		57		19.4		10
		63		23.5		14
		57		25.3		22
		51		22.3		18
		50		55.4		20
		52		21.2		20
		55		31.2		12
		57		23 45 1		13
		91		45.1		12
		66		27.8		34
		58		25.6		17
		51		45		18
		74		24.2		16
		99		23.7		19
		54		40.7		19
	B Section	217		26.2		23
		249		23.5		22
		141		45.5		19
				23.2		21
	Major WL	201		23.7		17
		196		26.5		20
		156		23.8		16
		171	B Section	46.3		25
		170		61.2		23
		191		51		21
		168				17
		230	Major BW			18
		211		83.2		22
		166		91.3		18
		182		89		19
		188		83.1		27
		244		76		27
		347		82.5		18
	1	5-11	1	02.5		10

	GPS Coordinates						
Project Nu	Project Number and Name: Project Number and Name: ????? (UT to Clark Creek at Cato Farms)						
Description	GPS Coordinate						
	Northering E	asting					
P-18	35.41170	80.82196					
P-17	35.41192	80.82210					
P-16	35.41105	80.82194					
P-15	35.41052	80.82181					
P-14	35.41021	80.82193					
P-13	35.41010	80.82176					
P-12	35,40982	80.82170					
P-11	35.40968	80.82179					
P-10	35.40953	80.82164					
P-9	n/a						
P-8	35.40948	80.82143					
P-7	35.40929	80.82156					
P-6	35.40906	80.82119					
P-5	35.40850	80.82070					
P-4	35.40823	80.82065					
P-3	35.40804	80.82060					
P-2	35.40793	80.82023					
P-1	35.40785	80.82030					
VP-1	35.41144	-80.82201					
VP-2	35.41105	80.82194					
VP-3	35.41030	-80.82192					
VP-4	35.40973	80.82171					
VP-5	35.40932	80.82141					
VP-6	35.40865	80.82103					
VP-7	35.40849	80.82077					
VP-8	35.40781	80.82025					
X-1	35.40819	80.82066					
X-2	35.40846	80.82085					
X-3	35.40918	80.82152					
X-4	35.40957	80.82164					
X-5	35.40986	80.82171					
X-6	35.40050	80.82191					
	05 44440	00 00007	Notes				
PA-1	35.41146	80.82207	Big scour behind matting, no vegetation				
PA-2	35.41135	80.82207	4 x2 minor slump, no veg from overland flow on upstream pointbar				
PA-3	35.41150	80.82230	Repaired lower section still has no veg, scour and fills along slope				
PA-4	35.41100	80.82203	o x3 scour bening malling, no veg, not repaired				
PA-5	35.41029	00.02191 20.22121	2 x4 scour and slump on outside bank				
PA-0 PA-7	35.41020	80 82183	Scour and slump along outside bank				
ΡΔ-8	35 41004	80 82181	Scour and slump along outside bank				
PA-9	35 40934	80 82147	Minor Bank Slump				
PA-10	35,40918	80.82152	Rills forming along channel bank/slope				
PA-11	35,40910	80.82120	Scour and slump along outside bank				
PA-12	35,40891	80.82122	Scour and slump along outside bank				
PA-13	35.40812	80.82061	Rills forming along channel bank/slope				
PA-14	35.40859	80.82107	Scour and slump along outside bank				
PA-15	35.40812	80.82061	Bank scour upstream of xvane				