MONITORING YEAR 4 ANNUAL REPORT

Final

UNDERWOOD MITIGATION SITE

Chatham County, NC
NCDEQ Contract 003268
DMS Project Number 94641

Data Collection Period: May 2016- November 2016
Draft Submission Date: December 1, 2016
Final Submission Date: January 11, 2017

PREPARED FOR:

NC Department of Environment Quality
Division of Mitigation Services
1652 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, NC 27699-1652

PREPARED BY:

Wildlands Engineering, Inc.
312 West Millbrook Road, Suite 225
Raleigh, NC 27609

Jason Lorch
jlorch@wildlandseng.com
Phone: 919.851.9986

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Wildlands Engineering (Wildlands) completed a full-delivery project for the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Mitigation Services (DMS) to restore and enhance a total of 9,133 linear feet (LF) of stream and restore, enhance, and create 13.84 acres (ac) of wetlands in Chatham County, North Carolina. The project streams consist of South Fork Cane Creek (South Fork) and three unnamed tributaries (UTs) of the South Fork. The largest of these streams, South Fork, ultimately drains to the Haw River. At the downstream limits of the project, the drainage area is 3,362 acres (5.25 square miles). The Site provides 6,765 Stream Mitigation Units (SMUs) and 9.1 Wetland Mitigation Units (WMUs).

The Underwood Mitigation Site, hereafter referred to as the Site, consists of two separate areas (Harris Site and Lindley Site) located in western Chatham County north of Siler City, North Carolina. The Harris Site is located within the upstream area of the project watershed along Clyde Underwood Road, just west of Plainfield Church Road. The Lindley Site is located downstream from the Harris Site, southwest of Moon Lindley Road between Johnny Lindley Road and Bob Clark Road (Figure 1). The Sites are located within the Carolina Slate Belt of the Piedmont Physiographic Province (USGS, 1998). It is within the North Carolina Division of Water Resources (NCDWR) subbasin 03-06-04 of the Cape Fear River Basin and the United States Geological Survey (USGS) Hydrologic Unit 03030002050050. Approximately 60% of the land in the project watershed is forested, 39% is classified as managed herbaceous cover or agricultural, and the remaining 1% is split between unmanaged herbaceous and open water (MRLC, 2001).

Prior to construction activities, the streams and wetlands on the Harris Site were impacted by cattle grazing, which led to stream bank erosion and instability. The Lindley Site was used for row crop agriculture and the streams were straightened and deepened and much of the riparian vegetation was removed. Related degradation includes declining aquatic habitat, loss of forest, degraded riparian buffers, loss of wetlands, and water quality problems related to increased sediment and nutrient loadings. The design features of this project were developed to achieve multiple project objectives. The stream restoration elements were designed to frequently flood the reconnected floodplain and adjacent riparian wetlands. This design approach provides more frequent dissipation of energy from higher flows (bankfull and above) to improve channel stability; provide water quality treatment through detention, settling, and biological removal of pollutants; and restore a more natural hydrologic regime. These objectives were achieved by restoring and enhancing 9,133 linear feet (LF) of perennial and intermittent stream channel, and restoring, enhancing, and creating 13.84 acres of riparian and non-riparian wetlands. The stream riparian zone and wetland areas were also planted to stabilize streambanks, improve habitat, and protect water quality. Figure 2 and Table 1 present design applications for the Site.

The following project goals were established to address the effects listed above from watershed and project site stressors:

- Restore and stabilize stream dimensions, pattern, and profile;
- Establish proper substrate distribution throughout restored and enhanced streams;
- Improve aquatic and riparian habitat;
- Reduce nutrient loads within the watershed and to downstream waters;
- Further improve water quality within the watershed through reductions of sediment, bacteria, and other pollutants;
- Decrease water temperature and increase dissolved oxygen concentrations;
- Establish appropriate hydrology for wetland areas;
- Restore native vegetation to wetlands and riparian buffers/improve existing buffers; and

- Create appropriate terrestrial habitat.

Stream and wetland restoration, enhancement, and creation construction efforts were completed in November 2012. A conservation easement is in place on 37.8 acres of riparian corridor and wetland resources to protect them in perpetuity.

Monitoring Year 4 (MY4) monitoring and site visits were completed between May and November 2016 to assess the conditions of the project. Overall, the Site has met the required vegetation, and stream success criteria for MY4. The overall average planted stem density of 434 stems/ acre is greater than the 260 stem/ acre density required for MY5. All restored and enhanced streams are stable and functioning as designed. The Site has met the Monitoring Year 5 (MY5) hydrology success criteria for bankfull events. Groundwater wells have not met MY5 criteria. Ten of 15 groundwater wells have met MY4 success criteria.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section 1: PROJECT OVERVIEW 1-1
1.1 Project Goals and Objectives 1-1
1.2 Monitoring Year 4 Data Assessment 1-2
1.2.1 Vegetative Assessment 1-2
1.2.2 Vegetation Areas of Concern 1-3
1.2.3 Stream Assessment 1-3
1.2.4 Stream Areas of Concern 1-3
1.2.5 Hydrology Assessment 1-3
1.2.6 Wetland Assessment 1-4
1.2.7 Maintenance Plan 1-4
1.3 Monitoring Year 4 Summary 1-5
Section 2: METHODOLOGY 2-1
Section 3: REFERENCES 3-1

APPENDICES

Appendix 1	**General Tables and Figures**
Figure 1	Project Vicinity Map
Figure 2a-c	Project Component/Asset Map
Table 1	Project Components and Mitigation Credits
Table 2	Project Activity and Reporting History
Table 3	Project Contacts Table
Table 4	Project Baseline Information and Attributes
Appendix 2	**Visual Assessment Data**
Figure 3.0-3.3	Integrated Current Condition Plan View
Figure 4.1-4.3	Supplemental Planting
Table 5a-h	Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table
Table 6	Vegetation Condition Assessment Table
	Stream Photographs
	Vegetation Photographs
Appendix 3	**Vegetation Plot Data**
Table 7	Vegetation Plot Criteria Attainment
Table 8	CVS Vegetation Table - Metadata
Table 9	Planted and Total Stem Counts (Species by Plot with Annual Means)
Appendix 4	**Morphological Summary Data and Plots**
Table 10a-c	Baseline Stream Data Summary
Table 11	Morphology and Hydraulic Summary (Dimensional Parameters – Cross Section)
Table 12a-f	Monitoring Data – Stream Reach Data Summary
	Longitudinal Profile Plots
	Cross Section Plots
	Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots
Appendix 5	**Hydrology Summary Data and Plots**
Table 13	Verification of Bankfull Events
Table 14	Wetland Gage Attainment Summary

Groundwater Gage Plots
Monthly Rainfall Data
Pre and Post Construction Groundwater Gage Comparison Plots

Section 1: PROJECT OVERVIEW

The Underwood Mitigation Site, hereafter referred to as the Site, consists of two separate areas (Harris Site and Lindley Site) located in western Chatham County within the Cape Fear River Basin (USGS Hydrologic Unit 03030002) north of Siler City, North Carolina. The Harris Site is located within the upstream area of the project watershed along Clyde Underwood Road, just west of Plainfield Church Road. The Lindley Site is located downstream from the Harris Site, southwest of Moon Lindley Road between Johnny Lindley Road and Bob Clark Road. The Site is located within the Carolina Slate Belt of the Piedmont Physiographic Province (USGS, 1998). The project watersheds consist of forested, managed herbaceous, unmanaged herbaceous, and open water areas (MRLC, 2001). The drainage areas for the Harris Site and Lindley Site are 1,051 acres (1.64 square miles) and 3,362 acres (5.25 square miles) respectively. The Site provides 6,765 Stream Mitigation Units (SMUs) and 9.1 Wetland Mitigation Units (WMUs).

The project stream reaches consist of SF1, SF3, SF4, SF4A, UT1, and UT2 (stream restoration and/or enhancement level I approach) and SF2, SF3, UT1, UT1A, and UT1B (enhancement level II approach). Mitigation work within the Site included restoring and enhancing 9,133 linear feet (LF) of perennial and intermittent stream channel and restoring, enhancing, and creating 13.84 acres of riparian and non-riparian wetland. The stream and wetland areas were also planted with native vegetation to improve habitat and protect water quality. Four separate conservation easements have been recorded and are in place along the riparian corridors and stream resources to protect them in perpetuity; 7.68 acres (Deed Book 1578, Page 495) within the tract owned by Mary Jean Harris, 18.44 acres (Deed Book 1578, Page 507) within the tract owned by William Darrel Harris, 5.34 acres (Deed Book 1579, Page 1067) within the tract owned by James Randall Lindley, and 6.29 acres (Deed Book 716, Page 707) within the tract owned by Jonathan Marshall Lindley. Directions and a map of the Site are provided in Figure 1 and project components are illustrated for the Site in Figures 2a, 2b and 2c.

1.1 Project Goals and Objectives

Prior to construction activities, the streams and wetlands on the Harris Site were impacted by cattle grazing, which led to stream bank erosion and instability. The Lindley Site was used for row crop agriculture and the streams were straightened and deepened and much of the riparian vegetation was removed. Related degradation included declining aquatic habitat, degraded riparian buffers, loss of wetlands, and water quality problems related to increased sediment and nutrient loadings. Tables 10a, 10b, and 10c in Appendix 4 present the pre-restoration conditions in detail.

The Site was designed to meet the over-arching goals as described in the Mitigation Plan (Wildlands, 2011) to address the effects from watershed and project site stressors. The project addresses multiple watershed stressors that have been documented for both the Cane Creek and Jordan Lake watersheds. While many of these benefits are limited to the Underwood Site project area, others, such as pollutant removal and improved aquatic and terrestrial habitat, have more far-reaching effects. The following project specific goals established in the mitigation plan include:

- Restore and stabilize stream dimensions, pattern, and profile;
- Establish proper substrate distribution throughout restored and enhanced streams;
- Improve aquatic and riparian habitat;
- Reduce nutrient loads within the watershed and to downstream waters;
- Further improve water quality within the watershed through reductions of sediment, bacteria, and other pollutants;
- Decrease water temperature and increase dissolved oxygen concentrations;

- Establish appropriate hydrology for wetland areas;
- Restore native vegetation to wetlands and riparian buffers/improve existing buffers; and
- Create appropriate terrestrial habitat.

The project goals were addressed through the following project objectives:

- Construct stream channels that will remain relatively stable over time and adequately transport their sediment loads without significant erosion or aggradation;
- Construct stream channels that maintain riffles with coarse bed material and pools with finer bed material;
- Provide aquatic and benthic habitat diversity in the form of pools, riffles, woody debris, and in-stream structures;
- Add riffle features and structures and riparian vegetation to decrease water temperatures and increase dissolved oxygen to improve water quality;
- Construct stream reaches so that floodplains and wetlands are frequently flooded to provide energy dissipation, detain and treat flood flows, and create a more natural hydrologic regime;
- Install fencing to keep livestock out of the streams;
- Raise local groundwater table through raising stream beds and removing agricultural drainage features;
- Grade wetland creation areas as necessary to promote wetland hydrology; and
- Plant native tree species to establish appropriate wetland and floodplain communities and retain existing, native trees where possible.

The project streams and wetlands were restored to the appropriate type based on the surrounding landscape, climate, and natural vegetation communities but also with strong consideration to existing watershed conditions and trajectory. The mitigation project corrected incision and lack of pattern caused by channelization, bank instability caused by erosion and livestock access, lack of vegetation in riparian zones, lack of riparian and aquatic habitat, and depletion of hydrology for adjacent wetlands. The final Mitigation Plan was submitted and accepted by the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality, Division of Mitigation Services (DMS) in September of 2011. Construction activities were completed by Land Mechanics Designs, Inc. in November 2012. Planting and seeding activities were completed by Bruton Natural Systems, Inc. in January 2013. Baseline monitoring (MY0) was conducted between December 2012 and February of 2013. Annual monitoring will be conducted for five years with the close-out anticipated to commence in 2018 given the success criteria are met. Appendix 1 provides more detailed project activity, history, contact information, and watershed/site background information for this project.

1.2 Monitoring Year 4 Data Assessment

Annual monitoring and quarterly site visits were conducted during Monitoring Year 4 (MY4) to assess the condition of the project. The stream and wetland mitigation success criteria for the Site follow the approved success criteria presented in the Underwood Mitigation Plan (Wildlands, 2011).

1.2.1 Vegetative Assessment

A total of 42 (29 at the Harris Site; 13 at the Lindley Site) vegetation plots were established within the project easement areas using standard 10 meter by 10 meter plots. The final vegetative success criteria will be the survival of 260 planted stems per acre at the end of MY5.

Early in MY4, supplemental planting was performed in low stem density areas along SF1, UT1, UT1B, and SF4 in areas shown to have low stem densities during MY3 (Figures 4.1-4.3 in Appendix 2). The MY4 vegetative survey was completed in June 2016. The 2016 annual vegetation monitoring resulted in an

average stem density of 434 stems per acre, which is greater than the final requirement of 260 planted stems per acre and approximately 39% less than the baseline density of 712 stems per acre. There was an average of 11 stems per plot compared to 19 stems per plot during MY0. While the Site is on track to meet the interim requirement, six plots are not meeting the success criteria. However, when volunteers and live stakes are included in the total stem counts, vegetation plots 10, 12, 16, and 40 met the success criteria. Vegetation plots 19 and 23 fall below the vegetation success criteria, even when volunteers are considered, and these plots will be closely monitored during subsequent monitoring years. Refer to Appendix 2 for vegetation plot photographs and the vegetation condition assessment table and Appendix 3 for vegetation data tables.

1.2.2 Vegetation Areas of Concern

During MY4 a few isolated areas were observed to have low tree densities. These areas are shown on the CCPV maps (Figures 3.0-3.3 in Appendix 2). Vegetation plots 19, and 23 did not meet the MY4 success criteria as noted above in section 1.2.1. Plot 19 is in a shaded area dominated by mature trees, and plot 23 is in a wet area which has resulted in poor growth of planted stems. Isolated areas with low tree densities will be monitored during subsequent monitoring years.

1.2.3 Stream Assessment

Morphological surveys for MY4 were conducted in May 2016. All streams within the Site are stable with little to no erosion and have met the success criteria for MY4. Refer to Appendix 2 for the visual assessment table, the Integrated Current Condition Plan View, and reference photographs. Refer to Appendix 4 for the morphological data and plots.

In general, cross sections show little to no change in the bankfull area, maximum depth ratio, or width-to-depth ratio. Surveyed riffle cross sections fell within the parameters defined for channels of the appropriate stream type based on the Rosgen classification system. The surveyed longitudinal profile data for SF1, UT2, SF3, UT1, SF4, and SF4A illustrates that the bedform features are maintaining lateral and vertical stability. The riffles are remaining steeper and shallower than the pools, while the pools are remaining deeper than the riffles and maintaining flat water surface slopes. The longitudinal profiles show that the bank height ratios remain very near to 1.0 for the restoration reaches.

Degradation was documented in the enhancement section on SF4A (approximate STA 900+00-905+33) between MY0 and MY1. At the beginning of MY4, SF4A was repaired and the stream has remained stable since. Details regarding the repair work are discussed below in section 1.2.7.

Pattern data will be collected in MY5 only if there are indicators from the profile or dimensions that significant geomorphic adjustments have occurred. No changes were observed during MY4 that indicated a change in the radius of curvature or channel belt width.

1.2.4 Stream Areas of Concern

During MY4 beaver activity was observed along SF3 and SF4. Two beaver dams were located on SF4 and SF3. Beaver dams caused backwater, sediment build up in constructed riffles, and death of some plant species on the stream banks. Live stakes and some planted stems were gnawed down by beaver. Details regarding beaver and dam removal is discussed below in section 1.2.7.

1.2.5 Hydrology Assessment

The hydrology success criteria for the site dictates that at the end of MY5, two or more bankfull events must have occurred in separate years within the restoration reaches. During MY4, bankfull events were recorded on all the streams by crest gages and onsite observations (wrack lines). All streams on the Site have had bankfull events in multiple monitoring years. Refer to Appendix 5 for hydrologic data.

1.2.6 Wetland Assessment

Fifteen groundwater monitoring gages were established within the wetland restoration, creation, and enhancement zones. The gages were installed at appropriate locations so that the data collected will provide an indication of groundwater levels throughout the Site. A barotroll logger (to measure barometric pressure used in the calculations of groundwater levels with well transducer data) and a rain gage were also installed within the wetland areas on both the Harris and Lindley Sites. To provide data for the determination of the growing season for the wetland areas, two soil temperature probes were installed, one on each site. These probes are used to better define the beginning of the growing season using the threshold soil temperature of 41 degrees or higher measured at a depth of 12 inches (USACE, 2010). During MY1 and MY2 NRCS WETS Data was used to determine the growing season. After discussions with the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) during MY2, it was agreed to use on-site soil temperature data to determine the beginning of the growing season and use NRCS WETS data to determine the end of the growing season in subsequent monitoring years. During MY4, the beginning of the growing season was extended by 29 days (from April 1 to March 3) based on data from the soil temperature probes. Onsite rain gage data was collected but a gage malfunction occurred in June of MY4. MY4 rain data was collected from an off-site USDA gage, SILER CITY 317924 and is shown on groundwater hydrology plots.

All monitoring gages were downloaded on a quarterly basis and maintained as needed. The success criteria for wetland hydrology for this project is to have a free groundwater surface within 12 inches of the ground surface for 7.5 percent of the growing season, which is measured on consecutive days under typical precipitation conditions. Ten of fifteen groundwater gages met the annual wetland hydrology success criteria for MY4. Wildlands believes that lower than normal rainfall was the main reason five of the groundwater wells did not meet the wetland success criteria for MY4. Monthly rain totals were compared to 30th and 70th percentile rainfall data from USDA weather station: Siler City 2S, NC7924. During MY4, five of ten months were below normal rainfall amounts, suggesting a drier than normal year at the Site. Refer to Appendix 2 for the groundwater gage locations and Appendix 5 for groundwater hydrology data and plots.

The USACE requested to have the pre-construction groundwater gage data overlain with the current monitoring year gage data to illustrate the hydrologic response of the wetlands associated with rainfall events. Wildlands overlaid the pre-construction groundwater well data with the closest monitoring groundwater well data and rain data for the monitoring period. Refer to Appendix 5 for pre and post construction groundwater gage comparison plots.

1.2.7 Maintenance Plan

As mentioned in Section 1.2.3, SF4A repair work was completed early in MY4. The repair work consisted of installing seven constructed riffles with log sills to raise the elevation of the stream bed back to the design elevation. Minor stream bank grading was also performed as necessary and native grass seed and live stakes were planted in disturbed areas. SF4A has remained stable since repairs were performed.

The USDA was contracted to trap beaver from the Sites. Four beaver were successfully removed from SF4 during MY4; however, the trapper was unable to locate any beaver on SF3 during MY4. Beaver trapping will continue during the winter on SF3. Live stakes along the banks of SF4, mainly black willow, were gnawed down by beaver. These live stakes are expected to grow back during MY5, therefore no supplemental planting of live stakes is expected during MY5. Two beaver dams were removed from SF4, one near the middle of the restoration reach and one near the lower end of the reach. Two beaver dams were also removed from the lower and middle sections of SF3. These areas are shown on the CCPV maps (Figures 3.0-3.3). Wildlands will make frequent site visits to make sure beaver activity isn't a problem in the future and will continue to contract the USDA to remove beaver as necessary.

1.3 Monitoring Year 4 Summary

All streams on the Site are stable and functioning as designed. The average planted stem density for the Site is on track to meeting the MY5 success criteria; however, six individual vegetation plots out of 42 did not meet the MY4 success criteria as noted in the Integrated Current Condition Plan View. When volunteer stems are counted in these seven plots, all but two meet MY5 success criteria. Beaver presence was noted onsite and successful removal of beaver and dams was completed. All streams have experienced multiple documented bankfull events, therefore, the MY5 stream hydrology attainment requirement has been met for the Site. Ten of 15 groundwater gages met hydrology success criteria during MY4.

Section 2: METHODOLOGY

Geomorphic data was collected following the standards outlined in The Stream Channel Reference Site: An Illustrated Guide to Field Techniques (Harrelson et al., 1994) and in the Stream Restoration: A Natural Channel Design Handbook (Doll et al., 2003). Cross sectional data was collected using a total station and was georeferenced. All data collected for the Integrated Current Condition Mapping was recorded using a Trimble handheld GPS with sub-meter accuracy and processed using Pathfinder and ArcGIS software. Crest gages were installed in surveyed riffle cross sections and monitored quarterly. Hydrology attainment installation and monitoring methods are in accordance with the USACE (2003) standards. Vegetation monitoring protocols followed the Carolina Vegetation Survey-DMS Level 2 Protocol (Lee et al., 2008). Reporting follows the DMS Monitoring Report Template and Guidance Version 1.2.1 (DMS, 2009). Summary information and data related to the performance of various project and monitoring elements can be found in the tables and figures in the report appendices. Narrative background and supporting information formerly found in these reports can be found in the Mitigation Plan documents available on DMS's website. All raw data supporting the tables and figures in the appendices are available from DMS upon request.

Section 3: REFERENCES

Doll, B.A., Grabow, G.L., Hall, K.A., Halley, J., Harman, W.A., Jennings, G.D., and Wise, D.E. 2003. Stream Restoration A Natural Channel Design Handbook.

Harrelson, C.C., Rawlins, C.L., Potyondy, J.P. 1994. *Stream Channel Reference Sites: An Illustrated Guide to Field Technique.* Gen. Tech. Rep. RM-245. Fort Collins, CO: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station. 61 p.

Lee, M.T., Peet, R.K., S.D., Wentworth, T.R. 2008. CVS-DMS Protocol for Recording Vegetation Version 4.2. Retrieved from http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/protocol/cvs-eep-protocol-v4.2-lev1-5.pdf.

Multi-Resolution Land Characteristics Consortium (MRLC). 2001. National Land Cover Database. http://www.mrlc.gov/nlcd.php

North Carolina Division of Mitigation Services (DMS). 2009. Monitoring Report Template and Guidance. Version 1.2.1. Raleigh, NC.

Rosgen, D. L. 1994. A classification of natural rivers. *Catena* 22:169-199.

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

Rosgen, D.L. 1997. A Geomorphological Approach to Restoration of Incised Rivers. Proceedings of the Conference on Management of Landscapes Disturbed by Channel Incision. Center For Computational Hydroscience and Bioengineering, Oxford Campus, University of Mississippi, Pages 12-22.

United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2003. Stream Mitigation Guidelines. USACE, NCDEQ-DWR, USEPA, NCWRC.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). 2002. Natural Resources Conservation Service, Climate Information for Catawba County, NC (1971-2000). WETS Station: Catawba 3 NNW, NC1579. http://www.wcc.nrcs.usda.gov/ftpref/support/climate/wetlands/nc/37035.txt

United States Geological Survey (USGS). 1998. North Carolina Geology. http://www.geology.enr.state.nc.us/usgs/carolina.htm

Wildlands Engineering, Inc (2011). Underwood Mitigation Site Mitigation Plan. DMS, Raleigh, NC.

Wildlands Engineering, Inc. 2013. Underwood Mitigation Site Baseline Monitoring Document and As-Built Baseline Report. DMS, Raleigh, NC.

APPENDIX 1. General Tables and Figures



WILDLANDS ENGINEERING

0 1 2 Miles

Figure 1 Project Vicinity Map
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Chatham County, NC



WILDLANDS ENGINEERING

0 100 200 Feet

Figure 2a Project Component/Asset Map
Underwood Mitigation Site - Harris Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Chatham County, NC



WILDLANDS ENGINEERING

0 150 300 Feet

N

Figure 2b Project Component/Asset Map
Underwood Mitigation Site - Harris Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Chatham County, NC



WILDLANDS ENGINEERING

0 100 200 Feet

Figure 2c Project Component/Asset Map
Underwood Mitigation Site - Lindley Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Chatham County, NC

Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Credits
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No.94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Mitigation Credits									
	Stream		Riparian Wetland		Non-Riparian Wetland		Buffer	Nitrogen Nutrient Offset	Phosphorous Nutrient Offset
Type	R	RE	R	RE	R	RE			
Totals	6,765		8.0		1.1		N/A	N/A	N/A

Project Components							
Reach ID	As-Built Stationing/ Location (LF)	Existing Footage (LF)/ Acreage (Ac)	Approach	Restoration or Restoration Equivalent	Restoration Footage (LF) / Acreage (Ac)*	Mitigation Ratio	Credits (SMU/ WMU)
Streams							
SF1	100+00-108+74	773	Priority 1	Restoration	874	1:1	874
SF2	300+00-303+02	302	N/A	Enhancement Level II	302	2.5:1	121
SF3	400+00-421+20	532	N/A	Enhancement Level II	359	2.5:1	144
		1,499	Priority 1	Restoration	1,586	1:1	1,586
		152	N/A	Enhancement Level I	153	1.5:1	102
SF4	800+00-814+29	1,450	Priority 1	Restoration	1,429	1:1	1,429
SF4A	900+00-908+66	0	Priority 1	Restoration	257	1:1	257
		609	N/A	Enhancement Level I	609	1.5:1	406
UT1	500+00-520+38	1,463	N/A	Enhancement Level II	1,468	2.5:1	587
		452	Priority 1	Restoration	515	1:1	515
UT1A	700+00-705+11	524	N/A	Enhancement Level II	511	2.5:1	204
UT1B	600+00-606+52	660	N/A	Enhancement Level II	652	2.5:1	261
UT2	0+00-4+18	421	N/A	Enhancement Level I	418	1.5:1	279
Wetlands							
RW1	N/A	1.25	N/A	Restoration	1.12	1:1	1.12
RW2	N/A	0.45	N/A	Creation	0.30	3:1	0.10
		0.50		Restoration	0.40	1:1	0.40
RW3	N/A	2.63	N/A	Creation	2.53	3:1	0.84
		1.33		Restoration	1.02	1:1	1.02
RW4	N/A	3.95	N/A	Creation	3.63	3:1	1.21
		3.65		Restoration	3.30	1:1	3.30
NRW1	N/A	1.20	N/A	Restoration	0.75	1:1	0.75
				Creation	0.45	3:1	0.15
NRW2	N/A	0.34	N/A	Enhancement	0.34	2:1	0.17

Component Summation						
Restoration Level	Stream (LF)	Riparian Wetland (acres)		Non-Riparian Wetland (acres)	Buffer (sq. ft)	Upland (acres)
		Riverine	Non-Riverine			
Restoration	4,661	5.84	-	0.75	-	-
Enhancement			-	0.34	-	-
Enhancement I	1,180					
Enhancement II	3,292					
Creation		6.46	-	0.45		
Preservation	-	-	-	-		-
High Quality Preservation	-	-	-	-		-

* Note that lengths do not match stationing because channel sections that do not generate credit have been removed from length calculations.

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No.94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Activity or Report	Date Collection Complete	Completion or Scheduled Delivery
Mitigation Plan	September 2011	September 2011
Final Design - Construction Plans	July 2012	July 2012
Construction	November 2012	November 2012
Temporary S&E mix applied to entire project area[1]	November 2012	November 2012
Permanent seed mix applied to reach/segments	November 2012	November 2012
Bare root and live stake plantings for reach/segments	January 2013	January 2013
Baseline Monitoring Document (Year 0 Monitoring - baseline)	March 2013	March 2013
Year 1 Monitoring	September 2013	November 2013
Year 2 Monitoring	December 2014	December 2014
Year 3 Monitoring	October 2015	December 2015
Year 4 Monitoring	November 2016	December 2016
Year 5 Monitoring	October 2017	December 2017

[1]Seed and mulch is added as each section of construction is completed.

Table 3. Project Contacts Table
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No.94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Designer Nicole Macaluso, PE	**Wildlands Engineering, Inc.** 312 West Millbrook Road, Suite 225 Raleigh, NC 27609 919.851.9986
Construction Contractor	**Land Mechanic Designs, Inc.** 126 Circle G Lane Willow Spring, NC 27592
Planting Contractor	**Bruton Natural Systems, Inc** P.O. Box 1197 Fremont, NC 27830
Seeding Contractor	**Land Mechanic Designs, Inc.** 126 Circle G Lane Willow Spring, NC 27592
Seed Mix Sources	**Green Resource, LLC**
Nursery Stock Suppliers **Bare Roots** **Live Stakes**	 **Arbor Glen, Inc** **Foggy Mountain Nursery**
Monitoring Performers Stream, Vegetation, and Wetland Monitoring POC	**Wildlands Engineering, Inc.** Jason Lorch 919.851.9986, ext. 107

Table 4. Project Baseline Information and Attributes
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No.94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Project Information									
Project Name	Underwood Mitigation Site								
County	Chatham County								
Project Area (acres)	38 ac								
Project Coordinates (latitude and longitude)	35° 48' 05"N, 79° 24' 10"W (Harris Site), 35° 49' 51"N, 79° 22' 60"W (Lindley Site)								
Project Watershed Summary Information									
Physiographic Province	Carolina Slate Belt of the Piedmont Physiographic Province								
River Basin	Cape Fear								
USGS Hydrologic Unit 8-digit	03030002								
USGS Hydrologic Unit 14-digit	03030002050050								
DWQ Sub-basin	03-06-04								
Project Drainage Area (acres)	1,504 ac (Harris Site) and 3,362 ac (Lindley Site)								
Project Drainage Area Percentage of Impervious Area	<1%								
CGIA Land Use Classification	60% Forest Land, 39% managed herbaceous cover/agricultural, 1% unmanaged herbaceous/open water								
Reach Summary Information									
Parameters	**SF1**	**SF2**	**SF3**	**UT1**	**UT1A**	**UT1B**	**UT2**	**SF4**	**SF4A**
Length of reach (linear feet) - Post-Restoration	874	302	2,098	1,983	511	652	418	1,429	866
Drainage area (acres)	134	781	1,056	230	11	11	78	3,362	637
NCDWQ stream identification score	36.0/50.5/43.3			40.0	22.8	24.3	38.0	U	34.5
NCDWQ Water Quality Classification	WS-V, NSW	WS-V, NSW	WS-V, NSW	C	C	C	C	WS-V, NSW	C
Morphological Desription (stream type)	P	P	P	P	I	I	P	P	P
Evolutionary trend (Simon's Model) - Pre-Restoration	IV	IV	IV	IV	IV	IV	IV	IV	IV
Underlying mapped soils	Nanford-Baden Complex						Georgeville Silt Loam	Chewacla and Wehadkee	
Drainage class	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Soil Hydric status	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Slope	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
FEMA classification	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	AE	---
Native vegetation community	Piedmont bottomland forest								
Percent composition of exotic invasive vegetation - Post-Restoration	0%								

Regulatory Considerations			
Regulation	**Applicable?**	**Resolved?**	**Supporting Documentation**
Waters of the United States - Section 404	X	X	USACE Nationwide Permit No.27 and DWQ 401 Water Quality Certification No. 3689
Waters of the United States - Section 401		X	
Division of Land Quality (Dam Safety)	N/A	N/A	N/A
Endangered Species Act	X	X	Underwood Mitigation Plan; no critical habitat for listed species exists within the project area (USFWS correspondence letter)
Historic Preservation Act	X	X	No historic resources were found to be impacted (letter from SHPO)
Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) / Coastal Area Management Act (CAMA)	N/A	N/A	N/A
FEMA Floodplain Compliance	X	X	Approved CLOMR
Essential Fisheries Habitat	N/A	N/A	N/A

APPENDIX 2. Visual Assessment Data



WILDLANDS ENGINEERING

0 500 1,000 1,500 2,000 Feet

Figure 3.0 Integrated Current Condition Plan View (Key)
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016
Chatham County, NC



WILDLANDS ENGINEERING

0 50 100 150 200 Feet

N

Figure 3.1 Integrated Current Condition Plan View
(Sheet 1 of 3)
Underwood Mitigation Site - Harris Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Chatham County, NC



WILDLANDS ENGINEERING

0 100 200 300 400 Feet

N

Figure 3.2 Integrated Current Condition Plan View
(Sheet 2 of 3)
Underwood Mitigation Site - Harris Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Chatham County, NC



WILDLANDS ENGINEERING

0 100 200 Feet

N

Figure 3.3 Integrated Current Condition Plan View
(Sheet 3 of 3)
Underwood Mitigation Site - Harris Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Chatham County, NC



WILDLANDS ENGINEERING

0 50 100 150 200 Feet

N

Figure 4.1 Supplemental Planting
(Sheet 1 of 3)
Underwood Mitigation Site - Harris Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Chatham County, NC

Supplemental Planting
at 61 Stems/ Acre

Supplemental Planting
at 20 Stems/ Acre

Stream
Crossing

Stream
Crossing

ALMA & ROLAND RD

CLYDE UNDERWOOD RD

UT1

UT1A

UT1B

RW3

NRW2

SF2

SF3

XS5

XS6

XS7

XS8

XS9

XS10

XS11

GWG 5

GWG 6

GWG 7

GWG 8

GWG 9

- Supplemental Planting-MY4
- Stream Restoration
- Stream Enhancement I
- Stream Enhancement II
- Stream Restoration (no credit)
- Wetland Restoration
- Wetland Enhancement
- Wetland Creation
- Designed Bankfull
- Conservation Easement
- Structures
- Cross Section (XS)
- Photo Point (PP)

Groundwater Gage (GWG) Condition-MY4

- Criteria Met
- Criteria Not Met

Vegetation Plot Condition-MY4

- Criteria Met
- Criteria Not Met

2014 Aerial Photography

WILDLANDS ENGINEERING

0 100 200 300 400 Feet

N

Figure 4.2 Supplemental Planting
(Sheet 2 of 3)
Underwood Mitigation Site - Harris Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Chatham County, NC



WILDLANDS ENGINEERING

0 100 200 Feet

N

Figure 4.3 Supplemental Planting
(Sheet 3 of 3)
Underwood Mitigation Site - Harris Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Chatham County, NC

Table 5a. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; SF1 (874 LF)

Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjust % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed	1. Vertical Stability (Riffle and Run units)	Aggradation			0	0	100%			
		Degradation			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	Texture/Substrate	15	15			100%			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	Depth Sufficient	15	15			100%			
		Length Appropriate	15	15			100%			
	4. Thalweg Position	Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	15	15			100%			
		Thalweg centering at downstream of meander bend (Glide)	15	15			100%			
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroded	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely. Does NOT include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, caving, or collapse			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
				TOTALS	0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
3. Engineered Structures[1]	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs	10	10			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill	10	10			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms	10	10			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%	10	10			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~Max Pool Depth : Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at baseflow	10	10			100%			

[1]Excludes constructed riffles since they are evaluated in section 1.

Table 5b. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; UT2 (418 LF)

Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjust % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed	1. Vertical Stability (Riffle and Run units)	Aggradation			0	0	100%			
		Degradation			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	Texture/Substrate	10	10			100%			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	Depth Sufficient	10	10			100%			
		Length Appropriate	10	10			100%			
	4. Thalweg Position	Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	10	10			100%			
		Thalweg centering at downstream of meander bend (Glide)	10	10			100%			
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroded	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely. Does NOT include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, caving, or collapse			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
				TOTALS	0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
3. Engineered Structures[1]	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~Max Pool Depth : Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at baseflow	n/a	n/a			n/a			

[1]Excludes constructed riffles since they are evaluated in section 1.

Table 5c. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; SF2 (302 LF)

Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjust % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed	1. Vertical Stability (Riffle and Run units)	Aggradation			0	0	100%			
		Degradation			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	Texture/Substrate	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	Depth Sufficient	n/a	n/a			n/a			
		Length Appropriate	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	4. Thalweg Position	Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	n/a	n/a			n/a			
		Thalweg centering at downstream of meander bend (Glide)	n/a	n/a			n/a			
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroded	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely. Does NOT include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, caving, or collapse			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
				TOTALS	0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
3. Engineered Structures	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~Max Pool Depth : Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at baseflow	n/a	n/a			n/a			

Table 5d. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; SF3 (2,120 LF)

Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjust % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed[1]	1. Vertical Stability (Riffle and Run units)	Aggradation			0	0	100%			
		Degradation			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	Texture/Substrate	19	19			100%			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	Depth Sufficient	19	19			100%			
		Length Appropriate	19	19			100%			
	4. Thalweg Position	Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	19	19			100%			
		Thalweg centering at downstream of meander bend (Glide)	19	19			100%			
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroded	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely. Does NOT include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, caving, or collapse			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
				TOTALS	0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
3. Engineered Structures[2]	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs	7	7			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill	7	7			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms	7	7			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%	7	7			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~Max Pool Depth : Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at baseflow	7	7			100%			

[1]Number of riffles and pools are determined based on the as-built survey along Restoration and Enhancement Level I reaches.

[2]Excludes constructed riffles since they are evaluated in section 1.

Table 5e. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; UT1 (2,038 LF)

Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjust % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed[1]	1. Vertical Stability (Riffle and Run units)	Aggradation			0	0	100%			
		Degradation			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	Texture/Substrate	7	7			100%			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	Depth Sufficient	7	7			100%			
		Length Appropriate	7	7			100%			
	4. Thalweg Position	Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	7	7			100%			
		Thalweg centering at downstream of meander bend (Glide)	7	7			100%			
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroded	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely. Does NOT include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, caving, or collapse			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
				TOTALS	0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
3. Engineered Structures[2]	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs	15	15			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill	15	15			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms	15	15			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%	15	15			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~Max Pool Depth : Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at baseflow	15	15			100%			

[1]Number of riffles and pools are determined based on the as-built survey along Restoration and Enhancement Level I reaches.

[2]Excludes constructed riffles since they are evaluated in section 1.

Table 5f. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; UT1A & UT1B (1,163 LF)

Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjust % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed	1. Vertical Stability (Riffle and Run units)	Aggradation			0	0	100%			
		Degradation			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	Texture/Substrate	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	Depth Sufficient	n/a	n/a			n/a			
		Length Appropriate	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	4. Thalweg Position	Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	n/a	n/a			n/a			
		Thalweg centering at downstream of meander bend (Glide)	n/a	n/a			n/a			
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroded	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely. Does NOT include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, caving, or collapse			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
				TOTALS	0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
3. Engineered Structures	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%	n/a	n/a			n/a			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~Max Pool Depth : Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at baseflow	n/a	n/a			n/a			

Table 5g. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Lindley Site; SF4 (1,429 LF)

Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjust % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed	1. Vertical Stability (Riffle and Run units)	Aggradation			0	0	100%			
		Degradation			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	Texture/Substrate	8	8			100%			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	Depth Sufficient	8	8			100%			
		Length Appropriate	8	8			100%			
	4. Thalweg Position	Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	8	8			100%			
		Thalweg centering at downstream of meander bend (Glide)	8	8			100%			
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroded	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely. Does NOT include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, caving, or collapse			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
				Totals	0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
3. Engineered Structures[1]	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs	2	2			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill	2	2			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms	2	2			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%	2	2			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~Max Pool Depth : Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at baseflow	2	2			100%			

[1]Excludes constructed riffles since they are evaluated in section 1.

Table 5h. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Lindley Site; SF4A (866 LF)

Major Channel Category	Channel Sub-Category	Metric	Number Stable, Performing as Intended	Total Number in As-Built	Number of Unstable Segments	Amount of Unstable Footage	% Stable, Performing as Intended	Number with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Footage with Stabilizing Woody Vegetation	Adjust % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed[1]	1. Vertical Stability (Riffle and Run units)	Aggradation			0	0	100%			
		Degradation			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	Texture/Substrate	10	10			100%			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	Depth Sufficient	9	9			100%			
		Length Appropriate	9	9			100%			
	4. Thalweg Position	Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	9	9			100%			
		Thalweg centering at downstream of meander bend (Glide)	9	9			100%			
2. Bank	1. Scoured/Eroded	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	2. Undercut	Banks undercut/overhanging to the extent that mass wasting appears likely. Does NOT include undercuts that are modest, appear sustainable and are providing habitat			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, caving, or collapse			0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
				TOTALS	0	0	100%	n/a	n/a	n/a
3. Engineered Structures[2]	1. Overall Integrity	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs	2	2			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill	2	2			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms	2	2			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%	2	2			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~Max Pool Depth : Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at baseflow	2	2			100%			

[1]Number of riffles and pools are determined based on the as-built survey along Restoration and Enhancement Level I reaches. Approximately 533 LF of the stream bed has downcut along SF4A and riffles and pools have shifted downstream. Although these conditions were not intended in the design, the stream has maintained a stable bedform with riffles and pools at a lower elevation.

[2]Excludes constructed riffles since they are evaluated in section 1.

Table 6. Vegetation Condition Assessment Table
Undewood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Planted Acreage **38**

Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold (Ac)	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Planted Acreage
Bare Areas	Very limited cover of both woody and herbaceous material.	0.10	0	0	0.0%
Low Stem Density Areas	Woody stem densities clearly below target levels based on MY3, 4, or 5 stem count criteria.	0.10	3	0.5	1.4%
		Total	**3**	**0.5**	**1.4%**
Areas of Poor Growth Rates or Vigor	Areas with woody stems of a size class that are obviously small given the monitoring year.	0.25	0	0.0	0.0%
		Cumulative Total	**0**	**0.0**	**0.0%**

Easement Acreage **38**

Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold (SF)	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Planted Acreage
Invasive Areas of Concern	Areas of points (if too small to render as polygons at map scale).	1,000	0	0.0	0.0%
Easement Encroachment Areas	Areas of points (if too small to render as polygons at map scale).	none	0	0.0	0.0%

Stream Photographs

Underwood (Harris Site)

	
Photo Point 1 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 1** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 2 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 2** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 3 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 3** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*

	
Photo Point 4 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 4** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 5 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 5** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 6 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 6** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*

	
Photo Point 7 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 7** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 8 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 8** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 9 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 9** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*

	
Photo Point 10 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 10** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 11 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 11** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 12 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 12** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*

	
Photo Point 13 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 13** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 14 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 14** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 15 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 15** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*

	
Photo Point 16 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 16** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 17 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 17** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 18 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 18** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*

	
Photo Point 19 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 19** – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 20 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 20** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 21 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 21** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*

	
Photo Point 22 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 22** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 23 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 23** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 24 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 24** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*

	
Photo Point 25 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 25** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 26 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 26** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 27 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 27** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*

	
Photo Point 28 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 28** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 29 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 29** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 30 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 30** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*

	
Photo Point 31 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 31** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 34 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 34** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 35 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 35** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*

	
Photo Point 36 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 36** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 37 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 37** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 38 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 38** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*

	
Photo Point 39 – looking upstream *(08/02/2016)*	**Photo Point 39** – looking downstream *(08/02/2016)*

Stream Photographs

Underwood (Lindley Site)

	
Photo Point 40 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 40** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 41 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 41** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 42 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 42** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*

	
Photo Point 43 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 43** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 44 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 44** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 45 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 45** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*

	
Photo Point 46 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 46** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 47 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 47** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*
	
Photo Point 48 – looking upstream *(05/08/2016)*	**Photo Point 48** – looking downstream *(05/08/2016)*

Vegetation Photographs

Underwood (Harris Site)

Vegetation Plot 1 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 2 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 3 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 4 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 5 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 6 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 7 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 8 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 9 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 10 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 11 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 12 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 13 (06/07/2016)

Vegetation Plot 14 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 15 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 16 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 17 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 18 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 19 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 20 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 21 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 22 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 23 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 24 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 25 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 26 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 27 *(06/07/2016)*



Vegetation Plot 28 *(06/07/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 29 (*06/07/2016*)

Vegetation Photographs

Underwood (Lindley Site)

Vegetation Plot 30 *(06/08/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 31 *(06/08/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 32 *(06/08/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 33 *(06/08/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 34 *(06/08/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 35 *(06/08/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 36 *(06/08/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 37 *(06/08/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 38 *(06/08/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 39 *(06/08/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 40 *(06/08/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 41 *(06/08/2016)*

Vegetation Plot 42 *(06/08/2016)*

APPENDIX 3. Vegetation Plot Data

Table 7. Vegetation Plot Criteria Attainment
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site		
Plot	**MY4 Success Criteria Met (Y/N)**	**Tract Mean**
1	Y	
2	Y	
3	Y	
4	Y	
5	Y	
6	Y	
7	Y	
8	Y	
9	Y	
10	N	
11	Y	
12	N	
13	Y	
14	Y	
15	Y	83%
16	N	
17	Y	
18	Y	
19	N	
20	Y	
21	Y	
22	Y	
23	N	
24	Y	
25	Y	
26	Y	
27	Y	
28	Y	
29	Y	

Lindley Site		
Plot	**MY4 Success Criteria Met (Y/N)**	**Tract Mean**
30	Y	
31	Y	
32	Y	
33	Y	
34	Y	
35	Y	
36	Y	92%
37	Y	
38	Y	
39	Y	
40	N	
41	Y	
42	Y	

Table 8. CVS Vegetation Table - Metadata
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Database name	Underwood MY4 cvs-eep-entrytool-v2.3.1.mdb
Database location	F:\Projects\005-02125 Underwood\Monitoring\Monitoring Year 4\Vegetation Assessment
Computer name	KENTON
DESCRIPTION OF WORKSHEETS IN THIS DOCUMENT----------	
Metadata	Description of database file, the report worksheets, and a summary of project(s) and project data.
Proj, planted	Each project is listed with its PLANTED stems per acre, for each year. This excludes live stakes.
Proj, total stems	Each project is listed with its TOTAL stems per acre, for each year. This includes live stakes, all planted stems, and all natural/volunteer stems.
Plots	List of plots surveyed with location and summary data (live stems, dead stems, missing, etc.).
Vigor	Frequency distribution of vigor classes for stems for all plots.
Vigor by Spp	Frequency distribution of vigor classes listed by species.
Damage	List of most frequent damage classes with number of occurrences and percent of total stems impacted by each.
Damage by Spp	Damage values tallied by type for each species.
Damage by Plot	Damage values tallied by type for each plot.
Planted Stems by Plot and Spp	A matrix of the count of PLANTED living stems of each species for each plot; dead and missing stems are excluded.
ALL Stems by Plot and spp	A matrix of the count of total living stems of each species (planted and natural volunteers combined) for each plot; dead and missing stems are excluded.
PROJECT SUMMARY----------	
Project Code	94641
project Name	Underwood Mitigation Site
Description	Stream and Wetland
Sampled Plots	42

Table 9. Planted and Total Stem Counts

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

			Current Plot Data (MY4 2016)																	
			94641-WEI-0001			94641-WEI-0002			94641-WEI-0003			94641-WEI-0004			94641-WEI-0005			94641-WEI-0006		
Scientific Name	**Common Name**	**Species Type**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																		
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1			
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Tree																2	2	2
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub																		
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	4	4	4	3	3	3	1	1	1
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree																		6
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree				1	1	1	1	1	1									
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	1	1	1	5	5	5	3	3	3	4	4	4	7	7	7	4	4	5
Quercus	oak	Tree																		
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree	4	4	4				6	6	6	3	3	3						
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree	4	4	4	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1				3	3	3
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree	2	2	2	6	6	6							3	3	3	2	2	2
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	Tree																		
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub																		
		Stem count	15	15	15	17	17	17	13	13	13	12	12	12	14	14	14	12	12	19
		size (ares)	1			1			1			1			1			1		
		size (ACRES)	0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02		
		Species count	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	6
		Stems per ACRE	607	607	607	688	688	688	526.1	526.1	526.1	485.6	485.6	485.6	566.6	566.6	566.6	485.6	485.6	768.9

Color Coding for Table

Exceeds requirements by 10%
Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements, by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements by more than 10%
Volunteer species included in total

PnoLS: Number of Planted stems excluding live stakes
P-all: Number of planted stems including live stakes,
T: Total Stems

Table 9. Planted and Total Stem Counts

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

			Current Plot Data (MY4 2016)																	
			94641-WEI-0007			94641-WEI-0008			94641-WEI-0009			94641-WEI-0010			94641-WEI-0011			94641-WEI-0012		
Scientific Name	**Common Name**	**Species Type**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																		
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree				2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Tree																		
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub									1		1	1						
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	4	4	4	1	1	1				3	3	3	3	3	3			100
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree																		
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree																		
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	1	1	1	4	4	4	1	1	1				3	3	3	3	3	3
Quercus	oak	Tree																		
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree	4	4	4	2	2	2				1	1	1	4	4	4			
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree							1	1	1				1	1	1			
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree							6	6	6				2	2	2	1	1	1
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	Tree																		
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub								1	1		4	4						
Stem count			9	9	9	9	9	9	10	11	12	5	10	10	14	14	14	6	6	106
size (ares)			1			1			1			1			1			1		
size (ACRES)			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02		
Species count			3	3	3	4	4	4	4	5	6	3	5	5	6	6	6	3	3	4
Stems per ACRE			364.2	364.2	364.2	364.2	364.2	364.2	404.7	445.2	485.6	202.3	404.7	404.7	566.6	566.6	566.6	242.8	242.8	4290

Color Coding for Table

Exceeds requirements by 10%
Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements, by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements by more than 10%
Volunteer species included in total

PnoLS: Number of Planted stems excluding live stakes
P-all: Number of planted stems including live stakes,
T: Total Stems

Table 9. Planted and Total Stem Counts

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

			Current Plot Data (MY4 2016)																	
			94641-WEI-0013			94641-WEI-0014			94641-WEI-0015			94641-WEI-0016			94641-WEI-0017			94641-WEI-0018		
Scientific Name	**Common Name**	**Species Type**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																		
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree							6	6	6	3	3	3						
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Tree																		
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub											3	3						
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree				1	1	1	3	3	3							3	3	3
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree																		
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree													4	4	4	1	1	1
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	16	16	16	5	5	5	4	4	4	2	2	2				2	2	2
Quercus	oak	Tree																		
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree				2	2	2				1	1	1				3	3	3
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree				2	2	2	1	1	1				2	2	2			
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree				3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	6	6	1	1	1
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	Tree																		
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub								1	1		4	4						
Stem count			16	16	16	13	13	13	15	16	16	7	14	14	12	12	12	10	10	10
size (ares)			1			1			1			1			1			1		
size (ACRES)			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02		
Species count			1	1	1	5	5	5	5	6	6	4	6	6	3	3	3	5	5	5
Stems per ACRE			647.5	647.5	647.5	526.1	526.1	526.1	607	647.5	647.5	283.3	566.6	566.6	485.6	485.6	485.6	404.7	404.7	404.7

Color Coding for Table

Exceeds requirements by 10%
Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements, by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements by more than 10%
Volunteer species included in total

PnoLS: Number of Planted stems excluding live stakes
P-all: Number of planted stems including live stakes,
T: Total Stems

Table 9. Planted and Total Stem Counts

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

			Current Plot Data (MY4 2016)																	
			94641-WEI-0019			94641-WEI-0020			94641-WEI-0021			94641-WEI-0022			94641-WEI-0023			94641-WEI-0024		
Scientific Name	**Common Name**	**Species Type**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																		
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree							1	1	1				1	1	1	1	1	1
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Tree																		
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub																		
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree							1	1	4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree						1												
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree										1	1	1						
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	4	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	6	6	6
Quercus	oak	Tree																		
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree				4	4	4	1	1	1	7	7	7						
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree				3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2			
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree	1	1	1				1	1	1	3	3	3				3	3	3
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	Tree															1			
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub																	2	2
		Stem count	5	5	5	9	9	10	8	8	11	15	15	15	5	5	6	11	13	13
		size (ares)		1			1			1			1			1			1	
		size (ACRES)		0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02	
		Species count	2	2	2	3	3	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	4	4	5	4	5	5
		Stems per ACRE	202.3	202.3	202.3	364.2	364.2	404.7	323.7	323.7	445.2	607	607	607	202.3	202.3	242.8	445.2	526.1	526.1

Color Coding for Table

Exceeds requirements by 10%
Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements, by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements by more than 10%
Volunteer species included in total

PnoLS: Number of Planted stems excluding live stakes
P-all: Number of planted stems including live stakes,
T: Total Stems

Table 9. Planted and Total Stem Counts

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

			Current Plot Data (MY4 2016)																	
			94641-WEI-0025			94641-WEI-0026			94641-WEI-0027			94641-WEI-0028			94641-WEI-0029			94641-WEI-0030		
Scientific Name	**Common Name**	**Species Type**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																		
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree				1	1	1				1	1	1	8	8	9			
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Tree										1	1	1						
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub																		
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree				4	4	4	2	2	5	3	3	3	1	1	3	9	9	9
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree																		
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree				1	1	1	1	1	1									
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	5	5	6	3	3	3				1	1	2	7	7	7			
Quercus	oak	Tree																		
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree	1	1	1	5	5	5	2	2	2									
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	3	3	1	1	1	3	3	3	2	2	2
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree	4	4	4							3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	Tree										1	1	1						
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub														2	2		2	2
Stem count			12	12	13	16	16	16	8	8	11	11	11	12	20	22	25	12	14	14
size (ares)			1			1			1			1			1			1		
size (ACRES)			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02		
Species count			4	4	4	6	6	6	4	4	4	7	7	7	5	6	6	3	4	4
Stems per ACRE			485.6	485.6	526.1	647.5	647.5	647.5	323.7	323.7	445.2	445.2	445.2	485.6	809.4	890.3	1012	485.6	566.6	566.6

Color Coding for Table

Exceeds requirements by 10%
Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements, by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements by more than 10%
Volunteer species included in total

PnoLS: Number of Planted stems excluding live stakes
P-all: Number of planted stems including live stakes,
T: Total Stems

Table 9. Planted and Total Stem Counts

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

			Current Plot Data (MY4 2016)																	
			94641-WEI-0031			94641-WEI-0032			94641-WEI-0033			94641-WEI-0034			94641-WEI-0035			94641-WEI-0036		
Scientific Name	**Common Name**	**Species Type**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree			20												5			
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree	4	4	4				1	1	1				1	1	1	3	3	3
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Tree																		
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub		1	1		1	1					2	2					2	2
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	2	2	22	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	4	4	1	1	5	3	3	3
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree			20												5			
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree																		
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	1	1	1	4	4	4	9	9	9	4	4	4	7	7	7			
Quercus	oak	Tree																		
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree																		
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree	2	2	2	1	1	1				2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree							3	3	3	2	2	2				5	5	5
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	Tree																		
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub		4	4		2	2					4	4					3	3
Stem count			9	14	74	9	12	12	16	16	16	12	18	18	10	10	24	12	17	17
size (ares)			1			1			1			1			1			1		
size (ACRES)			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02		
Species count			4	6	8	3	5	5	4	4	4	4	6	6	4	4	6	4	6	6
Stems per ACRE			364.2	566.6	2995	364.2	485.6	485.6	647.5	647.5	647.5	485.6	728.4	728.4	404.7	404.7	971.2	485.6	688	688

Color Coding for Table

Exceeds requirements by 10%
Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements, by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements by more than 10%
Volunteer species included in total

PnoLS: Number of Planted stems excluding live stakes
P-all: Number of planted stems including live stakes,
T: Total Stems

Table 9. Planted and Total Stem Counts

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

			Current Plot Data (MY4 2016)																	
			94641-WEI-0037			94641-WEI-0038			94641-WEI-0039			94641-WEI-0040			94641-WEI-0041			94641-WEI-0042		
Scientific Name	**Common Name**	**Species Type**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree												10						
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree				2	2	2	1	1	1				3	3	3	4	4	4
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Tree																		
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub														1	1		1	1
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree			15	4	4	14	1	1	1			10				1	1	1
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree																		
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree																		
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	3	3	3	13	1	1	1	2	2	2
Quercus	oak	Tree																		
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree	6	6	6															
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree	4	4	4	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	4	4	1	1	1
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree	1	1	1				2	2	2				1	1	1	1	1	1
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	Tree																		
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub												10		3	3		1	1
Stem count			12	12	27	8	8	21	9	9	9	5	5	45	9	13	13	9	11	11
size (ares)			1			1			1			1			1			1		
size (ACRES)			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02		
Species count			4	4	5	4	4	4	5	5	5	2	2	5	4	6	6	5	7	7
Stems per ACRE			485.6	485.6	1093	323.7	323.7	849.8	364.2	364.2	364.2	202.3	202.3	1821	364.2	526.1	526.1	364.2	445.2	445.2

Color Coding for Table

Exceeds requirements by 10%
Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements, by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements by more than 10%
Volunteer species included in total

PnoLS: Number of Planted stems excluding live stakes
P-all: Number of planted stems including live stakes,
T: Total Stems

Table 9. Planted and Total Stem Counts

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

			Annual Means														
			MY4 (2016)			MY3 (2015)			MY2 (2014)			MY1 (2013)			MY0 (2012)		
Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree			35			57			55						
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree	53	53	56	56	56	57	64	64	64	82	82	82	124	124	124
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Tree			1												
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub		12	13		16	16		16	20	25	25	25	30	30	30
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	76	76	245	74	74	573	74	74	387	82	82	142	86	86	86
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree									1						
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree			32			170			92						
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree	10	10	10	10	10	10	15	15	16	20	20	20	35	35	35
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	131	131	148	140	140	221	143	143	193	144	144	204	145	145	145
Quercus	oak	Tree						2									
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree	56	56	56	61	61	61	62	62	62	71	71	71	87	87	87
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree	60	60	61	68	68	69	72	72	73	93	93	93	131	131	131
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree	64	64	66	67	67	72	69	69	69	72	72	72	64	64	64
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	Tree			2			2									
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub		33	43		37	60		37	66	39	39	39	38	38	38
		Stem count	450	495	768	476	529	1370	499	552	1098	628	628	748	740	740	740
		size (ares)	42			42			42			42			42		
		size (ACRES)	1.04			1.04			1.04			1.04			1.04		
		Species count	7	9	13	7	9	13	7	9	12	9	9	9	9	9	9
		Stems per ACRE	433.6	477	740	458.6	509.7	1320	480.8	531.9	1058	605.1	605.1	720.7	712	712	712

Color Coding for Table

Exceeds requirements by 10%
Exceeds requirements, but by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements, by less than 10%
Fails to meet requirements by more than 10%
Volunteer species included in total

PnoLS: Number of Planted stems excluding live stakes
P-all: Number of planted stems including live stakes,
T: Total Stems

APPENDIX 4. Morphological Summary Data and Plots

Table 10a. Baseline Stream Data Summary
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; SF1 and UT2

		Pre-Restoration Condition				Reference Reach Data				Design				As-Built/Baseline			
Parameter	**Gage**	**SF1**		**UT2**		**Long Branch**		**UT to Cane Creek**		**SF1**		**UT2**		**SF1**		**UT2**	
		Min	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle																	
Bankfull Width (ft)	n/a	7.6		7.0		14.8	18.6	8.2	11.8	8.8		7.1		9.0		16.6	
Floodprone Width (ft)		51.9		133.2		50+		40+		50+		200+		50+		200+	
Bankfull Mean Depth		1.2		1.4		1.3	2.1	0.9	1.0	0.7		0.6		0.7		0.8	
Bankfull Max Depth		2.2		1.8		1.9	2.9	1.5	1.7	1.0		0.7		1.1		1.1	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)		9.5		9.6		25.0	34.6	8.5	10.7	6.5		4.2		6.3		13.6	
Width/Depth Ratio		6.2		5.2		7.9	13.8	7.9	13.1	12.0		12.0		12.9		20.4	
Entrenchment Ratio		6.8		18.9		3.4+		4.59+		2.2+		2.2+		2.2+		2.2+	
Bank Height Ratio		1.6		1.5		1.2	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0	
D50 (mm)		4.7		6.1										119.3		145.5	
Profile																	
Riffle Length (ft)	n/a					---		---		---		---		11	36	7	25
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)[4]		0.011	0.0100	---		0.0130	0.0120	0.0120		0.0143	0.0255	0.0197	0.0353	0.0053	0.0283	0.0040	0.1512
Pool Length (ft)						---		---		---		---		16	34	16	51
Pool Max Depth (ft)		---		---		---		---		---		---		1.67		2.70	
Pool Spacing (ft)^		---		---		---		---		35	62	29	50	37	61	23	59
Pool Volume (ft^3)																	
Pattern																	
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	n/a	N/A		N/A		60		50	77	26	44	N/A		26	44	N/A	
Radius of Curvature (ft)		N/A		N/A		16	87	11.3	27.1	15	25	N/A		15	25	N/A	
Rc:Bankfull Width (ft/ft)		---		---		1.1	4.7	1	2.5	2	3	N/A		2	3	N/A	
Meander Length (ft)		N/A		N/A		66	191	29	96	62	106	N/A		62	106	N/A	
Meander Width Ratio		---		---		3.2	4.1	50	77	3	5	N/A		3	5	N/A	
Substrate, Bed and Transport Parameters																	
Ri%/Ru%/P%/G%/S%	n/a																
SC%/Sa%/G%/C%/B%/Be%																	
d16/d35/d50/d84/d95/d100		N/A/0.9/4.7/20.9/87/362		N/A/N/A/6.1/62/128/256		---		---						SC/SC/SC/46.6/100/256		SC/SC/SC/58.6/111.2/180	
Reach Shear Stress (Competency) lb/ft^2[1]		---		---						0.42		---		0.39		N/A	
Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankfull																	
Stream Power (Capacity) W/m^2[2]																	
Additional Reach Parameters																	
Drainage Area (SM)	n/a	0.21		0.12		1.49		0.28		0.21		0.12		0.21		0.12	
Watershed Impervious Cover Estimate (%)		<1%		<1%		---		---		<1%		<1%		<1%		<1%	
Rosgen Classification		E4		E4		C/E4		C/E4		C4		C4		C5		C5	
Bankfull Velocity (fps)		3.1		2.04						3.1		3.1		3.2		1.0	
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)		20		13.1		101	124	20.6	53.2	20		13.1		20		13.1	
Q-NFF regression		45.2		30.96													
Q-USGS extrapolation		---		---													
Q-Mannings		---		---													
Valley Length (ft)		---		---		---		---		---		---					
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)		773		421		---		---		878		421		874		418	
Sinuosity (ft)		1.1		1.0		1.30		1.20		1.2		1.0		1.2		1.0	
Water Surface Slope ($ft/ft)^2$		0.011		0.015		0.004		0.005		0.0102		0.0141		0.0104		0.0143	
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)		---		---		0.006		---		---		---		0.0104		0.0145	

(---): Data was not provided
N/A: Not Applicable
[1]Design Parameters based on revised Shields Diagram.
[2]Channel was dry at time of baseline survey. Slopes were calculated using the channel thalweg.
[3]As-Built pattern measuremeants fell within the design ranges, therefore the design parameters set are still applicable.
[4]Slopes outside of design range are from the tie in points at the channel confluence.

Table 10b. Baseline Stream Data Summary
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; SF3 and UT1

		Pre-Restoration Condition				Reference Reach Data				Design						As-Built/Baseline			
Parameter	**Gage**	**SF3**		**UT1**		**Long Branch**		**UT to Cane Creek**		**SF3-u/s of UT1**		**SF3-d/s of UT1**		**UT1**		**SF3**		**UT1**	
		Min	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**			**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle																			
Bankfull Width (ft)		15.9		9.0		14.8	18.6	8.2	11.8	18.2		18.0		10.7		22.6	29.3	4.1	
Floodprone Width (ft)		48.6		14.2		50+		40+		50+		200+		>100		50+	200+	100+	
Bankfull Mean Depth		1.8		0.8		1.3	2.1	0.9	1.0	1.5		1.5		0.9		1.0	1.5	0.3	
Bankfull Max Depth		2.4		1.5		1.9	2.9	1.5	1.7	2.1		2.1		1.3		2.3	2.6	0.5	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	n/a	28.9		7.2		25.0	34.6	8.5	10.7	27.5		27.1		9.6		27.0	34.5	1.2	
Width/Depth Ratio		8.8		11.1		7.9	13.8	7.9	13.1	12.0		12.0		12.0		14.8	28.8	14.2	
Entrenchment Ratio		3.1		1.6		3.4+		4.59+		2.2+		2.2+		>2.2		2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	
Bank Height Ratio		1.6		1.9		1.2	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	
D50 (mm)		4.7		1.0												50.6	63.3	73.8	
Profile																			
Riffle Length (ft)						---		---		---		---		---		12	103	11	26
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)		0.030	0.0500			0.0130	0.0120	0.0120		0.005	0.009	0.0078	0.0140	0.0118	0.0210	0.0003	0.0169	0.0023	0.0185
Pool Length (ft)	n/a					---		---		---		---		---		23	100	20	80
Pool Max Depth (ft)		---		---		---		---		---		---		---		0.0	0.0	2.5	
Pool Spacing (ft)^		---		---		---		---		---		---		---		53	166	58	76
Pool Volume (ft^3)																			
Pattern																			
Channel Beltwidth (ft)		51	106	31	59	60		50	77	54	91	54	90	32	54	54	91	32	54
Radius of Curvature (ft)		27	105	10	83	16	87	11.3	27.1	31	51	31	50	21	30	31	51	21	30
Rc:Bankfull Width (ft/ft)	n/a	7	16	1	9	1	5	1	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3	2	3
Meander Length (ft)		46	272	80	161	66	191	29	96	127	218	126	216	75	129	126	218	75	129
Meander Width Ratio		26	70	3	7	3	4	50	77	3	5	3	5	3	5	3	5	3	5
Substrate, Bed and Transport Parameters																			
Ri%/Ru%/P%/G%/S%																			
SC%/Sa%/G%/C%/B%/Be%																			
d16/d35/d50/d84/d95/d100	n/a	7.53/16.66/40.82/74.02/97.42/180		N/A/N/A/1/16/107.3/256		---		---								0.08/0.21/11/67.2/256/>2048		0.07/0.16/0.3/26.9/71.7/256	
Reach Shear Stress (Competency) lb/ft^2 [1]		---		---						0.35		0.52		0.37		0.28		0.12	
Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankfull																			
Stream Power (Capacity) W/m^2																			
Additional Reach Parameters																			
Drainage Area (SM)		1.27		0.36		1.49		0.28		1.27				0.36		1.27		0.36	
Watershed Impervious Cover Estimate (%)		<1%		<1%		---		---		<1%		<1%		<1%		<1%		<1%	
Rosgen Classification		E4		E/G5		C/E4		C/E4		C4		C4		C5		C4		C5	
Bankfull Velocity (fps)		3.7		5.87						3.0		3.4		3.2		2.9	3.0	25.3	
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)		81.5		30.3		101	124	20.6	53.2	81.5		99.8		30.3		81.5	99.8	30.3	
Q-NFF regression		159.7		65.7															
Q-USGS extrapolation	n/a	---		---															
Q-Mannings		---		---															
Valley Length (ft)		---		---		---		---		---		---		---					
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)		2,183		1,915		---		---		2,116				1,997		2,120		2,038	
Sinuosity (ft)		1.2		1.2		1.3		1.2		1.2		1.2		1.2		1.2		1.2	
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)[2]		0.004		0.01		0.004		0.005		0.0036		0.0056		0.0084		0.0041		0.0075	
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)		---		---		0.006		---		---		---		---		0.0047		0.0083	

(---): Data was not provided
N/A: Not Applicable
[1]Design Parameters based on revised Shields Diagram.
[2]Channel was dry at time of baseline survey. Slopes were calculated using the channel thalweg.
[3]As-Built pattern measuremeants fell within the design ranges, therefore the design parameters set are still applicable.
[4]Slopes outside of design range are from the tie in points at the channel confluence.

Table 10c. Baseline Stream Data Summary
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Lindley Site; SF4 and SF4A

		Pre-Restoration Condition				Reference Reach Data				Design				As-Built/Baseline			
Parameter	**Gage**	**SF4**		**SFA**		**Long Branch**		**UT to Cane Creek**		**SF4**		**SFA**		**SF4**		**SFA**	
		Min	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**	**Min**	**Max**
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle																	
Bankfull Width (ft)	n/a	18.6		10.3		14.8	18.6	8.2	11.8	14.0		12.0		26.7	27.3	13.6	17.3
Floodprone Width (ft)		157.3		29.4		50+		40+		50+		200+		200+	200+	2..+	200+
Bankfull Mean Depth		2.7		1.6		1.3	2.1	0.9	1.0	1.9		1.2		2.0	2.9	1.2	1.6
Bankfull Max Depth		4.0		2.2		1.9	2.9	1.5	1.7	2.3		1.7		2.9	3.0	2.1	2.8
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)		49.7		16.9		25.0	34.6	8.5	10.7	53.0		18.0		49.0	53.8	16.1	27.1
Width/Depth Ratio		6.9		6.3		7.9	13.8	7.9	13.1	14.0		12.0		13.8	14.6	11.1	11.5
Entrenchment Ratio		3.5		2.9		3.4+		4.59+		2.2+		2.2+		2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+
Bank Height Ratio		1.4		1.8		1.2	1.5	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
D50 (mm)		0.3		0.8										117.2	134.4	22.6	82.0
Profile																	
Riffle Length (ft)	n/a					---		---		---		---		51	112	41	79
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)		---		---		0.0130	0.0120	0.0120		0.0048	0.0085	0.0108	0.0193	0.0010	0.0098	0.0001	0.0210
Pool Length (ft)						---		---		---		---		54	123	28	79
Pool Max Depth (ft)		---		---		---		---		---		---		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Pool Spacing (ft)^		---		---		---		---		---		---		146	210	71	110
Pool Volume (ft^3)																	
Pattern[3]																	
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	n/a	N/A		N/A		60		50	77	82	136	44	74	82	136	44	74
Radius of Curvature (ft)		N/A		N/A		16	87	11	27	46	76	25	41	46	76	25	41
Rc:Bankfull Width (ft/ft)		---		---		1	5	1	3	1.7	2.8	1.7	2.8	2	3	2	3
Meander Length (ft)		N/A		N/A		66	191	29	96	191	327	103	177	191	327	103	177
Meander Width Ratio		---		---		3	4	6	7	3	5	3	5	3	5	3	5
Substrate, Bed and Transport Parameters																	
Ri%/Ru%/P%/G%/S%	n/a																
SC%/Sa%/G%/C%/B%/Be%																	
d16/d35/d50/d84/d95/d100		N/A/N/A/0.3/17.9/45.8/90		N/A/0.1/0.8/204./62.9/362		---		---						0.13/0.36/5.3/102.5/320.7/>2048		SC/0.12/1.4/44/71.3/362	
Reach Shear Stress (Competency) $lb/ft^{2,1}$		---		---						0.32	0.63	---		0.33	0.33	0.44	0.58
Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankfull																	
Stream Power (Capacity) W/m^2																	
Additional Reach Parameters																	
Drainage Area (SM)	n/a	5.26		1.00		1.49		0.28		5.26		1.00		5.26		1.00	
Watershed Impervious Cover Estimate (%)		<1%		<1%		---		---		<1%		<1%		<1%		<1%	
Rosgen Classification		E5		E5		C/E4		C/E4		C5		C5		C4		C5	
Bankfull Velocity (fps)		5.9		5.26						3.9		3.7		4.2	3.8	2.5	4.2
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)		247.4		67.3		101	124	20.6	53.2	204		67.3		204		67.3	
Q-NFF regression		432.92		134.59													
Q-USGS extrapolation		---		---													
Q-Mannings		---		---													
Valley Length (ft)		---		---		---		---		---		---					
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)		1450.0		609.0		---		---		1,424		868		1,429		866	
Sinuosity (ft)		1.3		1.1		1.3		1.2		1.2		1.0		1.2		1.1	
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)[2]		0.003		0.008		0.004		0.005		0.0034		0.0077		0.0033		0.0070	
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)		---		---		0.006		---		0.0034		0.0077		0.0034		0.0067	

(---): Data was not provided
N/A: Not Applicable

[1]Design Parameters based on revised Shields Diagram.

[2]Channel was dry at time of baseline survey. Slopes were calculated using the channel thalweg.

[3]As-Built pattern measuremeants fell within the design ranges, therefore the design parameters set are still applicable.

[4]Slopes outside of design range are from the tie in points at the channel confluence.

Table 11. Morphology and Hydraulic Summary (Dimensional Parameters - Cross Section)
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris and Lindley Site

	SF1												UT2											
	Cross Section 1 (Riffle)						Cross Section 2 (Pool)						Cross Section 3 (Pool)						Cross Section 4 (Riffle)					
Dimension and Substrate	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
based on fixed bankfull elevation	595.5						594.9						600.2						599.5					
Bankfull Width (ft)	8.4	9.0	8.2	7.8	8.2		11.7	13.9	10.9	10.4	11.3		15.0	19.4	15.7	14.2	15.2		16.6	18.6	17.4	16.9	16.5	
Floodprone Width (ft)	50+	50+	50+	50+	50+		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6		0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	1.0		1.6	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.6		0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	1.0	
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	1.0	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.9		1.7	2.1	1.9	1.9	1.9		2.7	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.8		1.1	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.5	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	5.6	6.3	4.8	4.6	4.8		12.8	12.2	9.9	8.8	11.4		24.2	26.2	23.1	22.5	24.7		13.6	18.6	14.1	13.9	16.6	
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	12.8	12.9	14.2	13.5	14.1		N/A	N/A	12.0	12.3	11.2		N/A	N/A	10.7	9.0	9.4		20.4	25.4	21.4	20.6	16.5	
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	
Bankfull Bank Height Ratio	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	

	SF3																							
	Cross Section 5 (Riffle)						Cross Section 6 (Pool)						Cross Section 7 (Riffle)						Cross Section 8 (Pool)					
Dimension and Substrate	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
based on fixed bankfull elevation	567.8						575.0						574.7						572.9					
Bankfull Width (ft)	19.7	22.6	19.4	18.8	18.8		19.7	24.8	22.7	23.5	23.4		16.7	29.3	15.8	16.5	18.5		19.7	22.3	15.9	17.0	17.4	
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		200+	200+	200+	200+	200+		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5		1.6	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.8		1.2	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.2		1.4	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.7	
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.4		2.3	4.1	3.7	3.7	3.7		2.2	2.6	2.2	2.2	2.1		3.0	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.1	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	30.5	34.5	29.9	28.3	28.6		30.5	50.2	43.1	41.4	43.4		20.6	29.8	19.2	19.5	21.4		28.0	36.9	26.2	27.6	28.8	
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	12.7	14.8	12.5	12.5	12.4		12.7	12.1	12.0	13.3	12.7		13.5	28.8	12.9	14.0	16.0		13.9	13.5	9.7	10.5	10.5	
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Bankfull Bank Height Ratio	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	

	SF3						UT1												SF4					
	Cross Section 9 (Riffle)						Cross Section 10 (Riffle)						Cross Section 11 (Pool)						Cross Section 12 (Pool)					
Dimension and Substrate	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
based on fixed bankfull elevation	572.5						574.0						573.8						539.7					
Bankfull Width (ft)	15.9	24.2	14.9	15.4	14.9		12.6	10.1	11.3	10.6	10.8		14.2	19.4	12.0	13.4	14.0		33.3	34.1	29.8	29.6	33.2	
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+		100+	100+	100+	100+	100+		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.2		0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.9		1.3	0.9	1.2	1.1	1.2		2.2	2.1	2.4	2.4	2.2	
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	1.8	2.3	1.8	1.7	1.9		1.5	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.6		2.6	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.5		4.9	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.9	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	19.0	27.0	15.5	16.2	18.1		10.5	9.5	9.5	8.1	9.7		17.7	17.0	14.6	15.0	17.4		74.4	72.2	70.7	71.7	72.5	
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	13.3	21.6	14.4	14.6	12.2		15.1	10.7	13.4	13.8	11.9		11.3	22.1	10.0	12.0	11.2		14.9	16.2	12.5	12.2	15.2	
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+		2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Bankfull Bank Height Ratio	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	

	SF4																		SF4A					
	Cross Section 13 (Riffle)						Cross Section 14 (Pool)						Cross Section 15 (Riffle)						Cross Section 16 (Riffle)					
Dimension and Substrate	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
based on fixed bankfull elevation	539.6						537.8						537.7						540.4					
Bankfull Width (ft)	27.3	26.7	26.0	28.8	28.4		38.7	44.4	45.4	47.6	45.7		27.6	27.3	26.2	28.3	29.2		23.7	17.3	13.9	14.9	17.3	
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		200+	200+	200+	200+	200+		200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	1.8	2.9	1.9	1.8	1.9		1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.1		1.9	2.0	2.1	1.9	1.9		0.9	1.6	1.8	1.7	1.7	
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.1		4.3	4.6	5.0	5.0	5.7		3.2	3.0	3.2	3.1	3.5		2.3	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.4	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	49.5	49.0	49.7	51.8	54.3		70.6	78.1	82.2	86.0	96.0		51.2	53.8	53.9	53.3	56.6		20.4	27.1	25.2	25.5	30.3	
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	15.1	14.6	13.6	16.0	14.8		21.2	25.3	25.1	26.4	21.8		14.9	13.8	12.8	15.0	15.1		27.5	11.1	7.7	8.7	9.9	
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+		2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	
Bankfull Bank Height Ratio	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	

	SF4A											
	Cross Section 17 (Riffle)						Cross Section 18 (Pool)					
Dimension and Substrate	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**	**Base**	**MY1**	**MY2**	**MY3**	**MY4**	**MY5**
based on fixed bankfull elevation	537.3						536.9					
Bankfull Width (ft)	13.9	13.6	12.8	11.5	11.4		16.0	13.5	10.6	11.1	11.6	
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.6		1.4	1.6	1.9	1.6	2.1	
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	2.1	2.1	2.4	2.3	2.6		2.8	3.4	3.0	2.7	3.3	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	17.5	16.1	15.2	13.9	18.3		22.9	21.0	20.5	18.3	24.3	
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	11.0	11.5	10.7	9.5	7.1		11.1	8.6	5.4	6.7	5.5	
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Bankfull Bank Height Ratio	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	

Table 12a. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; SF1

Parameter	As-Built/Baseline		MY1		MY2		MY3		MY4		MY5	
	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle												
Bankfull Width (ft)	8.4		9.0		8.2		7.8		8.2			
Floodprone Width (ft)	50+		50+		50+		50+		50+			
Bankfull Mean Depth	0.7		0.7		0.6		0.6		0.6			
Bankfull Max Depth	1.0		1.1		1.0		0.9		0.9			
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	5.6		6.3		4.8		4.6		4.8			
Width/Depth Ratio	12.8		12.9		14.2		13.5		14.1			
Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+		2.2+		2.2+		2.2+		2.2+			
Bank Height Ratio	1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0			
D50 (mm)	23.3		27.8		31.0		34.6		23.9			
Profile												
Riffle Length (ft)	11	36	13	38	11	37	13	37	13	38		
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0053	0.0283	0.0008	0.0376	0.0077	0.0426	0.0111	0.0362	0.0080	0.0496		
Pool Length (ft)	16	34	15	30	15	33	18	36	13	29		
Pool Max Depth (ft)	1.7		2.1		1.9		1.7		1.9			
Pool Spacing (ft)	37	61	36	59	37	59	41	64	35	62		
Pool Volume (ft^3)												
Pattern												
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	26	44										
Radius of Curvature (ft)	15	25										
Rc:Bankfull Width (ft/ft)	1.7	2.8										
Meander Wave Length (ft)	62	106										
Meander Width Ratio	3.0	5.0										
Additional Reach Parameters												
Rosgen Classification	C5		C5		C5		C5		C5			
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)	874		874		874		874		874			
Sinuosity (ft)	1.2		1.2		1.2		1.2		1.2			
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	0.0104		0.0104		0.0111		0.0101		0.0112			
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)	0.0104		0.0108		0.0104		0.0099		0.0086			
Ri%/Ru%/P%/G%/S%												
SC%/Sa%/G%/C%/B%/Be%												
d16/d35/d50/d84/d95/d100	SC/SC/SC/46.6/100/256		SC/SC/SC/91.6/202.4/362		SC/0.2/9.7/42.0/128/256		SC/0.25/13.3/52.9/77.8/128		SC/9.0/23.9/96.6/180/320			
% of Reach with Eroding Banks			0%		0%		0%		0%			

Table 12b. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; UT2

Parameter	As-Built/Baseline		MY1		MY2		MY3		MY4		MY5	
	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle												
Bankfull Width (ft)	16.6		18.6		17.4		16.9		16.5			
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+		200+		200+		200+		200+			
Bankfull Mean Depth	0.8		0.9		0.8		0.8		1.0			
Bankfull Max Depth	1.1		1.4		1.2		1.2		1.5			
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	13.6		18.6		14.1		13.9		16.6			
Width/Depth Ratio	20.4		25.4		21.4		20.6		16.5			
Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+		2.2+		2.2+		2.2+		2.2+			
Bank Height Ratio	1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0			
D50 (mm)	34.3		77.3		27.6		29.3		20.1			
Profile												
Riffle Length (ft)	7	25	3	24	4	13	4	27	4	16		
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0040	0.1512	0.0045	0.0775	0.0117	0.0373	0.0098	0.0387	0.0049	0.0637		
Pool Length (ft)	16	51	11	46	18	47	17	45	17	43		
Pool Max Depth (ft)	2.7		2.7		2.6		2.3		2.3			
Pool Spacing (ft)	23	59	21	60	21	55	23	58	20	58		
Pool Volume (ft^3)												
Pattern												
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	N/A											
Radius of Curvature (ft)	N/A											
Rc:Bankfull Width (ft/ft)	N/A											
Meander Wave Length (ft)	N/A											
Meander Width Ratio	N/A											
Additional Reach Parameters												
Rosgen Classification	C5		C5		C5		C5		C5			
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)	418		418		418		418		418			
Sinuosity (ft)	1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0			
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	0.0143		0.0149		0.0152		0.0141		0.0147			
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)	0.0145		0.0141		0.0141		0.0128		0.0133			
Ri%/Ru%/P%/G%/S%												
SC%/Sa%/G%/C%/B%/Be%												
d16/d35/d50/d84/d95/d100	SC/SC/SC/110.1/163.3/256		SC/SC/SC/58.6/111.2/181		SC/0.5/17.4/58.6/99.5/128		SC/0.2/6.7/62.2/83.1/256		SC/10.04/20.1/69/160.7/362			
% of Reach with Eroding Banks			0%		0%		0%		0%			

Table 12c. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; SF3

Parameter	As-Built/Baseline		MY1		MY2		MY3		MY4		MY5	
	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle												
Bankfull Width (ft)	15.9	19.7	22.6	29.3	14.9	19.4	16.5	18.8	14.9	18.8		
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+		
Bankfull Mean Depth	1.2	1.6	1.0	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.1	1.5	1.2	1.5		
Bankfull Max Depth	1.8	2.3	2.3	2.6	1.8	2.4	1.7	2.4	1.9	2.4		
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	19.0	30.5	27.0	34.5	15.5	29.9	16.2	28.3	18.1	28.6		
Width/Depth Ratio	12.7	13.5	14.8	28.8	12.5	14.4	12.5	14.6	12.2	16.0		
Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+		
Bank Height Ratio	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		
D50 (mm)	19.8	35.4	22.6	39.8	18.6	38.7	13.9	35.5	29.2	46.5		
Profile												
Riffle Length (ft)	12	103	29	100	18	102	17	100	13	95		
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0003	0.0169	0.0019	0.0129	0.0008	0.0131	0.0012	0.0128	0.0004	0.0188		
Pool Length (ft)	23	100	45	74	21	72	19	78	22	77		
Pool Max Depth (ft)	2.3	2.5	2.8	5.0	3.0	3.7	3.4		2.9			
Pool Spacing (ft)	53	166	50	151	42	156	41	155	42	153		
Pool Volume (ft^3)												
Pattern												
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	54	91										
Radius of Curvature (ft)	31	51										
Rc:Bankfull Width (ft/ft)	1.7	3.0										
Meander Wave Length (ft)	126	218										
Meander Width Ratio	3.0	5.0										
Additional Reach Parameters												
Rosgen Classification	C4		C4		C5		C5		C5			
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)	2,120		2,120		2,120		2,120		2,120			
Sinuosity (ft)	1.2		1.2		1.2		1.2		1.2			
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	0.0041		0.0045		0.0043		0.0043		0.0044			
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)	0.0047		0.0047		0.0042		0.0043		0.0040			
Ri%/Ru%/P%/G%/S%												
SC%/Sa%/G%/C%/B%/Be%												
d16/d35/d50/d84/d95/d100	0.08/0.21/11/67.2/256/>2048		0.50/16.47/26/66.8/119.3/180		0.42/9.38/17.3/53.7/90/>2048		1.41/8/17/70.2/111.2/256		1.15/9.09/16.5/73.8/119.3/180			
% of Reach with Eroding Banks			0%		0%		0%		0%			

Table 12d. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; UT1

Parameter	As-Built/Baseline		MY1		MY2		MY3		MY4		MY5	
	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle												
Bankfull Width (ft)	12.7		10.1		11.3		10.6		10.8			
Floodprone Width (ft)	100+		100+		100+		100+		100+			
Bankfull Mean Depth	0.8		0.9		0.8		0.8		0.9			
Bankfull Max Depth	1.5		1.6		1.5		1.4		1.6			
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	10.5		9.5		9.5		8.1		9.7			
Width/Depth Ratio	15.1		10.7		13.4		13.8		12			
Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+		2.2+		2.2+		2.2+		2.2+			
Bank Height Ratio	1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0		1.0			
D50 (mm)	21.1		40.8		39.3		33.9		32.9			
Profile												
Riffle Length (ft)	11	39	19	36	14	36	14	36	18	36		
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0023	0.0185	0.0016	0.0258	0.0025	0.0407	0.0012	0.0299	0.0031	0.0218		
Pool Length (ft)	20	80	18	51	25	53	23	52	23	48		
Pool Max Depth (ft)	2.6		2.5		2.3		2.7		2.4			
Pool Spacing (ft)	58	76	39	76	43	73	52	77	52	82		
Pool Volume (ft^3)												
Pattern												
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	32	54										
Radius of Curvature (ft)	21	30										
Rc:Bankfull Width (ft/ft)	2.0	2.8										
Meander Wave Length (ft)	75	129										
Meander Width Ratio	3.0	5.0										
Additional Reach Parameters												
Rosgen Classification	C5		C5		C5		C 5		C 5			
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)	2,038		2,038		2,038		2,038		2,038			
Sinuosity (ft)	1.2		1.2		1.2		1.2		1.2			
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	0.0075		0.0078		0.0070		0.0077		0.0079			
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)	0.0083		0.0058		0.0077		0.0091		0.0078			
Ri%/Ru%/P%/G%/S%												
SC%/Sa%/G%/C%/B%/Be%												
d16/d35/d50/d84/d95/d100	0.07/0.16/0.3/26.9/71.7/256		SC/1.15/11/67.2/87.8/180		SC/0.20/6.7./45.0/84.1/362		SC/0.30/8.0/78.5/128.0/180.0		SC/.25/4.0/80.3/151.8/362			
% of Reach with Eroding Banks			0%		0%		0%		0%			

Table 12e. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Lindley Site; SF4

Parameter	As-Built/Baseline		MY1		MY2		MY3		MY4		MY5	
	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle												
Bankfull Width (ft)	27.3	27.6	26.7	27.3	26.0	26.2	28.3	28.8	28.4	29.8		
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+		200+		200+		200+		200+			
Bankfull Mean Depth	1.8	1.9	2.0	2.9	1.9	2.1	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9		
Bankfull Max Depth	3.0	3.2	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.1	3.5		
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	49.5	51.2	49.0	53.8	49.7	53.9	51.8	53.3	54.3	56.6		
Width/Depth Ratio	14.9	15.1	13.8	14.6	12.8	13.6	15.0	16.0	14.8	15.1		
Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+		2.2+		2.2+		2.2+		2.2+			
Bank Height Ratio	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		
D50 (mm)	29.1	35.6	19	25	26.9	28.1	28.5	40.5	52.3	59		
Profile												
Riffle Length (ft)	51	112	31	111	46	115	50	119	22	110		
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0010	0.0098	0.0034	0.0119	0.0028	0.0075	0.0032	0.0072	0.0017	0.0185		
Pool Length (ft)	54	123	27	169	26	123	24	135	28	122		
Pool Max Depth (ft)	4.3	4.9	4.6	4.7	4.9	5.0	4.9		5.3			
Pool Spacing (ft)	146	210	151	211	150	210	138	221	106	236		
Pool Volume (ft^3)												
Pattern												
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	82	136										
Radius of Curvature (ft)	46	76										
Rc:Bankfull Width (ft/ft)	1.7	2.8										
Meander Wave Length (ft)	191	327										
Meander Width Ratio	3.0	5.0										
Additional Reach Parameters												
Rosgen Classification	C4		C4		C4		C4		C4			
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)	1,429		1,429		1,429		1,429		1,429			
Sinuosity (ft)	1.2		1.2		1.2		1.2		1.2			
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	0.0033		0.0031		0.0031		0.0030		0.0033			
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)	0.0034		0.0034		0.0035		0.0031		0.0031			
Ri%/Ru%/P%/G%/S%												
SC%/Sa%/G%/C%/B%/Be%												
d16/d35/d50/d84/d95/d100	0.13/0.36/5.3/102.5/320.7/>2048		SC/0.25/5.1/72.7/139.4/256		SC/1.41/16/69.7/115.7/>2048		0.17/4.98/18.2/135.2/246.5/>204		.25/4.89/15/117.2/214.7/512			
% of Reach with Eroding Banks			0%		0%		0%		0%			

Table 12f. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Lindley Site; SF4A

Parameter	As-Built/Baseline		MY1		MY2		MY3		MY4		MY5	
	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max	Min	Max
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle												
Bankfull Width (ft)	13.9	23.7	13.6	15.4	12.8	13.9	11.5	14.9	11.4	17.3		
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+		200+		200+		200+		200+			
Bankfull Mean Depth	0.9	1.3	1.2	1.7	1.2	1.8	1.2	1.7	1.6	1.7		
Bankfull Max Depth	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.8	2.4	3.0	2.3	3.1	2.6	3.4		
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	17.5	20.4	16.1	26.3	15.2	25.2	13.9	25.5	18.3	30.3		
Width/Depth Ratio	11.0	27.5	9.0	11.5	7.7	10.7	8.7	9.5	7.1	9.9		
Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+		2.2+		2.2+		2.2+		2.2+			
Bank Height Ratio	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0		
D50 (mm)	9.4	12.7	4.4	17.1	31.4	32	17	25.1	20	33		
Profile												
Riffle Length (ft)	41	79	6	75	5	52	5	67	4	30		
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0001	0.0210	0.0177	0.0321	0.0063	0.0577	0.0004	0.0483	0.0087	0.0554		
Pool Length (ft)	28	79	15	46	16	68	16	61	23	82		
Pool Max Depth (ft)	2.1	2.8	2.8	3.8	3.0		3.8		4.1			
Pool Spacing (ft)	71	110	32	111	35	104	35	109	46	107		
Pool Volume (ft^3)												
Pattern												
Channel Beltwidth (ft)	44	74										
Radius of Curvature (ft)	25	41										
Rc:Bankfull Width (ft/ft)	1.7	2.8										
Meander Wave Length (ft)	103	177										
Meander Width Ratio	3.0	5.0										
Additional Reach Parameters												
Rosgen Classification	C5		C5		C5		C5		C5			
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)	866		866		866		866		866			
Sinuosity (ft)	1.1		1.1		1.1		1.1		1.1			
Water Surface Slope (ft/ft)	0.0070		0.0047		0.0049		0.0046		0.0060			
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)	0.0067		0.0077		0.0066		0.0067		0.0067			
Ri%/Ru%/P%/G%/S%												
SC%/Sa%/G%/C%/B%/Be%												
d16/d35/d50/d84/d95/d100	SC/0.12/1.4/44/71.3/362		SC/0.10/0.3/48.8/123.6/256		0.93/5.6/12.8/42.0/85.0/180		SC/0.71/18.0/64.0/121.7/512		SC/0.45/16.8/64.0/112.2/180.0			
% of Reach with Eroding Banks			43%		43%		50%		0%			

Longitudinal Profile Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; SF1



Longitudinal Profile Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; UT2



Longitudinal Profile Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; SF3



Longitudinal Profile Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Harris Site; UT1



Longitudinal Profile Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Lindley Site; SF4



Longitudinal Profile Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Lindley Site; SF4A



Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 1 - SF1



Bankfull Dimensions	
4.8	x-section area (ft.sq.)
8.2	width (ft)
0.6	mean depth (ft)
0.9	max depth (ft)
8.5	wetted parimeter (ft)
0.6	hyd radi (ft)
14.1	width-depth ratio
50.0	W flood prone area (ft)
6.1	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 2 - SF1



Bankfull Dimensions	
11.4	x-section area (ft.sq.)
11.3	width (ft)
1.0	mean depth (ft)
1.9	max depth (ft)
12.1	wetted parimeter (ft)
0.9	hyd radi (ft)
11.2	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 3 - UT2



Bankfull Dimensions	
24.7	x-section area (ft.sq.)
15.2	width (ft)
1.6	mean depth (ft)
2.8	max depth (ft)
16.6	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.5	hyd radi (ft)
9.4	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 4 - UT2



Bankfull Dimensions	
16.6	x-section area (ft.sq.)
16.5	width (ft)
1.0	mean depth (ft)
1.5	max depth (ft)
17.2	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.0	hyd radi (ft)
16.5	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
12.1	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016
Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 5 - SF3



Bankfull Dimensions	
28.6	x-section area (ft.sq.)
18.8	width (ft)
1.5	mean depth (ft)
2.4	max depth (ft)
19.7	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.4	hyd radi (ft)
12.4	width-depth ratio
100.0	W flood prone area (ft)
5.3	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 6 - SF3



Bankfull Dimensions	
43.3	x-section area (ft.sq.)
23.4	width (ft)
1.8	mean depth (ft)
3.7	max depth (ft)
24.9	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.7	hyd radi (ft)
12.7	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 7 - SF3



Bankfull Dimensions	
21.4	x-section area (ft.sq.)
18.5	width (ft)
1.2	mean depth (ft)
2.1	max depth (ft)
19.2	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.1	hyd radi (ft)
16.0	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
10.8	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 8 - SF3



Bankfull Dimensions	
28.8	x-section area (ft.sq.)
17.4	width (ft)
1.7	mean depth (ft)
3.1	max depth (ft)
19.2	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.5	hyd radi (ft)
10.5	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 9 - SF3



Bankfull Dimensions	
18.1	x-section area (ft.sq.)
14.9	width (ft)
1.2	mean depth (ft)
1.9	max depth (ft)
15.6	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.2	hyd radi (ft)
12.2	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
13.5	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016
Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 10 - UT1



Bankfull Dimensions	
9.7	x-section area (ft.sq.)
10.8	width (ft)
0.9	mean depth (ft)
1.6	max depth (ft)
11.2	wetted parimeter (ft)
0.9	hyd radi (ft)
11.9	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
18.6	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 11 - UT1



Bankfull Dimensions	
17.4	x-section area (ft.sq.)
14.0	width (ft)
1.2	mean depth (ft)
2.5	max depth (ft)
16.0	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.1	hyd radi (ft)
11.2	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 12 - SF4



Bankfull Dimensions	
72.5	x-section area (ft.sq.)
33.2	width (ft)
2.2	mean depth (ft)
4.9	max depth (ft)
36.1	wetted parimeter (ft)
2.0	hyd radi (ft)
15.2	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 13 - SF4



Bankfull Dimensions	
54.3	x-section area (ft.sq.)
28.4	width (ft)
1.9	mean depth (ft)
3.1	max depth (ft)
29.5	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.8	hyd radi (ft)
14.8	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
7.1	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 14 - SF4



Bankfull Dimensions	
96.0	x-section area (ft.sq.)
45.7	width (ft)
2.1	mean depth (ft)
5.7	max depth (ft)
49.1	wetted parimeter (ft)
2.0	hyd radi (ft)
21.8	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 15 - SF4



Bankfull Dimensions	
56.6	x-section area (ft.sq.)
29.2	width (ft)
1.9	mean depth (ft)
3.5	max depth (ft)
30.9	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.8	hyd radi (ft)
15.1	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
6.9	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 16 - SF4A



Bankfull Dimensions	
30.3	x-section area (ft.sq.)
17.3	width (ft)
1.7	mean depth (ft)
3.4	max depth (ft)
19.5	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.6	hyd radi (ft)
9.9	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
11.5	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 17 - SF4A



Bankfull Dimensions	
18.3	x-section area (ft.sq.)
11.4	width (ft)
1.6	mean depth (ft)
2.6	max depth (ft)
13.7	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.3	hyd radi (ft)
7.1	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
17.6	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross-Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4

Cross Section 18 - SF4A



Bankfull Dimensions	
24.3	x-section area (ft.sq.)
11.6	width (ft)
2.1	mean depth (ft)
3.3	max depth (ft)
14.3	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.7	hyd radi (ft)
5.5	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 5/2016

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

SF1, Reachwide

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Particle Count			Reach Summary	
		min	max	Riffle	Pool	Total	Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062		16	16	16	16
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125					16
	Fine	0.125	0.250					16
	Medium	0.25	0.50		1	1	1	17
	Coarse	0.5	1.0					17
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0		1	1	1	18
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8		2	2	2	20
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0		1	1	1	21
	Fine	4.0	5.6	3	3	6	6	27
	Fine	5.6	8.0	1	5	6	6	33
	Medium	8.0	11.0	2	3	5	5	38
	Medium	11.0	16.0	2	2	4	4	42
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	4	2	6	6	48
	Coarse	22.6	32	8	4	12	12	60
	Very Coarse	32	45	4	4	8	8	68
	Very Coarse	45	64	4	3	7	7	75
COBBLE	Small	64	90	7	1	8	8	83
	Small	90	128	4	1	5	5	88
	Large	128	180	6	1	7	7	95
	Large	180	256	3		3	3	98
BOULDER	Small	256	362	2		2	2	100
	Small	362	512					100
	Medium	512	1024					100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048					100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048					100
			Total	**50**	**50**	**100**	**100**	**100**

Reachwide	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	Silt/Clay
D_{35} =	9.09
D_{50} =	23.9
D_{84} =	96.6
D_{95} =	180.0
D_{100} =	362.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

SF1, Cross Section 1

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Riffle 100-Count	Summary	
		min	max		Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062	2	2	2
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			2
	Fine	0.125	0.250			2
	Medium	0.25	0.50			2
	Coarse	0.5	1.0	2	2	4
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0	2	2	6
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8	2	2	8
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0	6	6	14
	Fine	4.0	5.6	8	8	22
	Fine	5.6	8.0	11	11	33
	Medium	8.0	11.0	9	9	42
	Medium	11.0	16.0	7	7	49
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	6	6	55
	Coarse	22.6	32	9	9	64
	Very Coarse	32	45	5	5	69
	Very Coarse	45	64	11	11	80
COBBLE	Small	64	90	8	8	88
	Small	90	128	2	2	90
	Large	128	180	8	8	98
	Large	180	256	2	2	100
BOULDER	Small	256	362			100
	Small	362	512			100
	Medium	512	1024			100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048			100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048			100
			Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Cross Section 1	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	4.4
D_{35} =	8.6
D_{50} =	16.9
D_{84} =	75.9
D_{95} =	158.4
D_{100} =	256.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

UT2, Reachwide

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Particle Count			Reach Summary	
		min	max	Riffle	Pool	Total	Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062	1	16	17	17	17
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125					17
	Fine	0.125	0.250					17
	Medium	0.25	0.50		4	4	4	21
	Coarse	0.5	1.0					21
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0					21
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8					21
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0	1		1	1	22
	Fine	4.0	5.6					22
	Fine	5.6	8.0	2	6	8	8	30
	Medium	8.0	11.0	3	4	7	7	37
	Medium	11.0	16.0	3	6	9	9	46
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	3	3	6	6	52
	Coarse	22.6	32	9	5	14	14	66
	Very Coarse	32	45	5	2	7	7	73
	Very Coarse	45	64	8	1	9	9	82
COBBLE	Small	64	90	8	1	9	9	91
	Small	90	128	1	1	2	2	93
	Large	128	180	2	1	3	3	96
	Large	180	256	3		3	3	99
BOULDER	Small	256	362	1		1	1	100
	Small	362	512					100
	Medium	512	1024					100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048					100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048					100
			Total	**50**	**50**	**100**	**100**	**100**

Reachwide	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	Silt/Clay
D_{35} =	10.04
D_{50} =	20.1
D_{84} =	69.0
D_{95} =	160.7
D_{100} =	362.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

UT2, Cross Section 4

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Riffle 100-Count	Summary	
		min	max		Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062	1	1	1
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			1
	Fine	0.125	0.250			1
	Medium	0.25	0.50			1
	Coarse	0.5	1.0			1
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0	2	2	3
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			3
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0			3
	Fine	4.0	5.6	1	1	4
	Fine	5.6	8.0	2	2	6
	Medium	8.0	11.0	8	8	14
	Medium	11.0	16.0	6	6	20
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	8	8	28
	Coarse	22.6	32	8	8	36
	Very Coarse	32	45	4	4	40
	Very Coarse	45	64	15	15	55
COBBLE	Small	64	90	13	13	68
	Small	90	128	4	4	72
	Large	128	180	10	10	82
	Large	180	256	12	12	94
BOULDER	Small	256	362	6	6	100
	Small	362	512			100
	Medium	512	1024			100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048			100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048			100
			Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Cross Section 4	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	12.46
D_{35} =	30.64
D_{50} =	56.9
D_{84} =	190.9
D_{95} =	271.2
D_{100} =	362.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

SF3, Reachwide

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Particle Count			Reach Summary	
		min	max	Riffle	Pool	Total	Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062		8	8	8	8
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125		1	1	1	9
	Fine	0.125	0.250		2	2	2	11
	Medium	0.25	0.50					11
	Coarse	0.5	1.0		4	4	4	15
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0		5	5	5	20
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8					20
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0		1	1	1	21
	Fine	4.0	5.6	1	3	4	4	25
	Fine	5.6	8.0	1	5	6	6	31
	Medium	8.0	11.0	2	8	10	10	41
	Medium	11.0	16.0	2	6	8	8	49
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	7	5	12	12	61
	Coarse	22.6	32	5	2	7	7	68
	Very Coarse	32	45	4		4	4	72
	Very Coarse	45	64	7		7	7	79
COBBLE	Small	64	90	12		12	12	91
	Small	90	128	5		5	5	96
	Large	128	180	4		4	4	100
	Large	180	256					100
BOULDER	Small	256	362					100
	Small	362	512					100
	Medium	512	1024					100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048					100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048					100
			Total	**50**	**50**	**100**	**100**	**100**

Reachwide	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	1.15
D_{35} =	9.09
D_{50} =	16.5
D_{84} =	73.8
D_{95} =	119.3
D_{100} =	180.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

SF3, Cross Section 5

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Riffle 100-Count	Summary	
		min	max		Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062	4	4	4
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			4
	Fine	0.125	0.250	2	2	6
	Medium	0.25	0.50	2	2	8
	Coarse	0.5	1.0			8
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0			8
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			8
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0			8
	Fine	4.0	5.6	6	6	14
	Fine	5.6	8.0	5	5	19
	Medium	8.0	11.0	6	6	25
	Medium	11.0	16.0	7	7	32
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	7	7	39
	Coarse	22.6	32	15	15	54
	Very Coarse	32	45	13	13	67
	Very Coarse	45	64	10	10	77
COBBLE	Small	64	90	9	9	86
	Small	90	128	6	6	92
	Large	128	180	6	6	98
	Large	180	256	2	2	100
BOULDER	Small	256	362			100
	Small	362	512			100
	Medium	512	1024			100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048			100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048			100
			Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Cross Section 5	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	6.46
D_{35} =	18.55
D_{50} =	29.2
D_{84} =	83.4
D_{95} =	151.8
D_{100} =	256.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

SF3, Cross Section 7

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Riffle 100-Count	Summary	
		min	max		Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062	4	4	4
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			4
	Fine	0.125	0.250			4
	Medium	0.25	0.50	2	2	6
	Coarse	0.5	1.0	3	3	9
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0	3	3	12
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			12
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0			12
	Fine	4.0	5.6			12
	Fine	5.6	8.0	1	1	13
	Medium	8.0	11.0	3	3	16
	Medium	11.0	16.0	6	6	22
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	4	4	26
	Coarse	22.6	32	10	10	36
	Very Coarse	32	45	13	13	49
	Very Coarse	45	64	11	11	60
COBBLE	Small	64	90	12	12	72
	Small	90	128	10	10	82
	Large	128	180	7	7	89
	Large	180	256	9	9	98
BOULDER	Small	256	362	2	2	100
	Small	362	512			100
	Medium	512	1024			100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048			100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048			100
			Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Cross Section 7	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	11.00
D_{35} =	30.91
D_{50} =	46.5
D_{84} =	141.1
D_{95} =	227.6
D_{100} =	362.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

SF3, Cross Section 9

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Riffle 100-Count	Summary	
		min	max		Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062	4	4	4
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			4
	Fine	0.125	0.250			4
	Medium	0.25	0.50			4
	Coarse	0.5	1.0	4	4	8
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0			8
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			8
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0	2	2	10
	Fine	4.0	5.6	6	6	16
	Fine	5.6	8.0	4	4	20
	Medium	8.0	11.0	6	6	26
	Medium	11.0	16.0	8	8	34
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	7	7	41
	Coarse	22.6	32	10	10	51
	Very Coarse	32	45	6	6	57
	Very Coarse	45	64	11	11	68
COBBLE	Small	64	90	6	6	74
	Small	90	128	8	8	82
	Large	128	180	10	10	92
	Large	180	256	8	8	100
BOULDER	Small	256	362			100
	Small	362	512			100
	Medium	512	1024			100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048			100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048			100
			Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Cross Section 9	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	5.60
D_{35} =	16.81
D_{50} =	30.9
D_{84} =	137.0
D_{95} =	205.4
D_{100} =	256.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

UT1, Reachwide

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Particle Count			Reach Summary	
		min	max	Riffle	Pool	Total	Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062	4	25	29	29	29
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125		2	2	2	31
	Fine	0.125	0.250		4	4	4	35
	Medium	0.25	0.50		8	8	8	43
	Coarse	0.5	1.0					43
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0	2	2	4	4	47
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8					47
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0	3		3	3	50
	Fine	4.0	5.6	1		1	1	51
	Fine	5.6	8.0	2		2	2	53
	Medium	8.0	11.0	4	2	6	6	59
	Medium	11.0	16.0	2		2	2	61
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	4	2	6	6	67
	Coarse	22.6	32					67
	Very Coarse	32	45	4		4	4	71
	Very Coarse	45	64	4	3	7	7	78
COBBLE	Small	64	90	7	2	9	9	87
	Small	90	128	6		6	6	93
	Large	128	180	4		4	4	97
	Large	180	256	2		2	2	99
BOULDER	Small	256	362	1		1	1	100
	Small	362	512					100
	Medium	512	1024					100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048					100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048					100
			Total	**50**	**50**	**100**	**100**	**100**

Reachwide	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	Silt/Clay
D_{35} =	0.25
D_{50} =	4.0
D_{84} =	80.3
D_{95} =	151.8
D_{100} =	362.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

UT1, Cross Section 10

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Riffle 100-Count	Summary	
		min	max		Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062	3	3	3
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			3
	Fine	0.125	0.250	2	2	5
	Medium	0.25	0.50	2	2	7
	Coarse	0.5	1.0			7
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0			7
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8	3	3	10
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0	6	6	16
	Fine	4.0	5.6			16
	Fine	5.6	8.0			16
	Medium	8.0	11.0	10	10	26
	Medium	11.0	16.0	4	4	30
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	6	6	36
	Coarse	22.6	32	13	13	49
	Very Coarse	32	45	12	12	61
	Very Coarse	45	64	4	4	65
COBBLE	Small	64	90	10	10	75
	Small	90	128	6	6	81
	Large	128	180	10	10	91
	Large	180	256	7	7	98
BOULDER	Small	256	362	2	2	100
	Small	362	512			100
	Medium	512	1024			100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048			100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048			100
			Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Cross Section 10	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	4.00
D_{35} =	21.34
D_{50} =	32.9
D_{84} =	141.8
D_{95} =	220.1
D_{100} =	362.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

SF4, Reachwide

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Particle Count			Reach Summary	
		min	max	Riffle	Pool	Total	Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062		12	12	12	12
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125					12
	Fine	0.125	0.250	4		4	4	16
	Medium	0.25	0.50					16
	Coarse	0.5	1.0		1	1	1	17
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0	6	5	11	11	28
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8					28
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0	4		4	4	32
	Fine	4.0	5.6	1	4	5	5	37
	Fine	5.6	8.0	2	2	4	4	41
	Medium	8.0	11.0		4	4	4	45
	Medium	11.0	16.0	1	5	6	6	51
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	3	5	8	8	59
	Coarse	22.6	32	2	6	8	8	67
	Very Coarse	32	45	1	6	7	7	74
	Very Coarse	45	64	3		3	3	77
COBBLE	Small	64	90	4		4	4	81
	Small	90	128	4		4	4	85
	Large	128	180	6		6	6	91
	Large	180	256	8		8	8	99
BOULDER	Small	256	362					99
	Small	362	512	1		1	1	100
	Medium	512	1024					100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048					100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048					100
			Total	**50**	**50**	**100**	**100**	**100**

Reachwide	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	0.25
D_{35} =	4.89
D_{50} =	15.0
D_{84} =	117.2
D_{95} =	214.7
D_{100} =	512.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

SF4, Cross Section 13

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Riffle 100-Count	Summary	
		min	max		Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062			0
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			0
	Fine	0.125	0.250			0
	Medium	0.25	0.50			0
	Coarse	0.5	1.0			0
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0			0
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			0
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0			0
	Fine	4.0	5.6	2	2	2
	Fine	5.6	8.0	4	4	6
	Medium	8.0	11.0	4	4	10
	Medium	11.0	16.0	6	6	16
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	4	4	20
	Coarse	22.6	32	14	14	34
	Very Coarse	32	45	13	13	47
	Very Coarse	45	64	7	7	54
COBBLE	Small	64	90	14	14	68
	Small	90	128	12	12	80
	Large	128	180	10	10	90
	Large	180	256	3	3	93
BOULDER	Small	256	362	6	6	99
	Small	362	512	1	1	100
	Medium	512	1024			100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048			100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048			100
			Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Cross Section 13	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	16.00
D_{35} =	32.85
D_{50} =	52.3
D_{84} =	146.7
D_{95} =	287.3
D_{100} =	512.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

SF4, Cross Section 15

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Riffle 100-Count	Summary	
		min	max		Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062	5	5	5
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			5
	Fine	0.125	0.250	1	1	6
	Medium	0.25	0.50	1	1	7
	Coarse	0.5	1.0	1	1	8
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0	2	2	10
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			10
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0			10
	Fine	4.0	5.6			10
	Fine	5.6	8.0			10
	Medium	8.0	11.0	2	2	12
	Medium	11.0	16.0	4	4	16
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	4	4	20
	Coarse	22.6	32	9	9	29
	Very Coarse	32	45	11	11	40
	Very Coarse	45	64	13	13	53
COBBLE	Small	64	90	14	14	67
	Small	90	128	9	9	76
	Large	128	180	12	12	88
	Large	180	256	12	12	100
BOULDER	Small	256	362			100
	Small	362	512			100
	Medium	512	1024			100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048			100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048			100
			Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Cross Section 15	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	16.00
D_{35} =	38.54
D_{50} =	59.0
D_{84} =	160.7
D_{95} =	221.1
D_{100} =	256.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

SF4A, Reachwide

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Particle Count			Reach Summary	
		min	max	Riffle	Pool	Total	Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062	5	14	19	19	19
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125					19
	Fine	0.125	0.250		10	10	10	29
	Medium	0.25	0.50	1	6	7	7	36
	Coarse	0.5	1.0					36
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0					36
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8					36
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0					36
	Fine	4.0	5.6	6		6	6	42
	Fine	5.6	8.0	4		4	4	46
	Medium	8.0	11.0		1	1	1	47
	Medium	11.0	16.0		2	2	2	49
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	4	3	7	7	56
	Coarse	22.6	32	2	1	3	3	59
	Very Coarse	32	45	10	1	11	11	70
	Very Coarse	45	64	10	4	14	14	84
COBBLE	Small	64	90	2	4	6	6	90
	Small	90	128	4	4	8	8	98
	Large	128	180	2		2	2	100
	Large	180	256					100
BOULDER	Small	256	362					100
	Small	362	512					100
	Medium	512	1024					100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048					100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048					100
			Total	**50**	**50**	**100**	**100**	**100**

Reachwide	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	Silt/Clay
D_{35} =	0.45
D_{50} =	16.8
D_{84} =	64.0
D_{95} =	112.2
D_{100} =	180.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

SF4A, Cross Section 16

Particle Class		Diameter (mm) min	Diameter (mm) max	Riffle 100-Count	Summary: Class Percentage	Summary: Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062	4	4	4
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			4
	Fine	0.125	0.250			4
	Medium	0.25	0.50			4
	Coarse	0.5	1.0			4
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0	2	2	6
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			6
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0	2	2	8
	Fine	4.0	5.6	5	5	13
	Fine	5.6	8.0	6	6	19
	Medium	8.0	11.0	8	8	27
	Medium	11.0	16.0	14	14	41
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	13	14	55
	Coarse	22.6	32	12	12	67
	Very Coarse	32	45	9	9	76
	Very Coarse	45	64	10	10	86
COBBLE	Small	64	90	7	7	93
	Small	90	128	5	5	98
	Large	128	180	2	2	100
	Large	180	256			100
BOULDER	Small	256	362			100
	Small	362	512			100
	Medium	512	1024			100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048			100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048			100
			Total	**99**	**101**	**100**

Cross Section 16	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	6.68
D_{35} =	13.61
D_{50} =	20.0
D_{84} =	59.7
D_{95} =	103.7
D_{100} =	180.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

SF4A, Cross Section 17

Particle Class		Diameter (mm)		Riffle 100-Count	Summary	
		min	max		Class Percentage	Percent Cumulative
SILT/CLAY	Silt/Clay	0.000	0.062	3	3	3
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			3
	Fine	0.125	0.250	4	4	7
	Medium	0.25	0.50			7
	Coarse	0.5	1.0	3	3	10
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0			10
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			10
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0			10
	Fine	4.0	5.6			10
	Fine	5.6	8.0	1	1	11
	Medium	8.0	11.0	7	7	18
	Medium	11.0	16.0	9	9	27
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	10	10	37
	Coarse	22.6	32	12	12	49
	Very Coarse	32	45	11	11	60
	Very Coarse	45	64	7	7	67
COBBLE	Small	64	90	8	8	75
	Small	90	128	10	10	85
	Large	128	180	6	6	91
	Large	180	256	7	7	98
BOULDER	Small	256	362	2	2	100
	Small	362	512			100
	Medium	512	1024			100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048			100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048			100
			Total	**100**	**100**	**100**

Cross Section 17	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	10.04
D_{35} =	21.09
D_{50} =	33.0
D_{84} =	123.6
D_{95} =	220.1
D_{100} =	362.0





APPENDIX 5. Hydrology Summary Data and Plots

Table 13. Verification of Bankfull Events

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Reach	Date of Data Collection	Approximate Date of Occurrence	Method
SF1	5/8/2016	3/28/2016	Crest Gage/Visual (Rack Lines)
	11/15/2016	10/9/2016	
UT2	11/15/2016	10/9/2016	
SF3	5/8/2016	3/28/2016	
	11/15/2016	10/9/2016	
UT1	5/8/2016	3/28/2016	
	11/15/2016	10/9/2016	
SF4	5/8/2016	3/28/2016	
	11/15/2016	10/9/2016	
SF4A	5/8/2016	3/28/2016	
	11/15/2016	10/9/2016	

Table 14. Wetland Gage Attainment Summary

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 4 -2016

Summary of Groundwater Gage Results for Years 1 through 7							
Gage	Success Criteria Achieved/Max Consecutive Days During Growing Season (Percentage)						
	Year 1 (2013)	Year 2 (2014)	Year 3 (2015)	Year 4 (2016)	Year 5 (2017)	Year 6 (2018)	Year 7 (2019)
1	Yes/44.5 Days (20.6 %)	Yes/35.5 Days (16.4 %)	Yes/65 Days (27.1%)	Yes/45 Days (36.7 %)			
2	Yes/51.5 Days (23.8 %)	Yes/38.5 Days (17.8 %)	Yes/59 Days (24.6%)	No/13 Days (5.3 %)			
3	Yes/23.5 Days (10.9 %)	Yes/31.5 Days (14.6 %)	Yes/29 Days (12.1%)	Yes/19 Days (7.8 %)			
4	Yes/19.5 Days (9.0 %)	Yes/31.5 Days (14.6 %)	Yes/59 Days (24.6%)	Yes/19 Days (7.8 %)			
5	Yes/25 Days (11.6 %)	Yes/32.5 Days (15.0 %)	Yes/65 Days (27.1%)	Yes/47 Days (19.2 %)			
6	Yes/22.5 Days (10.4 %)	Yes/21 Days (9.7 %)	Yes/28 Days (11.7%)	No/12 Days (4.9 %)			
7	Yes/44.5 Days (20.6 %)	Yes/31.5 Days (14.6 %)	Yes/32 Days (13.3%)	Yes/38 Days (15.5 %)			
8	Yes/22 Days (10.2 %)	Yes/23 Days (14.6 %)	Yes/61 Days (25.4%)	Yes/23 Days (9.4 %)			
9	Yes/98 Days (45.4 %)	Yes/41.5 Days (10.6 %)	Yes/68 Days (28.3%)	Yes/49 Days (20 %)			
10	Yes/96.5 Days (44.7 %)	Yes/36 Days (16.7 %)	Yes/67 Days (27.9%)	Yes/23Days (9.4 %)			
11	Yes/66 Days (30.6 %)	Yes/40.5 Days (18.8 %)	Yes/61 Days (25.4%)	Yes/38 Days (15.5 %)			
12	Yes/23 Days (10.6 %)	Yes/32.5 Days (15.0 %)	Yes/28 Days (11.7%)	No/9 Days (3.7 %)			
13	Yes/22 Days (10.2 %)	No/12.5 Days (5.8 %)	Yes/27 Days (11.3%)	No/10 Days (4.1 %)			
14	Yes/21 Days (9.7 %)	Yes/32 Days (14.8 %)	Yes/29 Days (12.1%)	No/16 Days (6.5 %)			
15	Yes/163 Days (75.5 %)	Yes/57 Days (26.4 %)	Yes/80 Days (33.3%)	Yes/104 Days (42.4 %)			

* NRCS WETS data was used to determine the growing season for monitorg years 1 and 2. After discussions with the US Army Corps of Engineers, on-site soil temperature probe data is being used to determine the beginning of the growing season.

Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland Harris Site; RW1



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland Harris Site; RW2



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland Harris Site; NRW1



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland Harris Site; RW2



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland Harris Site; RW3



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland Harris Site; RW3



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland Harris Site; RW3



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland Harris Site; RW3



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland Harris Site; NRW2



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland RW4



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland RW4



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland RW4



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland RW4



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland RW4



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland RW4



Monthly Rainfall Data

Underwood Mitigation Site (NCDMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 -2016



[1] 2016 rainfall from USDA Station SILER CITY (317924)

[2] 30th and 70th percentile rainfall data collected from weather station Siler City 2 S, NC7924 (USDA, 2002).

Pre and Post Construction Groundwater Gage Comparison Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland RW1



Pre and Post Construction Groundwater Gage Comparison Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland RW2



Pre and Post Construction Groundwater Gage Comparison Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland RW4



Pre and Post Construction Groundwater Gage Comparison Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 4 - 2016

Wetland RW4