MONITORING YEAR 5 ANNUAL REPORT

FINAL

UNDERWOOD MITIGATION SITE

Chatham County, NC
NCDEQ Contract 003268
DMS Project Number 94641

Data Collection Period: March 2017 - November 2017
Draft Submission Date: December 5, 2017
Final Submission Date: January 5, 2018

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 9,190 linear feet (lf) of stream and restore, enhance, and create 13.63 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) to 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 Underwood Mitigation Site; hereafter referred to as the Site, provides 6,752 Stream Mitigation Units (SMUs) and 8.90 Wetland Mitigation Units (WMUs).

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 included 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 provided 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 9,190 lf of perennial and intermittent stream channel, and restoring, enhancing, and creating 13.63 ac 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 construction was 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 5 (MY5) monitoring and site visits were completed between March and November 2017 to assess the conditions of the project. Overall, the Site has met the required vegetation and stream success criteria for MY5. The overall average planted stem density of 428 stems per acre is greater than the 260 stems per acre density required for MY5. All restored and enhanced streams are stable and functioning as designed. The Site has met the MY5 hydrology success criteria for bankfull events. Unlike previous years where the majority of groundwater wells met success criteria, only four of fifteen groundwater wells met success criteria during MY5. This trend is consistent with other piedmont and coastal plain wetland sites in 2017.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

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 1,504 acres (1.64 square miles) and 3,362 acres (5.25 square miles) respectively. The Site provides 6,752 Stream Mitigation Units (SMUs) and 8.9 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 9,190 linear feet (lf) of perennial and intermittent stream channel and restoring, enhancing, and creating 13.63 acres (ac) 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-c.

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-c 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 2011 (Wildlands, 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 March 2013. Annual monitoring has been 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 5 Data Assessment

Annual monitoring and quarterly site visits were conducted during MY5 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 210 planted stems per acre at the end of MY7. The interim measure of vegetative success for the Site will be the survival of at least 260 stems per acre at the end of MY5.

The MY5 vegetative survey was completed in August 2017. The 2017 annual vegetation monitoring resulted in an average planted stem density of 428 stems per acre, which is greater than the final

requirement of 260 planted stems per acre and approximately 40% less than the baseline density of 712 stems per acre. There was an average of 10 planted stems per plot compared to 19 stems per plot during MY0. While the Site is on track to meet the final 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, 19, 39, and 40 met the success criteria. Vegetation plot 23 falls below the vegetation success criteria, even when volunteers are considered. This plot is in a low, wet area that has dense herbaceous cover which has resulted in low tree establishment in this area.

An abundance of green ash volunteers have been observed along portions of SF3, SF4, SF4A and in the wetland restoration areas. These volunteers are not competing with the planted trees and are further promoting the desired vegetative community at the Site. They are shading out herbaceous competition and creating a shaded forest floor. The green ash volunteers will be observed in subsequent monitoring years to assure they are not out competing planted tree species. 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 MY5, vegetation plot 23 was observed to have a low stem density due to frequent standing water. As mentioned above in section 1.2.1, this isolated area (0.08 acres) is located in a low spot with dense herbaceous cover. Even though trees have not become well established in this area, no remedial actions are recommended at this time due the small size. This area is shown on the CCPV maps (Figures 3.0-3.3 in Appendix 2).

1.2.3 Stream Assessment

Morphological surveys for MY5 were conducted in March 2017. All streams within the Site are stable with little to no erosion and have met the success criteria for MY5. 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 illustrate 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 at or very near to 1.0 for the restoration reaches.

Pattern data was required in MY5 only if there were indicators from the profile or dimensions that significant geomorphic adjustments had occurred. No changes were observed during MY5 that indicated a change in the radius of curvature or channel belt width.

1.2.4 Stream Areas of Concern

During MY5 two beaver dams were located on SF3 during different times of the year. The beaver dams caused backwater, sediment build up in constructed riffles, and loss of some plant species on the stream banks due to girdling. Details regarding beaver and dam removal is discussed further 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 MY5, 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 during multiple monitoring years therefore meeting the hydrology success criteria. 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 provided an indication of groundwater hydrology 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 were 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 MY5, the beginning of the growing season was extended by 31 days (from April 1 to March 1) based on data from the soil temperature probes. Due to a malfunction of the onsite rain gage, precipitation data was collected from an off-site USDA gage, SILER CITY 317924 and is shown on groundwater hydrology plots.

All monitoring gages were downloaded 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. Four of fifteen groundwater gages met the annual wetland hydrology success criteria for MY5. Groundwater well ten malfunctioned during MY5 and the data was inconclusive. Of the four wells that met wetland criteria, three were located in wetland creation areas and one was in a wetland enhancement area. None of the wells in wetland restoration areas met wetland criteria. Wildlands believes that abnormally low rainfall in the late winter and spring of 2017 was the main reason eleven of the groundwater wells did not meet the wetland success criteria for MY5. Monthly rain totals were compared to 30th and 70th percentile rainfall data from USDA weather station: Siler City 2S, NC7924.

During MY5, February had a total of 0.96 inches of rain, March had 2.20 inches, and April had 2.34 inches up to a large rain even that occurred on April 25th. These monthly rainfall totals are well below normal when compared to the 30th percentile (Appendix 5). The 30th percentile for February is 2.55 inches, which is almost three times the amount of rain received in 2017. For March, the 30th percentile is 3.17 inches of rain, which is approximately one and a half times the amount of rain that fell during March 2017. Assuming an even rainfall distribution across the month of April, the 30th percentile should be approximately 1.78 inches which is approximately the actual rainfall in 2017. Due to these drier than normal months, groundwater levels dropped from at or near the ground surface to below the 12 inch threshold in February compared to May in previous years with normal rainfall. In these previous years all groundwater gages have easily met wetland success criteria.

Along with below normal rainfall in 2017, rainfall patterns were atypical with periodic large events followed by extended periods of no rain. April had above normal rainfall with 5.47 inches, however 3.0 inches fell during one storm on April 25th. This large event occurred near the end of April after several months of below normal rainfall. When conditions are dry and large rainfall events occur, runoff tends to be high relative to infiltration (Winter 1998). During this crucial period for piedmont wetlands, rainfall was significantly below normal and did not allow the groundwater table to recharge from a dry 2016. This rainfall pattern continued throughout most of 2017.

Groundwater wells 1 and 11 are good examples of how rainfall affected groundwater levels during 2017. Both of these wells met wetland success criteria during the previous four years of monitoring. During MY5 both wells had groundwater within a few inches of the surface during January, however in February groundwater levels fell near the 12 inch threshold for wetland success criteria. With below normal rainfall in February, March, and most of April groundwater levels fell below 12 inches, except during a few large rain events. This pattern continued for most of 2017 and is the reason eleven groundwater wells did not meet wetland success criteria. The reference well displayed a similar groundwater pattern as wells 1 and 11. Along with below normal rainfall, 2017 had above average ambient temperatures in January and February, which increased evaporation exacerbating the problem. Refer to Appendix 2 for the groundwater gage locations and Appendix 5 for groundwater hydrology data and plots.

After multiple field observations Wildlands adjusted wetland boundaries for wetland RW1 and RW2 creation zones, based on hydrology, soils, topography, and vegetation during MY5. Hydric soils were not forming in a portion of these wetland areas, and it was clear they weren't wet from field observations. Therefore, these areas were removed from wetland credit and wetland mitigation credits were updated in Table 1 as were Figures 2a-c and 3.0-3.3.

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

The USDA was contracted to trap beaver from the Site during MY5. Two beavers were successfully removed in March and one in May from SF3. Live stakes along the banks of SF3, mainly black willow, were gnawed down by beaver. These live stakes are expected to resprout, therefore no supplemental planting of live stakes is expected. Two beaver dams were removed from SF3, one near the middle of the restoration reach and one near the lower end of the reach. These dams are shown on the CCPV maps (Figures 3.0-3.3). Wildlands will make frequent site visits to make sure beaver activity is not a problem in the future and will continue to contract the USDA to remove beaver as necessary.

Sporadic areas of minor erosion were repaired along the outer boundary of wetland RW4 creation zone. Runoff from the agricultural field had caused some minor rilling. These areas were graded, matted, and seeded to prevent future erosion.

1.3 Monitoring Year 5 Summary

Overall the average planted stem density for the Site is on track to meeting the MY5 success criteria; however, 6 individual vegetation plots out of 42 did not meet the MY5 success criteria as noted in the Integrated Current Condition Plan View. When volunteer stems are counted in these six plots, all but one met MY5 success criteria. All streams on the Site are stable and functioning as designed. All streams have experienced multiple documented bankfull events, therefore, the MY5 stream hydrology attainment requirement has been met for the Site. Unlike previous years where the majority of groundwater wells met success criteria, only four of fifteen groundwater wells have met success criteria during MY5. This trend is consistent with other piedmont and coastal plain wetland sites in 2017. Beaver presence was noted onsite and successful removal of beaver and dams was completed.

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.

Winter, Thomas C., Harvey, Judson W., Franke, O. Lehn, Alley, William M. 1998. Ground Water and Surface Water: A Single Source.

APPENDIX 1. General Tables and Figures



WILDLANDS ENGINEERING

0 1 2 Miles

N

Figure 1 Project Vicinity Map
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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 5 - 2017

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 5 - 2017

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 5 - 2017

Chatham County, NC

Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Credits
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Mitigation Credits									
	Stream		Riparian Wetland		Non-Riparian Wetland		Buffer	Nitrogen Nutrient Offset	Phosphorous Nutrient Offset
Type	R	RE	R	RE	R	RE			
Totals	6,752		7.83		1.07		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+78	773	Priority 1	Restoration	878	1:1	878
SF2	300+00-303+02	302	N/A	Enhancement Level II	302	2.5:1	121
SF3	400+00-404+87 405+08-405+34	532	N/A	Enhancement Level II	513	2.5:1	205
	405+34-419+84	1,499	Priority 1	Restoration	1,450	1:1	1,450
	419+84-421+37	152	N/A	Enhancement Level I	153	1.5:1	102
SF4	800+00-814+24	1,450	Priority 1	Restoration	1,424	1:1	1,424
SF4A	906+09-908+68	0	Priority 1	Restoration	259	1:1	259
	900+00-906+09	609	N/A	Enhancement Level I	609	1.5:1	406
UT1	500+00-509+73 510+30-514+63	1,463	N/A	Enhancement Level II	1,406	2.5:1	562
	514+63-520+54	452	Priority 1	Restoration	591	1:1	591
UT1A	700+00-705+24	524	N/A	Enhancement Level II	524	2.5:1	210
UT1B	600+00-606+60	660	N/A	Enhancement Level II	660	2.5:1	264
UT2	200+00-204+21	421	N/A	Enhancement Level I	421	1.5:1	281
Wetlands							
RW1	N/A	1.25	N/A	Restoration	0.98	1:1	0.98
RW2	N/A	0.45	N/A	Creation	0.23	3:1	0.08
		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	4,602	5.70	-	0.75	-	-
Enhancement		-	-	0.34	-	-
Enhancement I	1,183					
Enhancement II	3,405					
Creation		6.39	-	0.45		
Preservation	-	-	-	-		-
High Quality Preservation	-	-	-	-		-

* Credit calculations were originally calculated along the as-built thalweg and updated to be calculated along stream centerlines for Monitoring Year 5 after discusions with NC IRT.
** Wetlands RW1 and RW2 credit calculation were updated for Monitoring Year 5 based on soils, topography, and vegetation.
*** Wetland credits were reduced from as-built because stream channels were calculated as part of the wetland boundaries in the Mitigation Plan.

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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	Stream Survey	August 2013	November 2013
	Vegetation Survey	September 2013	
Year 2 Monitoring	Stream Survey	May 2014	December 2014
	Vegetation Survey	May 2014	
Year 3 Monitoring	Stream Survey	April 2015	December 2015
	Vegetation Survey	June 2015	
Beaver Removal			2015
Year 4 Monitoring	Stream Survey	May 2016	December 2016
	Vegetation Survey	June 2016	
Supplemental Planting			January 2016
Beaver Removal			2016
Stream Repair on SF4A			March 2016
Year 5 Monitoring	Stream Survey	March 2017	December 2017
	Vegetation Survey	August 2017	
Beaver Removal			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 5 - 2017

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 5 - 2017

Project Information									
Project Name	Underwood Mitigation Site								
County	Chatham County								
Project Area (acres)	37.8 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	878	302	2,116	1,997	524	660	421	1,424	868
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 5 - 2017
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 5 - 2017

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 5 - 2017

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 5 - 2017

Chatham County, NC

Table 5a. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment Table

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Harris Site; SF1 (878 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 5 - 2017

Harris Site; UT2 (421 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 5 - 2017

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 5 - 2017

Harris Site; SF3 (2,116 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 5 - 2017

Harris Site; UT1 (1,997 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 5 - 2017

Harris Site; UT1A & UT1B (1,184 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 5 - 2017

Lindley Site; SF4 (1,424 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 5 - 2017

Lindley Site; SF4A (868 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 5 - 2017

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	1	0.08	0.2%
		Total	**1**	**0.08**	**0.2%**
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 *(03/21/2017)*

Photo Point 1 – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

Photo Point 2 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*

Photo Point 2 – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

Photo Point 3 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*

Photo Point 3 – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

	
Photo Point 4 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 4** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 5 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 5** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 6 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 6** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

	
Photo Point 7 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 7** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 8 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 8** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 9 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 9** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

	
Photo Point 10 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 10** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 11 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 11** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 12 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 12** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

	
Photo Point 13 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 13** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 14 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 14** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 15 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 15** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

	
Photo Point 16 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 16** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 17 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 17** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 18 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 18** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

	
Photo Point 19 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 19** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 20 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 20** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 21 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 21** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

	
Photo Point 22 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 22** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 23 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 23** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 24 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 24** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

	
Photo Point 25 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 25** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 26 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 26** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 27 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 27** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

	
Photo Point 28 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 28** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 29 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 29** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 30 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 30** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

	
Photo Point 31 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 31** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 34 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 34** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 35 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 35** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

	
Photo Point 36 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 36** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 37 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 37** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 38 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 38** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

	
Photo Point 39 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 39** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

Stream Photographs

Underwood (Lindley Site)

Photo Point 40 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*

Photo Point 40 – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

Photo Point 41 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*

Photo Point 41 – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

Photo Point 42 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*

Photo Point 42 – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

	
Photo Point 43 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 43** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 44 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 44** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 45 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 45** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

	
Photo Point 46 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 46** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 47 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 47** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*
	
Photo Point 48 – looking upstream *(03/21/2017)*	**Photo Point 48** – looking downstream *(03/21/2017)*

Vegetation Photographs

Underwood (Harris Site)

Vegetation Plot 1 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 2 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 3 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 4 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 5 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 6 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 7 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 8 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 9 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 10 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 11 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 12 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 13 (08/02/2017)

Vegetation Plot 14 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 15 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 16 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 17 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 18 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 19 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 20 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 21 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 22 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 23 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 24 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 25 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 26 *(08/02/2017)*



Vegetation Plot 27 *(08/02/2017)*



Vegetation Plot 28 *(08/02/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 29 (*08/02/2017*)

Vegetation Photographs

Underwood (Lindley Site)

Vegetation Plot 30 *(08/10/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 31 *(08/10/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 32 *(08/10/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 33 *(08/10/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 34 *(08/10/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 35 *(08/10/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 36 *(08/10/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 37 *(08/10/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 38 *(08/10/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 39 *(08/10/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 40 *(08/10/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 41 *(08/10/2017)*

Vegetation Plot 42 *(08/10/2017)*

APPENDIX 3. Vegetation Plot Data

Table 7. Vegetation Plot Criteria Attainment
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Harris Site		
Plot	**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	86%
16	Y	
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	**Success Criteria Met (Y/N)**	**Tract Mean**
30	Y	
31	Y	
32	Y	
33	Y	
34	Y	
35	Y	
36	Y	85%
37	Y	
38	Y	
39	N	
40	N	
41	Y	
42	Y	

Table 8. CVS Vegetation Table - Metadata
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Database name	Underwood MY5 cvs-eep-entrytool-v2.3.1.mdb
Database location	F:\Projects\005-02125 Underwood\Monitoring\Monitoring Year 5\Vegetation Assessment
Computer name	CAROLYN
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 5 - 2017

			Current Plot Data (MY5 2017)																	
			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 negundo	boxelder	Tree																		
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																		
Baccharis	baccharis	Shrub																		
Baccharis halimifolia	eastern baccharis	Shrub																		
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2				1	1	1			
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Tree																1	1	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
Gleditsia triacanthos	honeylocust	Tree																		
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																		
Juniperus virginiana	eastern redcedar	Tree																		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree						4									20			10
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree							1	1	1									
Nyssa sylvatica	blackgum	Tree																		
Pinus	pine	Tree																		
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	1	1	1	5	5	5	3	3	3	4	4	4	7	7	7	4	4	4
Populus deltoides	eastern cottonwood	Tree																		
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 nigra	black willow	Tree																		13
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub																		
Ulmus	elm	Tree																		
		Stem count	15	15	15	16	16	20	14	14	14	12	12	12	14	14	34	10	10	35
		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	5	5	6	6	6	6	4	4	4	4	4	5	4	4	7
		Stems per ACRE	607	607	607	647	647	809	567	567	567	486	486	486	567	567	1,376	405	405	1,416

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 5 - 2017

			Current Plot Data (MY5 2017)																	
			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 negundo	boxelder	Tree																		
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																		
Baccharis	baccharis	Shrub																		
Baccharis halimifolia	eastern baccharis	Shrub																		
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						
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	4	4	4	1	1	2			1	3	3	5	3	3	5			115
Gleditsia triacanthos	honeylocust	Tree																		
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																		
Juniperus virginiana	eastern redcedar	Tree									1						1			
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree									25						1			
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree																		
Nyssa sylvatica	blackgum	Tree									4									
Pinus	pine	Tree																		
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	1	1	1	4	4	4	1	1	1				3	3	3	3	3	43
Populus deltoides	eastern cottonwood	Tree																		
Quercus	oak	Tree																		
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree	2	2	3	2	2	3				1	1	1	4	4	5			
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree							1	1	1				1	1	1			
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree							6	6	7				2	2	2	1	1	1
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	Tree												1						
Salix nigra	black willow	Tree																		
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub								1	1		4	4						2
Ulmus	elm	Tree															8			
		Stem count	7	7	8	9	9	11	10	11	43	5	10	13	14	14	27	6	6	163
		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	9	3	5	6	6	6	9	3	3	5
		Stems per ACRE	283	283	324	364	364	445	405	445	1,740	202	405	526	567	567	1,093	243	243	6,596

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 5 - 2017

			Current Plot Data (MY5 2017)																	
			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 negundo	boxelder	Tree																		
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																		
Baccharis	baccharis	Shrub																		
Baccharis halimifolia	eastern baccharis	Shrub																		
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree							6	6	6	3	3	4						
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Tree																		
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub											2	2						
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree			70	1	1	1	3	3	3							3	3	3
Gleditsia triacanthos	honeylocust	Tree																		
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																		7
Juniperus virginiana	eastern redcedar	Tree																		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree			27			40						13						
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree													4	4	5	1	1	1
Nyssa sylvatica	blackgum	Tree																		
Pinus	pine	Tree																		
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	16	16	16	5	5	5	4	4	4	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2
Populus deltoides	eastern cottonwood	Tree																		
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				3	3	3			
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree				3	3	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	4	4	4	1	1	1
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	Tree																		
Salix nigra	black willow	Tree												1						
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub								1	1		4	10						
Ulmus	elm	Tree																		
		Stem count	16	16	113	13	13	53	15	16	16	7	13	34	12	12	13	10	10	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	1	1	3	5	5	6	5	6	6	4	6	8	4	4	4	5	5	6
		Stems per ACRE	647	647	4,573	526	526	2,145	607	647	647	283	526	1,376	486	486	526	405	405	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 5 - 2017

			Current Plot Data (MY5 2017)																	
			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 negundo	boxelder	Tree																		
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																		
Baccharis	baccharis	Shrub																		5
Baccharis halimifolia	eastern baccharis	Shrub																		
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	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Gleditsia triacanthos	honeylocust	Tree						2						1						
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree			14			5												
Juniperus virginiana	eastern redcedar	Tree																		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree						2			10			1						
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree										1	1	1						
Nyssa sylvatica	blackgum	Tree																		
Pinus	pine	Tree																		
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	4	4	4	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	5	5	5
Populus deltoides	eastern cottonwood	Tree																		
Quercus	oak	Tree																		
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree				4	4	4	1	1	1	7	7	7						
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree				2	2	2	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																		
Salix nigra	black willow	Tree																		
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub																	2	2
Ulmus	elm	Tree			5															
		Stem count	5	5	24	8	8	17	8	8	18	15	15	17	5	5	5	10	12	22
		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	4	3	3	6	6	6	7	6	6	8	4	4	4	4	5	6
		Stems per ACRE	202	202	971	324	324	688	324	324	728	607	607	688	202	202	202	405	486	890

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 5 - 2017

			Current Plot Data (MY5 2017)																	
			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 negundo	boxelder	Tree																		
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																		
Baccharis	baccharis	Shrub																		
Baccharis halimifolia	eastern baccharis	Shrub																		
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree				1	1	1				1	1	1	8	8	8			
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Tree										1	1	1						
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub																		
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree				4	4	4	2	2	3	3	3	3	1	1	3	9	9	19
Gleditsia triacanthos	honeylocust	Tree																		
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																		
Juniperus virginiana	eastern redcedar	Tree																		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree																		8
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree				1	1	1	1	1	1									
Nyssa sylvatica	blackgum	Tree																		
Pinus	pine	Tree																		
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	5	5	6	3	3	3				1	1	1	7	7	7			
Populus deltoides	eastern cottonwood	Tree																		
Quercus	oak	Tree																		
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree	1	1	1	5	5	5	2	2	2							1	1	1
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree	4	4	4							3	3	3	1	1	1			1
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	Tree										1	1	1						
Salix nigra	black willow	Tree																		1
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub														2	2		1	1
Ulmus	elm	Tree															1			
		Stem count	12	12	13	16	16	16	7	7	8	11	11	11	19	21	24	12	13	33
		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	7	3	4	7
		Stems per ACRE	486	486	526	647	647	647	283	283	324	445	445	445	769	850	971	486	526	1,335

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 5 - 2017

			Current Plot Data (MY5 2017)																	
			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 negundo	boxelder	Tree			5						2						2			
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree																		
Baccharis	baccharis	Shrub																		
Baccharis halimifolia	eastern baccharis	Shrub									6									
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					3	3		1	1		2	2
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	2	2	19	4	4	44	3	3	14	4	4	19	1	1	16	3	3	18
Gleditsia triacanthos	honeylocust	Tree																		
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																		
Juniperus virginiana	eastern redcedar	Tree																		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree			10			20			5			5			20			10
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree																		
Nyssa sylvatica	blackgum	Tree																		
Pinus	pine	Tree												2						
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	1	1	1	4	4	4	7	7	17	4	4	19	7	7	7			2
Populus deltoides	eastern cottonwood	Tree												1						
Quercus	oak	Tree																		
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree																		1
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree	1	1	1	1	1	1				2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree							3	3	9	2	2	3				5	5	5
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	Tree																		
Salix nigra	black willow	Tree			15			5						1						1
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub		5	5		2	2					5	5					3	3
Ulmus	elm	Tree																		
		Stem count	8	14	61	9	12	77	14	14	54	12	20	60	11	12	49	12	17	46
		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	9	3	5	7	4	4	7	4	6	10	4	5	7	4	6	10
		Stems per ACRE	324	567	2,469	364	486	3,116	567	567	2,185	486	809	2,428	445	486	1,983	486	688	1,862

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 5 - 2017

			Current Plot Data (MY5 2017)																	
			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 negundo	boxelder	Tree												3						
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree									2									
Baccharis	baccharis	Shrub																		
Baccharis halimifolia	eastern baccharis	Shrub															5			5
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree				2	2	2	2	2	2				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			10	4	4	44	1	1	46			3			15			5
Gleditsia triacanthos	honeylocust	Tree																		
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree																		
Juniperus virginiana	eastern redcedar	Tree																		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree															5			5
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree																		
Nyssa sylvatica	blackgum	Tree																		
Pinus	pine	Tree																		2
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	6	3	3	8	1	1	21	2	2	27
Populus deltoides	eastern cottonwood	Tree																		
Quercus	oak	Tree																		
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree	5	5	5															
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree	3	3	3	1	1	1				2	2	2	4	4	4	1	1	1
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree													1	1	1	1	1	1
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	Tree																		
Salix nigra	black willow	Tree									4			4			5			
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub														3	3		1	1
Ulmus	elm	Tree																		
		Stem count	9	9	19	8	8	51	6	6	60	5	5	20	9	13	63	8	10	52
		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	4	4	4	4	3	3	5	2	2	5	4	6	10	4	6	10
		Stems per ACRE	364	364	769	324	324	2,064	243	243	2,428	202	202	809	364	526	2,550	324	405	2,104

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 5 - 2017

			Annual Means																	
			MY5 (2017)			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**	**PnoLS**	**P-all**	**T**
Acer negundo	boxelder	Tree			12															
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree			2			35			57			55						
Baccharis	baccharis	Shrub			5															
Baccharis halimifolia	eastern baccharis	Shrub			16															
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree	56	56	57	54	54	55	56	56	57	64	64	64	82	82	82	124	124	124
Carpinus caroliniana	American hornbeam	Tree	2	2	3	3	3	3												
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub		13	13		12	13		16	16		16	20	25	25	25	30	30	30
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	75	75	499	77	77	244	74	74	573	74	74	387	82	82	142	86	86	86
Gleditsia triacanthos	honeylocust	Tree			3															
Juglans nigra	black walnut	Tree			26									1						
Juniperus virginiana	eastern redcedar	Tree			2															
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree			241			32			170			92						
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree	9	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	15	15	16	20	20	20	35	35	35
Nyssa sylvatica	blackgum	Tree			4															
Pinus	pine	Tree			4															
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	131	131	255	133	133	149	140	140	221	143	143	193	144	144	204	145	145	145
Populus deltoides	eastern cottonwood	Tree			1															
Quercus	oak	Tree									2									
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree	54	54	58	56	56	56	61	61	61	62	62	62	71	71	71	87	87	87
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree	56	56	56	61	61	61	68	68	69	72	72	73	93	93	93	131	131	131
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree	60	60	69	66	66	66	67	67	72	69	69	69	72	72	72	64	64	64
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	Tree	1	1	2	1	1	2			2									
Salix nigra	black willow	Tree			50															
Salix sericea	silky willow	Shrub		34	42		33	43		37	60		37	66	39	39	39	38	38	38
Ulmus	elm	Tree			14															
		Stem count	444	491	1444	461	506	769	476	529	1370	499	552	1098	628	628	748	740	740	740
		size (ares)	42			42			42			42			42			42		
		size (ACRES)	1.04			1.04			1.04			1.04			1.04			1.04		
		Species count	9	11	24	9	11	13	7	9	13	7	9	12	9	9	9	9	9	9
		Stems per ACRE	428	473	1,391	444	488	741	459	510	1,320	481	532	1,058	605	605	721	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 5 - 2017

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																	
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 5 - 2017

Harris Site; SF3 and UT1

Parameter	Gage	Pre-Restoration Condition				Reference Reach Data				Design						As-Built/Baseline			
		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)	n/a	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)		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)	n/a					---		---		---		---		---		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)						---		---		---		---		---		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)	n/a	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)		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%	n/a																		
SC%/Sa%/G%/C%/B%/Be%																			
d16/d35/d50/d84/d95/d100		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)	n/a	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		---		---															
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 5 - 2017

Lindley Site; SF4 and SF4A

		Pre-Restoration Condition				Reference Reach Data				Design				As-Built/Baseline			
Parameter	**Gage**	**SF4**		**SF4A**		**Long Branch**		**UT to Cane Creek**		**SF4**		**SF4A**		**SF4**		**SF4A**	
		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 5 - 2017

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	7.8	11.7	13.9	10.9	10.4	11.3	11.2	15.0	19.4	15.7	14.2	15.2	15.0	16.6	18.6	17.4	16.9	16.5	15.9
Floodprone Width (ft)	50+	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	N/A	N/A	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	1.0	0.9	1.6	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	1.0	0.9
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	1.0	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.9	1.0	1.7	2.1	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.8	2.7	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.8	2.6	1.1	1.4	1.2	1.2	1.5	1.4
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	5.6	6.3	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.5	12.8	12.2	9.9	8.8	11.4	9.9	24.2	26.2	23.1	22.5	24.7	23.3	13.6	18.6	14.1	13.9	16.6	14.2
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	12.8	12.9	14.2	13.5	14.1	13.4	N/A	N/A	12.0	12.3	11.2	12.8	N/A	N/A	10.7	9.0	9.4	9.7	20.4	25.4	21.4	20.6	16.5	17.7
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	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	N/A	N/A	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	1.2	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	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	21.3	19.7	24.8	22.7	23.5	23.4	23.5	16.7	29.3	15.8	16.5	18.5	16.9	19.7	22.3	15.9	17.0	17.4	16.0
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.6	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.6
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.5	2.3	4.1	3.7	3.7	3.7	4.0	2.2	2.6	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.2	3.0	3.5	3.0	3.0	3.1	2.9
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	30.5	34.5	29.9	28.3	28.6	32.7	30.5	50.2	43.1	41.4	43.4	45.2	20.6	29.8	19.2	19.5	21.4	22.2	28.0	36.9	26.2	27.6	28.8	26.3
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	12.7	14.8	12.5	12.5	12.4	13.9	12.7	12.1	12.0	13.3	12.7	12.2	13.5	28.8	12.9	14.0	16.0	12.8	13.9	13.5	9.7	10.5	10.5	9.8
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	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	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	14.6	12.6	10.1	11.3	10.6	10.8	10.9	14.2	19.4	12.0	13.4	14.0	13.2	33.3	34.1	29.8	29.6	33.2	31.0
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	100+	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	N/A	N/A
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.2	1.1	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.8	1.3	0.9	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.2	2.2	2.1	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.4
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	1.8	2.3	1.8	1.7	1.9	1.8	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.6	1.5	2.6	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.4	4.9	4.7	4.9	4.8	4.9	5.0
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	19.0	27.0	15.5	16.2	18.1	15.6	10.5	9.5	9.5	8.1	9.7	8.9	17.7	17.0	14.6	15.0	17.4	15.7	74.4	72.2	70.7	71.7	72.5	74.5
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	13.3	21.6	14.4	14.6	12.2	13.6	15.1	10.7	13.4	13.8	11.9	13.4	11.3	22.1	10.0	12.0	11.2	11.1	14.9	16.2	12.5	12.2	15.2	12.9
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+	2.2+	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	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	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	25.7	38.7	44.4	45.4	47.6	45.7	40.7	27.6	27.3	26.2	28.3	29.2	28.5	23.7	17.3	13.9	14.9	17.3	16.8
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	1.8	2.9	1.9	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.1	2.2	1.9	2.0	2.1	1.9	1.9	1.8	0.9	1.6	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.6
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	3.0	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.1	4.3	4.6	5.0	5.0	5.7	5.5	3.2	3.0	3.2	3.1	3.5	3.2	2.3	2.8	3.0	3.1	3.4	3.0
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	49.5	49.0	49.7	51.8	54.3	49.5	70.6	78.1	82.2	86.0	96.0	89.8	51.2	53.8	53.9	53.3	56.6	51.5	20.4	27.1	25.2	25.5	30.3	26.2
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	15.1	14.6	13.6	16.0	14.8	13.4	21.2	25.3	25.1	26.4	21.8	18.4	14.9	13.8	12.8	15.0	15.1	15.8	27.5	11.1	7.7	8.7	9.9	10.8
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	N/A	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+	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	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	12.4	16.0	13.5	10.6	11.1	11.6	10.4												
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	200+	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A												
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.6	1.9	1.6	2.1	1.9												
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	2.1	2.1	2.4	2.3	2.6	2.5	2.8	3.4	3.0	2.7	3.3	2.8												
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	17.5	16.1	15.2	13.9	18.3	18.2	22.9	21.0	20.5	18.3	24.3	19.2												
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	11.0	11.5	10.7	9.5	7.1	8.5	11.1	8.6	5.4	6.7	5.5	5.6												
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	2.2+	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												

Table 12a. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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		7.8	
Floodprone Width (ft)	50+		50+		50+		50+		50+		50+	
Bankfull Mean Depth	0.7		0.7		0.6		0.6		0.6		0.6	
Bankfull Max Depth	1.0		1.1		1.0		0.9		0.9		1.0	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	5.6		6.3		4.8		4.6		4.8		4.5	
Width/Depth Ratio	12.8		12.9		14.2		13.5		14.1		13.4	
Entrenchment Ratio	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	
D50 (mm)	23.3		27.8		31.0		34.6		23.9		35.9	
Profile												
Riffle Length (ft)	11	36	13	38	11	37	13	37	13	38	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	0.0125	0.0428
Pool Length (ft)	16	34	15	30	15	33	18	36	13	29	16	29
Pool Max Depth (ft)	1.7		2.1		1.9		1.7		1.9		2.3	
Pool Spacing (ft)	37	61	36	59	37	59	41	64	35	62	37	58
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		C5	
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)	874		874		874		874		874		874	
Sinuosity (ft)	1.2		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		0.0103	
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)	0.0104		0.0108		0.0104		0.0099		0.0086		0.0111	
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		SC/0.25/11.0/109.5/172.5/512	
% of Reach with Eroding Banks			0%		0%		0%		0%		0%	

Table 12b. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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		15.9	
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+		200+		200+		200+		200+		200+	
Bankfull Mean Depth	0.8		0.9		0.8		0.8		1.0		0.9	
Bankfull Max Depth	1.1		1.4		1.2		1.2		1.5		1.4	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	13.6		18.6		14.1		13.9		16.6		14.2	
Width/Depth Ratio	20.4		25.4		21.4		20.6		16.5		17.7	
Entrenchment Ratio	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	
D50 (mm)	34.3		77.3		27.6		29.3		20.1		47.7	
Profile												
Riffle Length (ft)	7	25	3	24	4	13	4	27	4	16	4	18
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0040	0.1512	0.0045	0.0775	0.0117	0.0373	0.0098	0.0387	0.0049	0.0637	0.0031	0.0438
Pool Length (ft)	16	51	11	46	18	47	17	45	17	43	18	43
Pool Max Depth (ft)	2.7		2.7		2.6		2.3		2.3		2.7	
Pool Spacing (ft)	23	59	21	60	21	55	23	58	20	58	20	60
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		C5	
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)	418		418		418		418		418		418	
Sinuosity (ft)	1.0		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		0.0157	
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)	0.0145		0.0141		0.0141		0.0128		0.0133		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		SC/0.44/19.4/73.4/115.7/362	
% of Reach with Eroding Banks			0%		0%		0%		0%		0%	

Table 12c. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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	14.6	21.3
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+	200+	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	1.1	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	1.8	2.5
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	15.6	32.7
Width/Depth Ratio	12.7	13.5	14.8	28.8	12.5	14.4	12.5	14.6	12.2	16.0	12.8	13.9
Entrenchment Ratio	2.2+	2.2+	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	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	17.1	50.3
Profile												
Riffle Length (ft)	12	103	29	100	18	102	17	100	13	95	15	96
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0003	0.0169	0.0019	0.0129	0.0008	0.0131	0.0012	0.0128	0.0004	0.0188	0.0003	0.0197
Pool Length (ft)	23	100	45	74	21	72	19	78	22	77	14	76
Pool Max Depth (ft)	2.3	2.5	2.8	5.0	3.0	3.7	3.4		2.9		3.5	
Pool Spacing (ft)	53	166	50	151	42	156	41	155	42	153	39	173
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		C5	
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)	2,120		2,120		2,120		2,120		2,120		2,120	
Sinuosity (ft)	1.2		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		0.0042	
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)	0.0047		0.0047		0.0042		0.0043		0.0040		0.0042	
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		SC/0.35/7..8/82.0/149.6/256	
% of Reach with Eroding Banks			0%		0%		0%		0%		0%	

Table 12d. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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		10.9	
Floodprone Width (ft)	100+		100+		100+		100+		100+		100+	
Bankfull Mean Depth	0.8		0.9		0.8		0.8		0.9		0.8	
Bankfull Max Depth	1.5		1.6		1.5		1.4		1.6		1.5	
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	10.5		9.5		9.5		8.1		9.7		8.9	
Width/Depth Ratio	15.1		10.7		13.4		13.8		12		13	
Entrenchment Ratio	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	
D50 (mm)	21.1		40.8		39.3		33.9		32.9		32.9	
Profile												
Riffle Length (ft)	11	39	19	36	14	36	14	36	18	36	16	33
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0023	0.0185	0.0016	0.0258	0.0025	0.0407	0.0012	0.0299	0.0031	0.0218	0.0087	0.0203
Pool Length (ft)	20	80	18	51	25	53	23	52	23	48	22	51
Pool Max Depth (ft)	2.6		2.5		2.3		2.7		2.4		2.8	
Pool Spacing (ft)	58	76	39	76	43	73	52	77	52	82	50	84
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		C5	
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)	2,038		2,038		2,038		2,038		2,038		2,038	
Sinuosity (ft)	1.2		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		0.0079	
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)	0.0083		0.0058		0.0077		0.0091		0.0078		0.0057	
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		SC/1.88/7.2/42.9/98.7/180	
% of Reach with Eroding Banks			0%		0%		0%		0%		0%	

Table 12e. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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	25.7	28.5
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+		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	1.8	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	3.1	3.2
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	49.5	51.5
Width/Depth Ratio	14.9	15.1	13.8	14.6	12.8	13.6	15.0	16.0	14.8	15.1	13.4	15.8
Entrenchment Ratio	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	1.0	1.0
D50 (mm)	29.1	35.6	19.0	25.0	26.9	28.1	28.5	40.5	52.3	59.0	10.2	75.9
Profile												
Riffle Length (ft)	51	112	31	111	46	115	50	119	22	110	46	119
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0010	0.0098	0.0034	0.0119	0.0028	0.0075	0.0032	0.0072	0.0017	0.0185	0.0025	0.0132
Pool Length (ft)	54	123	27	169	26	123	24	135	28	122	24	130
Pool Max Depth (ft)	4.3	4.9	4.6	4.7	4.9	5.0	4.9		5.3		4.9	
Pool Spacing (ft)	146	210	151	211	150	210	138	221	106	236	140	227
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		C4	
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)	1,429		1,429		1,429		1,429		1,429		1,429	
Sinuosity (ft)	1.2		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		0.0030	
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)	0.0034		0.0034		0.0035		0.0031		0.0031		0.0040	
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		SC/11.71/35.4/120.7/ 174.0/2048	
% of Reach with Eroding Banks			0%		0%		0%		0%		0%	

Table 12f. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary
Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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	12.4	16.8
Floodprone Width (ft)	200+		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	1.5	1.6
Bankfull Max Depth	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.8	2.4	3.0	2.3	3.1	2.6	3.4	2.5	3.0
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	18.2	26.2
Width/Depth Ratio	11.0	27.5	9.0	11.5	7.7	10.7	8.7	9.5	7.1	9.9	8.5	10.8
Entrenchment Ratio	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	1.0	1.0
D50 (mm)	9.4	12.7	4.4	17.1	31.4	32	17	25.1	20	33	30.2	32.6
Profile												
Riffle Length (ft)	41	79	6	75	5	52	5	67	4	30	8	62
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0001	0.0210	0.0177	0.0321	0.0063	0.0577	0.0004	0.0483	0.0087	0.0554	0.0066	0.0809
Pool Length (ft)	28	79	15	46	16	68	16	61	23	82	20	49
Pool Max Depth (ft)	2.1	2.8	2.8	3.8	3.0		3.8		4.1		4.0	
Pool Spacing (ft)	71	110	32	111	35	104	35	109	46	107	37	112
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		C5	
Channel Thalweg Length (ft)	866		866		866		866		866		866	
Sinuosity (ft)	1.1		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		0.0059	
Bankfull Slope (ft/ft)	0.0067		0.0077		0.0066		0.0067		0.0067		0.0071	
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		0.16/5.24/14.1/74.5/137.0/256	
% of Reach with Eroding Banks			43%		43%		50%		0%		0%	

Longitudinal Profile Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Harris Site; SF1



Longitudinal Profile Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Harris Site; SF3



Longitudinal Profile Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Lindley Site; SF4

Longitudinal Profile Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Lindley Site; SF4A



Longitudinal Profile Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Harris Site; UT1



Longitudinal Profile Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Harris Site; UT2



Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 1 - SF1



Bankfull Dimensions	
4.5	x-section area (ft.sq.)
7.8	width (ft)
0.6	mean depth (ft)
1.0	max depth (ft)
8.1	wetted parimeter (ft)
0.6	hyd radi (ft)
13.4	width-depth ratio
50.0	W flood prone area (ft)
6.4	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 2 - SF1



Bankfull Dimensions	
9.9	x-section area (ft.sq.)
11.2	width (ft)
0.9	mean depth (ft)
1.8	max depth (ft)
12.3	wetted parimeter (ft)
0.8	hyd radi (ft)
12.8	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 3 - UT2



Bankfull Dimensions	
23.3	x-section area (ft.sq.)
15.0	width (ft)
1.6	mean depth (ft)
2.6	max depth (ft)
17.2	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.4	hyd radi (ft)
9.7	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 4 - UT2



Bankfull Dimensions	
14.2	x-section area (ft.sq.)
15.9	width (ft)
0.9	mean depth (ft)
1.4	max depth (ft)
16.5	wetted parimeter (ft)
0.9	hyd radi (ft)
17.7	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
12.6	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017
Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 5 - SF3



Bankfull Dimensions	
32.7	x-section area (ft.sq.)
21.3	width (ft)
1.5	mean depth (ft)
2.5	max depth (ft)
22.2	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.5	hyd radi (ft)
13.9	width-depth ratio
100.0	W flood prone area (ft)
4.7	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 6 - SF3



Bankfull Dimensions	
45.2	x-section area (ft.sq.)
23.5	width (ft)
1.9	mean depth (ft)
4.0	max depth (ft)
25.7	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.8	hyd radi (ft)
12.2	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 7 - SF3



Bankfull Dimensions	
22.2	x-section area (ft.sq.)
16.9	width (ft)
1.3	mean depth (ft)
2.2	max depth (ft)
17.6	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.3	hyd radi (ft)
12.8	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
11.9	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 03/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 8 - SF3



Bankfull Dimensions	
26.3	x-section area (ft.sq.)
16.0	width (ft)
1.6	mean depth (ft)
2.9	max depth (ft)
18.2	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.4	hyd radi (ft)
9.8	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 9 - SF3



Bankfull Dimensions	
15.6	x-section area (ft.sq.)
14.6	width (ft)
1.1	mean depth (ft)
1.8	max depth (ft)
15.4	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.0	hyd radi (ft)
13.6	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
13.7	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017
Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 10 - UT1



Bankfull Dimensions	
8.9	x-section area (ft.sq.)
10.9	width (ft)
0.8	mean depth (ft)
1.5	max depth (ft)
12.1	wetted parimeter (ft)
0.7	hyd radi (ft)
13.4	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
18.3	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 11 - UT1



Bankfull Dimensions	
15.7	x-section area (ft.sq.)
13.2	width (ft)
1.2	mean depth (ft)
2.4	max depth (ft)
15.0	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.0	hyd radi (ft)
11.1	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 12 - SF4



Bankfull Dimensions	
74.5	x-section area (ft.sq.)
31.0	width (ft)
2.4	mean depth (ft)
5.0	max depth (ft)
35.4	wetted parimeter (ft)
2.1	hyd radi (ft)
12.9	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 13 - SF4



Bankfull Dimensions	
49.5	x-section area (ft.sq.)
25.7	width (ft)
1.9	mean depth (ft)
3.1	max depth (ft)
27.0	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.8	hyd radi (ft)
13.4	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
7.8	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 14 - SF4



Bankfull Dimensions	
89.8	x-section area (ft.sq.)
40.7	width (ft)
2.2	mean depth (ft)
5.5	max depth (ft)
44.0	wetted parimeter (ft)
2.0	hyd radi (ft)
18.4	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 15 - SF4



Bankfull Dimensions	
51.5	x-section area (ft.sq.)
28.5	width (ft)
1.8	mean depth (ft)
3.2	max depth (ft)
29.4	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.8	hyd radi (ft)
15.8	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
7.0	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 16 - SF4A



Bankfull Dimensions	
26.2	x-section area (ft.sq.)
16.8	width (ft)
1.6	mean depth (ft)
3.0	max depth (ft)
18.7	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.4	hyd radi (ft)
10.8	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
11.9	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 17 - SF4A



Bankfull Dimensions	
18.2	x-section area (ft.sq.)
12.4	width (ft)
1.5	mean depth (ft)
2.5	max depth (ft)
13.7	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.3	hyd radi (ft)
8.5	width-depth ratio
200.0	W flood prone area (ft)
16.1	entrenchment ratio
1.0	low bank height ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Cross Section Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5

Cross Section 18 - SF4A



Bankfull Dimensions	
19.2	x-section area (ft.sq.)
10.4	width (ft)
1.9	mean depth (ft)
2.8	max depth (ft)
12.7	wetted parimeter (ft)
1.5	hyd radi (ft)
5.6	width-depth ratio

Survey Date: 3/2017

Field Crew: Wildlands Engineering

View Downstream

Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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		28	28	28	28
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125					28
	Fine	0.125	0.250	1	6	7	7	35
	Medium	0.25	0.50		4	4	4	39
	Coarse	0.5	1.0		1	1	1	40
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0					40
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8					40
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0		3	3	3	43
	Fine	4.0	5.6		3	3	3	46
	Fine	5.6	8.0		3	3	3	49
	Medium	8.0	11.0		1	1	1	50
	Medium	11.0	16.0	2		2	2	52
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	5		5	5	57
	Coarse	22.6	32	2	1	3	3	60
	Very Coarse	32	45	5		5	5	65
	Very Coarse	45	64	8		8	8	73
COBBLE	Small	64	90	6		6	6	79
	Small	90	128	9		9	9	88
	Large	128	180	8		8	8	96
	Large	180	256	1		1	1	97
BOULDER	Small	256	362	2		2	2	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} =	Silt/Clay
D_{35} =	0.25
D_{50} =	11.0
D_{84} =	109.5
D_{95} =	172.5
D_{100} =	512.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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			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	1	1	1
	Fine	5.6	8.0	1	1	2
	Medium	8.0	11.0	5	5	7
	Medium	11.0	16.0	7	7	14
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	12	12	26
	Coarse	22.6	32	18	18	44
	Very Coarse	32	45	18	18	62
	Very Coarse	45	64	20	20	82
COBBLE	Small	64	90	10	10	92
	Small	90	128	6	6	98
	Large	128	180			98
	Large	180	256			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 1	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	16.9
D_{35} =	26.9
D_{50} =	35.9
D_{84} =	68.5
D_{95} =	107.3
D_{100} =	362.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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		24	24	24	24
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125					24
	Fine	0.125	0.250	1	1	2	2	26
	Medium	0.25	0.50	2	9	11	11	37
	Coarse	0.5	1.0	2	1	3	3	40
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0					40
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8					40
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0					40
	Fine	4.0	5.6	2		2	2	42
	Fine	5.6	8.0					42
	Medium	8.0	11.0		1	1	1	43
	Medium	11.0	16.0		2	2	2	45
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	2	7	9	9	54
	Coarse	22.6	32	4	3	7	7	61
	Very Coarse	32	45	6	2	8	8	69
	Very Coarse	45	64	11		11	11	80
COBBLE	Small	64	90	10		10	10	90
	Small	90	128	7		7	7	97
	Large	128	180	2		2	2	99
	Large	180	256					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} =	0.44
D_{50} =	19.4
D_{84} =	73.4
D_{95} =	115.7
D_{100} =	362.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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			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	4	4	4
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0	4	4	8
	Fine	4.0	5.6			8
	Fine	5.6	8.0			8
	Medium	8.0	11.0	4	4	12
	Medium	11.0	16.0	8	8	20
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	10	10	30
	Coarse	22.6	32	8	8	38
	Very Coarse	32	45	10	10	48
	Very Coarse	45	64	12	12	60
COBBLE	Small	64	90	16	16	76
	Small	90	128	8	8	84
	Large	128	180	8	8	92
	Large	180	256	6	6	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 4	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	13.27
D_{35} =	28.09
D_{50} =	47.7
D_{84} =	128.0
D_{95} =	214.7
D_{100} =	362.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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		20	20	20	17
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125				20	33
	Fine	0.125	0.250		5	5		33
	Medium	0.25	0.50		9	9	5	37
	Coarse	0.5	1.0		1	1	9	45
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0				1	45
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8					45
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0					45
	Fine	4.0	5.6	2	4	6		45
	Fine	5.6	8.0	1	2	3	6	50
	Medium	8.0	11.0	1	2	3	3	53
	Medium	11.0	16.0	4	4	8	3	55
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	5	4	9	8	62
	Coarse	22.6	32	8		8	9	69
	Very Coarse	32	45	6		6	8	76
	Very Coarse	45	64	5		5	6	81
COBBLE	Small	64	90	4		4	5	85
	Small	90	128	8		8	4	88
	Large	128	180	6		6	8	95
	Large	180	256				6	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**	**51**	**101**	**120**	**100**

Reachwide	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	Silt/Clay
D_{35} =	0.35
D_{50} =	7.8
D_{84} =	82.0
D_{95} =	179.6
D_{100} =	256.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

SF3, Cross Section 5

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	9	9	9
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			9
	Fine	0.125	0.250	1	1	10
	Medium	0.25	0.50	1	1	11
	Coarse	0.5	1.0			11
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0	5	5	16
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			16
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0			16
	Fine	4.0	5.6	3	3	19
	Fine	5.6	8.0	1	1	20
	Medium	8.0	11.0	2	2	22
	Medium	11.0	16.0	4	4	26
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	2	2	28
	Coarse	22.6	32	7	7	35
	Very Coarse	32	45	9	9	44
	Very Coarse	45	64	19	19	63
COBBLE	Small	64	90	15	15	78
	Small	90	128	12	12	90
	Large	128	180	7	7	97
	Large	180	256	3	3	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} =	2.00
D_{35} =	32.00
D_{50} =	50.3
D_{84} =	107.3
D_{95} =	163.3
D_{100} =	256.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

SF3, Cross Section 7

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	9	9	9
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			9
	Fine	0.125	0.250			9
	Medium	0.25	0.50			9
	Coarse	0.5	1.0			9
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0			9
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8	1	1	10
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0	3	3	13
	Fine	4.0	5.6	6	6	19
	Fine	5.6	8.0	1	1	20
	Medium	8.0	11.0			20
	Medium	11.0	16.0	9	9	29
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	8	8	37
	Coarse	22.6	32	9	9	46
	Very Coarse	32	45	12	12	58
	Very Coarse	45	64	14	14	72
COBBLE	Small	64	90	18	18	90
	Small	90	128	7	7	97
	Large	128	180	3	3	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	**100**	**100**	**100**

Cross Section 7	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	4.73
D_{35} =	20.73
D_{50} =	35.9
D_{84} =	80.3
D_{95} =	115.7
D_{100} =	180.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

SF3, Cross Section 9

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	13	13	13
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			13
	Fine	0.125	0.250	2	2	15
	Medium	0.25	0.50	4	4	19
	Coarse	0.5	1.0	1	1	20
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0			20
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			20
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0			20
	Fine	4.0	5.6	6	6	26
	Fine	5.6	8.0	7	7	33
	Medium	8.0	11.0	6	6	39
	Medium	11.0	16.0	9	9	48
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	10	10	58
	Coarse	22.6	32	10	10	68
	Very Coarse	32	45	8	8	76
	Very Coarse	45	64	6	6	82
COBBLE	Small	64	90	6	6	88
	Small	90	128	4	4	92
	Large	128	180	7	7	99
	Large	180	256	1	1	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} =	0.30
D_{35} =	8.90
D_{50} =	17.1
D_{84} =	71.7
D_{95} =	148.1
D_{100} =	256.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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		22	22	22	22
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125		1	1	1	23
	Fine	0.125	0.250		3	3	3	26
	Medium	0.25	0.50		2	2	2	28
	Coarse	0.5	1.0		3	3	3	31
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0		4	4	4	35
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8	2	3	5	5	40
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0					40
	Fine	4.0	5.6	3		3	3	43
	Fine	5.6	8.0	5	4	9	9	53
	Medium	8.0	11.0	2	4	6	6	59
	Medium	11.0	16.0	8		8	8	67
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	7	1	8	8	75
	Coarse	22.6	32	2	2	4	4	79
	Very Coarse	32	45	5	1	6	6	85
	Very Coarse	45	64	7		7	7	92
COBBLE	Small	64	90	2		2	2	94
	Small	90	128	4		4	4	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	**49**	**50**	**99**	**100**	**100**

Reachwide	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	Silt/Clay
D_{35} =	1.88
D_{50} =	7.2
D_{84} =	42.9
D_{95} =	98.7
D_{100} =	180.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

UT1, Cross Section 10

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	10	10	10
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			10
	Fine	0.125	0.250			10
	Medium	0.25	0.50	2	2	12
	Coarse	0.5	1.0	2	2	14
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0	2	2	16
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8	10	10	26
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0	1	1	27
	Fine	4.0	5.6	12	12	39
	Fine	5.6	8.0	4	4	43
	Medium	8.0	11.0	10	10	53
	Medium	11.0	16.0	6	6	59
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	7	7	66
	Coarse	22.6	32	9	9	75
	Very Coarse	32	45	6	6	81
	Very Coarse	45	64	5	5	86
COBBLE	Small	64	90	2	2	88
	Small	90	128	5	5	93
	Large	128	180	7	7	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	**100**	**100**	**100**

Cross Section 10	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	2.00
D_{35} =	5.01
D_{50} =	10.0
D_{84} =	55.6
D_{95} =	141.1
D_{100} =	180.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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	7	20	27	27	27
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125					27
	Fine	0.125	0.250	1	2	3	3	30
	Medium	0.25	0.50	1	2	3	3	33
	Coarse	0.5	1.0	1		1	1	34
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0					34
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8					34
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0					34
	Fine	4.0	5.6					34
	Fine	5.6	8.0					34
	Medium	8.0	11.0					34
	Medium	11.0	16.0	2	4	6	6	40
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	3	2	5	5	45
	Coarse	22.6	32	2		2	2	47
	Very Coarse	32	45	3	7	10	10	57
	Very Coarse	45	64	6		6	6	63
COBBLE	Small	64	90	10	1	11	11	74
	Small	90	128	10	2	12	12	86
	Large	128	180	10		10	10	96
	Large	180	256	2		2	2	98
BOULDER	Small	256	362					98
	Small	362	512					98
	Medium	512	1024					98
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048	2		2	2	100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048					100
			Total	**60**	**40**	**100**	**100**	**100**

Reachwide	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	Silt/Clay
D_{35} =	11.71
D_{50} =	35.4
D_{84} =	120.7
D_{95} =	174.0
D_{100} =	2048.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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	10	10	10
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			10
	Fine	0.125	0.250	2	2	12
	Medium	0.25	0.50	2	2	14
	Coarse	0.5	1.0			14
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0			14
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			14
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0	1	1	15
	Fine	4.0	5.6	3	3	18
	Fine	5.6	8.0	6	6	24
	Medium	8.0	11.0	5	5	29
	Medium	11.0	16.0	1	1	30
	Coarse	16.0	22.6			30
	Coarse	22.6	32	2	2	32
	Very Coarse	32	45	6	6	38
	Very Coarse	45	64	9	9	47
COBBLE	Small	64	90	6	6	53
	Small	90	128	10	10	63
	Large	128	180	16	16	79
	Large	180	256	7	7	86
BOULDER	Small	256	362	6	6	92
	Small	362	512	8	8	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} =	4.47
D_{35} =	37.95
D_{50} =	75.9
D_{84} =	231.5
D_{95} =	412.3
D_{100} =	512.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

SF4, Cross Section 15

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	6	6	6
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125	4	4	10
	Fine	0.125	0.250	4	4	14
	Medium	0.25	0.50	6	6	21
	Coarse	0.5	1.0	2	2	23
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0	2	2	25
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			25
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0	4	4	29
	Fine	4.0	5.6	8	8	37
	Fine	5.6	8.0	8	8	45
	Medium	8.0	11.0	6	6	52
	Medium	11.0	16.0	4	4	56
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	4	4	60
	Coarse	22.6	32			60
	Very Coarse	32	45			60
	Very Coarse	45	64	2	2	62
COBBLE	Small	64	90	6	6	68
	Small	90	128	10	10	78
	Large	128	180	11	11	90
	Large	180	256	2	2	92
BOULDER	Small	256	362	4	4	96
	Small	362	512	4	4	100
	Medium	512	1024			100
	Large/Very Large	1024	2048			100
BEDROCK	Bedrock	2048	>2048			100
			Total	**97**	**100**	**100**

Cross Section 15	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	0.30
D_{35} =	5.14
D_{50} =	10.2
D_{84} =	151.7
D_{95} =	336.3
D_{100} =	512.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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		14	14	14	14
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125					14
	Fine	0.125	0.250		6	6	6	20
	Medium	0.25	0.50	1	7	8	8	28
	Coarse	0.5	1.0					28
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0					28
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8					28
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0		3	3	3	31
	Fine	4.0	5.6	1	4	5	5	36
	Fine	5.6	8.0	4	4	8	8	44
	Medium	8.0	11.0		4	4	4	48
	Medium	11.0	16.0	3		3	3	51
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	3	2	5	5	56
	Coarse	22.6	32	8		8	8	64
	Very Coarse	32	45	3	1	4	4	68
	Very Coarse	45	64	11	1	12	12	80
COBBLE	Small	64	90	8	1	9	9	89
	Small	90	128	4	1	5	5	94
	Large	128	180	4	1	5	5	99
	Large	180	256		1	1	1	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} =	0.16
D_{35} =	5.24
D_{50} =	14.1
D_{84} =	74.5
D_{95} =	137.0
D_{100} =	256.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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	12	13	13
SAND	Very fine	0.062	0.125			13
	Fine	0.125	0.250			13
	Medium	0.25	0.50	10	10	23
	Coarse	0.5	1.0			23
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0			23
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			23
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0			23
	Fine	4.0	5.6	4	4	27
	Fine	5.6	8.0	4	4	31
	Medium	8.0	11.0	2	2	33
	Medium	11.0	16.0	4	4	38
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	2	2	40
	Coarse	22.6	32	12	13	52
	Very Coarse	32	45	12	13	65
	Very Coarse	45	64	10	10	75
COBBLE	Small	64	90	17	18	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	**96**	**100**	**100**

Cross Section 16	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	0.32
D_{35} =	12.78
D_{50} =	30.2
D_{84} =	76.1
D_{95} =	105.1
D_{100} =	180.0





Reachwide and Cross Section Pebble Count Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

SF4A, Cross Section 17

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			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	2	2	2
	Very Coarse	1.0	2.0	11	10	12
GRAVEL	Very Fine	2.0	2.8			12
	Very Fine	2.8	4.0			12
	Fine	4.0	5.6	6	6	18
	Fine	5.6	8.0	5	5	22
	Medium	8.0	11.0	6	6	28
	Medium	11.0	16.0	5	5	32
	Coarse	16.0	22.6	8	7	40
	Coarse	22.6	32	10	9	49
	Very Coarse	32	45	18	17	66
	Very Coarse	45	64	15	14	80
COBBLE	Small	64	90	13	12	92
	Small	90	128	6	6	97
	Large	128	180	3	3	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	**108**	**100**	**100**

Cross Section 17	
Channel materials (mm)	
D_{16} =	5.09
D_{35} =	18.06
D_{50} =	32.6
D_{84} =	72.4
D_{95} =	111.2
D_{100} =	180.0





APPENDIX 5. Hydrology Summary Data and Plots

Table 13. Verification of Bankfull Events

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Reach	Date of Data Collection	Approximate Date of Occurrence	Method
SF1	3/21/2017	1/3/2017	Crest Gage/Visual (Rack Lines)
	6/27/2017	4/25/2017	
UT2	3/21/2017	1/3/2017	
SF3	3/21/2017	1/3/2017	
	6/27/2017	4/25/2017	
UT1	3/21/2017	1/3/2017	
	6/27/2017	4/25/2017	
SF4	3/21/2017	1/3/2017	
	6/27/2017	4/25/2017	
SF4A	3/21/2017	1/3/2017	
	6/27/2017	4/25/2017	

Table 14. Wetland Gage Attainment Summary

Underwood Mitigation Site
DMS Project No. 94641
Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

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 %)	No/7 Days (2.8 %)		
2	Yes/51.5 Days (23.8 %)	Yes/38.5 Days (17.8 %)	Yes/59 Days (24.6%)	No/13 Days (5.3 %)	No/0 Days (0.0 %)		
3	Yes/23.5 Days (10.9 %)	Yes/31.5 Days (14.6 %)	Yes/29 Days (12.1%)	Yes/19 Days (7.8 %)	Yes/31 Days (12.6 %)		
4	Yes/19.5 Days (9.0 %)	Yes/31.5 Days (14.6 %)	Yes/59 Days (24.6%)	Yes/19 Days (7.8 %)	No/10 Days (4.0 %)		
5	Yes/25 Days (11.6 %)	Yes/32.5 Days (15.0 %)	Yes/65 Days (27.1%)	Yes/47 Days (19.2 %)	No/11 Days (4.5 %)		
6	Yes/22.5 Days (10.4 %)	Yes/21 Days (9.7 %)	Yes/28 Days (11.7%)	No/12 Days (4.9 %)	No/7 Days (2.8 %)		
7	Yes/44.5 Days (20.6 %)	Yes/31.5 Days (14.6 %)	Yes/32 Days (13.3%)	Yes/38 Days (15.5 %)	Yes/80 Days (32.4 %)		
8	Yes/22 Days (10.2 %)	Yes/23 Days (14.6 %)	Yes/61 Days (25.4%)	Yes/23 Days (9.4 %)	No/15 Days (6.1 %)		
9	Yes/98 Days (45.4 %)	Yes/41.5 Days (10.6 %)	Yes/68 Days (28.3%)	Yes/49 Days (20 %)	Yes/47 Days (19.0 %)		
10	Yes/96.5 Days (44.7 %)	Yes/36 Days (16.7 %)	Yes/67 Days (27.9%)	Yes/23Days (9.4 %)	Well Malfunctioned		
11	Yes/66 Days (30.6 %)	Yes/40.5 Days (18.8 %)	Yes/61 Days (25.4%)	Yes/38 Days (15.5 %)	No/5 Days (2.0 %)		
12	Yes/23 Days (10.6 %)	Yes/32.5 Days (15.0 %)	Yes/28 Days (11.7%)	No/9 Days (3.7 %)	No/4 Days (1.6 %)		
13	Yes/22 Days (10.2 %)	No/12.5 Days (5.8 %)	Yes/27 Days (11.3%)	No/10 Days (4.1 %)	No/6 Days (2.4 %)		
14	Yes/21 Days (9.7 %)	Yes/32 Days (14.8 %)	Yes/29 Days (12.1%)	No/16 Days (6.5 %)	No/2 Days (0.8 %)		
15	Yes/163 Days (75.5 %)	Yes/57 Days (26.4 %)	Yes/80 Days (33.3%)	Yes/104 Days (42.4 %)	Yes/79 Days (32.0%)		

* 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 5 - 2017

Wetland Harris Site; RW1



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland Harris Site; RW2



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland Harris Site; NRW1



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland Harris Site; RW2



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland Harris Site; RW3



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland Harris Site; RW3



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland Harris Site; RW3



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland Harris Site; RW3



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland Harris Site; NRW2



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland RW4



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland RW4



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland RW4



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland RW4



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland RW4



Groundwater Gage Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland RW4



Monthly Rainfall Data

Underwood Mitigation Site

DMS Project No. 94641

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017



[1] 2017 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 5 - 2017

Wetland RW1



Pre and Post Construction Groundwater Gage Comparison Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland RW2



Pre and Post Construction Groundwater Gage Comparison Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland RW4



Pre and Post Construction Groundwater Gage Comparison Plots

Underwood Mitigation Site (DMS Project No. 94641)

Monitoring Year 5 - 2017

Wetland RW4