

**Bear Basin Restoration Site
Monitoring Report MY02
DMS Project # 95362
DMS Contract # 004741**



Submitted to:

NCDMS, 1652 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, NC 27699-1652

Construction Completed: February 2015

Data Collection: 2016

Submitted: December 2016

Monitoring and Design Firm



**4505 Falls of Neuse Road
Suite 400
Raleigh, NC 27609
Phone: (919) 278-2514
Fax: (919) 783-9266**

**Project Manager: Tim Morris
Email: tim.morris@kci.com
KCI Project No: 20122266**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY/PROJECT ABSTRACT	1
2.0 MONITORING RESULTS	2
2.1 Vegetation Monitoring	2
2.2 Hydrology Monitoring	2
3.0 METHODOLOGY.....	3
4.0 REFERENCES.....	4

Appendix A – Project Vicinity Map and Background Tables

Figure 1. Project Site Vicinity Map	5
Figure 2. Project Site Mitigation Plan View	6
Table 1 – Project Components	7
Table 2 – Project Activity and Reporting History	8
Table 3 – Project Contacts	8
Table 4 – Project Attributes	9

Appendix B – Visual Assessment Data

Figure 3. Current Condition Plan View	11
Table 5 – Vegetation Condition Assessment	12
Photo Point Photos	13
Vegetation Plot Photos.....	14

Appendix C – Vegetation Plot Data

Table 6 – Vegetation Plot Criteria Attainment	17
Table 7 – CVS Vegetation Plot Metadata.....	18
Table 8 – CVS Stem Count Total and Planted by Plot and Species	19

Appendix D – Hydrologic Data

Percent Saturation Figure.....	21
30-70 Percentile Graph	22
Precipitation and Water Level Plots.....	23
Table 9 – Wetland Hydrology Criteria Attainment.....	43

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY / PROJECT ABSTRACT

The Bear Basin Restoration Site (BBRS) is a full-delivery project that was developed for the North Carolina Division of Mitigation Services (DMS). Construction was completed in February 2015. The site is within the 03030001 Watershed Cataloging Unit (8-digit HUC) and the Local Watershed Unit (14-digit HUC) 03030001010010. In DMS' most recent publication of excluded and Targeted Local Watersheds/Hydrologic Units, the 03030001010010 14-digit HUC has been identified as a Targeted Local Watershed.

The project site, which is protected by an 11.9-acre permanent conservation easement held by the State of North Carolina, is situated in Onslow County in the Carolina Flatwoods ecoregion of the Coastal Plains physiographic province. The site is located on a single parcel located off of Jesse Williams Road approximately five miles west of Richlands, North Carolina.

The project goals and objectives are listed below.

Project Goals

- Protect and improve water quality by reducing sediment and nutrient inputs
- The protection of a watershed draining into shellfish harvesting waters
- Provide habitat for aquatic flora and fauna by improving physical structure and vegetative composition
- Increase the local hydroperiod by encouraging both surface and subsurface storage and retention
- Restore and establish a functional and diverse wetland community

Project Objectives

- Fill field ditches to restore surface flow retention and elevate local groundwater levels.
- Redevelop longer wetland flow patterns to increase surface flow retention time.
- Restore a diverse wetland vegetation community through maintenance and germination of existing wetland seed stores, planting of wetland trees and shrubs, and incorporation of a custom wetland seed mix.

The BBRS provided mitigation for wetland impacts within Hydrologic Unit 03030001 by restoring 8.6 acres of wetland and preserving 1.9 acres of upland, generating 8.6 non-riparian wetland mitigation units (WMU's). The wetland site will be monitored to determine if the project is on-track to meeting jurisdictional wetland status. In the restoration areas, the wetland site will be deemed successful once hydrology is established and vegetation success criteria are met. The site will be monitored for at least seven years or until the success criteria are achieved.

As designed, the western and southernmost ditches, located adjacent to the project easement were left open and not filled during construction. It is anticipated that leaving these ditches open will have minimal impacts to the overall hydrologic performance of the site. The hydrologic influence of these ditches was modeled using Lateral Effect, a software program that determines the lateral effect of a drainage ditch or borrow pit on adjacent wetland hydrology (NCSU BAE, 2011). This analysis determined that the potential horizontal drainage influence averages 85'. Due to the fact that these ditches cannot be filled because of the potential for hydrologic trespass, the area immediately adjacent to the ditch will not be a credit generating part of the site. It is assumed that with the onsite modifications, such as filling field ditches and surface roughening, the entire site will have more surface and groundwater storage, which may decrease the effect of the open ditches. For this reason, the non-credit generating portion of the site is assumed to be half of the zone of influence for the ditch.

2.0 MONITORING RESULTS

2.1 VEGETATION MONITORING

The success criteria for the planted species in the mitigation area will be based on survival. The site will demonstrate the re-establishment of targeted vegetative communities through the survival and growth of planted species and volunteer colonization, with an average stem density of 320 stems/acre after three years, 288 stems/acre after four years, 260 stems/acre after five years, and 210 stems/acre after seven years to be considered successful. To determine the success of the planted mitigation area, seven permanent vegetation monitoring plots (10 by 10 meters) have been established in the wetland restoration area at a density that represents the total mitigation acreage. The average density of these plots will determine whether the site meets the success criterion.

The second-year vegetation monitoring was based on the Level 2 CVS-EEP vegetation monitoring protocol. The site's average density for this monitoring period was 769 planted stems/acre. All ten plots had greater than 320 planted stems/acre. Including volunteers, the site averaged 844 total stems/acre. In general the site is well vegetated, with widespread herbaceous coverage and healthy planted stems.

2.2 HYDROLOGY MONITORING

Wetland hydrology will be monitored with a series of automatic gauges that record water table depth. The site must present continuous saturated or inundated hydrologic conditions for at least 8% of the growing season with a 50% probability of reoccurrence during normal weather conditions. A "normal" year is based on NRCS climatological data for Onslow County using the 30th to 70th percentile thresholds as the range of normal as documented in the USACE Technical Report "Assessing and Using Meteorological Data to Evaluate Wetland Hydrology, April 2000." The growing season for Onslow County is considered to extend from March 18 to November 16 (243 days). The water table of the restored wetlands must be within 12" of the soil surface continuously for at least 8% (21 days) of the 243-day growing season. Wetland hydrology will be monitored with twenty automatic gauges that record water table depth.

Due to the inherent variability in the site's soils and associated drainage characteristics, it is unlikely that the project will exhibit uniform hydrologic conditions across the site, making a single hydrologic performance criterion unrepresentative of the site's performance. As such, the gauge data can be evaluated and presented as a spatial average with each gauge representing the area half the distance to adjacent gauges. The spatial average will be the calculated value for comparison with the performance standard for credit validation. Gauges representing areas not achieving a minimum of 6.5% saturation will be considered non-attaining even if the spatial average exceeds the credit validation performance standard.

The wetland gauges will be checked and/or downloaded every other month. Daily data will be collected from the automatic gauges over the 7-year monitoring period.

To monitor the effect of the unfilled ditches described in Section 1.0, four sets of coupled gauges were installed perpendicular to the unfilled ditches. Each set includes a gauge that is 50' from the open ditch and another that is 80' from the ditch. An additional four gauges were installed between the coupled gauges to monitor hydrology less than 42.5' from the open ditch in the non-credit bearing zone.

The daily rainfall data was obtained from a local weather station in Jacksonville, NC; provided by the NC State Climate Office. For the 2016-year, the months of February, May, September, and October

experienced above average rainfall, while June and August experienced average rainfall. The months of January, March, April, July, and November recorded below average rainfall for the site. Overall, the area experienced average rainfall during the 2016 growing season.

While rainfall over the entire growing season ended up to be average for Onslow County, the months of March and April, when many restored wetlands typically achieve successful hydrology were abnormally dry. This dry period is the primary reason why only nine out of twenty gauges achieved the hydrology success criteria at the site. Four of the gauges that did not achieve hydrology are just outside of the credit bearing zone. Of the other gauges that did not meet this criteria, all of them met in MY01, except for two. Additionally, a handful of gauges experienced a malfunction at the beginning of the growing season. Four of those gauges that were not successful this year (Gauges 10, 11, 12, and 14) appear to have data that closely matches a successful gauge from this year (Gauge 9). It is likely that without the malfunction those four gauges would have been successful as well. It's expected that site hydrology will return to high levels of success in the 2017 monitoring year. Since eight gauges in the restoration area were below 6.5% continuous saturation, these gauges were not used in the analysis to determine the spatial average for the hydrology of the entire site. This analysis is based off percent saturation contours for the restoration area calculated from the gauge data. Following the method described above and as illustrated in the figure in Appendix D, it is determined that based on the spatial average, the site was continuously saturated for 13.7% of the growing season and met the hydrology success criteria of 8% for the second year of monitoring.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

The CVS-EEP protocol, Level 2 (<http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/methods.htm>) was used to collect vegetation data from the site. The vegetation monitoring was completed on July 5, 2016.

4.0 REFERENCES

Lee, M.T., R.K. Peet, S.D. Roberts, and T.R. Wentworth. 2006. CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.0 (<http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/methods.htm>)

USACE. 2003. Stream Mitigation Guidelines. USACE, NCDENR-DWQ, USEPA, NCWRC.

Sprecher, S. W. and Warne, A. G. 2000. "Assessing and Using Meteorological Data to Evaluate Wetland Hydrology," ERDC/EL TR-WRAP-00-01, U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS.

Appendix A

Project Vicinity Map and Background Tables




Figure 1. Vicinity Map






Table 1. Project Components									
Project Number and Name: 95362 – Bear Basin Restoration Site									
Mitigation Credits									
	Stream		Riparian Wetland		Non-riparian Wetland		Buffer	Nitrogen Nutrient Offset	Phosphorous Nutrient Offset
Type	R	RE	R	RE	R	RE			
Acres	-	-	-	-	8.6	-	-	-	-
Credits	-	-	-	-	8.6	-	-	-	-
TOTAL CREDITS	-		-		8.6		-	-	-
Project Components									
Project Component -or- Reach ID	Stationing/ Location		Existing Footage/ Acreage		Approach (PI, PII etc.)		Restoration -or- Restoration Equivalent	Restoration Footage or Acreage	Mitigation Ratio
Wetland Area	-		8.6 acres		-		Restoration	8.6 acres	1:1
Component Summation									
Restoration Level	Stream (linear feet)		Riparian Wetland (acres)		Non-riparian Wetland (acres)		Buffer (square feet)	Upland (acres)	
			Riverine	Non-Riverine					
Restoration	-		-	-	8.6 acres		-	-	
Enhancement			-	-	-		-	-	
Enhancement I	-								
Enhancement II	-								
Creation			-	-	-			-	
Preservation	-		-	-	-			1.9 acres	
High Quality Preservation	-		-	-	-			-	
TOTAL	-		-	-	8.6 acres			1.9 acres	

Table 2. Project Activity & Reporting History		
Bear Basin Wetland Restoration Site, DMS Project# 95362		
Activity or Report	Data Collection Complete	Actual Completion or Delivery
Mitigation Plan		July 14
Final Design – Construction Plans		July 14
Construction		Dec 14
Planting		March 15
Baseline Monitoring/Report	April/May 15	June 15
Year 1 Monitoring	Oct 15	Jan 15
Year 2 Monitoring	July 16	Dec 16

Table 3. Project Contacts	
Project Number and Name: 95362 - Bear Basin Restoration Site	
Design Firm	KCI Associates of North Carolina, PC 4505 Falls of Neuse Rd. Suite 400 Raleigh, NC 27609 Contact: Mr. Tim Morris Phone: (919) 278-2512 Fax: (919) 783-9266
Construction Contractor	KCI Environmental Technologies and Construction, Inc. 4505 Falls of Neuse Rd. Suite 400 Raleigh, NC 27609 Contact: Mr. Tim Morris Phone: (919) 278-2512 Fax: (919) 783-9266
Planting Contractor	Bruton Nurseries and Landscapes PO Box 1197 Freemont, NC 27830 Contact: Mr. Charlie Bruton Phone: (919) 242-6555
Monitoring Performers	
MY00-MY02	KCI Associates of North Carolina, PC 4505 Falls of Neuse Rd. Suite 400 Raleigh, NC 27609 Contact: Mr. Adam Spiller Phone: (919) 278-2514 Fax: (919) 783-9266

Table 4. Project Attribute Table			
Project Number and Name: 95362 – Bear Basin Restoration Site			
County	Onslow County		
Project Area (acres)	11.9 acres		
Project Coordinates (lat. and long.)	34.925365 N , -77.607461 W		
Project Watershed Summary Information			
Physiographic Province	Coastal Plain		
River Basin	White Oak		
USGS Hydrologic Unit 8-digit	03030001	USGS Hydrologic Unit 14-digit	03030001010010
DWQ Sub-basin	03-05-02b		
Project Drainage Area (acres)	32.7 acres		
Project Drainage Area Percentage of Impervious Area	2%		
CGIA Land Use Classification	44% Cultivated, 4% Managed Herbaceous Cover, 50% Southern Yellow Pine, and 2% High-Intensity Developed		
Wetland Summary Information			
Parameters	Wetland Area		
Size of Wetland (acres)	8.6 acres		
Wetland Type (non-riparian, riparian riverine or riparian non-riverine)	Non-riparian		
Mapped Soil Series	Rains and Stallings (Pantego and Lynchburg by detailed soil investigation)		
Drainage class	Poorly drained		
Soil Hydric Status	Drained Hydric		
Source of Hydrology	Precipitation		
Hydrologic Impairment	Ditching and Crops		
Native vegetation community	Crops		
Percent composition of exotic invasive vegetation	0%		



Appendix B

Visual Assessment Data

LEGEND:

- VEG PLOT ACHIEVING DENSITY CRITERION □
- VEG PLOT BELOW DENSITY CRITERION □
- VEG PLOT TOTAL / PLANTED STEM DENSITY **844/769**
- WETLAND GAUGE ACHIEVING HYDROLOGIC CRITERION ●
- WETLAND GAUGE BELOW HYDROLOGIC CRITERION ●
- PHOTO POINT (PP) ♂
- FILLED DITCHES
- NONRIPARIAN WETLAND RESTORATION = 8.6 ACRES
- CONSERVATION EASEMENT

IMAGE SOURCE: NC 2010 ORTHOIMAGERY



REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION	REVISIONS

NCDEQ DIVISION OF MITIGATION SERVICES

KCI ASSOCIATES OF NC
 ENGINEERS • PLANNERS • SCIENTISTS
 4505 FALLS OF NEUSE ROAD
 RALEIGH, NORTH CAROLINA 27609

BEAR BASIN RESTORATION SITE
 DMS PROJECT #95362
 RICHLANDS, ONSLOW COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA
 MONITORING YEAR 02

DATE: DEC 2016
 SCALE: GRAPHIC
 CURRENT CONDITION PLAN VIEW
 SHEET 1 OF 1
 FIGURE 3

Table 5. Vegetation Condition Assessment						
Project Number and Name: 95362 – Bear Basin Restoration Site						
Planted Acreage 11.9			Easement Acreage 8.6			
Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold	CCPV Depiction	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Planted Acreage
1. Bare Areas	Very limited cover of both woody and herbaceous material.	0.1 acres	Pattern and Color	0	0.00	0.0%
2. Low Stem Density Areas	Woody stem densities clearly below target levels based on MY3, 4, or 5 stem count criteria.	0.1 acres	Not Depicted, Covers Most of Restoration Area	0	0.00	0.0%
Total				0	0.00	0.0%
3. 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 acres	Pattern and Color	0	0.00	0.0%
Cumulative Total				0	0.00	0.0%
4. Invasive Areas of Concern	Areas or points (if too small to render as polygons at map scale).	1000 SF	Pattern and Color	0	0.00	0.0%
5. Easement Encroachment Areas	Areas or points (if too small to render as polygons at map scale).	none	Pattern and Color	0	0.00	0.0%

Photo Reference Points



PP1 – MY-02 – 8/16/16



PP2 – MY-02 – 8/16/16



PP3 – MY-02 – 8/16/16



PP4 – MY-02 – 8/16/16



PP5 – MY-02 – 8/16/16



PP6 – MY-02 – 8/16/16

Vegetation Monitoring Plot Photos



Vegetation Plot 1 – MY-02 – 7/5/16



Vegetation Plot 2 – MY-02 – 7/5/16



Vegetation Plot 3 – MY-02 – 7/5/16



Vegetation Plot 4 – MY-02 – 7/5/16



Vegetation Plot 5 – MY-02 – 7/5/16



Vegetation Plot 6 – MY-02 – 7/5/16



Vegetation Plot 7 – MY-02 – 7/5/16

Appendix C

Vegetation Plot Data

Table 6. Vegetation Plot Criteria Attainment

Project Number and Name: 95362 - Bear Basin Restoration Site


Vegetation Plot ID	Vegetation Survival Threshold Met? (320 planted stems/acre)	Monitoring Year 02 Planted Stem Density (stems/acre)	Monitoring Year 02 Total Stem Density (stems/acre)
1	Yes	769	769
2	Yes	688	809
3	Yes	1,295	1,376
4	Yes	1,052	1,133
5	Yes	364	445
6	Yes	648	809
7	Yes	567	567

Table 7. CVS Vegetation Plot Metadata	
Project Number and Name: 95362 - Bear Basin Wetland Restoration Site	
Report Prepared By	Randall Jones
Date Prepared	8/18/2016 11:00
database name	KCI-2015-95362_Bear Basin.mdb
database location	M:\2012\20122266 BearBasin\Monitoring\Veg Database
computer name	12-3ZV4FP1
file size	61739008
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	95362
project Name	Bear Basin
Description	Wetland Restoration Site
River Basin	White Oak
Sampled Plots	7


DMS Project Code 95362. Project Name: Bear Basin			Current Plot Data (MY2 2016)																					Annual Means										
Scientific Name	Common Name	Species Type	95362-01-0001			95362-01-0002			95362-01-0003			95362-01-0004			95362-01-0005			95362-01-0006			95362-01-0007			MY2 (2016)			MY1 (2015)			MY0 (2015)				
			PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all
Aronia arbutifolia	Red Chokeberry	Shrub							2	2	2							1	1	1				3	3	3	4	4	4	4	4	4		
Baccharis	baccharis	Shrub																																
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree	1	1	1				4	4	4							1	1	1				6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6		
Celtis occidentalis	common hackberry	Tree																			1	1	1	1	1	1								
Cephalanthus occidentalis	common buttonbush	Shrub							1	1	1													1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		
Diospyros virginiana	common persimmon	Tree				5	5	5																5	5	5	6	6	7	7	7	7		
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	5	5	5				3	3	3													8	8	8	7	7	7	8	8	8		
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree						1			2														5			8						
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree							4	4	4	3	3	3	2	2	3							9	9	10	10	10	10	15	15	15		
Magnolia virginiana	sweetbay	Tree	2	2	2				4	4	4							1	1	1				7	7	7	6	6	6	5	5	5		
Nyssa biflora	swamp tupelo	Tree	3	3	3																1	1	1	4	4	4								
Quercus	oak	Tree									1	1	1			2								1	1	6	3	3	4	2	2	2		
Quercus nigra	water oak	Tree																														1	1	1
Quercus pagoda	cherrybark oak	Tree	6	6	6	12	12	12	8	8	8	23	23	23	1	1	1	5	5	5	11	11	11	66	66	66	64	64	68	67	67	67		
Quercus phellos	willow oak	Tree	2	2	2				3	3	3				6	6	6	4	4	4	1	1	1	16	16	16	15	15	15	16	16	16		
Taxodium distichum	bald cypress	Tree							1	1	1													3	3	3	1	1	1					
Vaccinium corymbosum	highbush blueberry	Shrub							1	1	1													3	3	3	2	2	2	2	2	2		
Stem count			19	19	19	17	17	20	32	32	34	26	26	28	9	9	11	16	16	20	14	14	14	133	133	146	125	125	139	134	134	134		
size (ares)			1			1			1			1			1			1			1			7			7			7				
size (ACRES)			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.17			0.17			0.17				
Species count			6	6	6	2	2	4	11	11	12	2	2	3	3	3	4	7	7	9	4	4	4	14	14	16	12	12	13	12	12	12		
Stems per ACRE			769	769	769	688	688	809	1295	1295	1376	1052	1052	1133	364	364	445	647	647	809	567	567	567	769	769	844	723	723	804	775	775	775		

Appendix D



Hydrologic Data





**Bear Basin Wetland Restoration Site
30-70 Percentile Graph
WETS Station Name: KOAJ - Albert Ellis Airport**




Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 1




Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 2




Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 3




Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 4





Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 5




Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 6





Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 7




Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 8




Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 9




Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 10





Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 11 - non-credit zone




Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 12 - non-credit zone




Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 13




Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 14




Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 15




Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 16




Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 17 - non-credit zone



Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 18



Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 19



Bear Basin Restoration Site Hydrograph Wetland Gauge 20 - non-credit zone




Table 9. Wetland Hydrology Criteria Attainment Table							
Project Number and Name: 95362 - Bear Basin Restoration Site							
	Success Criteria Achieved / Max Consecutive Days During Growing Season (Percentage)						
Success Criteria (21 Days) (8%)	MY-01 2015	MY-02 2016	MY-03	MY-04	MY-05	MY-06	MY-07
Gauge 1	Yes/23 (9.3%)	Yes/24 (9.7%)					
Gauge 2	Yes/28 (11.3%)	Yes/42 (17.1%)					
Gauge 3	Yes/22 (9.1%)	No/14 (5.6%)					
Gauge 4	No/17 (7.0%)	No/15 (6.0%)					
Gauge 5	Yes/90 (36.8%)	Yes/48 (19.5%)					
Gauge 6	Yes/28 (11.3%)	Yes/41 (16.9%)					
Gauge 7	Yes/51 (20.8%)	Yes/45 (18.5%)					
Gauge 8	Yes/28 (11.3%)	Yes/42 (17.1%)					
Gauge 9	Yes/23 (9.3%)	Yes/23 (9.3%)					
Gauge 10	Yes/24 (9.7%)	No/18 (7.4%)					
Gauge 11*	No/15 (6.2%)	No/15 (6.2%)					
Gauge 12*	Yes/25 (10.3%)	No/19 (7.6%)					
Gauge 13	Yes/27 (11.1%)	Yes/42 (17.1%)					
Gauge 14	Yes/25 (10.3%)	No/19 (7.6%)					
Gauge 15	Yes/35 (14.2%)	Yes/42 (17.1%)					
Gauge 16	Yes/22 (9.1%)	No/14 (5.6%)					
Gauge 17*	Yes/23 (9.3%)	No/14 (5.6%)					
Gauge 18	Yes/22 (9.1%)	No/14 (5.6%)					
Gauge 19	No/18 (7.4%)	No/12 (4.9%)					
Gauge 20*	No/19 (7.6%)	No/12 (4.9%)					

*=non-credit bearing area