FINAL

ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT
YEAR 1 (2012)
HAUSER CREEK STREAM RESTORATION SITE
DAVIE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA
(EEP Project No. 92471, Contract No. 004804)
Construction Completed August 2011



Submitted to:
North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources
Ecosystem Enhancement Program
Raleigh, North Carolina

February 2013

FINAL

ANNUAL MONITORING REPORT
YEAR 1 (2012)
HAUSER CREEK STREAM RESTORATION SITE
DAVIE COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA
(EEP Project No. 92471, Contract No. 004804)
Construction Completed August 2011



Submitted to:
North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources
Ecosystem Enhancement Program
Raleigh, North Carolina

Prepared by:
Axiom Environmental, Inc.
218 Snow Avenue
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603

Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Ecosystem Enhancement PROGRAM

February 2013

Table of Contents

Appendices

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The North Carolina Ecosystem Enhancement Program (NCEEP) has completed approximately 2525 linear feet of stream restoration and 93 linear feet of enhancement (level II), located on the property of Alethea Segal in Davie County, North Carolina at the Hauser Creek Stream Restoration Site (hereafter referred to as the "Site") to assist in fulfilling stream mitigation goals in the area. The Site is located in United States Geological Survey (USGS) Hydrologic Unit 03040101160010 (North Carolina Division of Water Quality [NCDWQ] Subbasin 03-07-02) of the Yadkin Pee-Dee River Basin. The Site is not located in a Targeted Local Watershed. The Site drainage area is an approximately 2.64-square mile rural watershed at the Site outfall consisting primarily of forest and pasture land with low density residential property. This report (compiled based on NCEEP's *Procedural Guidance and Content Requirements for EEP Monitoring Reports* Version 1.4 dated 11/7/11) summarizes data for year 1 (2012) monitoring.

Restoration goals outlined in the approved *Hauser Creek Restoration Plan* [NCEEP 2008] are:

- Improve water quality with the construction of stable stream banks, removal of cattle access, and the establishment of a protective buffer.
- Control transport of sediment recruited by stream flows from cleared adjacent floodplains with the establishment of a forested buffer.
- Improve the stream function and habitat with the connection of the channelized and incised stream back to its floodplain.
- Restore long-term stability with the restoration of channel pattern, profile, and dimension.
- Improve in-stream habitat with the installation of root wads, constructed riffles, cross vanes, and single wing vanes to enhance pool depths.
- Improve buffer habitat by creating ephemeral pools within the old channel fill areas.

Project objectives outlined in the approved *Hauser Creek Restoration Plan* [NCEEP 2008] are:

- The restoration of 2525 linear feet of stream with Priority I Restoration in order to raise the stream elevation, reconnect the floodplain, restore pattern, and reestablish channel dimension.
- The enhancement of 93 linear feet of stream with Enhancement Level II activities which involve buffer restoration and bank stabilization.
- The preservation of 108 linear feet of stream by placing a conservation easement along the downstream reach of channel.
- Establish a riparian buffer with an average distance of 50 feet beyond each stream bank. Buffer restoration on 5.9 acres along the stream length will be established with the planting of riparian vegetation.

Prior to construction, the Site contained a degraded stream channel located within maintained pasture and floodplain fields with wooded uplands. Site streams were characterized by a narrow buffer, increased widths ranging from 20-35 feet, steep to moderate bank slopes, incision, and elevated bank-height ratios. Project construction was completed in August 2011. The Site will be protected by a permanent conservation easement held by the State of North Carolina.

Seven vegetation monitoring plots were monitored on October 24, 2012 for Year 1 (2012) monitoring. Vegetation success criteria dictate that an average density of 320 stems-per-acre must be surviving in the first three monitoring years. Subsequently, 288 stems-per-acre must be surviving in year 4 and 260 stems-per-acre in year 5. Stem counts will be based on an average of the evaluated vegetation plots. Based on the number of stems counted, average densities were measured at 422 stems-per-acre surviving in Year 1 (2012). The dominant species identified at the Site were planted stems of sycamore (*Platanus occidentalis*), green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*), and silky dogwood (*Cornus amomum*). Five of the seven individual plots met success criteria based on planted stems alone. Plots 2 and 6 were each one

stem shy of success criteria based on planted stems alone; however, when including naturally recruited stems of box elder (*Acer negundo*) and sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*) Plots 2 and 6 were above 320 stems per acre.

No vegetation problem areas were observed within the Site.

Success criteria for stream restoration will be assessed using measurements of stream dimension, pattern, and profile; Site photographs; visual assessments; and vegetation sampling. Success is based on the stability of the stream.

Overall, the stream is functioning properly and as designed. Three areas of minor bank erosion were noted in Figures 2A-2B in Appendix B, but these areas are not causing additional issues up or downstream and vegetation is establishing.

Map Label*	Station	Notes
PA-1	22+50	Minor erosion on both banks; vegetation is establishing
PA-2	18+75	Minor erosion and undercut bank on outer/left bank; vegetation is establishing
PA-3	12+00	Minor undercutting on outer/right bank; vegetation is establishing

*Map labels on Figures 2A-2B, Appendix B

Success criteria for stream restoration will include documentation of two bankfull channel events during the monitoring period. In the event that less than two bankfull events occur during the first five years, monitoring will continue until the second event is documented. In addition, bankfull events must occur during separate monitoring years. A crest gauge is located within the Site to assist with documentation of bankfull events (Figures 2 and 2A-2B, Appendix B). No bankfull event was documented during the Year 1 (2012) monitoring season.

Summary information/data related to the occurrence of items such as beaver or encroachment and statistics related to performance of various project and monitoring elements can be found in tables and figures within this report's appendices. Narrative background and supporting information formerly found in these reports can be found in the Baseline Monitoring Report (formerly Mitigation Plan) and in the Mitigation Plan (formerly the Restoration Plan) documents available on NCEEPs website. All raw data supporting the tables and figures in the appendices is available from NCEEP upon request.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

2.1 Vegetation Assessment

Seven vegetation plots were established and marked after construction with metal t-posts demarking the four corners of the plot. The plots are 10 meters square and are located randomly within the Site. These plots were surveyed on July 17, 2012 for the Year 1 (2012) monitoring season using the *CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.2* (Lee et al. 2008) (http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/methods.htm); results are included in Appendix C. The taxonomic standard for vegetation used for this document was *Flora of the Southern and Mid-Atlantic States* (Weakley 2012).

2.2 Stream Assessment

Annual stream monitoring was conducted in October of 2012. Measurements were taken using a Topcon GTS 303 total station and Recon data collector. The raw total station file was processed using Carlson Survey Software into a Computer Aided Design (CAD) file. Coordinates were exported as a text/ASCII file to Microsoft Excel for processing and presentation of data. Pebble counts were completed using the

modified Wolman method (Rosgen 1993). A crest gauge has been installed in the channel to assist with documentation of overbank events.

Annual stream monitoring was conducted the week of October 25, 2012. Seven permanent cross-sections, five riffle and two pool, will be used to evaluate stream dimension; locations are depicted on Figures 2 and 2A-2B (Appendix B). Cross-sections are permanently monumented with metal t-posts at each end point. Cross-sections will be surveyed annually to provide a detailed measurement of the stream and banks including points on the adjacent floodplain, top of bank, bankfull, breaks in slope, edge of water, and thalweg. Data will be used to calculate width-depth ratios, entrenchment ratios, and bank height ratios for each cross-section. In addition, pebble counts were completed at cross-sections 3,5, and7, and photographs will be taken at each permanent cross-section annually.

One approximately 2500-linear foot monitoring reach will be used to evaluated stream pattern and longitudinal profile; locations are depicted on Figures 2 and 2A-2B (Appendix B). Measurement of channel pattern will include belt-width, and meander length. Subsequently, data will be used to calculated meander-width ratios. Longitudinal profile measurements will include average water surface slopes and facet slopes and pool-to-pool spacing. In addition, visual stream morphology stability assessments will be completed in each of the monitoring reach annually to assess the channel bed, banks, and in-stream structures.

3.0 REFERENCES

Ecosystem Enhancement Program (EEP). Unpublished. Procedural Guidance and Content Requirements for EEP Monitoring Projects, Version 1.4, dated 11/07/11. NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources. Available online at http://portal.ncdenr.org/c/document_library/get_file?p_l_id=1169848&folderId=2288101&name=DLFE-39268.pdf.

Lee, Michael T., R.K. Peet, S.D. Roberts, and T.R. Wentworth. 2008. CVS-EEP Protocol for Recording Vegetation, Version 4.2. (online). Available: http://cvs.bio.unc.edu/methods.htm.

N.C. Ecosystem Enhancement Program. 2008. Ripshin Branch Stream & Wetland Restoration Plan - Ashe County, NC.

Weakley, Alan S. 2012. Flora of the Southern and Mid-Atlantic States. Available online at: http://www.herbarium.unc.edu/WeakleysFlora.pdf [September 28, 2012]. University of North Carolina Herbarium, North Carolina Botanical Garden, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

APPENDIX A

PROJECT SITE LOCATION MAP AND BACKGROUND TABLES

Figure 1. Site Location Map

Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Credits

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History

Table 3. Project Contacts Table

Table 4. Project Baseline Information and Attributes



Axiom Environmental, Inc.
Axiom Environmental
218 Snow Avenue
Raleigh, NC 27603
(919) 215-1693

SITE LOCATION MAP
HAUSER CREEK
EEP PROJECT NUMBER 92471
Davie County, North Carolina

Dwn. by.
KRJ

Date:
October 2012

Project:
12-004.11

FIGURE
1

Table 1. Project Components and Mitigation Credits
Hauser Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 92741)

Mitigation Credits							
	Stream		Riparian Wetland		Buffer		
Type	Restoration	Restoration Equivalent	Restoration	Restoration Equivalent			
Totals	2387	22	--	--	--		
Projects Components							
Project Component/ Reach ID	Station Range	Existing Linear Footage/ Acreage	Priority Approach	Restoration/ Restoration Equivalent	Restoration Linear Footage/ Acreage	Mitigation Ratio	Comment
Reach 1	00+72 – 16+40	--	P1	Restoration	1568	1:1	Priority 1 Restoration
Reach 2	16+40 – 19+90	--	P1	Restoration	350	2:1	Half Credit Due to Location Within a Utilities Easement
Reach 3	19+90 – 26+31	641	P1	Restoration	607	1:1	34 ft is Outside of Easement in a Piped Crossing
Reach 4	26+31–27+39	108	Pres	Preservation	108	5:1	Preservation
Reach 5	--	93	E11	Enhancement (Level II)	93	2.5:1	Level 11 Enhancement.

Component Summation			
Restoration Level	Stream (linear footage)	Riparian Wetland (acres)	Buffer (square footage)
Restoration	2525*	--	--
Enhancement (Level II)	93	--	--
Preservation	108	--	--
Totals	**2726**	--	--
Mitigation Units	**2409 SMUs**	--	--

*34 linear feet is located outside of the easement in a piped crossing and is therefore not counted for mitigation credit; in addition, 350 linear feet is located within a utilities easement and therefore only receives half credit (2:1 mitigation ratio)

Table 2. Project Activity and Reporting History
Hauser Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 92471)

Elapsed Time Since Grading Complete: 1 year 4 months
Elapsed Time Since Planting Complete: 0 year 11 months
Number of Reporting Years: 1

Activity or Deliverable	Data Collection Complete	Completion or Delivery
ERTR		April 2008
Restoration Plan		May 2008
No-rise Flood Study Approval		December 2009
Construction Plans / Erosion Control Plan		June 2010
Land Quality Approval		May 2011
Construction and Grading Begins		April 2011
Temporary S&E Mix Applied		April-August 2011
Permanent Seed Mix Applied		April-August 2011
Construction and Grading Ends		August 2011
Containerized Planting for Entire Reach		January 2012
As-Built Construction Drawings		March 2012
SCO Final Report		March 2012
Year 1 Monitoring (2012)	October 2012	December 2012
Year 2 Monitoring (2013)		
Year 3 Monitoring (2014)		
Year 4 Monitoring (2015)		
Year 5 Monitoring (2016)		

Table 3. Project Contacts Table
Hauser Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 92471)

Designer	Ward Consulting Engineers, P.C. 8368 Six Forks Road Suite 104 Raleigh, NC 27615-5083 Becky Ward 919-870-0526
Construction, Planting, and Seeding Contractor	Carolina Environmental Contracting, Inc. Mt. Airy, North Carolina 336-320-3849
Surveyor	Turner Land Surveying PLLC 3201 Glenridge Drive Raleigh, NC 27604 Elizabeth Turner 919-875-1378
Seed Mix Source	Unknown
Baseline Data Collection	Not Applicable
Year 1Monitoring Performer	Axiom Environmental, Inc. 218 Snow Avenue Raleigh, NC 27603 Grant Lewis 919-215-1693

Table 4. Project Baseline Information and Attributes
Hauser Stream Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 92471)

Project Information	
Project Name	Hauser Stream Restoration Site
Project County	Davie County, North Carolina
Project Area	9.11 acres
Project Coordinates	836,322.303◦N, 1,551,907.668◦E
Project Watershed Summary Information	
Physiographic Region	Piedmont
Ecoregion	Southern Outer Piedmont
Project River Basin	Yadkin Pee-dee
USGS 8-digit HUC	03040101
USGS 14-digit HUC	03040101160010
NCDWQ Subbasin	03-07-02
Project Drainage Area	2.64 square miles
Project Drainage Area Impervious Surface	0.6%
Watershed Type	Rural
Reach Summary Information	
Parameters	**Hauser Creek**
Restored/Enhanced Length	2726 linear feet
Drainage Area	2.64 square miles
NCDWQ Index Number	12-86
NCDWQ Classification	WS-IV
Valley Type/Morphological Description	VIII/C4
Dominant Soil Series	Wehadkee, Chewacla
Drainage Class	Poorly Drained, Somewhat poorly drained
Soil Hydric Status	Hydric, Nonhydric may contain hydric Wehadkee inclusions
Slope	0.0025
FEMA Classification	Regulated Stream
Native Vegetation Community	Piedmont/Low Mountain Alluvial Forest
Percent Composition of Exotic Invasives	<5%
Regulatory Considerations	
Regulation	**Applicable**
Waters of the U.S. –Sections 404 and 401	Yes-Received Appropriate Permits
Endangered Species Act	Yes-No Effect
Historic Preservation Act	No
CZMA/CAMA	No
FEMA Floodplain Compliance	Yes-Received a No Rise Certification
Essential Fisheries Habitat	No

APPENDIX B

VISUAL ASSESSMENT DATA

Figures 2 and 2A-2B. Current Conditions Plan View

Table 5. Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment

Table 6. Vegetation Condition Assessment

Stream Fixed Station Photographs

Vegetation Monitoring Photographs



Axiom Environmental, Inc.

Prepared for:

Ecosystem Enhancement Program

Project:

HAUSER CREEK RESTORATION SITE

EEP Project Number 92471
Davie County, NC

Title:

CURRENT CONDITIONS PLAN VIEW

Drawn by: KRJ/CLF

Date: February 2013

Scale: 1 in = 180 ft

Project No.: 12-004.11

FIGURE

2



Axiom Environmental, Inc.
Axiom Environmental
218 Snow Avenue
Raleigh, NC 27603
(919) 215-1693

CURRENT CONDITIONS PLAN VIEW
HAUSER CREEK
EEP PROJECT NUMBER 92471
Davie County, North Carolina

Dwn. by.	KRJ/CLF
Date:	February 2013
Project:	12-004.11

FIGURE
2A



Axiom Environmental, Inc.
Axiom Environmental
218 Snow Avenue
Raleigh, NC 27603
(919) 215-1693

CURRENT CONDITIONS PLAN VIEW
HAUSER CREEK
EEP PROJECT NUMBER 92471
Davie County, North Carolina

Dwn. by.
KRJ/CLF

Date:
Februrary 2013

Project:
12-004.11

FIGURE
2B

Table 5 **Visual Stream Morphology Stability Assessment**
Reach ID **Hauser**
Assessed Length **2468**

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	Adjusted % for Stabilizing Woody Vegetation
1. Bed	1. **Vertical Stability** (Riffle and Run units)	1. Aggradation - Bar formation/growth sufficient to significantly deflect flow laterally (not to include point bars)			0	0	100%			
		2. Degradation - Evidence of downcutting			0	0	100%			
	2. Riffle Condition	1. Texture/Substrate - Riffle maintains coarser substrate	15	15			100%			
	3. Meander Pool Condition	1. Depth Sufficient (Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth ≥ 1.6)	24	24			100%			
		2. Length appropriate (>30% of centerline distance between tail of upstream riffle and head of downstrem riffle)	100	100			100%			
	4.**Thalweg Position**	1. Thalweg centering at upstream of meander bend (Run)	100	100			100%			
		2. Thalweg centering at downstream of meander (Glide)	100	100			100%			
2. Bank	**1. Scoured/Eroding**	Bank lacking vegetative cover resulting simply from poor growth and/or scour and erosion			4	60	99%			99%
	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%			100%
	3. Mass Wasting	Bank slumping, calving, or collapse			3	30	99%			99%
				Totals	7	90	98%	0	0	98%
3. Engineered Structures	**1. Overall Integrity**	Structures physically intact with no dislodged boulders or logs.	8	8			100%			
	2. Grade Control	Grade control structures exhibiting maintenance of grade across the sill.	8	8			100%			
	2a. Piping	Structures lacking any substantial flow underneath sills or arms.	8	8			100%			
	3. Bank Protection	Bank erosion within the structures extent of influence does not exceed 15%. (See guidance for this table in EEP monitoring guidance document)	8	8			100%			
	4. Habitat	Pool forming structures maintaining ~ Max Pool Depth : Mean Bankfull Depth ratio ≥ 1.6 Rootwads/logs providing some cover at base-flow.	8	8			100%			

HAUSER

Table 6 Vegetation Condition Assessment

Planted Acreage[1] **5.9**

Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold	CCPV Depiction	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Planted Acreage
1. Bare Areas	Very limited cover of planted woody and herbaceous material on stream banks	0.1 acres	N/A	0	0.00	0.0%
2. Low Stem Density Areas	Woody stem densities clearly below target levels based on visual observations and MY3 stem count criteria.	0.1 acres	N/A	0	0.00	0.0%
			Total		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	N/A	0	0.00	0.0%
			Cumulative Total	0	0.00	0.0%

Easement Acreage[2] **13.34**

Vegetation Category	Definitions	Mapping Threshold	CCPV Depiction	Number of Polygons	Combined Acreage	% of Easement Acreage
4. Invasive Areas of Concern[4]	Microstegium, tall fescue, multiflora rose, Chinese privet, Chinese lespedeza	1000 SF	N/A	0	0.00	0.0%
5. Easement Encroachment Areas[3]	Microstegium encroachment	none	N/A	0	0.00	0.0%

1 = Enter the planted acreage within the easement. This number is calculated as the easement acreage minus any existing mature tree stands that were not subject to supplemental planting of the understory, the channel acreage, crossings or any other elements not directly planted as part of the project effort.

2 = The acreage within the easement boundaries.

3 = Encroachment may occur within or outside of planted areas and will therefore be calculated against the overall easement acreage. In the event a polygon is cataloged into items 1, 2 or 3 in the table and is the result of encroachment, the associated acreage should be tallied in the relevant item (i.e., item 1,2 or 3) as well as a parallel tally in item 5.

4 = Invasives may occur in or out of planted areas, but still within the easement and will therefore be calculated against the overall easement acreage. Invasives of concern/interest are listed below. The list of high concern spcies are those with the potential to directly outcompete native, young, woody stems in the short-term (e.g. monitoring period or shortly thereafter) or affect the community structure for existing, more established tree/shrub stands over timeframes that are slightly longer (e.g. 1-2 decades). The low/moderate concern group are those species that generally do not have this capacity over the timeframes discussed and therefore are not expected to be mapped with regularity, but can be mapped, if in the judgement of the observer their coverage, density or distribution is suppressing the viability, density, or growth of planted woody stems. Decisions as to whether remediation will be needed are based on the integration of risk factors by EEP such as species present, their coverage, distribution relative to native biomass, and the practicality of treatment. For example, even modest amounts of Kudzu or Japanese Knotweed early in the projects history will warrant control, but potentially large coverages of Microstegium in the herb layer will not likley trigger control because of the limited capacities to impact tree/shrub layers within the timeframes discussed and the potential impacts of treating extensive amounts of ground cover. Those species with the "watch list" designator in gray shade are of interest as well, but have yet to be observed across the state with any frequency. Those in *red italics* are of particular interest given their extreme risk/threat level for mapping as points where isolated specimens are found, particularly ealry in a projects monitoring history. However, areas of discreet, dense patches will of course be mapped as polygons. The symbology scheme below was one that was found to be helpful for symbolzing invasives polygons, particulalry for situations where the conditon for an area is somewhere between isolated specimens and dense, discreet patches. In any case, the point or polygon/area feature can be symbolized to describe things like high or low concern and species can be listed as a map inset, in legend items if the number of species are limited or in the narrative section of the executive summary.

High Concern:				Low/Moderate Concern:	
Vines	**Genus/Species**	**Shrubs/Herbs**	**Genus/Species**	**Shrubs/Herbs**	**Genus/Species**
Kudzu	*Pueraria lobata*	Japanese Knotweed	Polygonum cuspidatum	Japanese Privet	Ligustrum Japonicum
Porcelain Berry	Ampelopsis brevipeduncu	Oriental Bittersweet	Celastrus orbiculatus	Glossy Privet	Ligustrum lucidum
Japanese Honeysuckle	Lonicera japonica	Multiflora Rose	Rosa multiflora	Fescue	Festuca spp.
Japanese Hops	Humulus japonicus	Russian olive	Elaeagnus angustifolia	English Ivy	Hedera helix
Wisterias	Wisteria spp.	Chinese Privet	Ligustrum sinense	Microstegium	Microstegium vimineum
Winter Creeper	Euonymus fortunei	Chinese Silvergrass	Miscanthus sinensis	Burning Bush	Euonymus alatus
Bush Killer (Watch List)	Cayratia japonica	Phragmites	Phragmites australis	Johnson Grass	Sorghum halepense
		Bamboos	Phyllostachys spp	Bush Honeysuckles	Lonicera, spp.
Trees		Sericea Lespedeza	Sericea Lespedeza	Periwinkles	Vinca minor
Tree of Heaven	Ailanthus altissima	Garlic Mustard (Watch List)	Alliaria petiolata	Morning Glories	Morning Glories
Mimosa	Albizia julibrissin	Cogon Grass (Watch List)	Imperata cylindrica	Bicolor Lespedeza (Watch List)	Lespedeza bicolor
Princess Tree	Paulownia tomentosa	Giant Reed (Watch List)	Arundo donax	Chinese Yams (Watch List)	Dioscorea oppositifolia
China Berry	Melia azedarach	Tropical Soda Apple (Watch List)	Solanum viarum	Air Potato (Watch List)	Dioscorea bulbifera
Callery Pear	Pyrus calleryana	Japanese Spirea (Watch List)	Spiraea japonica	Japanese Climbing Fern (Watch List)	Lygodium japonicum
White Mulberry	Morus alba	Japanese Barberry (Watch List)	Berberis thunbergii		
Tallow Tree (Watch List)	Triadica sebifera				

Hauser Creek
Stream Fixed Station Photographs
Taken October 24, 2012


Stream Photo 1


Stream Photo 2


Stream Photo 3


Stream Photo 4


Stream Photo 5


Stream Photo 6

Hauser Creek
Vegetation Monitoring Photographs
Taken October 24, 2012





APPENDIX C

VEGETATION PLOT DATA

Table 7. Vegetation Plot Criteria Attainment

Table 8. CVS Vegetation Plot Metadata

Table 9. Total and Planted Stems by Plot and Species

Table 7. Vegetation Plot Criteria Attainment
Hauser Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 92741)

Vegetation Plot ID	Vegetation Survival Threshold Met?	Tract Mean
1	Yes	71%
2	No*	
3	Yes	
4	Yes	
5	Yes	
6	No*	
7	Yes	

*Based on planted stems alone, this plot doesn't meet success criteria; however, when including naturally recruited stems of box elder (*Acer negundo*) and sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*) these plots were above 320 stems per acre.

.

Table 8. CVS Vegetation Plot Metadata
Hauser Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 92741)

Report Prepared By	Corri Faquin
Date Prepared	10/29/2012 10:36
database name	Axiom-EEP-2012-A.mdb
database location	C:\Documents and Settings\kjernigan\Desktop
computer name	KEENAN
file size	57331712
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	92471
project Name	Hauser Creek
Description	Stream Restoration
River Basin	Yadkin-Pee Dee
length(ft)	
area (sq m)	
Required Plots (calculated)	
Sampled Plots	7

Table 9. Total and Planted Stems by Plot and Species
EEP Project Code 92471. Project Name: Hauser Creek

			Current Plot Data (MY1 2012)																			Annual Means		
			92471-01-0001			92471-01-0002			92471-01-0003			92471-01-0004			92471-01-0005			92471-01-0006			92471-01-0007			MY1 (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	PnoLS	P-all	T	PnoLS	P-all	T
Acer negundo	boxelder	Tree			2						5			5						2			1			15
Acer rubrum	red maple	Tree												2												2
Alnus serrulata	hazel alder	Shrub	1	1	1	1	1	1										2	2	2	1	1	1	5	5	5
Betula nigra	river birch	Tree							2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1				6	6	6
Callicarpa americana	American beautyberry	Shrub							2	2	2				1	1	1							3	3	3
Cornus amomum	silky dogwood	Shrub	3	3	3	2	2	2	1	1	1				1	1	1	2	2	2				9	9	9
Diospyros virginiana	common persimmon	Tree	1	1	1										1	1	1				1	1	1	3	3	3
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	Tree	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	4	4	4	1	1	1							14	14	14
Liquidambar styraciflua	sweetgum	Tree			51			4			6			15												76
Liriodendron tulipifera	tuliptree	Tree	1	1	1						4			3			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	11
Nyssa sylvatica	blackgum	Tree							1	1	1													1	1	1
Physocarpus opulifolius	common ninebark	Shrub							2	2	2										1	1	1	3	3	3
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	Tree	2	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	8	8	11	2	2	2				4	4	4	19	19	22
Quercus michauxii	swamp chestnut oak	Tree	1	1	1				1	1	1							1	1	1	2	2	2	5	5	5
Sambucus canadensis	Common Elderberry	Shrub	1	1	1																1	1	1	2	2	2
		Stem count	13	13	66	7	7	11	14	14	29	13	13	41	8	8	9	7	7	9	11	11	12	73	73	177
		size (ares)	1			1			1			1			1			1			1			7		
		size (ACRES)	0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.02			0.17		
		Species count	8	8	10	4	4	5	8	8	11	3	3	7	6	6	7	5	5	6	7	7	8	12	12	15
		Stems per ACRE	526.1	526.1	2671	283.3	283.3	445.2	566.6	566.6	1174	526.1	526.1	1659	323.7	323.7	364.2	283.3	283.3	364.2	445.2	445.2	485.6	422	422	1023

Color for Density

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%

APPENDIX D

STREAM SURVEY DATA

Cross-section Plots

Longitudinal Profile Plots

Substrate Plots

Table 10. Baseline Stream Data Summary

Tables 11a-b. Monitoring Data

Site	UT to Hauser
Watershed:	Yadkin Pee Dee
XS ID	XS - 1, Riffle
Feature	Riffle
Date:	10/25/2012
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Dean, Jernigan

Station	Elevation
0.0	99.40
3.8	99.24
5.8	98.98
7.5	98.80
9.0	97.95
10.3	97.60
11.5	97.47
12.5	97.37
13.7	96.83
14.7	96.26
15.5	96.15
16.5	96.03
17.7	95.58
19.1	95.36
20.2	95.17
21.9	95.28
23.6	95.35
24.4	95.48
25.3	95.54
26.1	95.67
27.2	95.9
28.1	96.2
29.5	97.0
30.4	97.4
31.5	97.8
32.9	97.8
34.7	98.0
37.0	98.9
39.3	99.0
43.0	98.9

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	98.8
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	61.8
Bankfull Width:	29.2
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	102.4
Flood Prone Width:	150.0
Max Depth at Bankfull:	3.6
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	2.1
W / D Ratio:	13.8
Entrenchment Ratio:	5.1
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0

Stream Type	E



Site	UT to Hauser
Watershed:	Yadkin Pee Dee
XS ID	XS - 2, Riffle
Feature	Riffle
Date:	9/12/2012
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Dean, Jernigan

Station	Elevation
0.00	100.61
3.53	100.50
6.44	99.59
8.99	99.07
11.01	98.62
12.09	98.60
14.39	97.97
16.13	97.63
17.55	97.19
18.31	97.02
18.86	96.86
19.89	96.50
20.78	96.21
22.28	95.97
23.11	95.99
24.4	95.60
24.6	95.67
25.2	95.95
26.1	96.15
26.7	96.45
27.4	96.68
28.6	97.09
29.3	97.38
31.0	97.98
32.28	98.33
33.66	98.84
35.42	99.31
37.4	99.46
39.9	99.54

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	99.3
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	49.5
Bankfull Width:	27.6
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	103.0
Flood Prone Width:	150.0
Max Depth at Bankfull:	3.7
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	1.8
W / D Ratio:	15.4
Entrenchment Ratio:	5.4
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0

Stream Type	E



Site	UT to Hauser
Watershed:	Yadkin Pee Dee
XS ID	XS - 3, Riffle
Feature	Riffle
Date:	9/12/2012
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Dean, Jernigan

Station	Elevation
0.00	101.93
3.76	102.01
5.98	101.91
8.95	100.59
10.80	99.78
12.46	99.41
13.59	99.07
16.51	97.88
17.99	97.95
19.57	97.73
23.77	97.67
25.66	97.84
27.96	97.97
30.27	98.34
31.73	99.13
33.1	99.60
35.7	100.18
39.7	101.32
41.9	101.49
44.6	101.61

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	101.3
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	76.3
Bankfull Width:	32.4
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	104.9
Flood Prone Width:	150.0
Max Depth at Bankfull:	3.6
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	2.4
W / D Ratio:	13.8
Entrenchment Ratio:	4.6
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0

Stream Type	E



Site	UT to Hauser
Watershed:	Yadkin Pee Dee
XS ID	XS - 4, Pool
Feature	Pool
Date:	9/12/2012
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Dean, Jernigan

Station	Elevation
0.0	101.5
3.3	101.6
5.9	101.5
7.2	101.3
10.1	100.1
12.7	99.1
14.8	98.5
16.2	97.5
17.9	97.0
19.5	96.0
21.1	95.8
22.6	95.4
23.9	95.9
26.0	97.0
27.6	97.9
29.1	98.3
31.3	99.1
33.7	100.0
36.7	101.6
43.0	101.7

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	101.3
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	88.3
Bankfull Width:	28.9
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	NA
Flood Prone Width:	NA
Max Depth at Bankfull:	5.9
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	3.1
W / D Ratio:	NA
Entrenchment Ratio:	NA
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0

Stream Type	C/E



Site	UT to Hauser
Watershed:	Yadkin Pee Dee
XS ID	XS - 5, Riffle
Feature	Riffle
Date:	9/12/2012
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Dean, Jernigan

Station	Elevation
0.00	101.92
5.39	101.94
7.77	100.78
9.95	99.85
12.76	99.55
14.58	98.67
16.17	98.15
17.84	97.65
20.16	97.82
21.78	97.68
23.20	97.87
25.18	97.83
26.13	98.54
28.28	98.97
30.43	99.76
32.6	99.95
39.7	102.15
45.0	102.13

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	101.9
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	85.8
Bankfull Width:	33.6
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	106.2
Flood Prone Width:	150.0
Max Depth at Bankfull:	4.3
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	2.6
W / D Ratio:	13.2
Entrenchment Ratio:	4.5
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0

Stream Type	E



Site	UT to Hauser
Watershed:	Yadkin Pee Dee
XS ID	XS - 6, Pool
Feature	Pool
Date:	9/12/2012
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Dean, Jernigan

Station	Elevation
0.00	103.13
2.15	103.05
4.68	102.59
7.58	101.95
10.26	101.54
12.40	101.29
14.77	100.77
16.58	100.52
18.70	100.03
21.25	99.70
22.54	99.67
23.60	99.38
24.40	99.11
24.74	98.39
25.91	97.93
27.45	97.51
28.87	97.40
30.57	97.93
31.33	97.99
32.29	98.35
32.90	98.67
33.96	99.21
34.82	99.48
35.71	99.68
37.07	100.35
38.86	101.02
41.96	103.12
44.99	103.25
48.43	103.32

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	103.1
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	109.9
Bankfull Width:	39.7
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	NA
Flood Prone Width:	NA
Max Depth at Bankfull:	5.6
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	2.8
W / D Ratio:	NA
Entrenchment Ratio:	NA
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0

Stream Type	E



Site	UT to Hauser
Watershed:	Yadkin Pee Dee
XS ID	XS - 7, Riffle
Feature	Riffle
Date:	9/12/2012
Field Crew:	Perkinson, Dean, Jernigan

Station	Elevation
0.00	103.39
3.38	103.44
5.79	103.17
7.90	102.50
9.37	101.59
10.36	101.12
11.73	100.85
13.26	100.40
13.97	99.98
14.91	99.62
16.05	99.29
17.62	98.84
19.06	98.53
20.76	98.35
22.17	98.69
23.26	98.53
24.63	98.50
26.03	98.97
27.02	98.88
28.01	99.56
29.54	99.72
30.92	100.13
32.33	100.45
33.06	100.76
34.39	100.72
35.61	101.08
38.74	102.36
40.28	102.72
41.83	102.90
43.81	102.89

SUMMARY DATA	
Bankfull Elevation:	102.7
Bankfull Cross-Sectional Area:	85.5
Bankfull Width:	33.0
Flood Prone Area Elevation:	107.1
Flood Prone Width:	150.0
Max Depth at Bankfull:	4.4
Mean Depth at Bankfull:	2.6
W / D Ratio:	12.7
Entrenchment Ratio:	4.5
Bank Height Ratio:	1.0

Stream Type	E



Project Name	Hauser Creek - Year 1 (2012) Profile		**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	
Reach	Main Reach (00+00 - 10+00)	**Avg. Water Surface Slope**	0.0022				
Feature	Profile	**Riffle Length**	48				
Date	10/25/12	**Avg. Riffle Slope**	0.0047				
Crew	Perkinson, Dean, Jernigan	**Pool Length**	16				
		Avg. Pool Slope	0.0005				



Project Name	Hauser Creek - Year 1 (2012) Profile		**2012**	**2013**	**2014**	**2015**	
Reach	Main Reach (10+00 - 22+50)	**Avg. Water Surface Slope**	0.0022				
Feature	Profile	**Riffle Length**	48				
Date	10/25/12	**Avg. Riffle Slope**	0.0047				
Crew	Perkinson, Dean, Jernigan	**Pool Length**	16				
		Avg. Pool Slope	0.0005				



	Pebble Count,
	Hauser Creek
	Yadkin Pee Dee

Note:	**Cross Section 3**



Size percent less than (mm)					Percent by substrate type					
D16	D35	D50	D84	D95	silt/clay	sand	gravel	cobble	boulder	bedrock
0.500	7.44	23.1	70	88	8%	24%	48%	20%	0%	0%

	Pebble Count,
	Hauser Creek
	Yadkin Pee Dee

Note:	**Cross Section 5**



Size percent less than (mm)					Percent by substrate type					
D16	D35	D50	D84	D95	silt/clay	sand	gravel	cobble	boulder	bedrock
#N/A	#N/A	0.1	0	18	37%	48%	15%	0%	0%	0%

Pebble Count,

	Hauser Creek
	Yadkin Pee Dee

Note:	**Cross Section 7**



Size percent less than (mm)					Percent by substrate type					
D16	D35	D50	D84	D95	silt/clay	sand	gravel	cobble	boulder	bedrock
1.057	12.87	22.0	112	204	12%	12%	35%	42%	0%	0%

Pebble Count,

	Hauser Creek
	Yadkin Pee Dee

Note:	**Reach Total**



Size percent less than (mm)					Percent by substrate type					
D16	D35	D50	D84	D95	silt/clay	sand	gravel	cobble	boulder	bedrock
#N/A	0.26	6.9	73	130	19%	28%	32%	21%	0%	0%

Table 10. Baseline Stream Data Summary
Hauser Stream Restoration Site-Project No. 92471

Parameter	Gauge[2]	Regional Curve			Pre-Existing Condition						Reference Reach(es) Data						Design		
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle Only		LL	UL	Eq.	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD[5]	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD[5]	n	Min	Med	Max
Bankfull Width (ft)	-	-	-	-	17.2		20.8	27.7			21.5		26.5	30.9				33	
Floodprone Width (ft)					176.8		275.2	333.4			306		415	530			210	268	330
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	-	-	-	-	2		2.6	3.1			1.6		2.2	3.4				2.5	
[1]Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	-				3.9		4.3	4.8			3.3		3.8	4.2			3.3	3.8	4.2
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	-	-	-	-	38		54.7	71.2			43		60	80				83.2	
Width/Depth Ratio	-				5.5		8	10.8			7		12	19				13	
Entrenchment Ratio	-				10		13.5	19.3			8.3		16	22.4			6.4	8.1	10
[1]Bank Height Ratio	-				0.8		1.26	1.65			0.7		0.86	1.07			0.9	1	1.1
Profile																			
Riffle Length (ft)					----		----	----			----		----	----			----	----	----
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)					----		----	----			----		----	----			----	----	----
Pool Length (ft)					----		----	----			----		----	----			----	----	----
Pool Max depth (ft)					4.6		5.4	7.2			3.8		4.5	5.2			3.5	4	4.7
Pool Spacing (ft)					12.3		83.2	308			30		64	106			65	89	110
Pattern																			
Channel Beltwidth (ft)					35		46.6	56			26		30	36			43	61.5	107
Radius of Curvature (ft)					23		92.1	273			13		85	275			50	80	155
Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)					1.2		4.5	14.4			0.53		3.58	11.2			1.5	2.4	4.7
Meander Wavelength (ft)					55		118	245			60		90	160			128	164	194
Meander Width Ratio					2.9		5.8	12.9			1.1		1.3	1.6			1.3	1.9	3.3
Transport parameters																			
Reach Shear Stress (competency) lb/f^2					----												----		
Max part size (mm) mobilized at bankfull					----												----		
Stream Power (transport capacity) W/m^2					----												----		
Additional Reach Parameters																			
Rosgen Classification	----				C5/E5						C5/E5						C5		
Bankfull Velocity (fps)	----	----	----	----	5.24												5		
Bankfull Discharge (cfs)	----	----	----	----	416														
Valley length (ft)					2156						----								
Channel Thalweg length (ft)					2242						----						2463		
Sinuosity (ft)					1.04						1.1						1.17		
Water Surface Slope (Channel) (ft/ft)	-				0.0024						0.0028						0.0025		
BF slope (ft/ft)	-				----						----						----		
[3]Bankfull Floodplain Area (acres)					----						----						----		
[4]% of Reach with Eroding Banks					----						----								
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric					----						----								
Biological or Other					----						----								

Shaded cells indicate that these will typically not be filled in.

1 = The distributions for these parameters can include information from both the cross-section surveys and the longitudinal profile. 2 = For projects with a proximal USGS gauge in-line with the project reach (added bankfull verification - rare).

3. Utilizing survey data produce an estimate of the bankfull floodplain area in acres, which should be the area from the top of bank to the toe of the terrace riser/slope.

4 = Proportion of reach exhibiting banks that are eroding based on the visual survey for comparison to monitoring data; 5. Of value/needed only if the n exceeds 3

Table 11a. Monitoring Data - Dimensional Morphology Summary (Dimensional Parameters – Cross Sections)

	Cross Section 1 (Riffle)						Cross Section 2 (Riffle)						Cross Section 3 (Riffle)						Cross Section 4 (Pool)					
Based on fixed baseline bankfull elevation[1]	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+
Record elevation (datum) used	98.8						99.3						101.3						101.3					
Bankfull Width (ft)	29.2						27.6						32.4						28.9					
Floodprone Width (ft)	150.0						150.0						150.0						NA					
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	2.1						1.8						2.4						3.1					
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	3.6						3.7						3.6						5.9					
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	61.8						49.5						76.3						88.3					
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	13.8						15.4						13.8						NA					
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	5.1						5.4						4.6						NA					
Bankfull Bank Height Ratio	1.0						1.0						1.0						1.0					
Cross Sectional Area between end pins (ft^2)	----						----						----						----					
d50 (mm)	NA						NA						23.1						NA					

	Cross Section 5 (Riffle)						Cross Section 6 (Pool)						Cross Section 7 (Riffle)					
Based on fixed baseline bankfull elevation[1]	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+	MY1	MY2	MY3	MY4	MY5	MY+
Record elevation (datum) used	101.9						103.1						102.7					
Bankfull Width (ft)	33.6						39.7						33.0					
Floodprone Width (ft)	150.0						NA						150.0					
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	2.6						2.8						2.6					
Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	4.3						5.6						4.4					
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	85.8						109.9						85.5					
Bankfull Width/Depth Ratio	13.2						NA						12.7					
Bankfull Entrenchment Ratio	4.5						NA						4.5					
Bankfull Bank Height Ratio	1.0						1.0						1.0					
Cross Sectional Area between end pins (ft^2)	----						----						----					
d50 (mm)	0.1						NA						22.0					

1 = Widths and depths for monitoring resurvey will be based on the baseline bankfull datum regardless of dimensional/depositional development. Input the elevation used as the datum, which should be consistent and based on the baseline datum established. If the performer has inherited the project and cannot acquire the datum used for prior years this must be discussed with EEP. If this cannot be resolved in time for a given years report submission a footnote in this should be included that states: “It is uncertain if the monitoring datum has been consistent over the monitoring history, which may influence calculated values. Additional data from a prior performer is being acquired to provide confirmation. Values will be recalculated in a future submission based on a consistent datum if determined to be necessary.”

Exhibit Table 11b. Monitoring Data - Stream Reach Data Summary
Hauser Stream Restoration-Project No. 92471 (2463 feet)

Parameter	MY-1						MY-2						MY- 3						MY- 4						MY- 5					
Dimension and Substrate - Riffle only	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD[4]	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD[4]	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD[4]	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD[4]	n	Min	Mean	Med	Max	SD[4]	n
Bankfull Width (ft)	27.6		32.4	33.6																										
Floodprone Width (ft)			150																											
Bankfull Mean Depth (ft)	1.8		2.4	2.6																										
[1]Bankfull Max Depth (ft)	3.6		3.7	4.4																										
Bankfull Cross Sectional Area (ft^2)	49.5		76.3	85.8																										
Width/Depth Ratio	12.7		13.5	15.3																										
Entrenchment Ratio	4.5		4.6	5.4																										
[1]Bank Height Ratio			1																											
Profile																														
Riffle Length (ft)	28	48	48	74	12.5	27																								
Riffle Slope (ft/ft)	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	2.8%	0.6%	25																								
Pool Length (ft)	3	16	12	49	11	31																								
Pool Max depth (ft)	5.6		5.8	5.9																										
Pool Spacing (ft)	8	77	85	118	27	31																								
Pattern																														
Channel Beltwidth (ft)																														
Radius of Curvature (ft)																														
Rc:Bankfull width (ft/ft)																														
Meander Wavelength (ft)																														
Meander Width Ratio																														

Pattern data will not typically be collected unless visual data, dimensional data or profile data indicate significant shifts from baseline

Additional Reach Parameters																														
Rosgen Classification	C4																													
Channel Thalweg length (ft)	2468																													
Sinuosity (ft)	1.17																													
Water Surface Slope (Channel) (ft/ft)	0.0022																													
BF slope (ft/ft)	----																													
[3]Ri% / Ru% / P% / G% / S%	52%	16%	20%	12%																										
[3]SC% / Sa% / G% / C% / B% / Be%	19	28	32	21	0	0																								
[3]d16 / d35 / d50 / d84 / d95 /	NA	0.26	6.9	73	130																									
[2]% of Reach with Eroding Banks	<5%																													
Channel Stability or Habitat Metric	----																													
Biological or Other	----																													

Shaded cells indicate that these will typically not be filled in.
1 = The distributions for these parameters can include information from both the cross-section surveys and the longitudinal profile.
2 = Proportion of reach exhibiting banks that are eroding based on the visual survey from visual assessment table
3 = Riffle, Run, Pool, Glide, Step; Silt/Clay, Sand, Gravel, Cobble, Boulder, Bedrock; dip = max pave, disp = max subpave
4. = Of value/needed only if the n exceeds 3

APPENDIX E

HYDROLOGY DATA

Table 12. Verification of Bankfull Events

Table 12. Verification of Bankfull Events

Hauser Creek Restoration Site (EEP Project Number 92741)

Date of Data Collection	Date of Occurrence	Method	Photo (if available)
10-30-2012	None Observed	-	--