Industri-Plex
Risk Assessment
QAPP
Revision: 1
Date: 06/07/99
Section 12
Page 1 of 4

12.0 SPECIFIC ROUTINE PROCEDURES TO ASSESS DATA PRECISION, ACCURACY, AND COMPLETENESS

The purpose of this section is to indicate the methods by which it will be ensured that the data collected for this investigation falls in line with the data quality objectives (DQOs) as described in Section 3 of this QAPP. To meet these DQOs, a combination of statistical procedures and qualitative evaluations will be used to check the quality of the data. These procedures will be used by the laboratory in generating the data, and by the Chemistry QA Team in the evaluation of the surface water, sediment, and biota results for ultimate use in the Environmental and Human Health Risk Assessments.

Results for QC samples, including field and laboratory blanks, spikes, and duplicates as previously described in Sections 3, 6, and 8 of this QAPP, will be evaluated using the equations described below to determine the validity and usability of the data. In addition, the data will be reviewed for indications of interferences to results caused by sample matrices, contamination during sampling, contamination in the laboratory, and sample preservation and storage anomalies (i.e., sample analysis performed outside of method holding time or analytical instrument problems). Along with the specific equations detailed in this section, all project data will undergo a usability review as described in Section 9 and Appendix D.

12.1 Precision Assessment

The relative percent difference (RPD), as a measure of variability, between the matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate for organics, or sample and matrix duplicate in the case of inorganics, and field duplicate pair will be calculated to compare to precision and representativeness DQOs. The RPD of duplicate measurements is calculated according to the following formula.

$$RPD = \frac{(Result\ in\ Sample\ 1 - Result\ in\ Sample\ 2)}{\frac{(Result\ in\ Sample\ 1 + Result\ in\ Sample\ 2)}{2}} \times 100$$

where:
Sample 1 = Initial Sample or spiked sample result
Sample 2 = Duplicate sample or duplicate spiked sample result

12.2 Accuracy Assessment

Accuracy, as a measure of bias, will be evaluated based on the percent recoveries of the matrix spike sample (organics and inorganics), matrix spike duplicate sample (organics), surrogates (organics), internal standards (organics), laboratory control samples and/or standard reference materials (organics and inorganics), initial and continuing calibration check samples (organics and inorganics). These QC results will be compared to the project DQOs for accuracy.

Menzie-Cura

Industri-Plex
Risk Assessment
QAPP
Revision: 1
Date: 06/07/99
Section 12
Page 2 of 4

The increase in concentration of the analyte observed in the spiked sample, due to the addition of a known quantity of the analyte, compared to the reported value of the same analyte in the unspiked sample determines the percent recovery.

Percent recoveries for spiked samples and QC are determined using the following equation:

$$\% R = \frac{(\text{Result in Spiked Sample - Result in original/unspiked Sample})}{\text{Known amount of spike added}} \times 100$$

Percent recoveries for LCS and SRM are determined using the following equation:

$$\% R = \frac{\text{Result for compound in LCS or SRM}}{\substack{\text{Verified amount of compound in LCS or SRM} \\ \text{from vendor information}}} \times 100$$

Additionally, field and laboratory blanks will be used to evaluate whether field or laboratory procedures represent a possible source of contamination in the biota samples. Unmonitored contamination can allow false positive results to be reported and treated as true sample components when, in fact, they are not. This type of error will adversely affect the accuracy of the reported results. Several types of blanks, including field blanks, method blanks, and instrument blanks, will be used in this project as described in Sections 3, 6, and 8.

Specific DQOs for blanks have been defined for this program in Sections 3, 6, and 8. In general, the procedure for assessing blank samples for potential contamination is as follows.

1. Tabulate blank compound results.
2. Identify blank samples for which compounds are reported above the project-required reporting limits.
3. If no compounds are detected above the reporting limits in any blanks, the associated data are reported unqualified and no blank actions are taken.
4. If compounds are detected above the reporting limits in the blanks, the associated sample compounds will be qualified during data validation. This qualification may result in the negation of results at raised reporting limits due to blank actions.

12.3   Completeness Assessment

Completeness is the ratio of the number of valid sample results to the total number of results planned for collection. Following completion of the sampling, analysis, and data validation, the percent completeness will be calculated and compared to the project DQO of $\geq 90\%$ (Section 3 of this QAPP) using the following equation.

Menzie-Cura

Industri-Plex
Risk Assessment
QAPP
Revision: 1
Date: 06/07/99
Section 12
Page 3 of 4

$$\% \text{ Completeness} = \frac{\text{number of valid/usable results obtained}}{\text{number of valid/usable results planned}} \times 100$$

12.4 Overall Assessment of Environmental Data

Data assessment will involve data evaluation and usability to determine if the data collected are of the appropriate quality, quantity and representativeness to support the Environmental Risk Assessment. The affect of the loss of data deemed unacceptable for use, for whatever reason, will be discussed and decisions made on corrective action for potential data gaps. The QC results associated with each analytical parameter for each matrix type will be compared to the objectives presented in Sections 3, 6, and 8 of this QAPP. Only data generated in association with QC results meeting these objectives and the data validation criteria will be considered usable for the Environmental Risk Assessment.

Factors to be considered in the overall data assessment based on the DQOs in this QAPP and the data evaluation by the third-party validator will include, but not necessarily be limited to, the following.

- Were all samples obtained using the methodologies and SOPs proposed in the QAPP?
- Were all proposed analyses performed according to the SOPs provided in the QAPP?
- Were samples obtained from all proposed sampling locations planned?
- Do any analytical results exhibit elevated detection limits due to matrix interferences or contaminants present at high concentrations?
- Were all laboratory data evaluated according to the validation protocols, including project-specific QC objectives as defined in this QAPP?
- Which data sets were found to be unusable (qualified as "R") based on the data evaluation results?
- Which data sets were found to be usable as estimated data, (qualified as "J" or "UJ") based on the data evaluation results?
- Has sufficient data of appropriate quality been generated to support the Environmental Risk Assessment?
- Were all issues requiring corrective action, if any, fully resolved?
- Have any remaining data gaps been identified and summarized in the final report?

Menzie-Cura

Industri-Plex
Risk Assessment
QAPP
Revision: 1
Date: 06/07/99
Section 12
Page 4 of 4

12.5 Reconciliation with Data Used to Assess Precision, Accuracy, Representativeness, Completeness, Comparability for Quality Objectives Measurement

The goal of this project is to produce an Ecological and Human Health Risk Assessment. As such, the data generated must meet the risk assessor's needs as defined in Section 1 and the project DQOs in Section 3 of this QAPP. In summary from Section 3, the primary objectives for assessing the usability of the data are (1) to collect data that are representative of Site conditions and comparable with prior data; (2) to produce data that meet the project reporting limit requirements for Ecological and Human Health Risk Assessment; (3) to produce data of the highest quality possible in order to accurately and precisely characterize the Site ecological conditions.

The Chemistry QA Team during Data Usability Review will apply the standard EPA data validation qualifiers to the data to indicate the level of uncertainty in the associated result. In general, for the purposes of the Environmental Risk Assessment, data that are left unqualified, data qualified "U" (non-detected), data qualified "J" (detected as an estimated result), and data qualified "UJ" (non-detected at an estimated detection reporting limit) are considered valid and usable for project objectives. Data that are qualified "R" (rejected), due to severe exceedances of QC requirements, will be considered invalid and unusable for the Environmental Risk Assessment. See Section 9 and Appendix D for a more detailed explanation of the Data Usability Review process planned for this project.

To meet the needs of this program, field sampling personnel, the analytical laboratory, the data validator and the risk assessors (human health and ecological) will work together on a frequent and regular basis to ensure that the project RLs (or PQLs) are as low as feasible for the media being sampled and that sample analytical results will achieve RLs within the limits of the selected analytical methods. The usability of such data with higher RLs will be evaluated during the risk assessment activities. In general, one half of the sample-specific detection levels may be used in risk calculations as a conservative estimate for compounds that do not meet the project RLs.

The goal of this QAPP program is to generate valid, usable data for the risk assessment activities. However, in environmental sampling and analysis, some data may be lost due to sampling location logistics, field or laboratory errors, or matrix effects that may cause the rejection of results for some compounds. The overall completeness of collection of valid and usable data, as defined in Section 3 of this QAPP, is 90%. The Chemistry QA Team will assess the completeness of the overall data generation against the project goal of producing 90% of the planned data as valid and usable results for the Ecological Risk Assessment. If this goal is not met, data gaps may exist that may compromise the risk assessment.

Menzie-Cura

Figure 4.1
Locations of Surface Water & Sediment Stations   Menzie Cura & Associates, Inc. 7/7/99

North Woburn, MA   Scale: 1" = 400'

MENZIE • CURA & ASSOCIATES, INC.

Environmental Consultants

One Courthouse Lane, Suite Two •Chelmsford, Massachusetts 01824-1794 • (978) 453-4300 • Fax (978) 453-7260

March 8, 2000

Joe LeMay
EPA – New England, Region I
1 Congress Street
Suite 1100 Mail Code HBO
Boston, MA 02114-2023

Reference Data for Industriplex, Woburn, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. LeMay:

The enclosed data package is for sediment and surface water for the Industriplex reference locations in Woburn, Massachusetts.

This package includes two copies of the following:

> A copy of the field notebook (previously sent to Bruce Yare)
> A copy of the Habitat Assessment Sheets (with the exception of SD-04 and SD-12)
> A written description of each reference location
> A summary of the Habitat Assessment Sheets
> All Reference Sediment data (Organic data previously sent to Bruce Yare)
> All Reference Surface water data (Organic data previously sent to Bruce Yare)
> Data Usability Reports.

The Habitat Assessment Sheets for stations SD-04 and SD-12 are in the possession of Patti Tyler (USEPA) and will be sent to you upon receipt. Electronic copies of the sediment and surface water data will be emailed to you when this package is sent out. These files are in Microsoft Excel.

If further information is needed regarding this data package, please don't hesitate to call Ken Cerreto at (978) 322-2852.

Sincerely,
Menzie-Cura & Associates, Inc.

Kenneth Cerreto
Assistant Scientist

Phone: (978) 322-2852
Fax: (978) 970-2791
Email: kcerreto@menziecura.com
http://www.menziecura.com

CC: Bruce Yare, Solutia, Inc.

SD	Water Body	Comments	Latitude N	Longitude W
01	Aberjona	Aberjona east of Acadia Street	42 31.7426	71 07.4009
02	South Pond	South Pond	42 32.3426	71 08.6546
03	Phillips Pond	Phillips Pond	42 31.0135	71 07.9605
04	Halls Brook	Halls Brook Reference Location	42 30.7878	71 08.8787
05	HBHA	Deep station at northern end of HBHA Pond	42 30.7785	71 08.4715
06	HBHA	West side of HBHA Pond, below Halls Brook	42 30.7511	71 08.4734
07	HBHA	deep station at southern end of HBHA Pond	42 30.6925	71 08.4254
08	HBHA	Stream segment in HBHA Wetland	42 30.5257	71 08.3067
09	HBHA	HBHA Wetland Pond #1	42 30.4131	71 08.3002
10	HBHA	Stream segment in HBHA wetland	42 30.2839	71 08.2272
11	HBHA	Pond 3 in HBHA Downstream	42 30.2483	71 08.1174
12	Halls Brook	Halls Brook reference location upstream of SD-04	42 30.7507	71 08.9418
13	Aberjona	Aberjona north of Olympia	42 29.9577	71 08.0568

SD-01 Aberjona River
This stretch of the Aberjona is similar to the downriver stretch near SD-13. Sediment consisted of black fine mud with leaf matter. Water was slow moving and shallow (0.5 to 3 inches). Water level was significantly reduced (width ranged from 2 to 3 feet), exposing muddy banks.

SD-02 South Pond
Water depth was less than 3 feet throughout the pond. Cattails, *Potamogeton*, stands of *Ceratophyllum*, and mats of *Cladophora* present. Wildlife was observed including small fish (possibly golden shiners) and turtles. Depositional sediment was observed (black fine-particulate matter with lots of sticks).

SD-03 Phillips Pond
Phillips Pond appears to act as a depositional area. Deep sediment samples were soft and anaerobic and contained a few chironomid larvae.

SD-04 Halls Brook
This stretch of Halls Brook drains an open field. This station is located just upstream of where Halls Brook runs through residential and commercial areas. Width ranged from 4 to 10 feet. This station may differ ecologically from the Aberjona and HBHA Downstream locations due to its open characteristics. Sediment was characterized by silt and large amounts of plant material. Mallards, frogs, and amphipods were observed.

SD-12 Halls Brook
This station is upstream of station SD-04. Sediment consisted of peaty muck. Slow moving, shallow water (0.5 to 3 inches). Water level was significantly reduced, width ranged from 2 to 3 feet, exposing muddy banks.

Figure 4.1
Locations of Surface Water & Sediment Stations   Menzie Cura & Associates, Inc. 7/7/99

North Woburn, MA   Scale: 1" = 400'

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (BACK)

Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
	Optimal	**Suboptimal**	**Marginal**	**Poor**
6. Channel Alteration	Channelization or dredging absent or minimal; stream with normal pattern.	Some channelization present, usually in areas of bridge abutments; evidence of past channelization, i.e., dredging, (greater than past 20 yr) may be present, but recent channelization is not present.	Channelization may be extensive; embankments or shoring structures present on both banks; and 40 to 80% of stream reach channelized and disrupted.	Banks shored with gabion or cement; over 80% of the stream reach channelized and disrupted. Instream habitat greatly altered or removed entirely.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 (11)	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
7. Channel Sinuosity	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 3 to 4 times longer than if it was in a straight line. (Note - channel braiding is considered normal in coastal plains and other low-lying areas. This parameter is not easily rated in these areas.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 3 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 1 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	Channel straight; waterway has been channelized for a long distance.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 (4) (3) 2 1 0
8. Bank Stability (score each bank)	Banks stable; evidence of erosion or bank failure absent or minimal; little potential for future problems. <5% of bank affected.	Moderately stable; infrequent, small areas of erosion mostly healed over. 5-30% of bank in reach has areas of erosion.	Moderately unstable; 30-60% of bank in reach has areas of erosion; high erosion potential during floods.	Unstable; many eroded areas; "raw" areas frequent along straight sections and bends; obvious bank sloughing; 60-100% of bank has erosional scars.
SCORE ___ (LB)	Left Bank 10 9	(8) 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE ___ (RB)	Right Bank 10 9	(8) 7 6 ·	5 4 3	2 1 0
9. Vegetative Protection (score each bank) Note: determine left or right side by facing downstream.	More than 90% of the streambank surfaces and immediate riparian zone covered by native vegetation, including trees, understory shrubs, or nonwoody macrophytes; vegetative disruption through grazing or mowing minimal or not evident; almost all plants allowed to grow naturally.	70-90% of the streambank surfaces covered by native vegetation, but one class of plants is not well-represented; disruption evident but not affecting full plant growth potential to any great extent; more than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	50-70% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption obvious; patches of bare soil or closely cropped vegetation common; less than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	Less than 50% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption of streambank vegetation is very high; vegetation has been removed to 5 centimeters or less in average stubble height.
SCORE ___ (LB)	Left Bank (10)	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE ___ (RB)	Right Bank (10)	8 7 6	• 5 4 3	2 1 0
10. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width (score each bank riparian zone)	Width of riparian zone >18 meters; human activities (i.e., parking lots, roadbeds, clear-cuts, lawns, or crops) have not impacted zone.	Width of riparian zone 12-18 meters; human activities have impacted zone only minimally.	Width of riparian zone 6-12 meters; human activities have impacted zone a great deal.	Width of riparian zone <6 meters: little or no riparian vegetation due to human activities.
SCORE ___ (LB)	Left Bank 10 9	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 (1) 0
SCORE ___ (RB)	Right Bank 10 9	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 (1) 0

Total Score _____

Parameters to be evaluated broader than sampling reach

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (FRONT)

STREAM NAME *Phillips Pond*	LOCATION *Waburn*
STATION # *SD03* RIVERMILE	STREAM CLASS
LAT _____ LONG _____	RIVER BASIN
STORET#	AGENCY
INVESTIGATORS	

FORM COMPLETED BY *FO*	DATE _____ TIME _____ AM PM	REASON FOR SURVEY

Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
	Optimal	**Suboptimal**	**Marginal**	**Poor**
1. Epifaunal Substrate/ Available Cover	Greater than 50% of substrate favorable for epifaunal colonization and fish cover; mix of snags, submerged logs, undercut banks, cobble or other stable habitat and at stage to allow full colonization potential (i.e., logs/snags that are not new fall and not transient).	30-50% mix of stable habitat; well-suited for full colonization potential; adequate habitat for maintenance of populations; presence of additional substrate in the form of newfall, but not yet prepared for colonization (may rate at high end of scale).	10-30% mix of stable habitat; habitat availability less than desirable; substrate frequently disturbed or removed.	Less than 10% stable habitat; lack of habitat is obvious; substrate unstable or lacking.
SCORE	20 19 (18) 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
2. Pool Substrate Characterization	Mixture of substrate materials, with gravel and firm sand prevalent; root mats and submerged vegetation common.	Mixture of soft sand, mud, or clay; mud may be dominant; some root mats and submerged vegetation present.	All mud or clay or sand bottom; little or no root mat; no submerged vegetation.	Hard-pan clay or bedrock; no root mat or vegetation.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	(15) 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
3. Pool Variability *N/A*	Even mix of large-shallow, large-deep, small-shallow, small-deep pools present.	Majority of pools large-deep; very few shallow.	Shallow pools much more prevalent than deep pools.	Majority of pools small-shallow or pools absent.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
4. Sediment Deposition	Little or no enlargement of islands or point bars and less than 5% <20% for low-gradient streams) of the bottom affected by sediment deposition.	Some new increase in bar formation, mostly from gravel, sand or fine sediment; 5-30% (20-50% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; slight deposition in pools.	Moderate deposition of new gravel, sand or fine sediment on old and new bars; 30-50% (50-80% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; sediment deposits at obstructions, constrictions, and bends; moderate deposition of pools prevalent.	Heavy deposits of fine material, increased bar development; more than 50% (80% for low-gradient) of the bottom changing frequently; pools almost absent due to substantial sediment deposition.
SCORE	20 (19) 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	(10) 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
5. Channel Flow Status	Water reaches base of both lower banks, and minimal amount of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills >75% of the available channel; or <25% of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills 25-75% of the available channel, and/or riffle substrates are mostly exposed.	Very little water in channel and mostly present as standing pools.
SCORE	20 19 (18) 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0

Parameters to be evaluated in sampling reach

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (BACK)

Parameters to be evaluated broader than sampling reach

Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
	Optimal	**Suboptimal**	**Marginal**	**Poor**
6. Channel Alteration (13)	Channelization or dredging absent or minimal; stream with normal pattern.	Some channelization present, usually in areas of bridge abutments; evidence of past channelization, i.e., dredging, (greater than past 20 yr) may be present, but recent channelization is not present.	Channelization may be extensive; embankments or shoring structures present on both banks; and 40 to 80% of stream reach channelized and disrupted.	Banks shored with gabion or cement; over 80% of the stream reach channelized and disrupted. Instream habitat greatly altered or removed entirely.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 (16)	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
7. Channel Sinuosity (4)	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 3 to 4 times longer than if it was in a straight line. (Note - channel braiding is considered normal in coastal plains and other low-lying areas. This parameter is not easily rated in these areas.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 3 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 1 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	Channel straight; waterway has been channelized for a long distance.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	(5) 4 3 2 1 0
8. Bank Stability (score each bank) (9)	Banks stable; evidence of erosion or bank failure absent or minimal; little potential for future problems. <5% of bank affected.	Moderately stable; infrequent, small areas of erosion mostly healed over. 5-30% of bank in reach has areas of erosion.	Moderately unstable; 30-60% of bank in reach has areas of erosion; high erosion potential during floods.	Unstable; many eroded areas; "raw" areas frequent along straight sections and bends; obvious bank sloughing; 60-100% of bank has erosional scars.
SCORE ___ (LB)	Left Bank 10 (9)	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE ___ (RB)	Right Bank 10 (9)	8 7 6 -	5 4 3	2 1 0
9. Vegetative Protection (score each bank) Note: determine left or right side by facing downstream. (7)	More than 90% of the streambank surfaces and immediate riparian zone covered by native vegetation, including trees, understory shrubs, or nonwoody macrophytes; vegetative disruption through grazing or mowing minimal or not evident; almost all plants allowed to grow naturally.	70-90% of the streambank surfaces covered by native vegetation, but one class of plants is not well-represented; disruption evident but not affecting full plant growth potential to any great extent; more than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	50-70% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption obvious; patches of bare soil or closely cropped vegetation common; less than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	Less than 50% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption of streambank vegetation is very high; vegetation has been removed to 5 centimeters or less in average stubble height.
SCORE ___ (LB)	Left Bank 10	8 (7) 6	5 (4) 3	2 1 0
SCORE ___ (RB)	Right Bank 10	8 7 6	5 (4') 3	2 1 0
10. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width (score each bank riparian zone) (3)	Width of riparian zone >18 meters; human activities (i.e., parking lots, roadbeds, clear-cuts, lawns, or crops) have not impacted zone.	Width of riparian zone 12-18 meters; human activities have impacted zone only minimally.	Width of riparian zone 6-12 meters; human activities have impacted zone a great deal.	Width of riparian zone <6 meters: little or no riparian vegetation due to human activities.
SCORE ___ (LB)	Left Bank 10 9	8 7 (6)	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE ___ (RB)	Right Bank 10 9	8 7 (6)	5 4 3	2 1 0

Total Score _____

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (FRONT)

STREAM NAME Phillips Pond	LOCATION
STATION # SD-3 RIVERMILE _____	STREAM CLASS
LAT _____ LONG _____	RIVER BASIN
STORET#	AGENCY
INVESTIGATORS	

FORM COMPLETED BY	DATE _____ TIME _____ AM PM	REASON FOR SURVEY

Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
	Optimal	**Suboptimal**	**Marginal**	**Poor**
1. Epifaunal Substrate/ Available Cover ⭕14	Greater than 50% of substrate favorable for epifaunal colonization and fish cover; mix of snags, submerged logs, undercut banks, cobble or other stable habitat and at stage to allow full colonization potential (i.e., logs/snags that are not new fall and not transient).	30-50% mix of stable habitat; well-suited for full colonization potential; adequate habitat for maintenance of populations; presence of additional substrate in the form of newfall, but not yet prepared for colonization (may rate at high end of scale).	10-30% mix of stable habitat; habitat availability less than desirable; substrate frequently disturbed or removed.	Less than 10% stable habitat; lack of habitat is obvious; substrate unstable or lacking.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 ⑧ 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
2. Pool Substrate Characterization ⭕11	Mixture of substrate materials, with gravel and firm sand prevalent; root mats and submerged vegetation common.	Mixture of soft sand, mud, or clay; mud may be dominant; some root mats and submerged vegetation present.	All mud or clay or sand bottom; little or no root mat; no submerged vegetation.	Hard-pan clay or bedrock; no root mat or vegetation.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 ⑦ 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
3. Pool Variability NA	Even mix of large-shallow, large-deep, small-shallow, small-deep pools present	Majority of pools large-deep; very few shallow.	Shallow pools much more prevalent than deep pools.	Majority of pools small-shallow or pools absent.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
4. Sediment Deposition ⭕10	Little or no enlargement of islands or point bars and less than 5% (<20% for low-gradient streams) of the bottom affected by sediment deposition.	Some new increase in bar formation, mostly from gravel, sand or fine sediment; 5-30% (20-50% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; slight deposition in pools.	Moderate deposition of new gravel, sand or fine sediment on old and new bars; 30-50% (50-80% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; sediment deposits at obstructions, constrictions, and bends; moderate deposition of pools prevalent.	Heavy deposits of fine material, increased bar development; more than 50% (80% for low-gradient) of the bottom changing frequently; pools almost absent due to substantial sediment deposition
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	⑤ 4 3 2 1 0
5. Channel Flow Status ⭕17	Water reaches base of both lower banks, and minimal amount of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills >75% of the available channel; or <25% of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills 25-75% of the available channel, and/or riffle substrates are mostly exposed.	Very little water in channel and mostly present as standing pools.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 ⑯	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0

Parameters to be evaluated in sampling reach

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (BACK)

Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
	Optimal	**Suboptimal**	**Marginal**	**Poor**
6. Channel Alteration	Channelization or dredging absent or minimal; stream with normal pattern.	Some channelization present, usually in areas of bridge abutments; evidence of past channelization, i.e., dredging (greater than past 20 yr) may be present, but recent channelization is not present.	Channelization may be extensive; embankments or shoring structures present on both banks; and 40 to 80% of stream reach channelized and disrupted.	Banks shored with gabion or cement; over 80% of the stream reach channelized and disrupted. Instream habitat greatly altered or removed entirely.
SCORE 13	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 (X)	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
7. Channel Sinuosity	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 3 to 4 times longer than if it was in a straight line. (Note - channel braiding is considered normal in coastal plains and other low-lying areas. This parameter is not easily rated in these areas.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 3 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 1 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	Channel straight; waterway has been channelized for a long distance.
NA?				
SCORE 5	20 19 18 17 16	15 (14) 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
8. Bank Stability (score each bank)	Banks stable; evidence of erosion or bank failure absent or minimal; little potential for future problems. <5% of bank affected.	Moderately stable; infrequent, small areas of erosion mostly healed over. 5-30% of bank in reach has areas of erosion.	Moderately unstable; 30-60% of bank in reach has areas of erosion, high erosion potential during floods.	Unstable; many eroded areas; "raw" areas frequent along straight sections and bends; obvious bank sloughing; 60-100% of bank has erosional scars.
SCORE 7 (LB)	Left Bank 10 (6)	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE 7 (RB)	Right Bank 10 (9)	8 7 6 ·	5 4 3	2 1 0
9. Vegetative Protection (score each bank) Note: determine left or right side by facing downstream.	More than 90% of the streambank surfaces and immediate riparian zone covered by native vegetation, including trees, understory shrubs, or nonwoody macrophytes; vegetative disruption through grazing or mowing minimal or not evident; almost all plants allowed to grow naturally.	70-90% of the streambank surfaces covered by native vegetation, but one class of plants is not well-represented; disruption evident but not affecting full plant growth potential to any great extent; more than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	50-70% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption obvious; patches of bare soil or closely cropped vegetation common; less than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	Less than 50% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption of streambank vegetation is very high; vegetation has been removed to 5 centimeters or less in average stubble height.
6/6				
SCORE 7 (LB)	Left Bank 10	8 (7) 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE 7 (RB)	Right Bank 10	8 (7) 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
10. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width (score each bank riparian zone)	Width of riparian zone >18 meters; human activities (i.e., parking lots, roadbeds, clear-cuts, lawns, or crops) have not impacted zone.	Width of riparian zone 12-18 meters; human activities have impacted zone only minimally.	Width of riparian zone 6-12 meters; human activities have impacted zone a great deal.	Width of riparian zone <6 meters: little or no riparian vegetation due to human activities.
SCORE 5 (LB)	Left Bank 10 9	8 (7) 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE 5 (RB)	Right Bank 10 9	8 (7) 6	5 4 3	2 1 0

Parameters to be evaluated broader than sampling reach

Total Score _____

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (FRONT)

STREAM NAME South Pond	LOCATION
STATION # SD-2 RIVERMILE	STREAM CLASS
LAT _____ LONG _____	RIVER BASIN
STORET #	AGENCY
INVESTIGATORS	
FORM COMPLETED BY Bart Hoskins	DATE 6-21-99 TIME _____ AM PM	REASON FOR SURVEY

Parameters to be evaluated in sampling reach

Habitat Parameter		Condition Category			
		Optimal	**Suboptimal**	**Marginal**	**Poor**
1. Epifaunal Substrate/ Available Cover		Greater than 50% of substrate favorable for epifaunal colonization and fish cover; mix of snags, submerged logs, undercut banks, cobble or other stable habitat and at stage to allow full colonization potential (i.e., logs/snags that are not new fall and not transient).	30-50% mix of stable habitat; well-suited for full colonization potential; adequate habitat for maintenance of populations; presence of additional substrate in the form of newfall, but not yet prepared for colonization (may rate at high end of scale).	10-30% mix of stable habitat; habitat availability less than desirable; substrate frequently disturbed or removed.	Less than 10% stable habitat; lack of habitat is obvious; substrate unstable or lacking.
SCORE 17		20 19 18 (17) 16	15 14 13 12 (11)	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
2. Pool Substrate Characterization		Mixture of substrate materials, with gravel and firm sand prevalent; root mats and submerged vegetation common.	Mixture of soft sand, mud, or clay; mud may be dominant; some root mats and submerged vegetation present.	All mud or clay or sand bottom; little or no root mat; no submerged vegetation.	Hard-pan clay or bedrock; no root mat or vegetation.
SCORE 15		20 19 18 17 (16)	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 (7) 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
3. Pool Variability	NA	Even mix of large-shallow, large-deep, small-shallow, small-deep pools present.	Majority of pools large-deep; very few shallow.	Shallow pools much more prevalent than deep pools.	Majority of pools small-shallow or pools absent.
SCORE NA		20 19 18 17 (16)	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
4. Sediment Deposition		Little or no enlargement of islands or point bars and less than 5% (<20% for low-gradient streams) of the bottom affected by sediment deposition.	Some new increase in bar formation, mostly from gravel, sand or fine sediment; 5-30% (20-50% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; slight deposition in pools.	Moderate deposition of new gravel, sand or fine sediment on old and new bars; 30-50% (50-80% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; sediment deposits at obstructions, constrictions, and bends; moderate deposition of pools prevalent.	Heavy deposits of fine material, increased bar development; more than 50% (80% for low-gradient) of the bottom changing frequently; pools almost absent due to substantial sediment deposition.
SCORE 3		20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 (9) 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
5. Channel Flow Status		Water reaches base of both lower banks, and minimal amount of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills >75% of the available channel; or <25% of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills 25-75% of the available channel, and/or riffle substrates are mostly exposed.	Very little water in channel and mostly present as standing pools.
SCORE 18		20 19 (18) 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (BACK)

Parameters to be evaluated broader than sampling reach

Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
	Optimal	**Suboptimal**	**Marginal**	**Poor**
6. Channel Alteration	Channelization or dredging absent or minimal; stream with normal pattern.	Some channelization present, usually in areas of bridge abutments; evidence of past channelization, i.e., dredging, (greater than past 20 yr) may be present, but recent channelization is not present.	Channelization may be extensive; embankments or shoring structures present on both banks; and 40 to 80% of stream reach channelized and disrupted.	Banks shored with gabion or cement; over 80% of the stream reach channelized and disrupted. Instream habitat greatly altered or removed entirely.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 (11)	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
7. Channel Sinuosity	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 3 to 4 times longer than if it was in a straight line. (Note - channel braiding is considered normal in coastal plains and other low-lying areas. This parameter is not easily rated in these areas.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 3 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 1 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	Channel straight; waterway has been channelized for a long distance.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 (2) 1 0
8. Bank Stability (score each bank)	Banks stable; evidence of erosion or bank failure absent or minimal; little potential for future problems. <5% of bank affected.	Moderately stable; infrequent, small areas of erosion mostly healed over. 5-30% of bank in reach has areas of erosion.	Moderately unstable; 30-60% of bank in reach has areas of erosion, high erosion potential during floods.	Unstable; many eroded areas; "raw" areas frequent along straight sections and bends; obvious bank sloughing; 60-100% of bank has erosional scars.
SCORE ___ (LB)	Left Bank 10 (9)	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE ___ (RB)	Right Bank 10 (9)	8 7 6 ·	5 4 3	2 1 0
9. Vegetative Protection (score each bank) Note: determine left or right side by facing downstream.	More than 90% of the streambank surfaces and immediate riparian zone covered by native vegetation, including trees, understory shrubs, or nonwoody macrophytes; vegetative disruption through grazing or mowing minimal or not evident; almost all plants allowed to grow naturally.	70-90% of the streambank surfaces covered by native vegetation, but one class of plants is not well-represented; disruption evident but not affecting full plant growth potential to any great extent; more than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	50-70% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption obvious; patches of bare soil or closely cropped vegetation common; less than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	Less than 50% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption of streambank vegetation is very high; vegetation has been removed to 5 centimeters or less in average stubble height.
SCORE ___ (LB)	Left Bank 10	8 (7) 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE ___ (RB)	Right Bank 10	8 (7) 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
10. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width (score each bank riparian zone)	Width of riparian zone >18 meters; human activities (i.e., parking lots, roadbeds, clear-cuts, lawns, or crops) have not impacted zone.	Width of riparian zone 12-18 meters; human activities have impacted zone only minimally.	Width of riparian zone 6-12 meters; human activities have impacted zone a great deal.	Width of riparian zone <6 meters: little or no riparian vegetation due to human activities.
SCORE ___ (LB)	Left Bank 10 9	8 7 6	5 (4) 3	2 1 0
SCORE ___ (RB)	Right Bank 10 9	8 7 6	5 (4) 3	2 1 0

Total Score _____

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (FRONT)

STREAM NAME S. Pond	LOCATION I Plex Woburn
STATION # SD02 RIVERMILE	STREAM CLASS
LAT _____ LONG _____	RIVER BASIN
STORET #	AGENCY
INVESTIGATORS	
FORM COMPLETED BY KO	DATE _____ TIME _____ AM PM	REASON FOR SURVEY

	Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
		Optimal	**Suboptimal**	**Marginal**	**Poor**
Parameters to be evaluated in sampling reach	1. Epifaunal Substrate/ Available Cover	Greater than 50% of substrate favorable for epifaunal colonization and fish cover; mix of snags, submerged logs, undercut banks, cobble or other stable habitat and at stage to allow full colonization potential (i.e., logs/snags that are not new fall and not transient).	30-50% mix of stable habitat; well-suited for full colonization potential; adequate habitat for maintenance of populations; presence of additional substrate in the form of newfall, but not yet prepared for colonization (may rate at high end of scale).	10-30% mix of stable habitat; habitat availability less than desirable; substrate frequently disturbed or removed.	Less than 10% stable habitat; lack of habitat is obvious; substrate unstable or lacking.
	SCORE	20 19 18 17 (16)	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
	2. Pool Substrate Characterization	Mixture of substrate materials, with gravel and firm sand prevalent; root mats and submerged vegetation common.	Mixture of soft sand, mud, or clay; mud may be dominant; some root mats and submerged vegetation present.	All mud or clay or sand bottom; little or no root mat; no submerged vegetation.	Hard-pan clay or bedrock; no root mat or vegetation.
	SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 (14) 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
	3. Pool Variability N/A	Even mix of large-shallow, large-deep, small-shallow, small-deep pools present.	Majority of pools large-deep; very few shallow.	Shallow pools much more prevalent than deep pools.	Majority of pools small-shallow or pools absent.
	SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
	4. Sediment Deposition	Little or no enlargement of islands or point bars and less than 5% <20% for low-gradient streams) of the bottom affected by sediment deposition.	Some new increase in bar formation, mostly from gravel, sand or fine sediment; 5-30% (20-50% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; slight deposition in pools.	Moderate deposition of new gravel, sand or fine sediment on old and new bars; 30-50% (50-80% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; sediment deposits at obstructions, constrictions, and bends; moderate deposition of pools prevalent.	Heavy deposits of fine material, increased bar development; more than 50% (80% for low-gradient) of the bottom changing frequently; pools almost absent due to substantial sediment deposition.
	SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 (0)
	5. Channel Flow Status	Water reaches base of both lower banks, and minimal amount of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills >75% of the available channel; or <25% of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills 25-75% of the available channel, and/or riffle substrates are mostly exposed.	Very little water in channel and mostly present as standing pools.
	SCORE	20 19 (18) 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 (3) 2 1 (0)

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (BACK)

Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
	Optimal	**Suboptimal**	**Marginal**	**Poor**
6. Channel Alteration *13*	Channelization or dredging absent or minimal; stream with normal pattern.	Some channelization present, usually in areas of bridge abutments; evidence of past channelization, i.e., dredging, (greater than past 20 yr) may be present, but recent channelization is not present.	Channelization may be extensive; embankments or shoring structures present on both banks; and 40 to 80% of stream reach channelized and disrupted.	Banks shored with gabion or cement; over 80% of the stream reach channelized and disrupted. Instream habitat greatly altered or removed entirely.
SCORE	20 19 (18) 17 16	15 14 (13) 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
7. Channel Sinuosity *5* *N/A*	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 3 to 4 times longer than if it was in a straight line. (Note - channel braiding is considered normal in coastal plains and other low-lying areas. This parameter is not easily rated in these areas.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 3 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 1 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	Channel straight; waterway has been channelized for a long distance.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	(5) 4 3 2 1 0
8. Bank Stability (score each bank) (9)	Banks stable; evidence of erosion or bank failure absent or minimal; little potential for future problems. <5% of bank affected.	Moderately stable; infrequent, small areas of erosion mostly healed over. 5-30% of bank in reach has areas of erosion	Moderately unstable; 30-60% of bank in reach has areas of erosion; high erosion potential during floods.	Unstable; many eroded areas; "raw" areas frequent along straight sections and bends; obvious bank sloughing; 60-100% of bank has erosional scars.
SCORE ___ (LB)	Left Bank 10 (9)	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE ___ (RB)	Right Bank 10 (9)	8 7 6 ·	5 4 3	2 1 0
9. Vegetative Protection (score each bank) Note: determine left or right side by facing downstream (6)	More than 90% of the streambank surfaces and immediate riparian zone covered by native vegetation, including trees, understory shrubs, or nonwoody macrophytes; vegetative disruption through grazing or mowing minimal or not evident; almost all plants allowed to grow naturally.	70-90% of the streambank surfaces covered by native vegetation, but one class of plants is not well-represented; disruption evident but not affecting full plant growth potential to any great extent; more than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	50-70% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption obvious; patches of bare soil or closely cropped vegetation common; less than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	Less than 50% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption of streambank vegetation is very high; vegetation has been removed to 5 centimeters or less in average stubble height.
SCORE ___ (LB)	Left Bank 10	8 7 6	(5) 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE ___ (RB)	Right Bank 10	8 7 6	(5) 4 3	2 1 0
10. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width (score each bank riparian zone) (5)	Width of riparian zone >18 meters; human activities (i.e., parking lots, roadbeds, clear-cuts, lawns, or crops) have not impacted zone.	Width of riparian zone 12-18 meters; human activities have impacted zone only minimally.	Width of riparian zone 6-12 meters; human activities have impacted zone a great deal.	Width of riparian zone <6 meters: little or no riparian vegetation due to human activities.
SCORE ___ (LB)	Left Bank 10 9	8 7 6	(5) 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE ___ (RB)	Right Bank 10 9	8 7 6	(5) 4 3	2 1 0

Parameters to be evaluated broader than sampling reach

Total Score _____

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (FRONT)

STREAM NAME South Pond	LOCATION
STATION # SD-2 RIVERMILE_____	STREAM CLASS
LAT_____ LONG_____	RIVER BASIN
STORET#	AGENCY
INVESTIGATORS CAM	
FORM COMPLETED BY CAM	DATE _____ TIME _____ AM PM	REASON FOR SURVEY

Habitat Parameter		Condition Category			
		Optimal	Suboptimal	Marginal	Poor
1 Epifaunal Substrate/ Available Cover **(17)**		Greater than 50% of substrate favorable for epifaunal colonization and fish cover, mix of snags, submerged logs, undercut banks, cobble or other stable habitat and at stage to allow full colonization potential (i.e., logs/snags that are not new fall and not transient).	30-50% mix of stable habitat; well-suited for full colonization potential; adequate habitat for maintenance of populations; presence of additional substrate in the form of newfall, but not yet prepared for colonization (may rate at high end of scale).	10-30% mix of stable habitat; habitat availability less than desirable; substrate frequently disturbed or removed.	Less than 10% stable habitat; lack of habitat is obvious; substrate unstable or lacking.
SCORE		20 19 (18) 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
2 Pool Substrate Characterization **(15)**		Mixture of substrate materials, with gravel and firm sand prevalent; root mats and submerged vegetation common.	Mixture of soft sand, mud, or clay; mud may be dominant; some root mats and submerged vegetation present.	All mud or clay or sand bottom; little or no root mat; no submerged vegetation.	Hard-pan clay or bedrock; no root mat or vegetation.
SCORE		20 19 18 17 (16)	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
3 Pool Variability **NA**		Even mix of large-shallow, large-deep, small-shallow, small-deep pools present.	Majority of pools large-deep; very few shallow.	Shallow pools much more prevalent than deep pools.	Majority of pools small-shallow or pools absent.
SCORE		20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
4 Sediment Deposition **(3)**		Little or no enlargement of islands or point bars and less than 5% (<20% for low-gradient streams) of the bottom affected by sediment deposition.	Some new increase in bar formation, mostly from gravel, sand or fine sediment; 5-30% (20-50% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; slight deposition in pools.	Moderate deposition of new gravel, sand or fine sediment on old and new bars; 30-50% (50-80% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; sediment deposits at obstructions, constrictions, and bends; moderate deposition of pools prevalent.	Heavy deposits of fine material, increased bar development; more than 50% (80% for low-gradient) of the bottom changing frequently; pools almost absent due to substantial sediment deposition.
SCORE		20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 (3) 2 1 0
5 Channel Flow Status **(18)**		Water reaches base of both lower banks, and minimal amount of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills >75% of the available channel; or <25% of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills 25-75% of the available channel, and/or riffle substrates are mostly exposed.	Very little water in channel and mostly present as standing pools.
SCORE		20 19 (18) 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0

Parameters to be evaluated in sampling reach

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (BACK)

Parameters to be evaluated broader than sampling reach

Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
	Optimal	Suboptimal	Marginal	Poor
6. Channel Alteration	Channelization or dredging absent or minimal; stream with normal pattern.	Some channelization present, usually in areas of bridge abutments; evidence of past channelization, i.e., dredging, (greater than past 20 yr) may be present, but recent channelization is not present.	Channelization may be extensive; embankments or shoring structures present on both banks; and 40 to 80% of stream reach channelized and disrupted.	Banks shored with gabion or cement; over 80% of the stream reach channelized and disrupted. Instream habitat greatly altered or removed entirely.
SCORE _20_	(20) 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
7. Channel Sinuosity	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 3 to 4 times longer than if it was in a straight line. (Note - channel braiding is considered normal in coastal plains and other low-lying areas. This parameter is not easily rated in these areas.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 3 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 1 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	Channel straight; waterway has been channelized for a long distance.
SCORE _10_	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	(10) 9 (8) 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
8. Bank Stability (score each bank)	Banks stable; evidence of erosion or bank failure absent or minimal; little potential for future problems. <5% of bank affected.	Moderately stable; infrequent, small areas of erosion mostly healed over. 5-30% of bank in reach has areas of erosion.	Moderately unstable; 30-60% of bank in reach has areas of erosion; high erosion potential during floods.	Unstable; many eroded areas; "raw" areas frequent along straight sections and bends; obvious bank sloughing; 60-100% of bank has erosional scars.
SCORE _7_ (LB)	Left Bank 10 (9)	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE _9_ (RB)	Right Bank 10 (9)	8 7 6 -	5 4 3	2 1 0
9. Vegetative Protection (score each bank) Note: determine left or right side by facing downstream. _10/10_	More than 90% of the streambank surfaces and immediate riparian zone covered by native vegetation, including trees, understory shrubs, or nonwoody macrophytes; vegetative disruption through grazing or mowing minimal or not evident; almost all plants allowed to grow naturally.	70-90% of the streambank surfaces covered by native vegetation, but one class of plants is not well-represented; disruption evident but not affecting full plant growth potential to any great extent; more than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	50-70% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption obvious; patches of bare soil or closely cropped vegetation common; less than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	Less than 50% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption of streambank vegetation is very high; vegetation has been removed to 5 centimeters or less in average stubble height.
SCORE _10_ (LB)	Left Bank 10	(8) 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE _10_ (RB)	Right Bank 10	(8) 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
10. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width (score each bank riparian zone) _10_	Width of riparian zone >18 meters; human activities (i.e., parking lots, roadbeds, clear-cuts, lawns, or crops) have not impacted zone.	Width of riparian zone 12-18 meters; human activities have impacted zone only minimally.	Width of riparian zone 6-12 meters; human activities have impacted zone a great deal.	Width of riparian zone <6 meters: little or no riparian vegetation due to human activities.
SCORE _9_ (LB)	Left Bank 10 (9)	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE _9/10_ (RB)	Right Bank 10 (9)	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0

Total Score _____

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (FRONT)

STREAM NAME South Branch of Aberjona	LOCATION Woburn
STATION # SD-1 RIVERMILE _____	STREAM CLASS
LAT _____ LONG _____	RIVER BASIN
STORET #	AGENCY
INVESTIGATORS	
FORM COMPLETED BY Bart Hoskins	DATE _____ TIME _____ AM PM	REASON FOR SURVEY

	Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
		Optimal	Suboptimal	Marginal	Poor
Parameters to be evaluated in sampling reach	1. Epifaunal Substrate/ Available Cover	Greater than 50% of substrate favorable for epifaunal colonization and fish cover; mix of snags, submerged logs, undercut banks, cobble or other stable habitat and at stage to allow full colonization potential (i.e., logs/snags that are not new fall and not transient).	30-50% mix of stable habitat; well-suited for full colonization potential; adequate habitat for maintenance of populations; presence of additional substrate in the form of newfall, but not yet prepared for colonization (may rate at high end of scale).	10-30% mix of stable habitat; habitat availability less than desirable; substrate frequently disturbed or removed.	Less than 10% stable habitat; lack of habitat is obvious; substrate unstable or lacking.
	SCORE ̶1̶6̶ (4)	20 19 18 17 (16)	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 (4) 3 2 1 0
	2. Pool Substrate Characterization	Mixture of substrate materials, with gravel and firm sand prevalent; root mats and submerged vegetation common.	Mixture of soft sand, mud, or clay; mud may be dominant; some root mats and submerged vegetation present.	All mud or clay or sand bottom; little or no root mat; no submerged vegetation.	Hard-pan clay or bedrock; no root mat or vegetation.
	SCORE ̶1̶3̶ (10)	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 (13) 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
	3. Pool Variability	Even mix of large-shallow, large-deep, small-shallow, small-deep pools present	Majority of pools large-deep; very few shallow.	Shallow pools much more prevalent than deep pools.	Majority of pools small-shallow or pools absent.
	SCORE 4	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 (4) 3 2 1 0
	4. Sediment Deposition	Little or no enlargement of islands or point bars and less than 5% (<20% for low-gradient streams) of the bottom affected by sediment deposition.	Some new increase in bar formation, mostly from gravel, sand or fine sediment; 5-30% (20-50% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; slight deposition in pools.	Moderate deposition of new gravel, sand or fine sediment on old and new bars; 30-50% (50-80% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; sediment deposits at obstructions, constrictions, and bends; moderate deposition of pools prevalent.	Heavy deposits of fine material, increased bar development; more than 50% (80% for low-gradient) of the bottom changing frequently; pools almost absent due to substantial sediment deposition.
	SCORE 4 ̶X̶	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 (6)	5 (4) 3 2 1 0
	5. Channel Flow Status	Water reaches base of both lower banks, and minimal amount of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills >75% of the available channel; or <25% of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills 25-75% of the available channel, and/or riffle substrates are mostly exposed.	Very little water in channel and mostly present as standing pools.
	SCORE 3 ̶X̶	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	(5) 4 (3) 2 1 0

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (BACK)

Parameters to be evaluated broader than sampling reach

Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
	Optimal	**Suboptimal**	**Marginal**	**Poor**
6. Channel Alteration **20**	Channelization or dredging absent or minimal; stream with normal pattern.	Some channelization present, usually in areas of bridge abutments; evidence of past channelization, i.e., dredging, (greater than past 20 yr) may be present, but recent channelization is not present.	Channelization may be extensive; embankments or shoring structures present on both banks; and 40 to 80% of stream reach channelized and disrupted.	Banks shored with gabion or cement; over 80% of the stream reach channelized and disrupted. Instream habitat greatly altered or removed entirely.
SCORE	(20) 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
7. Channel Sinuosity **10**	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 3 to 4 times longer than if it was in a straight line. (Note - channel braiding is considered normal in coastal plains and other low-lying areas. This parameter is not easily rated in these areas.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 3 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 1 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	Channel straight; waterway has been channelized for a long distance.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 (14) 13 12 11	(10) 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
8. Bank Stability (score each bank)	Banks stable; evidence of erosion or bank failure absent or minimal; little potential for future problems. <5% of bank affected.	Moderately stable; infrequent, small areas of erosion mostly healed over. 5-30% of bank in reach has areas of erosion.	Moderately unstable; 30-60% of bank in reach has areas of erosion, high erosion potential during floods.	Unstable; many eroded areas; "raw" areas frequent along straight sections and bends; obvious bank sloughing; 60-100% of bank has erosional scars.
SCORE **9** (LB)	Left Bank (10) 9	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE **9** (RB)	Right Bank (10) 9	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
9. Vegetative Protection (score each bank) Note: determine left or right side by facing downstream.	More than 90% of the streambank surfaces and immediate riparian zone covered by native vegetation, including trees, understory shrubs, or nonwoody macrophytes; vegetative disruption through grazing or mowing minimal or not evident; almost all plants allowed to grow naturally.	70-90% of the streambank surfaces covered by native vegetation, but one class of plants is not well-represented; disruption evident but not affecting full plant growth potential to any great extent; more than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	50-70% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption obvious; patches of bare soil or closely cropped vegetation common; less than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	Less than 50% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption of streambank vegetation is very high; vegetation has been removed to 5 centimeters or less in average stubble height.
SCORE **10** (LB)	Left Bank (10)	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE **10** (RB)	Right Bank (10)	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
10. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width (score each bank riparian zone)	Width of riparian zone >18 meters; human activities (i.e., parking lots, roadbeds, clear-cuts, lawns, or crops) have not impacted zone.	Width of riparian zone 12-18 meters; human activities have impacted zone only minimally.	Width of riparian zone 6-12 meters; human activities have impacted zone a great deal.	Width of riparian zone <6 meters; little or no riparian vegetation due to human activities.
SCORE **10** (LB)	Left Bank (10) 9	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE **10** (RB)	Right Bank (10) 9	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0

Total Score _____

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (FRONT)

STREAM NAME S. branch Abergma	LOCATION N. Reading
STATION # SD01　RIVERMILE ___0___	STREAM CLASS
LAT _____ LONG _____	RIVER BASIN
STORET#	AGENCY
INVESTIGATORS	
FORM COMPLETED BY　KTO	DATE _____ TIME _____ AM PM	REASON FOR SURVEY

Part+KO Concurs

Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
	Optimal	Suboptimal	Marginal	Poor
1. Epifaunal Substrate/ Available Cover　4	Greater than 50% of substrate favorable for epifaunal colonization and fish cover; mix of snags, submerged logs, undercut banks, cobble or other stable habitat and at stage to allow full colonization potential (i.e., logs/snags that are not new fall and not transient).	30-50% mix of stable habitat; well-suited for full colonization potential; adequate habitat for maintenance of populations; presence of additional substrate in the form of newfall, but not yet prepared for colonization (may rate at high end of scale).	10-30% mix of stable habitat; habitat availability less than desirable; substrate frequently disturbed or removed.	Less than 10% stable habitat; lack of habitat is obvious; substrate unstable or lacking.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 (4) 3 2 1 0
2. Pool Substrate Characterization　10	Mixture of substrate materials, with gravel and firm sand prevalent; root mats and submerged vegetation common.	Mixture of soft sand, mud, or clay; mud may be dominant; some root mats and submerged vegetation present.	All mud or clay or sand bottom; little or no root mat; no submerged vegetation.	Hard-pan clay or bedrock; no root mat or vegetation.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 (7) 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
3. Pool Variability　4	Even mix of large-shallow, large-deep, small-shallow, small-deep pools present.	Majority of pools large-deep; very few shallow.	Shallow pools much more prevalent than deep pools.	Majority of pools small-shallow or pools absent.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 (4) 3 2 1 0
4. Sediment Deposition　4	Little or no enlargement of islands or point bars and less than 5% (<20% for low-gradient streams) of the bottom affected by sediment deposition.	Some new increase in bar formation, mostly from gravel, sand or fine sediment; 5-30% (20-50% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; slight deposition in pools.	Moderate deposition of new gravel, sand or fine sediment on old and new bars; 30-50% (50-80% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; sediment deposits at obstructions, constrictions, and bends; moderate deposition of pools prevalent.	Heavy deposits of fine material, increased bar development; more than 50% (80% for low-gradient) of the bottom changing frequently; pools almost absent due to substantial sediment deposition.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 (2) 1 0
5. Channel Flow Status　3	Water reaches base of both lower banks, and minimal amount of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills >75% of the available channel; or <25% of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills 25-75% of the available channel, and/or riffle substrates are mostly exposed.	Very little water in channel and mostly present as standing pools.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 (3) 2 1 0

Parameter to be evaluated in sampling reach

http://www.epa.gov/owow/environmental/monitoring/AWPD/RBP/pics/a7.gif

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (BACK)

Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
	Optimal	**Suboptimal**	**Marginal**	**Poor**
6. Channel Alteration	Channelization or dredging absent or minimal; stream with normal pattern.	Some channelization present, usually in areas of bridge abutments; evidence of past channelization, i.e., dredging (greater than past 20 yr) may be present, but recent channelization is not present.	Channelization may be extensive; embankments or shoring structures present on both banks; and 40 to 80% of stream reach channelized and disrupted.	Banks shored with gabion or cement; over 80% of the stream reach channelized and disrupted. Instream habitat greatly altered or removed entirely.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
7. Channel Sinuosity	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 3 to 4 times longer than if it was in a straight line. (Note - channel braiding is considered normal in coastal plains and other low-lying areas. This parameter is not easily rated in these areas.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 3 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	The bends in the stream increase the stream length 2 to 1 times longer than if it was in a straight line.	Channel straight; waterway has been channelized for a long distance.
SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
8. Bank Stability (score each bank)	Banks stable; evidence of erosion or bank failure absent or minimal; little potential for future problems. <5% of bank affected.	Moderately stable; infrequent, small areas of erosion mostly healed over. 5-30% of bank in reach has areas of erosion.	Moderately unstable; 30-60% of bank in reach has areas of erosion, high erosion potential during floods.	Unstable; many eroded areas; "raw" areas frequent along straight sections and bends; obvious bank sloughing; 60-100% of bank has erosional scars.
SCORE ___ (LB)	Left Bank 10 9	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE ___ (RB)	Right Bank 10 9	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
9. Vegetative Protection (score each bank) Note: determine left or right side by facing downstream.	More than 90% of the streambank surfaces and immediate riparian zone covered by native vegetation, including trees, understory shrubs, or nonwoody macrophytes; vegetative disruption through grazing or mowing minimal or not evident; almost all plants allowed to grow naturally.	70-90% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation, but one class of plants is not well-represented; disruption evident but not affecting full plant growth potential to any great extent; more than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	50-70% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption obvious; patches of bare soil or closely cropped vegetation common; less than one-half of the potential plant stubble height remaining.	Less than 50% of the streambank surfaces covered by vegetation; disruption of streambank vegetation is very high; vegetation has been removed to 5 centimeters or less in average stubble height.
SCORE ___ (LB)	Left Bank 10	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE ___ (RB)	Right Bank 10	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
10. Riparian Vegetative Zone Width (score each bank riparian zone)	Width of riparian zone >18 meters; human activities (i.e., parking lots, roadbeds, clear-cuts, lawns, or crops) have not impacted zone.	Width of riparian zone 12-18 meters; human activities have impacted zone only minimally.	Width of riparian zone 6-12 meters; human activities have impacted zone a great deal.	Width of riparian zone <6 meters; little or no riparian vegetation due to human activities.
SCORE ___ (LB)	Left Bank 10 9	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0
SCORE ___ (RB)	Right Bank 10 9	8 7 6	5 4 3	2 1 0

Parameters to be evaluated broader than sampling reach

Total Score _____

HABITAT ASSESSMENT FIELD DATA SHEET—LOW GRADIENT STREAMS (FRONT)

STREAM NAME	LOCATION
STATION #_____ RIVERMILE_____	STREAM CLASS
LAT _____ LONG _____	RIVER BASIN
STORET #	AGENCY
INVESTIGATORS	
FORM COMPLETED BY	DATE _____ TIME _____ AM PM / REASON FOR SURVEY

	Habitat Parameter	Condition Category			
		Optimal	**Suboptimal**	**Marginal**	**Poor**
Parameters to be evaluated in sampling reach	1. Epifaunal Substrate/ Available Cover	Greater than 50% of substrate favorable for epifaunal colonization and fish cover; mix of snags, submerged logs, undercut banks, cobble or other stable habitat and at stage to allow full colonization potential (i.e., logs/snags that are not new fall and not transient).	30-50% mix of stable habitat; well-suited for full colonization potential; adequate habitat for maintenance of populations; presence of additional substrate in the form of newfall, but not yet prepared for colonization (may rate at high end of scale).	10-30% mix of stable habitat; habitat availability less than desirable; substrate frequently disturbed or removed.	Less than 10% stable habitat; lack of habitat is obvious; substrate unstable or lacking.
	SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
	2. Pool Substrate Characterization	Mixture of substrate materials, with gravel and firm sand prevalent; root mats and submerged vegetation common.	Mixture of soft sand, mud, or clay; mud may be dominant; some root mats and submerged vegetation present.	All mud or clay or sand bottom; little or no root mat; no submerged vegetation.	Hard-pan clay or bedrock; no root mat or vegetation.
	SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
	3. Pool Variability	Even mix of large-shallow, large-deep, small-shallow, small-deep pools present.	Majority of pools large-deep; very few shallow.	Shallow pools much more prevalent than deep pools.	Majority of pools small-shallow or pools absent.
	SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
	4. Sediment Deposition	Little or no enlargement of islands or point bars and less than 5% <20% for low-gradient streams) of the bottom affected by sediment deposition.	Some new increase in bar formation, mostly from gravel, sand or fine sediment; 5-30% (20-50% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; slight deposition in pools.	Moderate deposition of new gravel, sand or fine sediment on old and new bars; 30-50% (50-80% for low-gradient) of the bottom affected; sediment deposits at obstructions, constrictions, and bends; moderate deposition of pools prevalent.	Heavy deposits of fine material, increased bar development; more than 50% (80% for low-gradient) of the bottom changing frequently; pools almost absent due to substantial sediment deposition.
	SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0
	5. Channel Flow Status	Water reaches base of both lower banks, and minimal amount of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills >75% of the available channel; or <25% of channel substrate is exposed.	Water fills 25-75% of the available channel, and/or riffle substrates are mostly exposed.	Very little water in channel and mostly present as standing pools.
	SCORE	20 19 18 17 16	15 14 13 12 11	10 9 8 7 6	5 4 3 2 1 0