# **Wetland Delineation**

Quail Run Property Spokane, Washington

for Sonneland Commercial Properties, LLC c/o Schueler Consulting Services, LLC

October 24, 2014



### **Wetland Delineation**

Quail Run Property Spokane, Washington

for Sonneland Commercial Properties, LLC c/o Schueler Consulting Services, LLC

October 24, 2014



1525 South David Lane Boise, Idaho 83705 208.433.8098

## **Wetland Delineation**

# Quail Run Property Spokane, Washington

File No. 21508-001-01

October 24, 2014

Prepared for:

Sonneland Commercial Properties, LLC c/o Schueler Consulting Services, LLC 144 Northwest Vicksburg Avenue Bend, Oregon 97701

Attention: Kirk Schueler

Prepared by:

GeoEngineers, Inc. 1525 South David Lane Boise, Idaho 83705 208.433.8098

Jason E. Poulsen, PWS Senior Natural Resource Scientist

Æ

Jason R. Scott, CFP Associate

JEP:JRS:mlh

Disclaimer: Any electronic form, facsimile or hard copy of the original document (email, text, table, and/or figure), if provided, and any attachments are only a copy of the original document. The original document is stored by GeoEngineers, Inc. and will serve as the official document of record.

Copyright© 2014 by GeoEngineers, Inc. All rights reserved.



# **Table of Contents**

INTRODUCTION	1
SCOPE OF SERVICES	1
METHODS	1
Literature Review Wetland Delineation Methodology Ordinary High Water Mark Delineation Methodology Field Evaluation	.1 .2 .3
Wetland Classification and Rating	3
RESULTS	3
Literature Review Soils NWI Map Topographic Maps Historical Aerial Photographs Wetland Delineation/Assessment Soil and Hydrology Field Data Wetland Conditions	.3 .4 .4 .4 .5 .6
CONCLUSIONS	
LIMITATIONS	7
REFERENCES	7

### LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Vicinity Map Figure 2. Soils Map Figure 3. NWI Map Figure 4. Topographic Map Figure 5. Wetland Delineation Map

### APPENDICES

Appendix A. Site Photographs Appendix B. Eastern Washington Wetland Rating Forms Appendix C. Wetland Determination Data Forms



#### **INTRODUCTION**

GeoEngineers, Inc. (GeoEngineers) was retained by Sonneland Commercial Properties, LLC (Sonneland) to provide a wetland delineation and functions assessment on the approximately 34-acre Quail Run Property located southwest of the intersection of South Southeast Boulevard and East 29<sup>th</sup> Avenue in Spokane, Washington (Figure 1, Vicinity Map). GeoEngineers understands that Sonneland Commercial Properties, LLC (Sonneland) will use this wetland delineation report as documentation to support a site development plan and assist with future permitting requirements.

#### **SCOPE OF SERVICES**

GeoEngineers' delineation and functions assessment scope of services included: (1) a literature review; (2) a field assessment; and (3) the preparation of this report for future permitting and documentation purposes.

#### **METHODS**

#### **Literature Review**

GeoEngineers researched existing information on wetlands, streams, ditches, man-made features and or other aquatic habitat documented on or near the project area prior to conducting the site visit. The search for pertinent and applicable data and maps consisted of a review of the following.

- United States Geological Survey (USGS) topographic map;
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) maps;
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) National Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey for Spokane County, Washington; and
- Readily available historical aerial photographs.

The purpose of this pre-field review was to prepare for the site survey and to assist the field wetland biologist in determining the potential for wetlands and, if present, their location.

#### Wetland Delineation Methodology

Wetland delineation efforts followed the guidance set forth in the 1987 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Wetland Delineation Manual (Environmental Laboratory, 1987), the USACE Regional Supplement to the USACE Wetland Delineation Manual, Western Mountains, Valleys and Coastal Region (USACE 2010 Version 2.0) and the Washington State Wetlands Identification and Delineation Manual (Ecology 1997). These manuals follow the three-parameter approach for conducting wetland determinations which include analysis for the presence of: (1) hydrophytic vegetation; (2) hydric soils; and (3) wetland hydrology. The presence of all three criteria is required for a given area to be classified as a wetland.

Soil pits were dug as needed to confirm the presence/absence of hydric soils and hydrology. Soils were inspected from the hand-dug soil pits that extended approximately 13 to 14 inches below ground surface (bgs), depending on soil conditions, to be analyzed visually and physically. Within each soil pit, soil texture,



soil matrix color, presence or absence of redoximorphic features or gleying and depth of soil saturation, if present, were recorded. Soil matrix and redoximorphic feature colors were determined using Munsell Soil Color Charts (GretagMacbeth 2000). Additionally, wetland hydrology indicators, including drainage patterns, presence of surface water, depth to groundwater within soil pits and evidence of inundation were also noted at each sample plot, if applicable.

Soil test pit coordinates were collected using an iPad and associated global positioning system (GPS) and GISPro application package. This data was then used in conjunction with desktop GIS mapping software to produce site maps.

### **Ordinary High Water Mark Delineation Methodology**

Open water features, located within the study area, were determined based on their ordinary high water mark (OHWM) in accordance with the guidance set forth by the USACE in their Regulatory Guidance Letter titled Ordinary High Water Mark Identification (USACE, 2005) and various indicators outlined with the USACE A Guide to OHWM for Non-Perennial Streams in the Western Mountains, Valleys and Cast Region of the Unites States (USACE 2014) and the Field Guide to Identification of the OHWM in the Arid West Region of the Western United States (USACE 2008). Please note, the Arid West OHWM document was also used because many of the characteristics and attributes of the waters/waterways in the region of the study area are similar to those found in the Arid West region. The OHWM is defined by the USACE as:

The term "ordinary high water mark" means that line on the shore established by the fluctuations of weather and indicated by physical characteristics such as a clear, natural line impressed on the bank, shelving, changes in the character of soil, destruction of terrestrial vegetation, the presence of litter and debris, or other appropriate means that consider the characteristics of the surrounding areas (USACE 2008).

Physical characteristics that are present on the shoreline of a watercourse may vary depending on the type of water body and conditions of the area. There are no required physical indicators that must be present to make an OHWM determination. However, the following physical characteristics were considered when making the OHWM determination:

- Natural line impressed on the bank
- Shelving or topographic breaks
- Changes in the character of soil
- Destruction of terrestrial vegetation
- Presence of litter or debris (drift lines)
- Wracking
- Vegetation matted down, bent, or absent
- Leaf litter disturbed, matted or washed away
- Water staining
- Change in plant community



Combinations of physical characteristics and other methods are typically used when available for determining the OHWM. Because many types of water bodies occur with varying conditions including topography, morphology and flow/elevation dynamics, other physical characteristics indicative of the OHWM may also be used that are not identified in the USACE guidance.

OHWM points were collected using an iPad and associated GPS and GISPro application package. This data was then used in conjunction with desktop GIS mapping software to produce site maps.

#### **Field Evaluation**

A GeoEngineers' biologist conducted field delineation and functions assessment services for the site on September 4, 2014. A photographic record of existing site conditions is provided in Appendix A, Site Photographs. Potential wetland areas, within the subject site, were evaluated based upon three criteria: (1) the presence of hydrophytic vegetation; (2) hydric soils; and (3) wetland hydrology. Based upon positive confirmation of all three parameters, the GeoEngineers' biologist would established soil pits in the field to determine the wetland boundary and document the conditions of the wetlands and adjacent upland habitat.

#### Wetland Classification and Rating

Wetlands were delineated and characterized using the wetland classes defined by the Cowardin system (Cowardin *et al.*, 1979). The Cowardin system describes wetlands by the plant communities, soils and hydrologic regimes present. The hierarchical order identifies five major types of wetland systems: Marine, Estuarine, Riverine, Lacustrine and Palustrine. These systems are further stratified into classes and subclasses based on substrate materials, flooding regime and vegetation life form. Each class and subclass is then annotated with specific modifiers for water regimes, water chemistry, soil and other special conditions. The naming convention was developed by USFWS for the NWI maps.

Wetlands were also rated using the categories according to Washington State Wetland Rating System for Eastern Washington (Hruby, 2004). This four-tier rating system was used to determine the hydrogeomorphic class of, and to rate the water quality, hydrologic, and habitat functions for each wetland (SCC 11.20.050(B); Hruby, 2004). The completed wetland rating forms are included in Appendix B, Eastern Washington Wetland Rating Forms). Wetland buffer width is determined from the wetland category, land intensity use and habitat function points.

#### RESULTS

#### **Literature Review**

#### Soils

The USDA NRCS Web Soil Survey (USDA NRCS Soil Survey <u>http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/</u>) for Spokane County, Washington identified two soil types within the area of the project site, as shown in Figure 2, Soils Map. A general description of each soil type as defined by the NRCS Web Soil Survey is provided below.



- 3117 Northstar-Rock outcrop-Rockly complex, 0% to 15 % Slopes: Landform: Plateaus / Available water storage in profile: Very Low / Parent material: Loess with an influence of volcanic ash over residuum and/or colluvium derived from basalt / Drainage class: Well drained.
- 7131 Urban land Northstar, disturbed complex, 3% to 8 % Slopes: Landform: Plateaus / Available water storage in profile: Very low / Parent material: Loess with an influence of volcanic ash over residuum and/or colluvium derived from basalt / Drainage class: Well drained.

Only the Northstar-Rock outcrop (3117) soil type was classified by the National Hydric Soils List as a potential hydric soil in depressions.

#### NWI Map

The USFWS NWI maps depicted two wetland classifications on the site; one Palustrine Emergent Persistent Wetland, Seasonally Flooded (PEM1C) and one Palustrine, Scrub-shrub, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Seasonally Flooded (PSS1C) (Figure 3, NWI Map). Based on our field observations, only the wetland location depicted by the NWI map as PSS1C was present on the site. However, GeoEngineers' study reclassified the NWI PSS1C classification as a Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Semi-permanently Flooded (PFO1F) wetland with a shallow, open water component.

#### Topographic Maps

GeoEngineers reviewed the 1974 photorevised 1986 Spokane Northwest, Washington, the 1973 photorevised 1986 Spokane Southwest, Washington and Spokane Southeast, Washington 7.5 minute series topographic maps for the project site. The topographic maps indicate the presence of seasonal drainage through the central portion of the site and an undefined marsh area along the far west property boundary prior to 1973/1974 (Figure 4, Topographic Map). The drainage and marsh characteristics depicted by the topographic maps were not observed by the field biologist during the assessment.

#### **Historical Aerial Photographs**

GeoEngineers reviewed the following historical aerial photographs associated with the site to assist with the evaluation process. *Please note, not all aerial photographs were reproduced in the attached figures due to copy right restrictions.* 

- July 1995: The 1995 aerial photograph shows the majority of the site as undeveloped land except for four residential structures, one located on the west end of the property and three located on the east end of the property. There also appears to be earth moving activities (grading) on the northeast portion of the site and general dirt road access through the central portion of the property. No clear evidence of wetland or aquatic features were observed in this photograph due to poor scale and clarity.
- May 2002 / August 2005 / August 2006 / May 2009 / August 2011: The 2002, 2005, 2006 and 2011 aerial photograph appears similar to the 1995 photograph.
- **July 2013**: The 2013 photograph appears similar to the previous photographs; however, the pond that was identified near the west property boundary (adjacent to the west residential structure) can be identified in this photograph. No other water features were observed in the photograph.

#### Wetland Delineation/Assessment

GeoEngineers identified one wetland, approximately 0.48 acres (21,244 square feet) in size within the Quail Run Property project boundary. This wetland is identified as Wetland A and, as previously mentioned,



was reclassified by the field biologist as a Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Semi permanently Flooded (PF01F) wetland with a shallow, open water component. This wetland was delineated using OHWM methods as described above, therefore a wetland data sheet was not completed for Wetland A. Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) points were recorded using an iPad and associated GISPro application package. Please note, the OHWM boundaries associated with Wetland A were not surveyed by a professional land surveyor for mapping purposes and are therefore considered approximate. As the OHWM was determined, appropriate pin flagging was labeled and inserted into the ground along the OHWM boundary determined by the field biologist. A waypoint was established on the hand-held GPS unit for each pin flag location. Following the field study, these data were then used in conjunction with desktop GIS mapping software to depict the OHWM boundary as illustrated on Figure 5, Wetland Delineation Map.

Only two areas were identified that expressed potential vegetative and/or topographically depressed characteristics that led to require the advancement of hand dug soil test pits (SP-1 ns SP-2). In both soil test pits, neither hydrology nor hydric soil indicators were identified and therefore were characterized as upland soil test pits.

#### Soil and Hydrology Field Data

The GeoEngineers' wetland biologist surveyed the property to estimate presence/absence of wetlands on site. Based on site observations, one wetland (Wetland A) was identified on-site. GeoEngineers established a total of two soil pits (SP-1 and SP-2) within the area of the project site. Sample pits were located based on observations related to topography gradient or low points within the terrain, general vegetative cover type or color change and data obtained from the literature review. Table 1, provides a summary of soil and hydrology data conditions encountered during the delineation/assessment.

Soil Pit ID	Approximate Depth (inches bgs.)	Hue, Value, Chroma	Redox Features	Soil Description	Sulfide Odor	Depth to Water / Saturation (inches bgs)	Hydric Soils Present? (Yes / No)
SP-1	0" - 7"	10YR 3/2	No	Silt	No	Not present	No
	7" - 14"	10YR 5/2	No	Sandy Silt	No	Not present	No
SP-2	0" - 8"	10YR 3/3	No	Silt	No	Not present	No
	8" - 13"	10YR 5/2	No	Silt	No	Not present	No

#### TABLE 1. SOIL/HYDROLOGY DATA SUMMARY

The data collected from each soil pit was compared in an effort to identify consistent soil types. Soil data gathered from soil pits (Appendix C, Wetland Determination Data Forms) revealed a consistent non-hydric or upland soil profile of silt texturing with soil colors ranging from 10YR 3/2 to 10YR 5/2. No apparent redoximorphic features (GretagMacbeth, 2000) were observed in either of these two soil pits. Photographs were collected of each soil pit and are presented in Appendix A, Site Photographs. Please note, soil pits were not dug in association with Wetland A. This Wetland A was delineated using topographic relief and OHWM primary indicators described above.

#### **Wetland Conditions**

#### **General Vegetation**

The Wetland A is surrounded by a deciduous forest and relatively steep basalt outcroppings. The majority of Wetland A consists of an open water component with only a narrow forested wetland fringe vegetated mainly with Cascara buckthorn (*Frangula pushiana*) and Pacific willow (*Salix lucida*). A significant algal mat was also observed across the open water component. These general vegetation types are common and are typically found in or adjacent to freshwater habitats.

#### Wetland Rating/Buffers

GeoEngineers completed a functional attributes assessment on Wetland A using the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology), Washington State Wetland Rating System for Eastern Washington (Ecology Publication #04-06-15 dated 2007) Eastern Washington Rating Form (Appendix B). Based on the functional attributes associated with this wetland, the rating form characterized the on-site wetland as a Category III system; scoring a total of 33 points. The wetland meets criteria consistent with a Category III rating as defined by Ecology and the City of Spokane (City of Spokane's Municipal Code Section 17E.070.100 - Wetland Rating System) because of its score for water quality functions (10 points), hydrologic functions (12 points) and habitat functions (11 points).

Based on the current habitat function score identified above (11 points) and the current land use type (Moderate – Residential: one unit per acre or less), as defined by Spokane Municipal Code Alternative 2 (Section 17E.070.110 Wetland Buffers), Wetland A currently has an established buffer of 60 feet from the edge of the wetland. However, if future development occurs that increases the land use type to a density greater than one residential unit per acre, it would result in a "High" land use classification type. This increase to "High" land use type would require the buffer to be increased to a total of 80 feet (Section 17E.070.110 Wetland Buffers B. 2.) from the edge of the wetland. Spokane Municipal Code (17E.070.110 Wetland Buffers H. Structural Setbacks from Buffers) also requires a 10 foot structural setback beyond the wetland buffer. Figure 5, Wetland Delineation Map, illustrates the approximate location of each buffer width related to the edge of Wetland A but does not include the additional 10 foot structural setback line.

#### CONCLUSIONS

GeoEngineers identified, delineated and assessed one Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Semi-permanently Flooded (PF01F) wetland (Wetland A) with a shallow, open water component approximately 0.48 acres (21,244 square feet) in size. This wetland was classified as a Category III wetland with a current regulatory (City of Spokane) buffer of 60 feet. If future development increased the current land use type classification from "Moderate" to "High" by increasing the number of residential units, then a new regulatory buffer of 80 feet will be required along with a 10-foot structural setback.

This report contains opinions from GeoEngineers based on specific site data and previous professional experience; however, all jurisdictional determinations and regulatory requirements are beyond GeoEngineers' control and at the sole discretion of the City of Spokane, Ecology and the USACE.



#### LIMITATIONS

GeoEngineers has developed this wetland delineation report in general accordance with the scope and limitations of our proposal. Within the limitations of scope, schedule and budget, our services have been executed in accordance with the generally accepted practices for wetland delineation in this area at the time this report was prepared. No warranty or other conditions, express or implied, should be understood.

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of Sonneland Commercial Properties, LLC and their authorized agents following the described methods and information available at the time of our services. No other party may rely on the product of our services unless we agree in advance to such reliance in writing. The information contained herein should not be applied for any purpose or project except the one originally contemplated.

#### REFERENCES

- Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of Wetland and Deep Water Habitats of the United States. Performed for Office of Biological Services, Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.
- Environmental Laboratory. 1987. "U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual," Technical Report Y-87-1, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.

GretagMacbeth. 2000. Munsell® Soil Color Charts. New Windsor, New York.

- Hruby, T. 2004. Washington State Wetland Rating System for Eastern Washington Revised. Washington State Department of Ecology Publication #04-06-015.
- McMillan, Andy. 1997. Washington State Wetlands Identification and Delineation Manual. Washington State Department of Ecology Publication #96-94.
- United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2008. "Interim Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys and Coast Region, ed. J.S. Wakeley, R. W. Lichvar, and C.V. Noble. ERDC/EL TR-08-28. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center.
- United States Army Corps of Engineers. 1987. "Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual," Technical Report Y-87-1, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
- United States Army Corps of Engineers. 2005. "Regulatory Guidance Letter Subject: Ordinary High Water Mark."
- United States Army Corps of Engineers. 2014. "Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Western Mountains, Valleys and Coast Region (Version 2.0)"
- United States Department of Agriculture National Resource Conservation Service (USDA-NRCS). 2009a. Web Soil Survey. <u>http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/</u> (Accessed Oct.1, 2014).



- United States Department of Agriculture National Resource Conservation Service (USDA-NRCS). 2009b. National Hydric Soils List by State. <u>http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/use/hydric/</u> (Accessed Oct.1, 2014).
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2009. Wetlands Mapper. http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/mapper.html (Accessed Aug. 29, 2014).









P:\21\21508001\_GIS\01\GIS\MXD\2150800100\_Soils.mxd Path: PORT



P:\21\21508001\_GIS\01\GIS\MXD\2150800100\_NWI.mxd Path: Office: PORT



P:\21\21508001\_GIS\01\GIS\MXD\2150800100\_Topo.mxd Path: Office: PORT





Projection: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 11N













# **APPENDIX A** Site Photographs



General view of Wetland A from the southwest (facing northeast).



General view of Wetland A from the northeast (facing southwest).





General view of SP-1.



General view of SP-1 soils.

# Site Photographs

Quail Run Property Spokane, Washington

GEOENGINEERS

Appendix A-2



General view of SP-2.



General view of SP-2 soils.





General view of the central portion of the site (facing south).



General view of the central portion of the site (facing southeast).





General view of the southeast portion of the site (facing north).



General view of the southeast portion of the site (facing southeast).



# APPENDIX B Eastern Washington Wetland Rating Forms

Wetland	name	or	number:	
---------	------	----	---------	--

#### WETLAND RATING FORM -EASTERN WASHINGTON

Version 2 – Updated July 2006 to increase accuracy and reproducibility among users – Updated Oct. 2008 with the new WDFW definitions for priority habitats

Name of v	wetland (if known): <u>N/A</u>				D	ate of site visit:	<u>9/4/14</u>
Rated by:	JEP Tra	ined by Ecolog	gy?	Yes 🛛 No		Date of training	g:
SEC: <u>33</u>	TWNSHP: <u>25N</u>	RNGE: <u>43E</u>	]	Is S/T/R in Append	dix D? 🗌 Y	es 🛛 No	
	Map of wetland	unit: Figure		Estimated	size		
		CTINANA A I					
Catal	hand an EUNOTIONS and the	SUMMAI					
Category	based on FUNCTIONS provided	by wetland:	LΙ				
	Category I = Score > 70	s	Score for	"Water Quality" H	functions	10	
	Category II = Score 51 - 69		Scor	e for Hydrologic F	functions	12	
	Category III = Score 30 - 50		S	Score for Habitat F	functions	11	_
	Category IV = Score < 30		Т	TOTAL score for F	functions	33	1
Category	based on SPECIAL CHARACTER	」 ISTCS of Wetl	and:	I II		🛛 Does not	Apply
	Final Cata	anry (abaaaa	the "hig	hest" category from	mahaya")	TTT	
	I'mai Cate	gor y (choose	the mg	nest category no.	m above )	III	
	Summary of basic	information a					
	Wetland Type Vernal Pool		Depres	Wetland Class			
	Alkali		Riverin				
	Natural Heritage Wetlan	d 🗌	Lake-f				
	Bog		Slope				
	Forest	$\square$	Check i	f unit has multiple	;		
	None of the above		HGM c	lasses present			
Does the	wetland being rated meet any of t If you answer YES to any of the q regulations regarding the special c	uestions below	you will		e wetland acco	ording to the	
Check	List for Wetlands that Need S				the Rating	YES	NO
	s the wetland unit been documented				0		
	langered <b>animal or plant</b> species (2						$\boxtimes$
	the purposes of this rating system,	"documented"	means th	ne wetland is on th	e appropriate		
	e or federal database. s the wetland unit been documented	l an habitat for	any Stat	a listed Threatened	lon		
	dangered <b>animal</b> species? For the						
	land is on the appropriate state data						$\boxtimes$
	categorized as Category 1 Natural						
SP3. Do	es the wetland unit contain individu	als of Priority	species l	isted by the WDFV	V for the state?	·	$\boxtimes$
wet	es the wetland unit have a local signalised in the short of the second	reline Master P	rogram,	v	<b>1</b>		$\boxtimes$
in a	local management plan as having s	special signific	ance.				

#### To complete the next part of the data sheet you will need to determine the Hydrogeomorphic Class of the wetland being rated.

The hydrogeomorphic classification groups wetlands into those that function in similar ways. Classifying the wetland first simplifies the questions needed to answer how it functions. The Hydrogeomorphic Class of a wetland can be determined using the key below. See p. 20 for more detailed instructions on classifying wetlands.

Wetland	name	or	number:	
---------	------	----	---------	--

#### **Classification of Vegetated Wetlands for Eastern Washington**

	the hydrologic criteria listed in each question do not apply to the entire unit being rated, you probably have a unit with ultiple HGM classes. In this case, identify which hydrologic criteria in questions 1-7 apply, and go to Question 8.					
1.	<ul> <li>Does the entire wetland unit meet both of the following criteria?</li> <li>The vegetated part of the wetland is on the shores of a body of open water (without any vegetation on the surface) where at least 20 acres (8 ha) in size;</li> <li>At least 30% of the open water area is deeper than 3 m (10 ft)?</li> </ul>					
	$\square$ NO – go to Step 2 $\square$ YES – The wetland class is Lake-fringe (lacus	strine fringe)				
2.	Does the wetland unit <b>meet all</b> of the following criteria?					
	<ul> <li>The wetland is on a slope (slope can be very gradual).</li> <li>The water flows through the wetland in one direction (unidirection flow subsurface, as sheetflow, or in a swale without distinct banks The water leaves the wetland without being impounded?</li> <li>NOTE: Surface water does not pond in these types of wetlands examples the stand without build be and the stand stand without be and the stand stand without be and the stand stand stand without be and the stand stand stand be and the stand stand stand be an additional standard s</li></ul>	cept occasionally in very small and				
	$\square$ NO – go to Step 3 $\square$ YES – The wetland class is Slope					
3.	Is the wetland unit in a valley or stream channel where it gets inundated by overbank flooding from that stream or river? In general, the flooding should occur at least once every ten years to answer "yes". <i>The wetland can contain depressions that are filled with water when the river is not flooding.</i> NO – go to Step 4					
4.	Is the wetland unit in a topographic depression, outside areas that are inundated ponds, or is saturated to the surface, at some time of the year. <i>This means that a interior of the wetland</i> .					
	$\square \text{ NO} - \text{go to Step 5} \qquad \boxtimes \textbf{YES} - \text{The wetland class is Depressional}$					
5.	Your wetland unit seems to be difficult to classify and probably contains several different HGM classes. For example, seeps at the base of a slope may grade into a riverine floodplain, or a small stream within a depressional wetland has a zone of flooding along its sides. GO BACK AND IDENTIFY WHICH OF THE HYDROLOGIC REGIMES DESCRIBED IN QUESTIONS 1-7 APPLY TO DIFFERENT AREAS IN THE UNIT (make a rough sketch to help you decide). Use the following table to identify the appropriate class to use for the rating system if you have several HGM classes present within your wetland. NOTE: Use this table only if the class that is recommended in the second column represents 10% or more of the total area of the wetland unit being rated. If the area of the class listed in column 2 is less than 10% of the unit, classify the wetland using the class that represents more than 90% of the total area.					
	HGM Classes Within One Delineated Wetland Boundary	Class to Use for Rating				
	Slope + Riverine Slope + Depressional	Riverine Depressional				
	Slope + Lake-fringe Depressional + Riverine (riverine is within boundary of depression)	Lake-fringe Depressional				

If you are unable still to determine which of the above criteria apply to your wetland, or you have more than 2 HGM classes within a wetland boundary, classify the wetland as **Depressional** for the rating.

Depressional + Lake-fringe

Depressional

D	Depressional and Flat Wetlands	Points
	WATER QUALITY FUNCTIONS – Indicators that wetland functions to improve water quality.	(only 1 score per box)
D 1	Does the wetland unit have the <u>potential</u> to improve water quality?	(see p.38)
	D 1.1 Characteristics of surface water flows out of the wetland unit:	
	<ul> <li>Wetland has no surface water outlet</li></ul>	5
	• Wetland has a highly constricted permanently flowing outlet	5
	Wetland has a permanently flowing surface outlet	
	<b>YES</b> points = 3 $\square$ <b>NO</b> points = 0	0
	D 1.3 Characteristics of persistent vegetation (emergent, shrub, and/or forest Cowardin class): Watland has persistent ungrand vegetation for $\lambda = 2/2$ of area	Figure 🗌
	<ul> <li>Wetland has persistent, ungrazed vegetation for &gt; = 2/3 of area points = 5</li> <li>Wetland has persistent, ungrazed vegetation from 1/3 to 2/3 of area points = 3</li> </ul>	
	• Wetland has persistent, ungrazed vegetation from $1/10$ to $< 1/3$ of areapoints = 1	
	• Wetland has persistent, ungrazed vegetation < 1/10 of areapoints = 0 🛛 Map of Cowardin vegetation classes	0
	D 1.4 Characteristics of seasonal ponding or inundation: This is the area of ponding that fluctuates every year.	<b>T</b> <sup>1</sup>
	<ul> <li>Do not count the area that is permanently ponded.</li> <li>Area seasonally ponded is &gt; 1/2 total area of wetland points = 3 </li> </ul>	Figure 🗌
	• Area seasonally ponded is 1/4 to 1/2 total area of wetlandpoints = 1	
	• Area seasonally ponded is $< 1/4$ total area of wetland	0
	NOTE: See text for indicators of seasonal and permanent inundation/floodingMap of HydroperiodsTotal for D 1Add the points in the boxes above	5
D 2	<b>Does the wetland unit have the <u>opportunity</u> to improve water quality?</b> Answer YES if you know or believe there are pollutants in groundwater or surface water coming into	
	the wetland that would otherwise reduce water quality in streams, lakes or groundwater downgradient	
	from the wetland? Note which of the following conditions provide the sources of pollutants. A unit may have pollutants coming from several sources, but any single source would qualify as opportunity.	
	Grazing in the wetland or within 150 ft	
	<ul> <li>Untreated stormwater discharges to wetland</li> <li>Tilled fields or orchards within 150 ft. of wetland</li> </ul>	
	A stream or culvert discharges into wetland that drains developed areas, residential areas, farmed	
	fields, roads, or clear-cut logging	Multiplier
	Residential, urban areas, golf courses are within 150 ft. of wetland Wetland is fed by groundwater high in phosphorus or nitrogen	
	Other	2
	XES multiplier is 2     □NO multiplier is 1	
•	<u>TOTAL</u> – Water Quality Functions Multiply the score from D1 by D2. <i>Record score on p. 1 of field form</i>	<u>10</u>
<b>D</b> 2	HYDROLOGIC FUNCTIONS – Indicators that wetland functions to reduce flooding and stream erosion. Does the wetland unit have the <u>potential</u> to reduce flooding and stream erosion?	(see p.39)
D 3	D 3.1 Characteristics of surface water flows out of the wetland unit:	(see p.59)
	<ul> <li>Wetland has no surface water outlet.</li> <li>Wetland has no surface water outlet.</li> </ul>	
	• wetland has an intermittently flowing outlet	8
	<ul> <li>Wetland has a highly constricted permanently flowing outlet</li></ul>	
	D 3.2 Depth of storage during wet periods. Estimate the height of ponding above the surface of the wetland	
1	(see text for description of measuring height). In wetlands with permanent ponding, the surface is the lowest elevation of "permanent" water).	
	• Marks of ponding are at least 3 ft. above the surface points = 8	
	• The wetland is a "headwater" wetland (see p. 39)	4
	<ul> <li>Marks are 2 ft. to &lt; 3 ft. from surface</li></ul>	
	• Marks are 6 in. to < 1 ft. from surface	
	• No marks above 6 in. or wetland has only saturated soils	
<b>D</b> (	Total for D 3     Add the points in the boxes above	12
D 4	<b>Does the wetland unit have the <u>opportunity</u> to reduce flooding and erosion?</b> Answer NO if the major source of water is groundwater, irrigation return flow, or water levels in the wetland	(see p. 42)
	are controlled by a reservoir. Answer YES if the wetland is in a location in the watershed where the flood	
	storage, or reduction in water velocity it provides helps protect downstream property and aquatic resources from floading or avaessive and/or prosive flows. Note which of the following conditions apply	
	from flooding or excessive and/or erosive flows. <i>Note which of the following conditions apply.</i> Use the structure of a river or stream that has flooding problems.	
	Wetland drains to a river or stream that has flooding problems	Multiplier
	Wetland has no outlet and impounds surface runoff water that might otherwise flow into a river or stream that has flooding problems	
	Other	1
1	<b>YES</b> multiplier is 2 <b>NO</b> multiplier is 1	
	<b>TOTAL</b> – <b>Hydrologic Functions</b> Multiply the score from D3 by D4; then <i>record score on p.1 of field form</i> .	12

Wetland name or number: \_\_\_\_\_

R	R Riverine Wetlands P			
	WATER QUALITY FUNCTIONS – Indicators that wetland functions to improve water quality.	(only 1 score per box)		
<b>R</b> 1	Does the wetland unit have the <u>potential</u> to improve water quality?	(see p.45)		
	<ul> <li>R 1.1 Area of surface depressions within the riverine wetland that can trap sediments during a flooding event:</li> <li>Depressions cover &gt; 1/3 area of wetland</li></ul>	Figure 🗌		
	<ul> <li>Depressions present but cover &lt; 1/10 area of wetland</li></ul>			
	R 1.2 Characteristics (cover) of the vegetation in the unit (area of polygons with > 90% cover at person height. This is not Cowardin vegetation classes): <ul> <li>Forest or shrub &gt; 2/3 the area of the wetland</li></ul>	Figure <u> </u>		
	Total for R1Add the points in the boxes above			
R 2	Does the wetland have the <u>opportunity</u> to improve water quality?	(see p. 46)		
	Answer YES if you know or believe there are pollutants in groundwater or surface water coming into the wetland that would otherwise reduce water quality in streams, lakes or groundwater downgradient from the wetland. Note which of the following conditions provide the sources of pollutants. A unit may have pollutants coming from several sources, but any single source would qualify as opportunity. Grazing in the wetland or within 150 ft Wetland intercepts groundwater within the Reclamation Area			
	<ul> <li>Untreated stormwater flows into wetland</li> <li>Tilled fields or orchards within 150 ft. of wetland</li> <li>Water flows into wetland from a stream or culvert that drains developed areas, residential areas, farmed fields, roads, or clear-cut logging</li> <li>Residential or urban areas are within 150 ft. of wetland</li> <li>The river or stream that floods the wetland has a contributing basin where human activities have raised levels of sediment, toxic compounds or nutrients in the river water above water quality standards.</li> <li>Other YES multiplier is 2</li> </ul>	Multiplier		
•	<u>TOTAL</u> – Water Quality Functions Multiply the score from R1 by the multiplier in R2; then <i>record score on p.1 of field form</i> .			
	HYDROLOGIC FUNCTIONS – Indicators that wetland functions to reduce flooding and stream degradation.			
<b>R</b> 3	Does the wetland have the <u>potential</u> to reduce flooding and erosion?	(see p.47)		
	R 3.1       Amount overbank storage the wetland provides: Estimate the average width of the wetland perpendicular to the direction of the flow of water and the width of the stream or river channel (distance between banks). Calculate the ratio: width of wetland / width of stream.         • If the ratio is 2 or more	Figure 🗌		
	Aerial photo or map showing average widths           R 3.2         Characteristics of vegetation that slow down water velocities during floods: Treat large woody debris as "forest or			
	<ul> <li>shrub" (areas of polygons with &gt; 90% cover at person height. This is not Cowardin vegetation classes):</li> <li>Forest or shrub for more than 2/3 the area of the wetland</li></ul>	Figure 🗌		
	Total for R3Add the points in the boxes above	/ #		
R 4	Does the wetland have the <u>opportunity</u> to reduce flooding and erosion?	(see p.50)		
	Answer NO if the major source of water is irrigation return flow or water levels are controlled by a reservoir. Answer YES if the wetland is in a location in the watershed where the flood storage, or reduction in water velocity it provides helps protect downstream property and aquatic resources from flooding or excessive and/or erosive flows. Note which of the following conditions apply.  There are human structures and activities downstream (roads, buildings, bridges, farms) that can be damaged by flooding.  There are natural resources downstream (e.g. salmon redds) that can be damaged by flooding Other NEC multiplicatio 2	Multiplier		
	YES multiplier is 2       NO multiplier is 1         TOTAL       Hydrologic Expections			
•	<u>TOTAL</u> – Hydrologic Functions Multiply the score from R3 by the multiplier in R4. <i>Record score on p.1 of field form.</i>			

Wetland name or number: \_\_\_\_\_

L	Lake-fringe Wetlands	Points
	WATER QUALITY FUNCTIONS – Indicators that wetland functions to improve water quality.	(only 1 score per box)
L 1	Does the wetland have the <u>potential</u> to improve water quality?	(see p.52)
	L 1.1 Average width of vegetation along the lakeshore: • Vegetation is more than 33 ft. (10m) wide points = 6 • Vegetation is more than 16 ft.(5m) wide and < 33 ft wide points = 3 • Vegetation is 6 ft. (2m) wide to < 16 ft wide points = 1 Map of Cowardin classes with widths marked	Figure 🔲
	<ul> <li>L 1.2 Characteristics of the vegetation in the wetland: Choose the appropriate description that results in the highest points, and do not include any open water in your estimate of coverage. The herbaceous plants can be either the dominant form or as an understory in a shrub or forest community. These are not Cowardin classes. Area of Cover is total cover in the unit, but it can be in patches. NOTE: Herbaceous does not include aquatic bed.</li> <li>Herbaceous plants cover &gt; 90% of the vegetated area</li></ul>	Figure 🗌
	Total for L1Add the points in the boxes above	
L 2	<b>Does the wetland have the <u>opportunity</u> to improve water quality?</b> Answer YES if you know or believe there are pollutants in the lake water, or surface water flowing through the	(see p.53)
	wetland to the lake is polluted. Note which of the following conditions provide the sources of pollutants. A unit may have pollutants coming from several sources, but any single source would qualify as opportunity.          Wetland is along the shores of a lake or reservoir that does not meet water quality standards         Grazing in the wetland or within 150 ft         Untreated stormwater flows into the wetland         Tilled fields or orchards within 150 ft. of wetland         Powerboats with gasoline or diesel engines use the lake         Parks with grassy areas that are maintained, ballfields, golf courses (all within 150 ft. of shore of lake)         Other         YES multiplier is 2	Multiplier
•	<u>TOTAL</u> – Water Quality Functions Multiply the score from L1 by the multiplier in L2.	
	<i>Record score on p.1 of field form.</i> HYDROLOGIC FUNCTIONS – Indicators that wetland functions to reduce shoreline erosion.	
L 3	Does the wetland have the <u>potential</u> to reduce shoreline erosion?	(see p.54)
	L 3.1       Average width and characteristics of vegetation along the lakeshore (do not include aquatic bed): (choose the highest scoring description that matches conditions in the wetland)         • > 3/4 of vegetation is shrubs or trees at least 33 ft. (10m) wide       points = 6         • > 3/4 of vegetation is shrubs or trees at least 6 ft. (2m) wide       points = 4         • > 1/4 of vegetation is shrubs or trees at least 33 ft. (10m) wide       points = 4         • Vegetation is at least 6 ft. (2m) wide       points = 2         • Vegetation is less than 6 ft. (2m) wide       points = 0	Figure
L 4	Does the wetland have the <u>opportunity</u> to reduce erosion?	(see p. 55)
	<ul> <li>Are there features along the shore that will be impacted if the shoreline erodes? Note which of the following conditions apply.</li> <li>There are human structures and activities along the shore behind the wetland (buildings, fields) that can be damaged by erosion.</li> <li>There are undisturbed natural resources along the shore (e.g. mature forests, other classes of wetland) behind the wetland that can be damaged by shoreline erosion.</li> <li>Other MES_ multiplicatio 2.</li> </ul>	Multiplier
	YES multiplier is 2       NO multiplier is 1         TOTAL       Hydrologia Experiment	
•	TOTAL – Hydrologic FunctionsMultiply the score from L3 by the multiplier L4.Record score on p.1 of field form.	

Comments:

S	Slope Wetlands	Points
	WATER QUALITY FUNCTIONS – Indicators that wetland functions to improve water quality.	(only 1 score per box)
<b>S</b> 1	Does the wetland have the <u>potential</u> to improve water quality?	(see p.56)
	<ul> <li>S 1.1 Characteristics of average slope of wetland:</li> <li>Slope is 1% or less (a 1% slope has a 1 ft. vertical drop in elevation for every 100 ft. horizontal distance)</li></ul>	
	S 1.2 The soil 2 inches below the surface is clay or organic, or smells anoxic ( <i>use NRCS definitions of soil types</i> ). <b>YES</b> = 3 points <b>NO</b> = 0 points	
	<ul> <li>S 1.3 Characteristics of the vegetation in the wetland that trap sediments and pollutants: Choose the points appropriate for the description that best fits the vegetation in the wetland. Dense vegetation means you have trouble seeing the soil surface (&gt; 75% cover), and uncut means not grazed or mowed and plants are higher than 6 inches.</li> <li>Dense, ungrazed, herbaceous vegetation &gt; 90% of the wetland unit points = 6</li> <li>Dense, ungrazed, herbaceous vegetation &gt; 1/2 of unit points = 3</li> <li>Dense, woody, vegetation &gt; 1/2 of unit points = 1</li> </ul>	Figure 🗌
	• Does not meet any of the criteria above for herbaceous vegetation	
	Total for S 1     Add the points in the boxes above	
S 2	Does the wetland have the <u>opportunity</u> to improve water quality?	(see p. 58)
	Answer YES if you know or believe there are pollutants in groundwater or surface water coming into the wetland that would otherwise reduce water quality in streams, lakes or groundwater downgradient from the wetland? Note which of the following conditions provide the sources of pollutants. A unit may have pollutants coming from several sources, but any single source would qualify as opportunity. Grazing in the wetland or within 150 ft Wetland is a groundwater seep within the Reclamation Area	
	Untreated stormwater flows through the wetland Tilled fields, logging, or orchards within 150 ft. of wetland Residential, urban areas, golf courses are within 150 ft. upslope of wetland Other YES multiplier is 2 NO multiplier is 1	Multiplier
•	<u>TOTAL</u> – Water Quality Functions Multiply the score from S1 by the multiplier in S2. <i>Record score on p.1 of field form.</i>	
	HYDROLOGIC FUNCTIONS – Indicators that wetland functions to reduce flooding and stream erosion.	
<b>S</b> 3	Does the wetland unit have the <u>potential</u> to reduce flooding and stream erosion?	(see p.59)
	<ul> <li>S 3.1 Characteristics of vegetation that reduce the velocity of surface flows during storms: Choose the points appropriate for the description that best fits conditions in the wetland. See questions S 1.3 for definition of dense and uncut. Rigid means that the stems of plants should be thick enough (usually &gt; 1/8 in), or dense enough to remain erect during surface flows.</li> <li>Dense, uncut, rigid vegetation covers &gt; 90% of the area of the unit points = 6</li> <li>Dense, uncut, rigid vegetation &gt; 1/2 - 90% area of unit points = 3</li> <li>Dense, uncut, rigid vegetation &gt; 1/4 - 1/2 of unit points = 1</li> <li>More than 1/4 of area is grazed, mowed, tilled, or vegetation is not rigid points = 0</li> </ul>	
	S 3.2 Characteristics of slope wetland that holds back small amounts of flood flows. The slope has small surface depressions that can retain water over at least 10% of its area. <b>YES</b> = 2 points <b>NO</b> = 0 points	
	Total for S3Add the points in the boxes above	
<b>S</b> 4	Does the wetland unit have the <u>opportunity</u> to reduce flooding and erosion? (see p. 61)	
	Answer NO if the major source of water is irrigation return flow (e.g. a seep that is on the downstream side of a dam or at the base of an irrigated field. Answer YES if the wetland is in a landscape position where the reduction in water velocity it provides helps protect downstream property and aquatic resources fro flooding or excessive and/or erosive flows. <i>Note which of the following conditions apply</i> . Wetland has surface runoff that can cause flooding problems downgradient	Multiplier
	YES multiplier is 2     NO multiplier is 1	
•	<b><u>TOTAL</u> – Hydrologic Functions</b> Multiply the score from S3 by S4. <i>Record score on p.1 of field form.</i>	

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Thes	se questions apply to wetlands of all HGM classes.	Points
	HABITAT FUNCTIONS – Indicators that wetland functions to provide important habitat.	(only 1 score per box)
H 1	Does the wetland have the <u>potential</u> to provide habitat for many species? (see P. 62)	
	H 1.1 <u>Categories of Vegetation structure</u> : Check the vegetarian classes (as defined by Cowardin) and heights of emergents present. Size threshold for each class or height category is 1/4 acre or more than 10% of the area if unit is < 2.5 acres. ☐ Aquatic bed	Figure 🗌
	Emergent plants 0-12 inches (0-30cm) high are the highest layer and have > 30% cover         Emergent plants >12 - 40 inches (30 - 100cm) high are the highest layer with > 30% cover         Emergent plants >40 inches (>100cm) high are the highest layer with > 30% cover         Scrub/shrub (areas where shrubs have > 30% cover)         Add the number of vegetation types that qualify. If you have:         4 -6 types         3 types         map of Cowardin vegetation classes and areas with different heights of emergents	1
	H 1.2 Is one of the vegetation types "aquatic bed?" (see $p.64$ ) <b>YES</b> = 1 point <b>NO</b> = 0 points	0
	<ul> <li>H 1.3 Surface Water (see p. 65)</li> <li>H1.3.1 Does the unit have areas of "open" water (without emergent or shrub plants) over at least 1/4 acre or 10% of its area during the spring (March – early June) OR in early fall (August – end of September)? Note: answer YES for Lake-fringe wetlands.</li> </ul>	Figure 🗌
	✓ YES = 3 points & go to H 1.4       □ NO = go to H 1.3.2         H 1.3.2 Does the unit have an intermittent or permanent stream within its boundaries, or along one side, over at least 1/4 acre or 10% of its area, AND that has an unvegetated bottom (answer yes only if H 1.3.1 is NO)?       □ YES = 3 points         □ YES = 3 points       □ NO = 0 points Map showing areas of open water	3
	H 1.4       Richness of Plant Species (see p. 66)         Count the number of plant species in the wetland that cover at least 10 ft <sup>2</sup> (different patches of the same species can be combined to meet the size threshold)         You do not have to name the species. Do not include Eurasian Milfoil, reed canarygrass, purple loosestrife, Russian Olive, Phragmites, Canadian Thistle, Yellow-flag Iris, and Salt Cedar (Tamarisk)         If you counted:       > 9 species points = 2         4 - 9 species case       points = 1         K + 10 + 10 + 10 + 10 + 10 + 10 + 10 + 1	0
	<ul> <li>H 1.5 Interspersion of Habitats (see p. 67)</li> <li>Decided from the diagrams below whether interspersion between types of vegetation (described in H1.1), or categories and unvegetated areas (can include open water or mudflats) is high, medium, low, or none.</li> </ul>	Figure 🗌
	None = 0 points $Low = 1$ point $Moderate = 2$ points Moderate = 2 points Moderate = 2 points Moderate = 2 points High = 3 points Note: If you have 4 or more vegetation categories or 3 vegetation categories and open water, the rating is always "high"	2
Com	is always "high". Use maps from H 1.1 and H 1.3	
Comm		

Wetland name or number: \_\_\_\_\_

	H 1.6	<u>Special Habitat Features</u> (see p. 68) Check the habitat features that are present in the wetland unit. The number of checks is the number of	
		points you put into the next column.	
		<ul> <li>Loose rocks larger than 4" or large, downed, woody debris (&gt; 4 in. diameter) within the area of surface ponding or in stream</li> </ul>	
		Cattails or bulrushes are present within the unit Standing snags (diameter at the bottom > 4 inches) in the wetland unit or within 30m (100 ft) of the	
		Standing snags (diameter at the bottom > 4 inches) in the wetland unit or within 30m (100 ft) of the edge	2
		<ul> <li>Emergent or shrub vegetation in areas that are permanently inundated/ponded. The presence of "yellow flag" Iris is a good indicator of vegetation in areas permanently ponded.</li> <li>Stable steep banks of fine material that might be used by beaver or muskrat for denning</li> </ul>	2
		(> 45 degree slope) OR signs of recent beaver activity	
		Invasive species cover less than 20% in each stratum of vegetation (canopy, sub-canopy, shrubs, herbaceous, moss/ground cover)	
		$Maximum \ score \ possible = 6$	
		<b>H 1 TOTAL Score</b> – potential to provide habitat Add the scores in the column above	8
H 2	Does th	ne wetland have the <u>opportunity</u> to provide habitat for many species?	(only 1 score per box)
	H 2.1	Buffers (see P. 71):	Figure 🗌
		Choose the description that best represents condition of buffer of wetland unit. The highest scoring	i igui e <u>L</u>
		criterion that applies to the wetland is to be used in the rating. See text for definition of "undisturbed". Relatively undisturbed also means no grazing, no landscaping, no daily human use, and no structures or	
		paving within undisturbed part of buffer.	
		330 ft (100m) of relatively undisturbed vegetated areas, rocky areas, or open water >	
		95% of circumference. <b>points = 5</b>	
		□ 330 ft (100m) of relatively undisturbed vegetated areas, rocky areas, or open water > 50% circumference points = 4	
		☐ 170 ft (50m) of relatively undisturbed vegetated areas, rocky areas, or open water	2
		> 95% circumference points = 4	3
		□ 330 ft (100m) of relatively undisturbed vegetated areas, rocky areas, or open water > 25% circumference points = 3	
		170  ft (50m)  of relatively undisturbed vegetated areas, rocky areas, or open water for	
		> 50% circumference	
		If buffer does not meet any of the three criteria above:	
		No paved areas (except paved trails) or buildings within 80 ft (25m) of wetland > 95% circumference. Light to moderate grazing or lawns are OK points = 2	
		$\square$ No paved areas of buildings within 170 ft (50m) of wetland for > 50% circumference.	
		Light to moderate grazing or lawns are OK points = 2	
		Heavy grazing in buffer points = 1	
		Vegetated buffers are < 6.6 ft wide (2m) for more than 95% of the circumference (e.g. tilled fields, paving, basalt bedrock extend to edge of wetland) <b>points = 0</b>	
		Buffer does not meet any of the criteria above	
	H 2.2	Wet Corridors (see p. 72)	
		H 2.2.1 Is the wetland part of a relatively undisturbed and unbroken, $> 30$ ft. wide, vegetated corridor	
		at least 1/4 mile long with surface water or water flowing water throughout most of the year (>	
		9 months/yr?) (dams, heavily used gravel roads, paved roads, fields tilled to edge of stream, or	
		pasture to edge of stream are considered breaks in the corridor). <b>YES = 4 points</b> (go to H 2.3) $\square$ <b>NO</b> = go to H 2.2.2	
		H. 2.2.2 Is the unit part of a relatively undisturbed and unbroken, $> 30$ ft. wide, vegetated corridor, at	0
		least 1/4 mile long with water flowing seasonally, <b>OR</b> a lake-fringe wetland without a "wet"	0
		corridor, <b>OR</b> a riverine wetland without a surface channel connecting to the stream?	
		$\square YES = 2 points (go to H 2.3) \qquad \square NO = go to H 2.2.3$	
		H. 2.2.3 Is the wetland within $1/2$ mile of any permanent stream, seasonal stream, or lake ( <i>do not</i>	
		include man-made ditches)? <b>YES</b> = 1 point <b>XO</b> = 0 points	
		$\square$ TES – 1 point $\square$ NO = 0 points	

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

Wetland name or number: \_\_\_\_\_

•	Total Score for Habitat FunctionsAdd the points for H 1, H 2 and H 3; and record the result on p. 1	11
	H 3.1       Indicator of reduced habitat functions (see p. 75)         Do the areas of open water in the wetland unit have a resident population of carp (see text for indicators of the presence of carp)? Note: This question does not apply to reservoirs with water levels controlled by dams, such as the reservoirs on the Columbia and Snake Rivers. <b>YES</b> = 5 points <b>NO</b> = 0 points	Points will be subtracted 0
Н3	Does the wetland unit have indicators that its ability to provide habitat is reduced?	• <b></b>
	<b>H 2</b> TOTAL Score – opportunity for providing habitat Add the scores in the columns above	3
	<ul> <li>There is at least 1 wettand within 1/2 inne</li></ul>	0
	<ul> <li>disturbed points = 2</li> <li>There is at least 1 wetland within 1/2 mile points = 1</li> </ul>	0
	• There are at least 3 other wetlands within $1/2$ mile, BUT the connections between them are disturbed	
	paved roads, fill, fields, heavy boat traffic or other development	
	relatively undisturbed (light grazing in the connection or an open water connection along a lake shore without heavy boat traffic are OK, but connections should NOT be bisected by	
	<ul> <li>There are at least 3 other wetlands within 1/2 mile, and the connections between them are</li> </ul>	
	(Generally, this means outside boundaries of reclamation areas, irritation district, or reservoirs.)	
	<ul> <li>The wetland unit is in an area where annual rainfall is less than 12 inches, and its water regime is not influenced by irrigation practices, dams, or water control structures.</li> </ul>	
	H 2.4 <u>Landscape</u> : Choose the <b>one</b> description of the landscape around the wetland that best fits. (see p. 76)	
	Note: All vegetated wetlands are by definition a priority habitat but are not included in this list. Nearby wetlands are addressed in H 2.4)	
	If wetland has 1 Priority Habitat = 2 points No Priority habitats = 0 points	0
	diameter at the largest end, and > 6 m (20 ft) long. If we land has $2 \text{ or more}$ Priority Habitats = $4 \text{ points}$	0
	characteristics to enable cavity excavation/use by wildlife. Priority snags have a diameter at breast height of > $30 \text{ cm} (12 \text{ in})$ in eastern Washington and are > $2 \text{ m} (6.5 \text{ ft})$ in height. Priority logs are > $30 \text{ cm} (12 \text{ in})$ in	
	<b>Snags and Logs:</b> Trees are considered snags if they are dead or dying and exhibit sufficient decay	
	<ul> <li>Cliffs: Greater than 7.6 m (25 ft) high and occurring below 5000 ft.</li> <li>Talus: Homogenous areas of rock rubble ranging in average size 0.15 - 2.0 m (0.5 - 6.5 ft), composed of basalt, andesite, and/or sedimentary rock, including riprap slides and mine tailings. May be associated with cliffs.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>rock, ice, or other geological formations and is large enough to contain a human.</li> <li>Cliffs: Greater than 7.6 m (25 ft) high and occurring below 5000 ft.</li> </ul>	
	<b>Caves:</b> A naturally occurring cavity, recess, void, or system of interconnected passages under the earth in soils,	
	<b>Instream:</b> The combination of physical, biological, and chemical processes and conditions that interact to provide functional life history requirements for instream fish and wildlife resources.	
	Inland Dunes This placeholder is for a new priority habitat that will capture areas known as Inland Dunes. A definition will be developed later in Fall 2008. ( <i>check WDFW web site</i> )	
	terrestrial ecosystems which mutually influence each other.	
	<ul> <li>conspicuous but discontinuous layer of shrubs (see Eastside Steppe for sites with little or no shrub cover).</li> <li>Riparian: The area adjacent to aquatic systems with flowing water that contains elements of both aquatic and</li> </ul>	
	Shrub-steppe: A nonforested vegetation type consisting of one or more layers of perennial bunchgrasses and a	
	oak component is important ( <i>full descriptions in WDFW PHS report p. 158</i> ). <b>Juniper Savannah</b> : All juniper woodlands ( <i>SE part of state only; check map</i> )	
	<b>Oregon white Oak:</b> Woodlands Stands of pure oak or oak/conifer associations where canopy coverage of the	
	due to the influence of fire, climate, and soils. Mature: Stands $80 - 160$ yrs old. Decay, decadence, numbers of snags, and quantity of large downed material is generally less than that found in old-growth.	
	growth: Stands are > 150 yrs in age; may be variable in tree species composition and structural characteristics	
	bunchgrasses, or a combination of both (full description of species found here in WDFW PHS report p. 153).	
	fish and wildlife (may include urban or urban growth areas) ( <i>full descriptions in WDFW PHS report p. 152</i> ). <b>Eastside Steppe:</b> Non-forested vegetation type dominated by broadleaf herbaceous flora(i.e., forbs), perennial	
	<b>Biodiversity Areas and Corridors</b> : Areas of habitat that are relatively important to various species of native	
	<i>NOTE: the connections to the habitats can be disturbed.</i> <b>Aspen Stands:</b> Pure or mixed stands of aspen greater than 0.4 ha (1 acre).	
	Which of the following priority habitats are within 330ft (100m) of the wetland unit?	
	H 2.3 Near or adjacent to other priority habitats listed by WDFW (see new and complete descriptions of WDFW priority habitats, and the counties in which they can be found, in the PHS report <u>http://wdfw.wa.gov/hab/phslist.htm</u> ).	

Comments:

### CATEGORIZATION BASED ON SPECIAL CHARACTERISTICS

Please determine if the wetland meets the attributes described below and circle the appropriate Category. NOTE: A wetland may meet the criteria for more than one set of special characteristics. Record all those that apply. NOTE: All units should also be characterized based on their functions.

	Wetland Type – Check off any criteria that apply to the wetland. Circle the Category when the appropriate criter	ia are met.
SC1	Vernal pools (see p.79)	
BCI	Is the wetland unit less than 4,000 ft <sup>2</sup> , and does it meet at least two of the following criteria?	
	Its only source of water is rainfall or snowmelt from a small contributing basin and has no	
	groundwater input.	
	Wetland plants are typically present only in the spring; the summer vegetation is typically upland	
	annuals. NOTE: If you find perennial, "obligate", wetland plants the wetland is probably NOT a	
	vernal pool.	
	The soil in the wetland are shallow ( $<1$ ft. deep (30cm) and is underlain by an impermeable layer	
	such as basalt or clay.	
	Surface water is present for less than 120 days during the "wet" season.	
	<b>EXAMPLE</b> Surface which is present for response that $120$ days during the week season. <b>EXAMPLE YES</b> = Go to SC 1.1 <b>EXAMPLE NO</b> not a vernal pool	
	SC 1.1 Is the vernal pool relatively undisturbed in February and March?	
	<b>SET :</b> If is the vertical pool relatively undisturbed in Peortuary and Match? <b>TEN YES</b> = Go to SC 1.2 <b>ID NO</b> = not a vertical pool with special	
	— — 1 1	
	characteristics	
	SC 1.2 Is the vernal pool in an area where there are at least 3 separate aquatic resources within 0.5 miles (other	🗌 Cat. II
	wetlands, rivers, lakes etc.)?	Cat. III
	YES = Category II     NO = Category III	
SC2	<u>Alkali wetlands</u> (see p.81)	
	Does the wetland unit meet <b>one</b> of the following two criteria?	
	The wetland has a conductivity $> 3.0$ mS/cm.	
	The wetland has a conductivity between $2.0 - 3.0$ mS, and more than 50% of the plant cover in the	
	wetland can be classified as "alkali" species (see Table 2 for list of plants found in alkali	
	systems).	
	If the wetland is dry at the time of your field visit, the central part of the area is covered with a	
	layer of salt.	
	<b>OR</b> does the wetland meet <b>two</b> of the following three sub-criteria?	
	Salt encrustations around more than 80% of the edge of the wetland.	
	More than 3/4 of the plant cover consists of species listed on Table 2.	
	A pH above 9.0. All alkali wetlands have a high pH, but please note that some freshwater wetlands	
	may also have a high pH. Thus, pH alone is not a good indicator of alkali wetlands.	Cat. I
	$\square \textbf{YES} = Category I \qquad \qquad \boxtimes \textbf{NO} - not an alkali wetland$	
SC3	Natural Heritage Wetlands (see p. 82)	
~	Natural Heritage wetlands have been identified by the Washington Natural Heritage Program/DNR as	
	either high quality undisturbed wetlands or wetlands that support state Threatened, Endangered, or	
	Sensitive plant species.	
	SC 3.1 Is the wetland unit being rated in a Section/Township/Range that contains a natural heritage wetland?	
	(This question is used to screen out most sites before you need to contact WNHP/DNR.)	
	S/T/R information from Appendix D or accessed from WNHP/DNR web site	
	<b>YES</b> $\square$ Contact WNHP/DNR (see p. 79) and go to SC 3.2 <b>NO</b> $\square$	
	SC 3.2 Has DNR identified the wetland unit as a high quality undisturbed wetland or as a site with state	
	threatened or endangered plant species?	Cat. I
	$\square$ <b>YES</b> = Category 1 $\square$ <b>NO</b> – not a natural heritage wetland	

SC4	<ul> <li>Bogs (see p. 82)         <ul> <li>Does the wetland unit (or any part of the wetland unit) meet both the criteria for soils and vegetation in bogs? Use the key below to identify if the wetland is a bog. If you answer yes you will still need to rate the wetland based on its functions.</li> <li>SC 4.1 Does the wetland have organic soil horizons (i.e. layers of organic soil), either peats or mucks, that compose 16 inches or more of the first 32 inches of the soil profile? (See Appendix B for a field key to identify organic soils.)</li></ul></li></ul>	
	<ul> <li>bedrock or an impermeable hardpan such as clay or volcanic ash, or that are floating on top of a lake or pond? □ YES = go to 4.3</li></ul>	
	<ul> <li>criterion by measuring the pH of the water that seeps into a hole dug at least 16" deep. If the pH is less than 5.0 and the "bog" plant species in Table 3 are present, the wetland is a bog.</li> <li>SC 4.4 Is the unit, or any part of it, forested (&gt; 30% cover) with sitka spruce, subalpine fir, western red cedar, western hemlock, lodgepole pine, quaking aspen, Englemann's spruce, or western white pine, WITH any of the species (or combination of species) on the bog species plant list in Table 3 as a significant component of the ground cover (&gt; 30% coverage of the total shrub/herbaceous cover)?</li> <li>□ YES = Category 1 bog ○ NO</li> </ul>	Cat. I
SC5	Forested Wetlands (see p. 85)         Does the wetland unit have an area of forest (you should have identified a forested class, if present, in question H 1.1) rooted within its boundary that meet at least one of the following three criteria?         □       The wetland is within the "100 year" floodplain of a river or stream.         □       Aspen (Populus tremuloides) are a dominant or co-dominant of the "woody" vegetation.         (Dominants means it represents at least 50% of the cover of woody species, co-dominant means it represents at least 20% of the total cover of woody species.)         □       There is at least 1/4 acre of trees (even in wetlands smaller than 2.5 acres) that are "mature" or "old-growth" according to the definitions for these priority habitats developed by WDFW (see p. 83).         □       YES = got o SC 5.1       NO – not a forested wetland with special characteristics	
	SC 5.1 Does the wetland unit have a forest canopy where more than 50% of the tree species (by cover) are slow growing native trees? Slow growing trees are: western red cedar ( <i>Thuja plicata</i> ), Alaska yellow cedar ( <i>Chamaecyparis nootkatensis</i> ), pine spp. mostly "white" pine (Pinus monticola), western hemlock ( <i>Tsuga heterophylla</i> ), Englemann spruce ( <i>Picea engelmannii</i> )?         □ <b>YES</b> = Category I       □ <b>NO</b> = go to SC 5.2	Cat. I
	SC 5.2 Does the unit have areas where aspen ( <i>Populus tremuloides</i> ) as a dominant or co-dominant species? $\square$ <b>YES</b> = Category I $\square$ <b>NO</b> = go to SC 5.3	Cat. I
	<ul> <li>SC 5.3 Does the wetland unit have a forest canopy where more than 50% of the tree species (by cover) are fast growing species? Fast growing species are: Alders – red (alnus rubra), thin-leaf (A. tenuifolia); Cottonwoods – narrow-leaf (Populus angustifolia), black (P. balsamifera); Willows – peach-leaf (Salix amygdaloides), Sitka (S. sitchensis), Pacific (S. lasiandra), Aspen – Populus tremuloides), Water Birch (Betula occidentalis)</li> <li>YES = Category II</li> <li>NO = go to SC 5.5</li> </ul>	Cat. II
	SC 5.5 Is the forested component of the wetland within the "100 year floodplain" of a river or stream?	Cat. II
•	Category of wetland based on Special Characteristics Choose the "highest" rating if wetland falls into several categories. If you answered NO for all types enter "Not Applicable" on p. 1	<u>N/A</u>

# **APPENDIX C** Wetland Determination Data Forms

### WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project Site:	<u>Qu</u>	iail Run	Prope	<u>erty</u>			Ci	ty/County:	<u>Spok</u> Cour		<u>pokane</u>	Sampling D	ate:	<u>Sep</u>	t. 4, 20	<u>014</u>
Applicant/Owner:	So	nneland	b								State: <u>WA</u>	Sampling P	oint:	SP-	<u>1</u>	
Investigator(s):	JE	<u>P</u>							Se	ection,	Township, Ran	ge: <u>Sec 33,</u>	T25N, R	43E		
Landform (hillslope, te	errac	e, etc.):	: <u>d</u>	epression			Local relie	ef (concave	, conve	x, non	e): <u>concave</u>		Slop	e (%):	<u>N/A</u>	
Subregion (LRR):	L	RR E			Lat:	47.625414			Long:	<u>-117.3</u>	<u>384181</u>		Datum:	NAD 8	<u>3</u>	
Soil Map Unit Name:	3	117 No	rthstar	r-Rock outcrop							NWI clas	sification:	N/A			
Are climatic / hydrolog	gic co	ondition	s on tl	he site typical fo	r this tir	me of year?	Yes	$\boxtimes$	No		(If no, explain i	n Remarks.)				
Are Vegetation	l, S	Soil	□,	or Hydrology	<b>□</b> , s	significantly dis	sturbed?	Are "Nor	mal Cir	cumst	ances" present?	?	Yes	$\boxtimes$	No	
Are Vegetation	l, S	Soil	□,	or Hydrology	□, r	naturally proble	ematic?	(If neede	ed, expl	ain an	y answers in Re	emarks.)				

#### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS - Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes	$\boxtimes$	No					
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes		No		Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes	No	$\boxtimes$
Hydric Soil Present? Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes No							

Remarks: NWI Maps indicated the potetnial presence of a PSS1C wetland in this area. This wetland type was not identified.

#### **VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants**

Tree Stratum (Plot size:)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Indicator Status	Dominance Test Wo	rksheet:			
1. Salix lasiandra (Pacific willow)	15%	no	FACW	Number of Dominant	Species	4		(4)
2. Betula pendula (Eur. Whitebirch)	<u>15%</u>	<u>no</u>	FACU	That Are OBL, FACW	, or FAC:	<u>1</u>		(A)
3				Total Number of Dom		<u>2</u>		(B)
4				Species Across All St	rata:	-		(2)
50% =, 20% = Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size:)	<u>30%</u>	= Total Cove	er	Percent of Dominant That Are OBL, FACW		<u>.50</u>		(A/B)
1. Cornus sericea (Redosier dogwood)	<u>15%</u>	no	FACW	Prevalence Index we	,			
2	1370	<u>110</u>	<u>1 AOW</u>		Cover of:	Multip	v hv:	
3				OBL species	0%	x1 =	<u>0</u>	
4				FACW species	<u>30%</u>	x1 = x2 =	<u>=</u> 60	
5.				FAC species	20%	x2 =	<u>60</u>	
50% =, 20% =	15%	= Total Cov		FACU species	<u>15%</u>	x4 =	<u>60</u>	
Herb Stratum (Plot size:)	1576	- 10141 0000	CI	UPL species	<u>13%</u> 0%	x4 = x5 =	<u>00</u>	
1. <u>Tanacetum volgare (Common tansey)</u>	20%	ves	NI	Column Totals:	<u>65%</u> (A)	xo -	<u>∽</u> 180 (B)	
2. Cirsium arvense (Canada thistle)	20%	<u>no</u>	FAC		revalence Index	= B/A = 2 77	<u></u> (2)	
3. other various grasses	15%	no	NI	Hydrophytic Vegeta				
4	<u></u>	<u></u>	<u></u>		for Hydrophytic V	egetation		
5				2 - Dominance		9		
6				3 - Prevalence	Index is <3.01			
7				4 Manulastania	al Adaptations <sup>1</sup> (	Provide suppo	tina	
8					arks or on a sepa		ung	
9				5 - Wetland Nor	n-Vascular Plants	s <sup>1</sup>		
10				Problematic Hyperbolic Hyper	drophytic Vegeta	tion <sup>1</sup> (Explain)		
11								
50% =, 20% =	<u>55%</u>	= Total Cove	er	<sup>1</sup> Indicators of hydric s be present, unless dis				
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size:)								
1								
2				Hydrophytic	X			_
50% =, 20% =	<u>0%</u>	= Total Cove	er	Vegetation Present?	Yes	$\boxtimes$	No	
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum 0%								

#### Project Site: Quail Run

SOIL								Sampling Point: SP-	. <u>1</u>				
Profile Desc	ription: (Describe to	the depth	needed to d	ocument the indica	ator or confi	m the absence	of indicators	.)					
Depth	Matrix			Redox Fe	eatures								
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (mo	ist) %	Type <sup>1</sup>	Loc <sup>2</sup>	Texture	Remarks					
<u>0 - 7</u>	<u>10YR 3/2</u>		<u>N/A</u>				Silt	No sulfur odor					
<u>7 - 14</u>	<u>10YR 5/2</u>		<u>N/A</u>				Silt	No sulfur odor					
<sup>1</sup> Type: C= Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. <sup>2</sup> Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix													
Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.) Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils <sup>3</sup> :													
Histoso	ol (A1)			Sandy Redox (S5	)			2 cm Muck (A10)					
Histic E	Epipedon (A2)			Stripped Matrix (S	6)			Red Parent Material (1	ΓF2)				
Black H	listic (A3)			Loamy Mucky Min	neral (F1) <b>(ex</b>	cept MLRA 1)		Very Shallow Dark Su	rface (TF	<sup>-</sup> 12)			
Hydrog	en Sulfide (A4)			Loamy Gleyed Ma	atrix (F2)			Other (Explain in Rem	arks)				
Deplete	ed Below Dark Surfac	ce (A11)		Depleted Matrix (F	=3)								
Thick D	Dark Surface (A12)			Redox Dark Surfa	ce (F6)								
Sandy	Mucky Mineral (S1)			Depleted Dark Su	rface (F7)			ors of hydrophytic veg and hydrology must be					
Sandy	Gleyed Matrix (S4)			Redox Depression	ns (F8)			ss disturbed or proble		.,			
Restrictive L	ayer (if present):												
Туре:													
Depth (inches	s):					Hydric Soils Pr	resent?	Yes		No	$\boxtimes$		
Remarks:													

#### HYDROLOGY

Wetla	and Hydrology Indicat	ors:											
Prima	ary Indicators (minimum	of one re	equired	; check	all that	t apply)		Sec	ondary Indicators (2 or r	more requir	ed)		
	Surface Water (A1)					Water-Stained Leaves (B9)			Water-Stained Leaves	s (B9)			
	High Water Table (A2)	)				(except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B)			(MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and	4B)			
	Saturation (A3)					Salt Crust (B11)			Drainage Patterns (B1	10)			
	Water Marks (B1)					Aquatic Invertebrates (B13)			Dry-Season Water Ta	ble (C2)			
	Sediment Deposits (B	2)				Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)			Saturation Visible on A	Aerial Imag	ery (CS	9)	
	Drift Deposits (B3)					Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living R	oots (C3)		Geomorphic Position	(D2)			
	Algal Mat or Crust (B4	.)				Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)			Shallow Aquitard (D3)	)			
	Iron Deposits (B5)					Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (	C6)		FAC-Neutral Test (D5	i)			
	Surface Soil Cracks (E	36)				Stunted or Stresses Plants (D1) (LRR	A)		Raised Ant Mounds (	D6) <b>(LRR A</b>	.)		
	Inundation Visible on A	Aerial Ima	agery (E	37)		Other (Explain in Remarks)			Frost-Heave Hummoo	cks (D7)			
	Sparsely Vegetated C	oncave S	Surface	(B8)									
Field	Observations:												
Surfa	ce Water Present?	Yes		No	$\boxtimes$	Depth (inches):							
Wate	r Table Present?	Yes		No	$\boxtimes$	Depth (inches):							
	ation Present? des capillary fringe)	Yes		No	$\boxtimes$	Depth (inches):	Wetl	and Hy	drology Present?	Yes		No	
Desc	ribe Recorded Data (str	eam gau	ge, mor	nitoring	well, a	erial photos, previous inspections), if av	ailable:						
Rema	arks:												

### WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM – Western Mountains, Valleys, and Coast Region

Project Site:	<u>Quail Ru</u>	n Prope	<u>erty</u>			C	ity/County:	<u>Społ</u> Cour		<u>pokane</u>	Sampling D	ate:	<u>Sep</u>	t. 4, 20	014
Applicant/Owner:	Sonnelar	nd								State: WA	Sampling P	oint:	<u>SP-</u>	2	
Investigator(s):	<u>JEP</u>							Se	ection,	Township, Ran	ge: <u>Sec 33,</u>	T25N, R	43E		
Landform (hillslope, ter	race, etc.)	):				Local relie	ef (concave	, conve	x, nor	ie): <u>concave</u>		Slop	e (%):	<u>N/A</u>	
Subregion (LRR):	<u>LRR E</u>			Lat:	47.624265			Long:	<u>-117.</u>	<u>381026</u>		Datum:	NAD 8	<u>3</u>	
Soil Map Unit Name:	<u>3117 No</u>	orthsta	r-Rock outcrop							NWI clas	sification:	N/A			
Are climatic / hydrologi	c conditio	ns on t	he site typical fo	or this ti	me of year?	Yes	$\boxtimes$	No		(If no, explain i	n Remarks.)				
Are Vegetation	Soil	□,	or Hydrology	□, :	significantly di	sturbed?	Are "Noi	rmal Cir	cumst	ances" present?	?	Yes	$\boxtimes$	No	
Are Vegetation $\Box$ ,	Soil	□,	or Hydrology	□, ı	naturally probl	ematic?	(If neede	ed, expl	ain an	y answers in Re	emarks.)				

#### SUMMARY OF FINDINGS - Attach site map showing sampling point locations, transects, important features, etc.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes	$\boxtimes$	No					
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes		No		Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?	Yes	No	$\boxtimes$
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes		No	$\boxtimes$				
Remarks: NWI Maps indicated the potetnial presence of	faPEN	/1C w	etlanc	d in thi	s area. This wetland type was not identified.			

#### VEGETATION – Use scientific names of plants

Tree Stratum (Plot size:)	Absolute <u>% Cover</u>	Dominant Species?	Indicator <u>Status</u>	Dominance Test V	Vorksheet:			
1 2				Number of Dominal That Are OBL, FAC		<u>1</u>		(A)
3 4		_		Total Number of Do Species Across All		<u>1</u>		(B)
50% =, 20% = Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size:)	<u>0%</u>	= Total Cove	er	Percent of Dominar That Are OBL, FAC		<u>1</u>		(A/B
1				Prevalence Index	worksheet:			
2				Total %	6 Cover of:	Multipl	y by:	
3				OBL species	<u>0%</u>	x1 =	<u>0</u>	
4				FACW species	<u>100%</u>	x2 =	200	
5				FAC species	<u>0%</u>	x3 =	<u>0</u>	
50% =, 20% =	<u>0%</u>	= Total Cove	er	FACU species	<u>0%</u>	x4 =	<u>0</u>	
Herb Stratum (Plot size:)				UPL species	<u>0%</u>	x5 =	<u>0</u>	
1. Phalaris arundinacea (Reed canarygrass)	<u>100%</u>	<u>ves</u>	FACW	Column Totals:	<u>100%</u> (A)		<u>200</u> (B)	
2					Prevalence Index =	= B/A = <u>2.00</u>		
3				Hydrophytic Vege	tation Indicators:			
4				1 – Rapid Tes	st for Hydrophytic Ve	egetation		
5				2 - Dominanc	e Test is >50%			
6				3 - Prevalenc	e Index is <3.01			
7					jical Adaptations <sup>1</sup> (F		ting	
8				data in Re	marks or on a separ	rate sheet)		
9	. <u> </u>			5 - Wetland N	lon-Vascular Plants <sup>1</sup>	1		
10				Problematic H	lydrophytic Vegetati	ion <sup>1</sup> (Explain)		
11				<sup>1</sup> Indicators of hydrid	soil and wetland hy	vdrology must		
50% =, 20% =		= Total Cove	er		disturbed or problen			
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size:)								
1				Hydrophytic				
2				Vegetation	Yes		No	
50% =, 20% =	<u>0%</u>	= Total Cove	er	Present?		—		
% Bare Ground in Herb Stratum 0%								

#### Project Site: Quail Run

S	0	I	l

SOIL									Sampling	Point: <u>SP</u>	-1				
Profile Desc	ription: (Describe to	o the depth	needed to de	ocument the i	ndicator or	confirm the	absence	of indicators	s.)						
Depth	Matrix		Redox Features												
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (mo	ist) %	Ту	pe <sup>1</sup>	Loc <sup>2</sup>		Remarks						
<u>0 - 8</u>	10YR 3/3		<u>N/A</u>					Silt	No sulfur odor						
<u>8 - 13</u>	<u>10YR 5/2</u>		<u>N/A</u>					Silt	No sulfu	ir odor					
<sup>1</sup> Type: C= C	oncentration, D=Depl	etion, RM=R	educed Matri	ix, CS=Covere	d or Coated	Sand Grains	s. <sup>2</sup> Lo	cation: PL=Po	ore Lining, M	l=Matrix					
Hydric Soil Indicators: (Applicable to all LRRs, unless otherwise noted.) Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils <sup>3</sup> :															
Histos	ol (A1)			Sandy Redox	< (S5)				2 cm Muck (	A10)					
Histic	Epipedon (A2)		Stripped Matrix (S6)					Red Parent Material (TF2)							
Black	Histic (A3)		Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1) (e				LRA 1)	Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)							
Hydro	gen Sulfide (A4)			Loamy Gleye	ed Matrix (F2	)		Other (Explain in Remarks)							
Deplet	Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)														
Thick	Dark Surface (A12)			Redox Dark	Surface (F6)										
Sandy Mucky Mineral (S1) Depleted Dark Surface (F7)					7)		<sup>3</sup> Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present,								
□ Sandy	Gleyed Matrix (S4)			Redox Depressions (F8)						unless disturbed or problematic.					
Restrictive	Layer (if present):														
Туре:															
Depth (inche	s):						Hydric Soils Present? Yes					No	$\boxtimes$		
Remarks:															

#### HYDROLOGY

Wetla	and Hydrology Indicat	ors:												
Primary Indicators (minimum of one required; check all that apply)						Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)								
	Surface Water (A1) Water-Stained Leaves (B9)							Water-Stained Leaves (B9)						
	High Water Table (A2)	)				(except MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B)			(MLRA 1, 2, 4A, and 4B)					
	Saturation (A3)					Salt Crust (B11)		Drainage Patterns (B1	10)					
	Water Marks (B1)					Aquatic Invertebrates (B13)			Dry-Season Water Table (C2)					
	Sediment Deposits (B2)					Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)			Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)					
	Drift Deposits (B3)					Oxidized Rhizospheres along Living Roots (C3)			Geomorphic Position (D2)					
	Algal Mat or Crust (B4)					Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)			Shallow Aquitard (D3)					
	Iron Deposits (B5)					Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)			FAC-Neutral Test (D5)					
	Surface Soil Cracks (B6)					Stunted or Stresses Plants (D1) (LRR A)			Raised Ant Mounds (D6) (LRR A)					
	Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)					Other (Explain in Remarks)			Frost-Heave Hummocks (D7)					
Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)														
Field Observations:														
Surfa	ce Water Present?	Yes		No	$\boxtimes$	Depth (inches):								
Wate	r Table Present?	Yes		No	$\boxtimes$	Depth (inches):								
	Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes D No		$\boxtimes$	Depth (inches):	Wetland Hydrology Present?			Yes		No				
Desc	ribe Recorded Data (str	eam gau	ge, mor	nitoring	well, a	erial photos, previous inspections), if availab	ble:							
Rema	arks:													

Have we delivered World Class Client Service? Please let us know by visiting **www.geoengineers.com/feedback**.

