Wetland Delineation



Clinton Manufacturing Drive Reconstruction

Prepared for:

McClure Engineering 1740 Lininger Lane North Liberty, IA 52317

Prepared by:



Impact7G, Inc. 310 Second St. Coralville, Iowa 52241 Project #: McClure-004

6/17/2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS Contents

1.0 Executive Summary	2
1.1 Purpose & Need	2
1.2 Location	2
1.3 Summary Findings	2
2.0 Methodology: Delineation of Wetlands and Other Waters of the U.S	2
2.1 Wetlands	2
2.2 Streams & Tributaries	2
2.3 Ditches	2
3.0 Discussion of Findings	3
3.1 Current Conditions	3
3.2 Wetland Determinations	3
3.3 Streams & Tributaries	1
4.0 Regulatory Review	1
5.0 Conclusions	5
References	5
Figure A: Wetland Delineation Map	7
Figure B: Location Map	3
Figure C: USGS Topo 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Map (1:24,000)	9
Figure D: Soils and National Wetland Inventory (NWI) Map10)
Figure E: FEMA National Flood Hazard Layer12	2
Appendix A: Photos	3
Appendix B: Wetland Delineation Data Sheets	5

1.0 Executive Summary

1.1 Purpose & Need

Impact7G was contracted by McClure Engineering to complete a wetland delineation investigation for a proposed project corridor along Manufacturing Drive and associated roadways in Clinton, Iowa. The intent of this wetland investigation is to document existing site conditions, at the time of delineation, as may be of consequence to any potential regulatory compliance needs.

1.2 Location

Township:	81 N	81 N	81 N
Range:	6 E	6 E	6 E
Section:	11	14	15
Quarter:	SW ¼, SE ¼	NW 1⁄4	NE ¼, SE ¼

Street Address: Manufacturing Dr.

See Figure B for Location Map.

1.3 Summary Findings

Impact7G delineated 0.20 acres of wetland, including 0.05 acres of emergent wetlands and 0.15 acres of forested wetlands within the Investigation Area.

Jurisdiction of wetlands by state or federal agencies is not determined in this report.

2.0 Methodology: Delineation of Wetlands and Other Waters of the U.S.

2.1 Wetlands

Field analysis was completed using the routine onsite determination method defined in the *U.S. Army Corps* of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual (Environmental Laboratory, 1987) and the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Midwest Region (USACE, 2010). Delineation data points and wetland boundaries were recorded across the site and associated shapefiles are available upon request.

2.2 Streams & Tributaries

For the purposes of this report, streams & tributaries are characterized by having both a defined bed and bank, and an ordinary high-water mark (OHWM). Stream types (i.e. ephemeral, intermittent, or perennial) are based on definitions provided in the Iowa Stream Mitigation Method Version 2.0, according to best available knowledge of flow regime at the time of the field survey.

2.3 Ditches

Any areas identified as Ditches within the investigation area were specifically designed and are maintained to promote roadway or other drainage. Ditches exhibiting wetland characteristics (hydrophytic vegetation, hydric soils, or wetland hydrology), that were constructed in upland areas are not identified as wetlands or other waters of the U.S. For the purposes of this report, ditches or portions of ditches meeting wetland characteristics that were likely constructed in pre-existing wetlands and/or intersect existing wetlands, or

other waters of the U.S., are identified as wetlands. Furthermore, Ditches are distinguished herein from streams or tributaries if they lack a defined bed and bank, ordinary high-water mark, and perennial flow.

3.0 Discussion of Findings

Wetland delineation fieldwork was completed on May 18, 2020, by:

Will Downey, Certified Wetland Delineator

Tyler Dursky, Certified Wetland Delineator

3.1 Current Conditions

The Investigation Area consists of a 6.18-mile corridor along Manufacturing Drive and other associated roadways within Clinton, Iowa that is currently in use for a variety of purposes including roadside ditches, residential, commercial, and industrial developments, and row-crop agriculture. The Investigation Area intersects Mill Creek and Hart's Mill Creek.

The Palmer Hydrological Drought Index for the weeks of the wetland delineation field work indicates wetter than normal conditions (moderately moist) for the region. Additionally, 0.85 inches of rainfall occurred during the day field work took place. Within the Investigation Area most wetland boundaries were delineated based upon changes in topography, landscape position, and wetland indicators associated with vegetation and hydric soils.

National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps wetlands that overlap portions of the Investigation Area surrounding Mill Creek, Hart's Mill Creek, and a depressional area within a wooded corridor (Figure D). The majority of the Investigation Area is mapped as 0% hydric presence, but some areas northeast of Mill Creek mapped as NWI and along Manufacturing Drive are listed as 100% hydric presence (Figure D). Additionally, all sections of the Investigation Area excluding its northeastern most extent, lie within the regulatory floodway, the 1% or 0.2% annul chance flood hazard, are within an area of reduced flood risk due to an existing levee (Figure E).

3.2 Wetland Determinations

Emergent wetland areas include reed canary grass-dominated low-landscape areas along stream terraces within the floodplain of Mill Creek and its associated tributary (data point 4-02). Emergent wetlands are unforested within the delineated boundary, but have some overhanging floodplain forest tree canopy, as well as surrounding sediment deposits. Adjacent upland areas near delineated wetlands contain hydrophytic vegetation but lack hydric soils and hydrology indicators.

Forested wetlands consist of floodplain forests dominated by ash-leaf maple in the tree stratum and Canadian clearweed in the herbaceous stratum (data point 4-04). Located within the regulatory floodway and within or surrounding areas mapped as NWI, these areas are subject to periods of inundation and display saturation within the upper 12 inches of the soil.

Table 1. Defineated Wetland meas (cowaram classificad
Palustrine Wetland Class	Total Acres
Emergent	0.05
Forested	0.15

Table 1: Delineated Wetland Areas (Cowardin Classification)

See also: Figure A: Wetland Delineation Map Appendix A: Photos Appendix B: Wetland Delineation Datasheets

3.3 Streams & Tributaries

Tributary name information reflects data provided from the United States Geological Survey (USGS) 1:24,000 topographic maps (Figure C).

Mill Creek

Mill Creek is a third order perennial stream located within the Investigation Area and is illustrated on Figure A. Within the Investigation Area the tributary is described as follows:

- 564 linear feet
- 30 feet average width
- 4 feet general depth
- 2 feet water depth
- Well connected to floodplain
- Silt, Sand, Gravel substrate
- Silt, Sand bank material
- Moderately Functional because it is neither fully functional or functionally compromised

Noted evidence of the OHWM include: a natural line impressed on the bank; changes in the character of soil; destruction of terrestrial vegetation; presence of litter and debris; sediment sorting; scour; deposition; and bed and banks.

Hart's Mill Creek

A third order, perennial tributary of Mill Creek is located within the Investigation Area and is illustrated on Figure A. This tributary is mapped as perennial flow according to the *Stream Centerlines in Iowa* GIS dataset provided by the Iowa DNR. Within the Investigation Area, the tributary is described as follows.

- 501 linear feet
- 25 feet average width
- 7 feet general depth
- 1.5-2.5 feet water depth
- Not connected to Floodplain, Moderately Incised
- Silt, Sand, Cobble, Gravel substrate
- Silt, Sand, Cobble, Gravel bank material
- Functionally Compromised

Noted evidence of the OHWM include: a natural line impressed on the bank; shelving; changes in the character of soil; destruction of terrestrial vegetation; presence of litter and debris; sediment sorting; leaf litter disturbed or washed away; scour; deposition; and bed and banks

4.0 Regulatory Review

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers regulates the discharge of dredged or fill materials into all regulated waters of the United States (WATERS), including wetlands and streams, in Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (USAEWES Environmental Laboratory, 1987). The process of Jurisdictional Determination, conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, may determine that all or part of the WATERS delineated for this project are considered regulated. Based on the information provided, it appears this project may involve filling part of WATERS and therefore may require permits from the Corps of Engineers and the Iowa Department of Natural Resources prior to beginning work.

The Corps of Engineers normally requires acquisition of a Section 404 permit and mitigation when any WATERS impact is proposed. In general, there are two types of permits as described below. <u>Nationwide Permits:</u> A nationwide permit is generally the simplest form of the 404 permits. Wetland loss of 1/2 acre or less is typically permitted under a Nationwide Permit. Stream impacts of 300 linear feet or less

are typically permitted under a Nationwide Permit. This permit often requires preconstruction notification to the Corps for impacts to as little as 1/10 of an acre or less. Generally, this permit takes 30 to 45 days to obtain.

<u>Individual Permits</u>: An individual permit requires a full public interest review. A Public Notice is distributed to all known interested persons. After evaluating comments and information received, a final decision on the application is made. The permit decision is generally based on the outcome of a public interest balancing process in which the benefits of the project are balanced against the detriments. A permit will be granted unless the proposal is found to be contrary to the public interest. Processing time usually takes 60 to 120 days unless a public hearing is required, or an environmental statement must be prepared.

During the permitting process for either type of permit, the Corps of Engineers requires that applicants first establish that impacts to WATERS cannot be avoided. Permit applicants then must demonstrate that reasonable efforts to minimize impacts to WATERS have been made in the design and construction plans. Having taken the first two steps, applicants then must provide a plan for compensation, usually through mitigation, for unavoidable impacts. In general, our experience has been that the Corps requires in-kind mitigation be done at a minimum ratio of one (1) to one (1) but may require a compensation ratio of 1.5:1 to 2.5:1 (i.e., two and one-half acres of constructed wetland for every one acre of impact) in some circumstances.

5.0 Conclusions

Impact7G delineated 0.20 acres of wetland, including 0.05 acres of emergent wetlands and 0.15 acres of forested wetlands within the Investigation Area. Impact7G also determined that there are 1,065 L.F. of perennial tributary within the Investigation Area.

If proposed activities will disturb these areas, consultation with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Iowa Department of Natural resources is strongly recommended

This report has been prepared for the exclusive use of our client, and for specific application to the project discussed. To the best of my knowledge the above statements, attachments, including those labeled and identified as enclosures, and all conclusions are true, accurate, and based on current environmental principles and science. No warranties, either expressed or implied, are intended or made. In the event that changes in the nature, design or location of the project as shown are planned, the conclusions and recommendations contained on this form shall not be considered valid unless Impact7G, Inc. reviews the changes and either verifies or modifies the conclusions of this form in writing. This report has been prepared by:

Tyler Vusty

<u>6 /17/2020</u> Date

Prepared by: Tyler Dursky, Environmental Specialist Will Downey, Environmental Specialist II

Reviewed by: Chant Eicke, PWS

References

Courtenay, Booth and Zimmerman, James H, 1972. Wildflowers and Weeds. Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

- Eggers, Steve D. and Reed, Donald M. 1997. <u>Wetland Plants and Plant Communities of Minnesota & Wisconsin</u>. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Paul District.
- Hurt, G.W. (ed.), 2006. Field Indicators of Hydric Soils in the United States, Version 6.0. USDA, NRCS, Baltimore, MD.
- USAEWES Environmental Laboratory, 1987. <u>Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual</u>. Technical Report Y-87-1.
- U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), 2005. <u>Subject: Ordinary High-Water Mark Identification</u>. Regulatory Guidance Letter No. 05-05. Date: 12/7/2005.
- U. S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), 2010. <u>Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation</u> <u>Manual: Midwest Region.</u> ERDC/EL TR-08-27. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center.
- Weather Underground. "Moline Iowa Weather History-Quad City International Airport Station," 18 May. 2020 https://www.wunderground.com/history/daily/us/il/moline/KMLI/date/2020-5-18
- "Weekly Palmer Drought Indices." *National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration,* US Department of Commerce, 10 June 2020, https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/temp-and-precip/drought/weekly-palmers/

GIS & Mapping Layer Sources

All field data shown on maps for wetlands, waterways, bat tree habitat, and data points field-collected and post-processed using ArcGIS by Impact7G Inc., 2020.

Aerial photography provided by Iowa GEODATA (ArcGIS Server) Source: <u>https://geodata.iowa.gov/</u>

Base-mapping data provided by Iowa GEODATA, including:

- 2-foot contour lines
- USGS 24,000 Topographic Mapping
- National Wetland Inventory (NWI) mapping
- Stream Centerlines in Iowa
- Source: <u>https://geodata.iowa.gov/</u>

Digital SSURGO Soils Data provided by USDA data gateway. Source: <u>http://datagateway.nrcs.usda.gov/</u>

Figure A: Wetland Delineation Map



Wetland Delineation Report Impact7G, Inc.

Figure B: Location Map



Wetland Delineation Report Impact7G, Inc.

Figure C: USGS Topo 7.5 Minute Quadrangle Map (1:24,000)



Wetland Delineation Report Impact7G, Inc. Page 9 June 2020



Figure D: Soils and National Wetland Inventory (NWI) Map

Wetland Delineation Report Impact7G, Inc.

Page 10 June 2020

		Hydric
MUSYM	Mapunit Name	Presence (%)
54	Zook silty clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	100
88	Nevin silty clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	5
121	Tama silt loam, driftless, 0 to 2 percent slopes	5
133	Colo silty clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	100
142	Chaseburg silt loam, moderately well drained, 0 to 2 percent slopes	0
159	Finchford loamy sand, 0 to 2 percent slopes	0
160	Walford silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	100
221	Palms muck, 0 to 3 percent slopes	100
249	Zwingle silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	100
354	Aquolls, ponded	100
733	Calco silty clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	100
923	Coyne fine sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	0
933	Sawmill silty clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	100
949	Zwingle variant silty clay, 0 to 2 percent slopes	100
962	Elvira silty clay loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	100
976	Raddle silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	0
1226	Lawler loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, rarely flooded	10
1291	Atterberry silt loam, benches, 1 to 3 percent slopes	5
5010	Pits, gravel	0
5040	Orthents, loamy	0
163E2	Fayette silt loam, 14 to 18 percent slopes, moderately eroded	0
662E2	Mt. Carroll silt loam, 14 to 18 percent slopes, moderately eroded	0
163E3	Fayette silty clay loam, 14 to 18 percent slopes, severely eroded	0
110C	Lamont fine sandy loam, 2 to 9 percent slopes	0
121B	Tama silt loam, driftless, 2 to 6 percent slopes	0
129B	Arenzville-Chaseburg complex, 1 to 5 percent slopes	0
133+	Colo silt loam, overwash, 0 to 2 percent slopes	100
159C	Finchford loamy sand, 2 to 9 percent slopes	0
162C2	Downs silt loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes, moderately eroded	0
162D2	Downs silt loam, 9 to 14 percent slopes, moderately eroded	0
163C	Fayette silt loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes	0
163C2	Fayette silt loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes, moderately eroded	0
163D3	Fayette silty clay loam, 9 to 14 percent slopes, severely erode	0
178B	Waukee loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes	0
217C	Ripon silt loam, 30 to 40 inches to limestone, 5 to 9 percent slopes	0
41B	Sparta loamy fine sand, 2 to 5 percent slopes	0
41C	Sparta loamy fine sand, 5 to 9 percent slopes	0
428B	Ely silt loam, 2 to 5 percent slopes	5
462B	Downs silt loam, terrace, 2 to 5 percent slopes	0
63E	Chelsea loamy fine sand, 9 to 18 percent slopes	0
63G	Chelsea loamy fine sand, 18 to 25 percent slopes	0
662C2	Mt. Carroll silt loam, 5 to 9 percent slopes, moderately eroded	0
662D2	Mt. Carroll silt loam, 9 to 14 percent slopes, moderately eroded	0
W	Water	0

Figure E: FEMA National Flood Hazard Layer



Wetland Delineation Report Impact7G, Inc.

Appendix A: Photos



Photo 1: Perennial Stream Terrace Data Point 4-01 Date: 5/18/2020 Direction: Facing west

Photo 2: Emergent Wetland Data Point 4-02 Date: 5/18/2020 Direction: Facing north

Photo 3: Wet Ditch Data Point 4-03 Date: 5/18/2020 Direction: Facing southwest



Photo 4: Forested Wetland Data Point 4-04 Date: 5/18/2020 Direction: Facing north

Photo 5: Mill Creek Date: 5/18/2020 Direction: Facing north

Photo 6: Hart's Mill Creek Date: 5/18/2020 Direction: Facing northwest



Photo 7: Drainage Ditch Date: 5/18/2020 Direction: Facing northeast

Photo 8: Wet Ditch Date: 5/18/2020 Direction: Facing southwest

Photo 9: Wet Ditch Date: 5/18/2020 Direction: Facing north

Appendix B: Wetland Delineation Data Sheets

See Figure A: Wetland Delineation Map for data point locations.

	Wetland Determinat	ion Data	Form - I	Vidwe	st Region-		
Project/Site: McClure-004	Clint Manufacturing Drive	Reconstructio	on Wetland	City/Co	ounty: Clinton	Date:	5/18/2020
Applicant/Owner: McClure Engineering				State:	IA	Sample Point:	4-01
Investigator(s): Impact7G Inc. (Will Down	ey, Tyler Dursky)		Section,	Township	, Range: Secti	on 15, Township 81 I	N, Range 6 E
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Stream	Terrace	Lo	ocal relief (co	oncave, c	onvex, none):	concave	
Slope (%) 0-2% Latitude(dd): 41	.822756	Longitude(dd)	: -90.2414	66	D	atum NAD 1983 UTI	I Zone 15N
Soil Map Unit Name: Orthents, loamy							
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the	e site typical for this time of yea	ar? Yes 🗸	No 🗌 (If	^r no, expla	ain in Remarks.)	
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrolog	gy 🔄 significantly disturbed?				Are "Normal	Circumstances" pres	ent? 🔽 No 🗌
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrolog	gy 🔄 naturally problematic?				(If needed,	explain any answers	in Remarks.)
Summary of Findings -	Attach site map show	ving samp	ling poin	t locatio	ons, transe	cts, important f	eatures, etc.
Hydrophytic Vegetation	n present? 🔽	a tha Sar		roo	Wotlan	d 🗆 Wet	land Type
Hydric So	il present?	within a	Wetland	d?	Wetlan		
Wetland Hydrolog	y present?	in a l		- N	NOII-Wellan	u <u>v</u>	
The data point was taken on a stream te	errace within a utility right -of-w	/ay area.					
vegetation		Absolute	Dominant		_		
Tree Stratum: Plot size: 30	lft radius, DBH >: Common Name	% Cover	Species?	Status	Number of D	I est worksheet:	
1.		0			That Are OB	L, FACW, OR FAC:	1 (A)
3.		0			Total Numbe Species Acro	r of Dominant oss All Strata:	1(B)
4	_	0			Percent of D That Are OB	ominant Species L, FACW, or FAC:	100% (A/B)
Sapling/Shrub Stratum: Plot size: 15	' radius Common Name	0	= Total Cover		Duravalanaa		
1.		0			Frevelance	andex worksheet:	
2.		0					
3.		0			FACW specie	ies: 102 x 2	204
4.		0			FAC specie	s: 0 x 3	0
5.		0			FACU spec	es: 4 x 4	16
Herbaceous Stratum: Plot size: 5'	radius Common Name	0 =	= Iotal Cover		UPL specie	s: <u>0</u> x 5	0
1. Phalaris arundinacea	Reed Canary Grass	95	YES	FACW	Column Tot	als: <u>106</u> (A)	(B
2. Urtica dioica			NO	FACW	Prevalen	ce Index = B/A =	2.08
			NO				
4.	_	0			Hydrophytic	Vegetation Indicate	ors:
6		0			Dominar	ice Test is >50%	
7		0			Prevaler	ce Index is ≤3.01	Duesside
8.		0			supportir separate	ng data in Remarks o sheet)	r on a
9.		0			Problem	atic Hydrophytic Veg	etation¹ (Explain)
10		106	= Total Cover		1Indicatora a	bydric coil and wette	and hydrology
Vine Stratum: Plot size: 30	ft radius, > 1m t Common Name				must be pres	sent, unless disturbed	l or problematic.
1.							
2.			= Total Cover		Hydroph	ytic Vegetation Present?	Yes 🗹
Remarks: (Include photo numbers here	or on a separate sheet)				•		

All identified vegetation lies within the utility right-of-way.

Soils											Sample Point:	4	-01
Profile De	escription: (De	escribe to	the dep	th neede	ed to docur	ment the	indicator	or confirm th	ne absence	e of indicators.))		
Depth	Matrix			R	edox Feat	ures							
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color	(moist)	%	Type ¹	Loc ²	Texture	Remarks	S:			
0-18	10YR 3/2							I.					
'Type: C=	Concentration, D	=Depletio	on, RM=	Reduced	Matrix, C	S=Cover	ed or Coa	ated Sand Gr	rains.	² Location: Pl	_=Pore Lining, M=M	atrix	
Hydric So	oil Indicators:												
His	tosol (A1)			⊡Sa	andy Gleye	d Matrix	(S4)	India	cators for F	Problematic H	/dric Soils³		
His	tic Epipedon (A2))		Sa	andy Redo	x (S5)	. ,		Coast Prair	۔ rie Redox (A16	3)		
Bla	ck Histic (A3)			Sti	ripped Mat	rix (S6)			ron-Manga	anese Masses	(F12)		
Hy	drogen Sulfide (A	4)		Lo	amy Muck	xy Minera	al (F1)		Other (Expl	lain in Remark	s)		
Str	atified Layers (A5)			amy Gleye	ed Matrix	(F2)						
2 c	m Muck (A10)	. Cumfran	()		epleted Ma	itrix (F3)							
	pieted Below Dari		(A11)		adox Dark	Surface (rk Surfac	(F0)		³ Indic	ators of hydro	phytic vegetation		
	ndv Muckv Minera	al (S1)			edox Depre	essions (I	F8)		unl	ess disturbed	or problematic.		
 5 c	m Mucky Peat or	Peat (S3))		•	,	- /						
Restrictiv	e Laver (if obser	rved):											
		veu).		Dont	h (inchoo):					Hydric Soil	Present?	Yes	
rype.				Debr	n (inches).					-		No	
Hydrc	ology ——												
y Wetland I	Hydrology Indica	tors:											
Primary Ir	dicators (minimur	m of one i	s require	ed. checl	k all that a	(vlaa				Secondary I	ndicators (minimum	of two	required)
Su	face Water (A1)		oroquii		Water-S	Stained L	eaves (B	9)		Surface S	oil Cracks (B6)		roquirou)
Hig	h Water Table (A	2)			Aquatic	Fauna (I	B13)	,		Drainage	Patterns (B10)		
Sat	turated in Upper 1	2" (A3)			True Ac	quatic Pla	nts (B14)		Dry-Seaso	on Water Table (C2))	
⊡Wa	iter Marks (B1)				Hydrog	en Sulfide	e Odor (0	C1)		Crayfish E	Burrows (C8)		
Se	diment Deposits (B2)				d Rhizos	pheres o	n Living Root	ts (C3)	Saturation	Visible on Aerial In	nagery	(C9)
	ft Deposits (B3)	24)			Presen	ce of Red	luced Iro	n (C4) Tilled Seile (Stunted o	r Stressed Plants (D	01)	
	al Mat or Crust (E Deposits (B5)	54)			Thin Mu	Iron Red	uction in	Tilled Solis ((0)		ral Test (D5)		
	ndation Visible or	n Aerial Im	naderv (I	B7)	Gauge	or Well D	ata (D9)				.ui 1001 (D0)		
Spa	arsely Vegetated	Concave	Surface	, (B8)	Other (I	Explain ir	Remark	s)					
Field Obs	ervations.												
Surface W	/ater Present? Ye	s 🗌 No	🗹 Dep	th (inche	es)								_
Water Tab	ble Present? Ye	s 🗌 No		th (inche	es):				Wetla	nd Hydrolog	gy Present?	Yes	
Saturatior (includes	n Present? Ye capillary fringe)	s 🗌 No	✓ Dep	th (inche	es):							No	
Describe	Recorded Data (s	tream gau	uge, moi	nitoring v	vell, aerial	photos, p	orevious	inspections),	if available	9:			
Hydrology	Remarks:												
The data	point is 15 feet fro	om a strea	m's edg	e, which	is flowing	10 feet b	elow gro	und elevation	n. Light rair	nfall occurred o	during sampling.		

	—Wetland Determina	ition Data	Form -	Midwe	st Region—		
Project/Site: McClure-004	Clint Manufacturing Drive ♀ ⊤/⊏	e Reconstruction	on Wetland	City/Co	ounty: Clinton	Date:	5/18/2020
Applicant/Owner: McClure Engineeri	ng			State:	IA	Sample Point:	4-02
Investigator(s): Impact7G Inc. (Will Do	owney, Tyler Dursky)		Section,	Township	o, Range: Section	n 14, Township 81 N	N, Range 6 E
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Stre	eam Terrace	Le	ocal relief (c	oncave, c	onvex, none): co	oncave	
Slope (%) 2-5% Latitude(dd):	41.82416	Longitude(dd): -90.2380	086	Dat	tum NAD 1983 UTN	I Zone 15N
Soil Map Unit Name: Orthents, loamy							
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions or	n the site typical for this time of y	ear? Yes 🗸	No 🗌 (I	f no, expla	ain in Remarks.)		
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydr	ology 🔄 significantly disturbed	?			Are "Normal C	ircumstances" pres	ent? 🖌 No
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydr	ology 🔄 naturally problematic?				(If needed, e	xplain any answers	in Remarks.)
Summary of Findings	- Attach site map sho	wing samp	oling poir	nt locati	ons, transec	ts, important f	eatures, etc.
Hydrophytic Vegeta	tion present? 🔽	le the Sa	mnled A	roa	Wetland	Vet	and Type:
Hydric	Soil present? 🖌	within a	Wetlan	d? ⊾	lon-Wotland	we	t prairie
Wetland Hydrol Remarks:	ogy present? 🔽			r	Non-Wetland		
The data point was taken on a stream	m terace within a small depression	on below a leve	ee. The data	a point lies	within the flood	blain and is set back	from the
stream channel.							
Vegetation		Absolute	Dominant		1		
Tree Stratum: Plot size:	30ft radius, DBH >: Common Nam	e % Cover	Species?	Status	Dominance T	est worksheet:	
1.		0			Number of Do That Are OBL,	minant Species FACW, OR FAC:	3 (A)
2.		0			Total Number	of Dominant	、 /
3.		0			Species Acros	s All Strata:	3 (B)
4.		0			Percent of Dor	minant Species	4000((A/D)
5.			= Total Cover		That Are OBL,	FACW, or FAC:	100% (A/B)
Sapling/Shrub Stratum: Plot size:	15' radius Common Nam	e		540	Prevelance In	dex worksheet:	
1. Cornus racemosa	Gray Dogwood	10	YES	FAC	Total % (Cover of:	Multiply by:
2.		0			OBL species:	x 1	0
3.		0			FACW specie	es: <u>78</u> x 2	156
5		0			FAC species:	X 3	51
		10	= Total Cover		FACU specie	s: <u>0</u> x 4	0
Herbaceous Stratum: Plot size:	5' radius Common Nam	e	YES	FACW	UPL species:	x 5	10
Persicaria lapathifolia	Dock-I eaf Smartweed	15	YES	FACW	Column Total	s: (A)	(B
2 Pilea pumila	Canadian Clearweed	7	NO	FACW	Prevalence	e Index = B/A =	2.24
A Solidago gigantea	Late Goldenrod	7	NO	FACW			
5. Populus deltoides	Eastern Cottonwood	5	NO	FAC	Hydrophytic V	egetation Indicate	ors:
6. Acer saccharinum	Silver Maple	5	NO	FACW		e lest is $>50\%$	
7. Urtica dioica	Stinging Nettle	2	NO	FACW		uical Adaptations ¹ (Provide
8. Conium maculatum	Poison-Hemlock	2	NO	FACW	supporting	data in Remarks o	r on a
9. Barbarea vulgaris	Garden Yellow-Rocket	2	NO	FAC	Broblomet	ic Hydrophytic Voo	atation ¹ (Evaluin)
10. Cirsium altissimum	Tall Thistle	2	NO	UPL			
Vine Stratum: Plot size:	30ft radius, > 1m t Common Nam	e87	= Total Cover		¹ Indicators of h	nydric soil and wetla	nd hydrology
1.		0			must be prese	nt, uniess uisturbed	or problematic.
2.		0			Hydrophy	tic Vegetation	Yes 🗹
Remarks: (Include photo numbers h	nere or on a separate sheet)	0	= Total Cover		Pi	resent?	No 🗌

Soils									Sample Point:	4-02			
Profile De	escription: (D	escribe to	the depth need	ded to docu	ment the	indicator	r or confirm the	e absence of indicators.)	L				
Depth	Matrix	(Redox Feat	ures								
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Туре¹	Loc ²	Texture	Remarks:					
0-4	10YR 3/2						1						
4-20	10YR 3/2		5YR 4/4	5	С	М	L						
¹ Type: C=	¹ Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. ² Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix												
Hydric So	oil Indicators:												
His	tosol (A1)	`		Sandy Gleye	ed Matrix	(S4)	Indic	ators for Problematic Hyd	ric Soils³				
⊟⊟is	ick Histic (A3))		Stripped Mat	trix (S6)			Coast Prairie Redox (A16)	-10)				
Hy	drogen Sulfide (A	4)		.oamy Muck	ky Miner	al (F1)		on-mangariese masses (F other (Explain in Remarks)	12)				
Str	atified Layers (A5	5)		oamy Gleye	ed Matrix	(F2)		, ,					
2 c	m Muck (A10) pleted Below Dar	k Surface	(A11)	Depleted Ma Redox Dark	atrix (F3) Surface	(E6)							
 Thi	ck Dark Surface	(A12)		Depleted Da	irk Surfac	(F7)		and wetland hydrology	ytic vegetation must be present,				
Sa	ndy Mucky Miner	al (S1)	□ F	Redox Depre	essions (F8)		unless disturbed or	problematic.				
5 c	m Mucky Peat or	Peat (S3)											
Restrictiv	ve Layer (if obse	rved):							10	Yes 🔽			
Type:			Dep	oth (inches)	:			Hydric Soil P	resent?	No 🗌			
Soil Rem	arks:												
Some are	eas of fine sedim	ent deposit	ts were presen	t during san	npling.								
Hydro	loav —												
Wetland I	Hydrology Indic:	ators.											
Primary Ir	idicators (minimu	im of one is	s required: che	ck all that a	(vlaa			Secondary Ind	icators (minimum	of two required)			
Su	face Water (A1)		,,,	Water-	Stained L	eaves (E	39)	Surface Soi	Cracks (B6)				
Hig	h Water Table (A	42)		Aquatio	: Fauna (B13)		Drainage Pa	atterns (B10)				
	turated in Upper	12" (A3)			quatic Pla	ants (B14	4) C1)	Dry-Season	Water Table (C2)	I			
	diment Deposits	(B2)			en Sund d Rhizos	spheres c	on Living Root	s (C3) Saturation V	/isible on Aerial In	nagery (C9)			
Dri	ft Deposits (B3)	()		Presen	ce of Re	duced Irc	on (C4)	Stunted or S	Stressed Plants (D	1)			
Alg	al Mat or Crust (I	B4)		Recent	Iron Red	duction in	n Tilled Soils (0	C6) Geomorphic	Position (D2)				
	n Deposits (B5) Indetion Visible o	n Aorial Im	egony (P7)		uck Surfa	ace (C7)	,	FAC-Neutra	l Test (D5)				
	arsely Vegetated	Concave S	Surface (B8)	Other (Explain i	n Remarl) ks)						
Field Obs	ervations.		. ,		•		,						
Surface W	/ater Present? Ye	es 🗌 No 🛛	Depth (incl	nes)						_			
Water Tab	ble Present? Ye	es 🗌 No 🛛	Depth (incl	nes):				Wetland Hydrology	Present?	Yes 🗹			
Saturatior	Present? Ye	es 🗹 No	Depth (incl	nes): 0	in					No			
(includes	capillary fringe)												
Describe	Recorded Data (s	stream gau	ige, monitoring	well, aerial	photos,	previous	inspections), i	if available:					
Hydrology	Remarks:												
Surface s	aturation is due to	o recent ra	Infall. Sedimen	t deposits a	ire prese	nt on sur	rounding vege	etation.					

	Vetland Determina	tion Data	Form - I	Midwes	st Region—					
Project/Site: McClure-004	Clint Manufacturing Drive	e Reconstructio	on Wetland	City/Co	unty: Clinton	Date:	5/18/2020			
Applicant/Owner: McClure Engineering				State:	IA	Sample Point:	4-03			
Investigator(s): Impact7G Inc. (Will Downe	y, Tyler Dursky)		Section,	Township	, Range: Section	14, Township 81 N	l, Range 6 E			
Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Roadsid	e Ditch	Lo	Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave							
Slope (%) 0-2% Latitude(dd): 41.8	25697	Longitude(dd)	: -90.2366	81	Datu	m NAD 1983 UTM	I Zone 15N			
Soil Map Unit Name: Sawmill silty clay loan	n, 0 to 2 percent slopes									
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on the	site typical for this time of ye	ear? Yes 🗸	No 🗌 (It	^r no, expla	in in Remarks.)					
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrology	significantly disturbed	?			Are "Normal Cir	cumstances" prese	ent? 📃 No 🖌			
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrology	naturally problematic?				(If needed, ex	plain any answers	in Remarks.)			
Summary of Findings -	Attach site map sho	wing samp	ling poin	t locatio	ons, transect	s, important fe	atures, etc.			
Hydrophytic Vegetation	present? 🔽	la tha Sar		roo	Wotland	□ Wetl	and Type			
Hydric Soil	present?	within a	Wetlan	d?						
Wetland Hydrology	present? 🔽	widini d	votan		ion-wetland					
The data point was taken within a roadsid	e ditch with a history of dist	urbance, locate	ed withina a	highly dev	veloped urban are	a. Ditches constru	cted along			
Manufacturing Drive were specifically des	igned to hold and convey w	ater, resulting i	niomation	or wettan	u muicators in sor	le aleas.				
Vegetation		Absolute	Dominant							
Tree Stratum: Plot size: 30ft	radius, DBH >: Common Nam	e % Cover	Species?	Status	Dominance Te	st worksheet:				
1.		0			Number of Dom That Are OBL, I	FACW, OR FAC:	1 (A)			
2.		0			Total Number o	f Dominant				
3.		0			Species Across	All Strata:	1 (B)			
4.		0			Percent of Dom	inant Species	4000((A/D)			
5.			= Total Cover		That Are OBL, I	-ACVV, or FAC:	100% (A/B)			
Sapling/Shrub Stratum: Plot size: 15'	adius Common Nam	e			Prevelance Inc	ex worksheet:				
1.					Total % C	over of: N	fultiply by:			
2.				-	OBL species:	0 x 1	0			
3.		0			FACW species	: <u>5</u> x 2	10			
4.		0			FAC species:	X 3	210			
5.					FACU species	0 x 4	0			
Herbaceous Stratum: Plot size: 5' ra	dius Common Nam	e	= I otal Cover		UPL species:	0 x 5	0			
1. Poa pratensis	Kentucky Blue Grass	70	YES	FAC	Column Totals	: 75 (A)	220 (B			
2. Veronica peregrina	Neckweed	5	NO	FACW	Prevalence	Index = B/A =	2.93			
3.		0								
4.		0			Hydrophytic V	egetation Indicato	rs:			
6		0			Dominance	Test is >50%				
7		0			Prevalence	Index is ≤3.0¹				
8.		0			Morphologi supporting separate sh	cal Adaptations ¹ (F data in Remarks or neet)	rovide on a			
9.		0			Problematic	: Hydrophytic Vege	tation¹ (Explain)			
10		0								
Vine Stratum: Plot size: 30ft	radius, > 1m t Common Nam	e	= l'otal Cover		¹ Indicators of hy must be presen	/dric soil and wetla t, unless disturbed	nd hydrology or problematic.			
1.		0								
2.		0	= Total Cover		Hydrophyt Pre	ic Vegetation	Yes 🗹 No			

 Remarks:
 (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet)

 Ponded water lies over some areas of kentucky bluegrass.

Soils ·								Sample Point	4-03				
Profile De	escription: (De	escribe to t	he depth need	ed to docu	ument the indicat	or or confirm th	ne absence of indica	ators.)					
Depth	Matrix		F	Redox Fea	tures	_							
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color (moist)	%	Type ¹ Loc	² Texture	Remarks:						
0-10	10YR 2/1					sil	sil likely masked redox due to soil saturation						
¹ Tvpe: C=	Concentration. D	=Depletior	n. RM=Reduce	d Matrix. C	CS=Covered or C	Coated Sand G	rains. ² Locatio	on: PL=Pore Lining. M=	Matrix				
Hydric So	oil Indicators:		.,										
	tosol (A1)			andv Glev	ed Matrix (S4)	Indi	cators for Problema	atic Hydric Soils ³					
His	tic Epipedon (A2)		s	andy Red	ox (S5)		Coast Prairie Redo	x (A16)					
⊟Bla	ck Histic (A3)			tripped Ma	atrix (S6)		Iron-Manganese Ma	asses (F12)					
Hyd	drogen Sulfide (A4	4)		oamy Muc	ky Mineral (F1)		Other (Explain in Re	emarks)					
Stra	atified Layers (A5))		oamy Gley	ved Matrix (F2)			,					
2 ci	m Muck (A10)			epleted M	atrix (F3)								
	oleted Below Dark	(Surface (A11) []R	edox Dark	(Surface (F6)		³ Indicators of	hydrophytic vegetation					
	ndv Mucky Minera	A12) al (S1)		edox Dep	ressions (F8)		unless distu	irbed or problematic.	ι,				
5 ci	m Mucky Peat or I	Peat (S3)											
Restrictiv	e Laver (if obser	ved):							Yes 🗌				
Type [.]		vou).	Den	th (inches).		Hydric	Soil Present?	Yes				
rype.			Вер).				No 💌				
Hvdro	loav ——												
ر Wetland H	Jydrology Indica	tors:											
Primary In	dicators (minimur	m of one is	required: chec	k all that a	(vlage		Secon	darv Indicators (minimu	m of two required)				
Sur	face Water (A1)			Water-	Stained Leaves	(B9)		ace Soil Cracks (B6)					
Hig	h Water Table (A2	2)		Aquati	c Fauna (B13)	. ,	Drai	nage Patterns (B10)					
Sat	urated in Upper 1	2" (A3)		True A	quatic Plants (B	14)	Dry-	Season Water Table (C	2)				
⊡Wa	ter Marks (B1)			Hydro	gen Sulfide Odor	(C1)		/fish Burrows (C8)	(20)				
	diment Deposits (B ft Doposits (B3)	B2)			ed Rhizospheres	s on Living Roo	ots (C3) Satu	Iration Visible on Aerial	Imagery (C9)				
	al Mat or Crust (B	34)			t Iron Reduction	in Tilled Soils ((C6)	morphic Position (D2)	(DT)				
	n Deposits (B5)	()			luck Surface (C7))		-Neutral Test (D5)					
 Inu	ndation Visible on	Aerial Ima	agery (B7)	Gauge	or Well Data (D	9)		(),					
Spa	arsely Vegetated (Concave S	urface (B8)	Other	(Explain in Rema	arks)							
Field Obs	ervations:												
Surface W	/ater Present? Yes	s 🗹 No 🛛	Depth (inch	es) 3	3 in								
Water Tab	le Present? Yes	s 🗌 No 🛛	Depth (inch	es):			Wetland Hyd	rology Present?	Yes 💌				
Saturation (includes o	Present? Yes Capillary fringe)	s 🗹 No 🛛	Depth (inch	es): C) in				NO 🗆				
Describe F	Recorded Data (st	tream gau	ge, monitoring	well, aeria	l photos, previou	s inspections),	if available:						
Hydrology	Remarks:												
Ponding p	resent at the data	a point is lik	ely the result o	of recent ra	ainfall within the	ast 12 hours.							

Proiect/Site: McClure-004	Wetland Determinat	ion Data Reconstructio	Form -	Midwe Citv/Co	st Region—	Da	ite:	5/18/2	2020
Applicant/Owner: McClure Engineering	<u>₽</u> . ⊤/⊏			State:	IA	Sample Point:		4.07	1
Investigator(s): Impact7G Inc. (Will Down	nev Tyler Dursky)		Section	Townshir	Range: Section	14 Township	81 N F	4-04	1 6 F
Landform (hillslone terrace etc.): Old R		14	ocal relief (c		onvex none): co	ncave	o : : i, i		
Slope (%) 0.2%		ongitudo(dd)		104	Dot			'ono 15	N
	1.824292	_ongituae(aa): -90.2332	+24	Dau	IM NAD 1983 (one 15	IN
Soil Map Unit Name: Orthents, loamy									
Are climatic / hydrologic conditions on th	e site typical for this time of yea	ar?Yes 🗸	No (I	f no, expla	ain in Remarks.)				
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrolo	gy significantly disturbed?				Are "Normal Ci	rcumstances" p	present	? 🗸	No
Are Vegetation Soil or Hydrolo	gy 📄 naturally problematic?				(If needed, ex	plain any answ	/ers in	Remar	ks.)
Summary of Findings -	Attach site map show	ving samp	oling poir	nt locati	ons, transect	s, importar	nt fea	tures	, etc
Hydrophytic Vegetatic Hydric So	n present? <mark> </mark>	s the Sai within a	mpled A Wetlan	rea d?	Wetland	✓ V wet	Netlan prairie	d Type (forest	: ed)
Wetland Hydrolog Remarks:	y present? 🔽	Within G	riotari	ч. г	Non-welland				
The data point was taken within an old	railroad bed depression. This a	rea may lie w	/ithin a flood	plain.					
Vegetation		Alter alteria	Densinent						
Tree Stratum: Plot size: 3	Oft radius, DBH >: Common Name	% Cover	Species?	Status	Dominance Te	st worksheet:			
1. Acer negundo	Ash-Leaf Maple	30	YES	FAC	Number of Don	ninant Species	C.	5	(Δ)
2. Populus deltoides	Eastern Cottonwood	5	NO	FAC			U	5	(~)
3.		0			Species Across	All Strata:		5	(B)
4.		0			Percent of Dom	inant Species			
5.		0			That Are OBL,	FACW, or FAC	: _1(00%	(A/B)
Sapling/Shrub Stratum: Plot size: 1	5' radius Common Name	35	= Iotal Cover		Prevelance Inc	lex worksheet	t:		
1. Acer negundo	Ash-Leaf Maple	10	YES	FAC	Total % C	over of:	Mul	Itiply by	/ :
2.		0			OBL species:	0	x 1	0	
3.		0			FACW species	s: 65	x 2	130	
4.		0			FAC species:	67	x 3	201	
5.		10	= Total Cover		FACU species	: 15	x 4	60	
Herbaceous Stratum: Plot size: 5	radius Common Name			FAON	UPL species:	0	x 5	0	
1. Pilea pumila	Shawnoo Salad	40	YES	FACW	Column Totals	:((A) _	391	(B
2. Sanicula canadensis	Canadian Black-Snakeroot	8	NO	FACU	Prevalence	Index = B/A =	:	2.66	
Glechoma hederacea	Groundivy	7	NO	FACU					
5 Acer saccharinum	Silver Maple	5	NO	FACW	Hydrophytic V	egetation India	cators	:	
6. Elymus virginicus	Virginia Wild Rye	5	NO	FACW		1 est is > 50%			
7. Acer negundo	Ash-Leaf Maple	4	NO	FAC		cal Adaptations	s¹ (Prc	ovide	
8. Toxicodendron radicans	Eastern Poison Ivy	3	NO	FAC	supporting	data in Remark	(s or or	na	
9. Persicaria virginiana	Jumpseed	3	NO	FAC		c Hydrophytic V	/egetai	tion¹ (F	xplain
10		0					Systat		, piani
Vine Stratum: Plot size: 3	Oft radius, > 1m t Common Name	87	= Total Cover		¹ Indicators of h	ydric soil and w	/etland	hydrol	ogy
1. Vitis riparia	River-Bank Grape	15	YES	FACW		t, unicoo ulotul	Sec O	PIODIG	mailo.
2.		0			Hydrophyt	ic Vegetatio	n	Yes	
Remarks: (Include photo numbers ber	e or on a separate sheet)	15	= Total Cover		Pro	esent?		No	

Soils										Sample Point:	4	-04	
Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)												•	
Depth	Matrix			R	edox Feati	ures							
(inches)	Color (moist)	%	Color	(moist)	%	i ype'	Loc ²	Texture	Remarks:				
0-1	10YR 2/1							1					
1-10	10YR 2/1		7.5YR	4/4	5	С	М	L					
¹ Type: C=	Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. ² Location: PL=Pore Lining, M=Matrix												
Hydric So	Hydric Soil Indicators:												
His	tosol (A1)			Sa	indy Gleye	d Matrix	(S4)	Indic	ators for Problematic	Hydric Soils ³			
His	tic Epipedon (A2))		Sa	indy Redo	x (S5)			Coast Prairie Redox (/	416)			
Bla	ck Histic (A3)			Sti	ipped Mat	rix (S6)	-1 (54)		on-Manganese Mass	ses (F12)			
⊟ Hyo ⊡ Str	arogen Suifide (A atified Lavers (A5	4) ()			amy Muck amy Gleve	y Miner d Matrix	al (F1) (F2)		other (Explain in Rem	arks)			
2 c	m Muck (A10)	/			epleted Ma	trix (F3)	(-)						
De	pleted Below Dar	k Surface	(A11)	∠ R∉	dox Dark	Surface	(F6)		³ Indicators of hyd	drophytic vegetation			
Thi	ck Dark Surface	(A12)		De	epleted Da	rk Surfac	ce (F7)		and wetland hydro	logy must be present,			
Sal	ndy Mucky Minera m Mucky Peat or	al (S1) Peat (S3)		Re	edox Depre	essions (F8)			ed of problematic.			
		1 eat (00)											
Restrictiv	e Layer (if obse	rved):							Hydric Se	oil Present?	Yes	\checkmark	
Туре:				Dept	h (inches):				inguite et		No		
Hydro	Soil Remarks:												
y Wetland I		ators:											
Primary Ir	idicators (minimu	m of one is	s requir	ed; checl	c all that a	oply)			Secondar	y Indicators (minimum	of two i	required)	
ý √ Su	face Water (A1)		•		Water-S	Stained L	eaves (E	39)	Surface	e Soil Cracks (B6)			
Hig	h Water Table (A	2)			Aquatic	Fauna (B13)		Draina	ge Patterns (B10)			
✓ Sat	urated in Upper 1 ter Marks (B1)	12" (A3)				uatic Pla on Sulfid	ants (B14	f) C1)	Dry-Se	eason Water Table (C2)		
	diment Deposits (B2)				d Rhizos	spheres c	on Living Root	s (C3) Satura	tion Visible on Aerial Ir	nagery	(C9)	
Dri	ft Deposits (B3)	. /			Presend	ce of Re	duced Irc	on (C4)	Stunte	d or Stressed Plants ([D1)	()	
Alg	al Mat or Crust (E	34)			Recent	Iron Rec	duction in	Tilled Soils (C6) Geomo	orphic Position (D2)			
	n Deposits (B5)				Thin Mu	uck Surfa	ace (C7)		FAC-N	eutral Test (D5)			
	ndation Visible of arsely Vegetated	n Aerial Im	agery (Surface	B7) (B8)	Gauge	or Well L Evolain ii	Data (D9) n Remarl) ke)					
			Junace	, (во)			Internation	(3)					
Field Obs	ervations: /ater Present? Ve	s 🔽 No	Der	oth (inche	e) 1	in							
Water Tak	ble Present? Ve			oth (inche	.s)				Wetland Hvdro	loav Present?	Yes		
Saturation (includes	Present? Ye capillary fringe)	s ⊻ No	Dep	oth (inche	s): 0	in			···· · ·······························		No		
Describe	Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:												
Hydrology Remarks:													
Saturation	and surfave wat	er present	is like	ly attribut	ted to rainf	fall withir	n the last	12 hours. This	s data point may also	lies within the floodpla	ain.		