Case No. 24-1043-EL-BLN

Part 1 of 7

Letter of Notification for the Vassell – Green Chapel 345 kV Transmission Line Adjustment No. 2 Project

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

An AEP Company

BOUNDLESS ENERGY

PUCO Case No. 24-1043-EL-BLN

Submitted to:
The Ohio Power Siting Board
Pursuant to Ohio Administrative Code
Section 4906-6-05

Submitted by:
AEP Ohio Transmission Company, Inc.

November 27, 2024

LETTER OF NOTIFICATION

AEP Ohio Transmission Company, Inc.

Vassell – Green Chapel 345 kV Transmission Line Adjustment No. 2 Project

4906-6-05 Accelerated Application Requirements

AEP Ohio Transmission Company, Inc. (the "Company") provides the following information to the Ohio Power Siting Board (OPSB) in accordance with the accelerated application requirements of Ohio Administrative Code Section 4906-6-05.

4906-6-05(B) General Information

B(1) Project Description

The name of the project and applicant's reference number, names and reference number(s) of resulting circuits, a brief description of the project, and why the project meets the requirements for a Letter of Notification.

The Company is proposing the Vassell – Green Chapel 345 kV Transmission Line Adjustment No. 2 Project (the "Project"), located within Harlem Township in Delaware County, Ohio. The Project involves adjusting approximately 0.4 mile of the Vassell – Green Chapel 345 kV Transmission Line (approved OPSB Case No. 24-0014-EL-BLN). The proposed adjustments involve shifting two previously approved structures (structures 37 and 38), based on landowners' requests during negotiations for acquiring right-of-way ("ROW") for the Project. The location of the proposed transmission line ("Project Area") is shown on Maps 1, 2, and 3 in Appendix A.

The Project meets the requirements for a Letter of Notification (LON) as defined by Items 1(d)(ii) of Appendix A to Ohio Administrative Code Section 4906-1-01, *Application Requirement Matrix for Electric Power Transmission Lines*:

> *(1) New construction, extension, or relocation of single or multiple circuit electric power transmission line(s), or upgrading existing transmission or distribution line(s) for operation at a higher transmission voltage, as follows:*
>
> > *(d) Line(s) primarily needed to attract or meet the requirements of a specific customer or customers as follows:*
> >
> > > *(ii) Any portion of the line is on property owned by someone other than the specific customer or applicant.*

The Project has been assigned Case No. 24-1043-EL-BLN.

B(2) Statement of Need

If the proposed Letter of Notification project is an electric power transmission line or gas or natural gas transmission line, a statement explaining the need for the proposed facility.

The Project involves adjusting approximately 0.4 mile of the Vassell – Green Chapel 345 kV Transmission Line resulting from shifting two previously approved structures (structures 37 and 38). The need of the overall project remains the same as what was reported and approved in OPSB Case No. 24-0014-EL-BLN.

The New Albany area continues to see some of the fastest growing electric demand in the AEP system. The robust economic development activity in New Albany is creating a continued influx of new customer interconnection requests.

The approximate load in the New Albany area today is 500 MW, with demand expected to exceed 2,000 MW by the end of 2027 and will continue to grow in future years. Due to the projected customer load, existing facilities that serve the area including the 345 kV circuits between Corridor Station and Vassell Station will exceed their thermal capacities under certain scenarios.

The Company proposes to introduce new 345 kV sources into the area to address identified planning criteria violations by constructing two new 345 kV transmission lines between AEP Ohio Transmission Company Inc.'s Vassell Station and the Green Chapel and Curleys Stations, respectively. Several projects in the New Albany area will be needed to address issues created by the projected load growth and to serve the current demand of more than 10 new customer requests in the area.

Failure to move forward with the proposed Project and future projects will result in the inability to serve the various customer load expectations (existing and new customers). In addition to direct customer service, failure to move forward with the Project would have a negative impact on economic development in the area.

Each customer need was presented and reviewed with stakeholders between February 2022 and April 2023, at the PJM SRRTEP or TEAC Meetings. The solution to the Project was presented in the December 5, 2023, PJM TEAC Meeting. The PJM supplemental number S3442.27 has been assigned to this Project. The Project was included in the Company's 2024 Long Term Forecast Report (LTFR) on pages 123 and 124 (See Appendix B).

B(3) Project Location

The applicant shall provide the location of the project in relation to existing or proposed lines and substations shown on an area system map of sufficient scale and size to show existing and proposed transmission facilities in the Project area.

The location of the Project in relation to existing transmission lines and substations is shown on Map 1 and Map 2 in Appendix A. Map 3, in Appendix A, identifies the Project components on a 2022 aerial photograph.

B(4) Alternatives Considered

The applicant shall describe the alternatives considered and reasons why the proposed location or route is best suited for the proposed facility. The discussion shall include, but not be limited to, impacts associated with socioeconomic, ecological, construction, or engineering aspects of the project.

The proposed route adjustments accommodate impacted landowners' requests gathered during negotiations for acquiring ROW for the Project. No additional wetland, streams, or cultural resource impacts are anticipated, and no additional tree clearing is required for the adjustments.

Based on the information gathered, the Company selected the proposed route and adjustments as shown on Map 3 in Appendix A, which represents the most suitable location and most appropriate alignment for the Project.

B(5) Public Information Program

The applicant shall describe its public information program to inform affected property owners and tenants of the nature of the project and the proposed timeframe for project construction and restoration activities.

The Project's public communications and outreach process began in early 2023, when the Company initiated stakeholder engagement by coordinating with local governments and agencies. Company representatives invited landowners within the Project area to in-person open house meetings, conducted on May 2 and May 3, 2023, and provided a link to the Project website to access information via a virtual open house. The landowners were also provided with contact information for the Company's outreach specialist and were encouraged to submit comments and questions.

Additionally, the Company will further inform affected property owners and tenants about this Project through several different mediums. Within seven days of filing this LON, the Company will issue a public notice in a newspaper of general circulation in the Project area. The notice will comply with all requirements of OAC Section 4906-6-08(A)(1-6). Further, the Company will mail a letter, via first class mail, to affected landowners, tenants, contiguous owners and any other landowner the Company may

approach for an easement necessary for the construction, operation, or maintenance of the Project. The letter will comply with all requirements of OAC Section 4906-6-08(B). The Company maintains a website (http://aeptransmission.com/ohio/) which hosts an electronic copy of this LON and the public notice of this LON. An electronic copy of the LON will be served to the public library in each political subdivision affected by this Project. In addition, the Company retains ROW land agents that discuss Project timelines, construction and restoration activities and convey this information to affected owners and tenants.

B(6) Construction Schedule

The applicant shall provide an anticipated construction schedule and proposed in-service date of the project.

Construction of the Project is planned to begin in January 2025 with an anticipated in-service date of April 2026.

B(7) Area Map

The applicant shall provide a map of at least 1:24,000 scale clearly depicting the facility with clearly marked streets, roads, and highways, and an aerial image.

Maps 1 and 2, in Appendix A, identify the location of the Project area on a United States Geological Survey 1:24,000 topographic quadrangle map (Sunbury). Appendix A, Map 3 shows the Project area on a 2022 aerial photograph.

B(8) Property Agreements

The applicant shall provide a list of properties for which the applicant has obtained easements, options, and/or land use agreements necessary to construct and operate the facility and a list of the additional properties for which such agreements have not been obtained.

A **revised** list of properties required for the Project are provided in the table below. The easement form exhibit provided in Appendix C represents the minimum easement rights the Company would require in order to construct, operate, and maintain these facilities.

Property Parcel Number	Agreement Type	Easement or Option Obtained (Yes/No)
316-110-02-015-002	New Easement	Yes
316-110-03-001-000	New Easement	Yes

B(9) Technical Features

The applicant shall describe the following information regarding the technical features of the project.

B(9)(a) Operating characteristics, estimated number and types of structures required, and right-of-way and/or land requirements.

The two previously approved Vassell – Green Chapel 345 kV Transmission Line structures to be shifted will include the following:

Voltage:	345 kV
Conductors:	(2) 2-Bundle 1590 kCM Falcon ACSS (54/19)
Static Wire:	2x (1) 144 Ct OPGW
Insulators:	Polymer
ROW Width:	150 feet
Structure Type:	One (1) Steel monopole, strain insulator, deadend structure on concrete pier with anchor bolt foundation (STR 37). One (1) steel monopole, BOLD V-string suspension insulators, tangent structure on concrete pier with anchor bolt foundation (STR 38).

B(9)(b) Electric and Magnetic Fields

For electric power transmission lines that are within one hundred feet of an occupied residence or institution, the production of electric and magnetic fields during the operation of the proposed electric power transmission line.

B(9)(b)(i) Calculated Electric and Magnetic Field Strength Levels

i) Calculated Electric and Magnetic Field Levels

There are no residences within 100 feet of the proposed shifts. The EMF calculations provided in the Vassell – Green Chapel 345 kV Transmission Line (approved OPSB Case No. 24-0014-EL-BLN) remain the same for the overall project.

B(9)(b)(ii) Design Alternatives

A discussion of the applicant's consideration of design alternatives with respect to electric and magnetic fields and their strength levels, including alternate conductor configuration and phasing, tower height, corridor location, and right-of-way width.

There are no residences within 100 feet of the proposed shifts, however, the design alternatives provided in the Vassell – Green Chapel 345 kV Transmission Line (approved OPSB Case No. 24-0014-EL-BLN) remain unchanged.

B(9)(b)(ii)(c) Project Cost

The estimated capital cost of the project.

There is no cost increases associated with the proposed modifications.

B(10) Social and Ecological Impacts

The applicant shall describe the social and ecological impacts of the project:

B(10)(a) Operating Characteristics

Provide a brief, general description of land use within the vicinity of the proposed project, including a list of municipalities, townships, and counties affected.

The Project is located in Harlem Township within Delaware County, Ohio. Cultivated farmland is the dominant land use for the overall project area, followed by residential development, as classified by the county auditor or identified during field review. There are no schools, parks, cemeteries, churches, wildlife management areas, or nature preserve lands within 1,000 feet of the centerline of the Project.

B(10)(b) Agricultural Land Information

Provide the acreage and a general description of all agricultural land, and separately all agricultural district land, existing at least sixty days prior to submission of the application within the potential disturbance area of the project.

The Delaware County Auditor was contacted in early November 2024 to obtain information about agricultural district lands, and the data was received via email correspondence on November 12, 2024. No agricultural district lands or Ohio Department of Agriculture (ODA) conservation easements are within the potential disturbance area of the proposed line adjustment.

The Project occupies approximately 8.3 acres, all of which has historically been used for row crop land. However, agricultural impacts will be minimized by using monopole structures and the fact that agricultural activities are a compatible and permitted use within the transmission right-of-way.

B(10)(c) Archaeological and Cultural Resources

Provide a description of the applicant's investigation concerning the presence or absence of significant archaeological or cultural resources that may be located within the potential disturbance area of the project, a statement of the findings of the investigation, and a copy of any document produced as a result of the investigation.

The Company's consultant completed Phase I Archaeological and Phase I History/Architectural surveys for a 300-foot-wide survey corridor that encompasses the proposed 150-foot-wide ROW of the proposed

line route adjustments. The surveys involved subsurface testing and visual inspection for an area encompassing the overall project.

No previously unrecorded resources that were identified were considered as being landmarks or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. As a result, the Company recommended to the SHPO that the overall project would have no adverse effect on historic properties and no further cultural resource work would be necessary. In their response, dated January 8, 2024, SHPO supported the consultant's recommendations. See Appendix D.

B(10)(d) Local, State, and Federal Agency Correspondence

Provide a list of the local, state, and federal governmental agencies known to have requirements that must be met in connection with the construction of the project, and a list of documents that have been or are being filed with those agencies in connection with siting and constructing the project.

A Notice of Intent will be filed with the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency for authorization of construction stormwater discharges under General Permit OHC000006. The Company will also coordinate stormwater permitting needs with the appropriate local entities as required. The Company will implement and maintain best management practices (BMPs) as outlined in the Project-specific Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to minimize erosion control sediment to protect surface water quality during storm events.

Wetland and stream delineation field surveys were completed for the overall project in June 2023 and between September to December 2023, and August 2024 (see Appendix E). No wetlands, streams, or ponds are located within the 300-foot-wide environmental survey corridor encompassing the proposed 150-foot-wide ROW of the proposed line route adjustments.

Prior to construction within jurisdictional waters (wetlands and/or streams), the Company intends to attain the necessary approvals from either or both the USACE or Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA), if warranted.

The FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) was reviewed to identify any floodplains/flood hazard areas that have been mapped within the Project Area (specifically, map numbers 39089C0140J and 39089C0139H). Based on this mapping, no FEMA-designated 100-year floodplains or regulatory floodways cross the proposed line route adjustments. Local floodplain permitting, if deemed necessary for the overall project, will be coordinated with agencies of jurisdiction as applicable prior to construction.

B(10)(e) Threatened, Endangered, and Rare Species

Provide a description of the applicant's investigation concerning the presence or absence of federal and state designated species (including endangered species, threatened species, rare species, species proposed for listing, species under review for listing, and species of special interest) that may be located within the potential disturbance area of the project, a statement of the findings of the investigation, and a copy of any document produced as a result of the investigation.

Coordination letters were sent to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and Ohio Department of Natural Resources-Division of Wildlife (ODNR-DOW). The USFWS response was received on September 11, 2023, and ODNR-DOW's response was received on October 13, 2023. Copies of the agencies' correspondence letters are provided in Appendix D**.** The proposed route adjustments are minor and an update to the USFWS or ODNR-DOW was not necessary, as the original correspondence is still valid.

As part of the ecological study completed for the overall project, a coordination letter was submitted to the USFWS Ohio Ecological Services Field Office seeking technical assistance on the overall project for potential impacts to threatened or endangered species. The September 11, 2023, response letter from the USFWS (see Appendix D) indicated that the federally endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and northern long-eared bat (*My*otis *septentrionalis*) occur throughout the state of Ohio. The USFWS indicated that seasonal tree clearing would be required if suitable bat habitat trees were identified. Any tree clearing required for the Project will adhere to seasonal restrictions (March 31 through October 1); therefore, adverse impacts to protected bat species are not anticipated as a result of the Project. Due to the overall project type, size, and location, USFWS does not anticipate adverse effects to any other federally endangered, threatened, proposed, or candidate species.

A coordination letter was submitted to the ODNR-DOW Ohio Natural Heritage Program (ONHP) and the ODNR - Office of Real Estate seeking an environmental review of the overall project for potential impacts on state listed and federally listed threatened or endangered species. Correspondence from ODNR DOW/OHNP and the ODNR – Office of Real Estate was received on October 13, 2023 (See Appendix D).

According to the DOW, the overall project is within the range of the state and federally endangered Indiana bat, the state and federally endangered northern long-eared bat, the state endangered little brown bat (*Myotis lucifugus*), and the state endangered tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*). Additionally, the DOW indicated that the southern portion of the overall project is within the vicinity of records for the northern long-eared bat. Because of the presence of state endangered bat species established in the area, summer tree cutting is not recommended, and additional summer surveys would not constitute presence/absence in the area.

Similar to the USFWS response, ODNR recommends cutting between October 1 and March 31 to avoid impacts to theses protected bat species. Based on a desktop survey for caves, mines, and other potential openings, no winter hibernacula were identified within 0.25 mile of the Project (See Appendix E). No tree clearing is anticipated for the proposed shifts. Approximately 28 acres of tree clearing are anticipated for the overall project, which will occur within the seasonal restrictions. Therefore, no additional coordination with ODNR regarding bat species is required.

The ODNR-DOW indicated that the overall project is within the range of five mussel species: the federally endangered rayed bean (*Villosa fabalis*), the federally endangered snuffbox (*Epioblasma triquetra*), the federally threatened rabbitsfoot (*Quadrula cylindrica cylindrica*), the state threatened salamander mussel (*Simpsonaias ambigua*), and the state threatened pondhorn (*Uniomerus tetralasmus*). No in-water work within a perennial stream is proposed for the overall project; therefore, these species are not anticipated to be impacted by the overall project.

In addition, the ODNR lists the overall project in the range of the northern harrier (*Circus hudsonius*). The ODNR recommends that nesting habitats for the listed species be avoided during their nesting periods. The professional survey completed for avian resources concluded no suitable habitat was observed for the northern harrier in the overall project area; therefore, no impacts to this bird species are anticipated.

Of the previous ten state and/or federal listed threatened and endangered species identified within range of the overall project area as identified within the Original Ecological Report (December 2023), no habitat for any of the listed aquatic or bird species were identified within the Addendum #2 Project Survey Area. However, the four bat species (Indiana bat, Northern long-eared bat, little brown bat, and tricolored bat) were identified as having potential summer roosting habitat and no hibernacula within the Original Ecological Report Project Survey area, which is consistent with the original threatened and endangered species coordination for the original route. Therefore, no further coordination with either the USFWS and/or ODNR is warranted. A copy of the Original Ecological Report with further discussion of threatened and endangered species has been provided in Appendix E.

B(10)(f) Areas of Ecological Concern

Provide a description of the applicant's investigation concerning the presence or absence of areas of ecological concern (including national and state forests and parks, floodplains, wetlands, designated or proposed wilderness areas, national and state wild and scenic rivers, wildlife areas, wildlife refuges, wildlife management areas, and wildlife sanctuaries) that may be located within the potential disturbance area of the project, a statement of the findings of the investigation, and a copy of any document produced as a result of the investigation.

As stated in Section B(10)(e), a copy of the correspondence letters received from the USFWS and ODNR-DOW are provided in Appendix D. USFWS indicated no impacts to proposed or designated critical habitats, which is still true with the proposed route adjustment.

The Company's consultant conducted a wetland and stream delineation survey in the overall Project study area and prepared an Ecological Survey Report. The Original Ecological Report provided in Appendix E.

No wetlands, streams, or ponds are located within the 300-foot-wide environmental survey corridor encompassing the proposed 150-foot-wide ROW of the proposed line route adjustments. No additional impacts are anticipated for existing delineated features.

Based on a review of the Protected Areas Database of the United States as well as the Conservation Easement Database, there are no state or national parks, forests, or wildlife areas within the vicinity of the Project.

B(10)(g) Unusual Conditions

Provide any known additional information that will describe any unusual conditions resulting in significant environmental, social, health, or safety impacts.

To the best of the Company's knowledge, no unusual conditions exist that would result in significant environmental, social, health, or safety impacts.

Appendix A Project Maps



Proposed AEP Substation
Existing AEP Substation
Existing AEP Transmission Line
Proposed Shift
Proposed Shifts to the Vassell-Green Chapel 345kV Transmission Line
Vassell-Green Chapel 345kV Transmission Line (Approved Case No. 24-0014-EL-BLN)
Municipality
Township Boundary
USGS 7.5' Topographic Quad Boundary

Sources: USGS (2021)

StatePlane Ohio North NAD 83

November 13, 2024

Map 1
Project Overview

Vassell - Green Chapel 345 kV Transmission Line Adjustment No. 2 Project

0 0.5 1 1.5
Miles



Proposed Shifts to the Vassell-Green Chapel 345kV Transmission Line

Vassell-Green Chapel 345kV Transmission Line (Approved Case No. 24-0014-EL-BLN)

USGS 7.5' Topographic Quad Boundary

Sources:
USGS (2021)

StatePlane
Ohio North
NAD 83

November 13, 2024

Map 2
Project Area

AEP OHIO

Vassell - Green Chapel
345 kV Transmission Line
Adjustment No. 2 Project

0 1,000 2,000
Feet



Proposed Shifts to the Vassell - Green Chapel 345 kV Transmission Line

Vassell - Green Chapel 345kV Transmission Line (Approved OPSB Case No. 24-0014-EL-BLN)

Parcel Boundary

Sources:
NAIP Imagery (USDA 2022)

StatePlane
Ohio South
NAD 83

November 13, 2024



Map 3
Aerial Map

AEP OHIO
An AEP Company

Vassell - Green Chapel
345 kV Transmission Line
Adjustment No. 2 Project

0 250 500 750
Feet

Appendix B PJM Solution

New Albany Area

- AEP is experiencing significant load growth in the New Albany area.
- As a result of the land development in this region, new easements and rights-of-way are becoming increasingly difficult and costly to obtain.
- In anticipation of this continual and future growth, AEP is planning to acquire ROW options/easements for two corridors in this area to facilitate any required future infrastructure development.

AEP Transmission Zone M-3 Process
Central/NW OH, Indiana.

Process Stage: Solutions Meeting 5/9/2023, 12/5/2023

Reason for review:

In March 2023, AEP informed stakeholders of its intent to acquire ROW for two 345 kV transmission lines to New Albany in recognition of the interest AEP has received in the area. AEP is now coming back to recommend the supplemental build of these lines to address the amount of load that has signed an LOA. PJM has confirmed in its DNH analysis that these lines do not cause other issues and address the build out of the loads in the area.

AEP Transmission Zone M-3 Process
Central/NW OH, Indiana.

Need Number: AEP-2022-OH023, AEP-2022-OH034, AEP-2022-OH036, AEP-2022-OH045, AEP-2022-OH046, AEP-2022-OH075, AEP-2022-OH077, AEP-2023-OH016, AEP-2023-OH019, AEP-2023-OH032, AEP-2023-OH040, AEP-2023-OH044, AEP-2023-OH052, AEP-2023-OH063

Process Stage: Solutions Meeting 5/9/2023, 12/5/2023

Proposed Solution (continued):

The following components are system reinforcements that were initially identified by AEP and later confirmed by PJM through their DNH analysis:

- **Vassell – Green Chapel 345 kV line:** Install approximately 12.5-mile long 345 kV transmission between Vassell and Green Chapel stations to mitigate overloading on multiple transmission facilities including other 345 kV transmission lines and 345-138 kV transformers. Cost: **$75.0 M**
- **Vassell – Curleys 345 kV line:** Install approximately 12.5-mile long 345 kV transmission between Vassell and Curleys stations to mitigate overloading on multiple transmission facilities including other 345 kV transmission lines and 345-138 kV transformers. Cost: **$75.0 M**
- **Vassell 765 & 345 kV stations: A**dd 3-345 kV breakers to connect new lines to Curleys and Green Chapel. Cost: **$10 M**
- **Green Chapel 345/138 kV station:** Install two 675 MVA, 345/138 kV transformers to connect the new Vassell – Green Chapel 345 kV line to 138 kV system and to mitigate overloading on the other 345/138 kV transformers in the system. Cost: **$39.2 M**

System Upgrades: $199.2 M

Appendix C Form Easement

Line Name: Vassell - Green Chapel
Line No.: TLN380:OH422
Easement No.:

EASEMENT AND RIGHT OF WAY

On this _____ day of _____, 202__, for good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is hereby acknowledged, and the covenants hereinafter set forth, __[landowner name and marital status]__, whose address is _____ ("Grantor"), whether one or more persons, hereby grants, sells, conveys, and warrants to AEP Ohio Transmission Company, Inc., an Ohio corporation, a unit of American Electric Power, whose principal business address is 1 Riverside Plaza, Columbus, Ohio 43215 ("AEP"), and its successors and affiliates, a permanent easement and right of way ("Easement") for a single electric transmission line, not to exceed 345 kV, and for internal communication purposes related to the supply of electricity (the "Transmission Line"), being, in, on, over, under, through and across the following described lands of Grantor, situated in the State of Ohio, County of _____, and Township of _____ and being a part of ___[abbreviated legal description]____ ("Grantor's Property").

Contingent provision: [Spouse of Grantor, if any] join herein for the purpose of releasing all dower rights in regard to the Easement.

Grantor claims title by ___[name of vesting instrument]___ dated _____ from ___[name of first grantor]___, recorded on _____ at ___[record volume, page]___ in the _____ County Recorder's Office.

Auditor/Key/Tax Number: ____[Tax Parcel Number]____

The Easement Area is more fully described and depicted on Exhibit "A", a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof ("Easement Area").

GRANTOR FURTHER GRANTS AEP THE FOLLOWING RIGHTS:

The right, now or in the future, to construct, reconstruct, operate, maintain, alter, improve, inspect, patrol, protect, repair, remove, replace, upgrade and relocate within the Easement Area, structures and appurtenant equipment necessary for the Transmission Line.

The right, in AEP's discretion, now or in the future, to cut down, trim or remove, and otherwise control, any and all trees, overhanging branches, vegetation or brush situated within the Easement Area and any temporary access roads or temporary workspaces identified on Exhibit "A" outside the Easement Area. Provided, however, that AEP shall not use herbicides or similar products for these purposes on any portions of the Grantor's Property maintained for residential or agricultural use. AEP shall also have the right to cut down, trim or remove trees situated on Grantor's Property which adjoin the Easement Area within the Tree Protection Zone when in the reasonable opinion of AEP those trees are dead, dying, diseased, leaning, or structurally defective and may endanger the safety of, or interfere with the construction, operation or maintenance of AEP's facilities or

ingress or egress to, from or along the Easement Area. The Tree Protection Zone extends eighty feet on all sides of the Easement Area depicted in Exhibit A.

AEP shall also have the right of reasonable ingress and egress over, across and upon the Easement Area only, unless additional access routes are depicted in the attached Exhibit A. Provided, however, that in the event access over, across and upon the Easement Area – and access routes, if any, shown in Exhibit A – shall become blocked or otherwise rendered unsafe or hazardous for use, AEP may temporarily access the Easement Area from other points across Grantor's Property, so long as that access is both reasonable and limited to the duration of the interference or safety hazard. AEP shall return the access area to its preexisting condition or pay damages to Grantor.

AEP shall also have the right to use temporary workspaces and temporary access roads outside the Easement Area, if any are shown on Exhibit A, in connection with its initial construction of the Transmission Line. AEP may shift the location of such temporary workspaces, if any, up to twenty (20) feet in any direction, and also shift the location of such temporary access roads, if any, up to twenty (20) feet in any direction, as field conditions or other requirements dictate. Upon completion of the overall Transmission Line project, but in no event later than two (2) years following the start of construction on Grantor's Property, AEP shall remove its equipment from all such temporary workspaces and temporary access roads outside the Easement Area, and AEP's temporary rights outside of the Easement Area shall automatically cease, terminate and revert to Grantor. AEP shall return any such areas to their preexisting condition or pay damages to Grantor as soon as practicable.

THIS GRANT IS SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:

Grantor reserves the right to cultivate annual crops, pasture, construct fences (provided gates are installed that adequately provide AEP the access rights conveyed herein) and roads or otherwise use Grantor's Property encumbered by this Easement in any way not inconsistent with the rights herein granted. In no event, however, shall Grantor, its heirs, successors, affiliates and assigns plant or cultivate any trees or place, construct, install, erect or permit any temporary or permanent building, structure, improvement or obstruction including but not limited to, storage tanks, billboards, signs, sheds, dumpsters, light poles, water impoundments, above ground irrigation systems, swimming pools or wells, or permit any alteration of the ground elevation, over, or within the Easement Area. AEP may, at Grantor's cost, remove any structure or obstruction if placed within the Easement Area, and may re-grade any alterations of the ground elevation within the Easement Area.

AEP agrees to repair or pay Grantor for actual damages sustained by Grantor to crops, fences, gates, irrigation and drainage systems, drives, or lawns that are permitted herein, when such damages arise out of AEP's exercise of the rights herein granted.

Pursuant to R.C. 163.02, Grantor possesses a right of repurchase pursuant to R.C. 163.211 if AEP decides not to use Grantor's Property for the purpose stated in the appropriation petition and Grantor provides timely notice of a desire to repurchase.

This instrument contains the complete agreement, expressed or implied between the parties herein

and shall inure to the benefit of and be binding on their respective successors, affiliates, heirs, executors, and administrators.

This Easement may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which, taken together, shall constitute one and the same instrument.

Any remaining space on this page left intentionally blank. See next page(s) for signature(s).

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, said Grantor hereunto set their hand(s) and seal(s) as of the last date set forth below.

GRANTOR

SIGNATURE BLOCK FOR A BUSINESS ENTITY / TRUST:

[name of entity/trust & kind of business association identified]

By:_____
Print name:_____
Its Authorized Signer

State of Ohio §
§ SS:
County of _____ §

This instrument was acknowledged before me on this _____ day of _____, 202__ by _____, the _____[title]_____ of ___[name of entity/trust]___, a/an ___[state of incorporation and type of entity/trust]____, on behalf of ___[name of entity/trust]___.

_____
Notary

SIGNATURE BLOCK FOR AN INDIVIDUAL:

_____
____[Typed name of individual]____

State of Ohio §
§ SS:
County of _____ §

This instrument was acknowledged before me on this _____ day of _____, 202__ by ___[name of individual]____.

_____
Notary

This instrument prepared by Marland Turner, American Electric Power Service Corporation, 1 Riverside Plaza, Columbus, OH 43215 for and on behalf of AEP Ohio Transmission Company, Inc., a unit of American Electric Power.

When recorded return to: American Electric Power – Transmission Right of Way, 8600 Smith's Mill Road, New Albany, OH 43054.

Appendix D Agency Coordination

In reply, refer to
2023-DEL-59893

January 8, 2024

Ryan Weller
Weller & Associates, Inc.
1395 W. Fifth Ave.
Columbus, OH 43212
rweller@wellercrm.com

RE: Vassell-Green Chapel 345kV North Transmission Line Greenfield Project, Delaware and Licking Counties, Ohio

Dear Mr. Weller:

This letter is in response to the correspondence received December 11, 2023 regarding the proposed Vassell-Green Chapel 345kV North Transmission Line Greenfield Project, Delaware and Licking Counties, Ohio. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on this project. The comments of the Ohio State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) are made pursuant to Section 149.53 of the Ohio Revised Code and the Ohio Power Siting Board rules for siting this project (OAC 4906-4 & 4906-5). The comments of the Ohio SHPO are also submitted in accordance with the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (54 U.S.C. 306108 [36 CFR 800]).

The following comments pertain to the *Phase I Archaeological Investigation for the 20.2 km (12.6 mi) Vassell-Green Chapel 345kV North Transmission Line Greenfield Project in Delaware and Licking County, Ohio* by Ryan J. Weller (Weller & Associates, Inc. 2023).

A literature review, visual inspection, surface collection, shovel probe, and shovel test unit excavation was completed as part of the investigations. Ten (10) previously identified archaeological sites are located within the project area, Ohio Archaeological Inventory (OAI) #33DL2618-33DL2620, 33DL2630, 33DL2632, 33DL2691, 33DL2712-33DL2714, and 33LI3550. OAI#33DL2618 was previously recommended potentially eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Intensive survey in and around this site during this survey failed to identify the site. The reminder of the previously identified archaeological sites were previously determined not eligible for listing in the NRHP. Our office agrees with this recommendation and no additional survey is needed at OAI#33DL2618. Twenty-six (26) new archaeological sites were identified during survey, OAI#33DL3695-3703, 33LI3608, 33LI3610-33LI3612, and 33LI3615-33LI3627. None of the sites are recommended eligible for listing in the NRHP. Our office agrees with this recommendation and no additional archaeological survey.

The following comments pertain to the *History/Architecture Investigations for the 20.2 km (12.6 mi) Vassell-Green Chapel 345kV North Transmission Line Greenfield Project in Delaware and Licking Counties, Ohio* by Scott McIntosh (Weller & Associates, Inc. 2023).

A literature review and field survey were conducted as part of the investigations. A total of forty-nine (49) architectural resources fifty years of age or older were identified in the Area of Potential Effects (APE). One (1) resource was previously determined eligible under Criterion C and was recorded to the Ohio Historic Inventory (OHI) as part of this survey (DEL0122813). None of the other resources are recommended eligible. Our office agrees with Weller's recommendations of eligibility. Based on the information provided, the project as proposed will have no direct effect on the historic resource.

Based on the information provided, we agree the project as proposed will have no adverse effect on historic properties. No further coordination with this office is necessary, unless the project changes or unless new or additional historic properties are discovered during implementation of this project. In such a situation, this office should be contacted. If you have any questions, please contact me at (614) 298-2022, or by e-mail at khorrocks@ohiohistory.org or Joy Williams at jwilliams@ohiohistory.org. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Krista Horrocks, Project Reviews Manager
Resource Protection and Review

RPR Serial No: 1100944-1100945

Office of Real Estate
Tara Paciorek, Chief
2045 Morse Road – Bldg. E-2
Columbus, OH 43229
Phone: (614) 265-6661
Fax: (614) 267-4764

October 13, 2023

Anna Findish
AECOM
707 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Re: 23-1066; AEP Vassell - Green Chapel North Enhancement

Project: The proposed project involves the implementation of improvements between the existing Vassell Station and a proposed station (approximately 12.4 miles).

Location: The proposed project is located in Berkshire, Trenton, and Harlem townships, Delaware County, and Monroe and Jersey townships, Licking County, Ohio.

The Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) has completed a review of the above referenced project. These comments were generated by an inter-disciplinary review within the Department. These comments have been prepared under the authority of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), the National Environmental Policy Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, Ohio Revised Code and other applicable laws and regulations. These comments are also based on ODNR's experience as the state natural resource management agency and do not supersede or replace the regulatory authority of any local, state, or federal agency nor relieve the applicant of the obligation to comply with any local, state, or federal laws or regulations.

Natural Heritage Database: A review of the Ohio Natural Heritage Database indicates there are no records of state or federally listed plants or animals within one mile of the specified project area. Records searched date from 1980.

Please note that Ohio has not been completely surveyed and we rely on receiving information from many sources. Therefore, a lack of records for any particular area is not a statement that rare species or unique features are absent from that area.

Fish and Wildlife: The Division of Wildlife (DOW) has the following comments.

The DOW recommends that impacts to streams, wetlands and other water resources be avoided and minimized to the fullest extent possible, and that Best Management Practices be utilized to minimize erosion and sedimentation.

The portion of the project south of Duncan Plains Road is within the vicinity of records for the northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), a state endangered and federally endangered species. Because presence of state endangered bat species has been established in this area, summer tree cutting is not recommended, and additional summer surveys would not constitute presence/absence in the area. However, limited summer tree cutting inside this buffer may be

acceptable after further consultation with DOW (contact Eileen Wyza at Eileen.Wyza@dnr.ohio.gov).

In addition, the entire state of Ohio is within the range of the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), a state endangered and federally endangered species, the northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), a state endangered and federally endangered species, the little brown bat (*Myotis lucifugus*), a state endangered species, and the tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*), a state endangered species. During the spring and summer (April 1 through September 30), these bat species predominately roost in trees behind loose, exfoliating bark, in crevices and cavities, or in the leaves. The DOW recommends tree cutting only occur from October 1 through March 31, conserving trees with loose, shaggy bark and/or crevices, holes, or cavities, as well as trees with DBH ≥ 20 if possible. However, if trees are present within this area, (outside of the area delineated above) and trees must be cut during the summer months, the DOW recommends a mist net survey or acoustic survey be conducted from June 1 through August 15, prior to any cutting. Mist net and acoustic surveys should be conducted in accordance with the most recent version of the "*OHIO DIVISION OF WILDLIFE GUIDANCE FOR BAT SURVEYS AND TREE CLEARING*". If state listed bats are documented, DOW recommends cutting only occur from October 1 through March 31. However, limited summer tree cutting may be acceptable after consultation with the DOW.

The DOW also recommends that a desktop habitat assessment is conducted, followed by a field assessment if needed, to determine if a potential hibernaculum is present within the project area. Direction on how to conduct habitat assessments can be found in the current USFWS "*RANGE-WIDE INDIANA BAT & NORTHERN LONG-EARED BAT SURVEY GUIDELINES*." If a habitat assessment finds that a potential hibernaculum is present within 0.25 miles of the project area, please send this information to Eileen Wyza, for project recommendations. If a potential or known hibernaculum is found, the DOW recommends a 0.25-mile tree cutting and subsurface disturbance buffer around the hibernaculum entrance, however, limited summer or winter tree cutting may be acceptable after consultation with the DOW. If no tree cutting or subsurface impacts to a hibernaculum are proposed, this project is not likely to impact these species.

This project is within the range of the following listed mussel species.
Federally Endangered
rayed bean (*Villosa fabalis*)
snuffbox (*Epioblasma triquetra*)

Federally Threatened
rabbitsfoot (*Quadrula cylindrica cylindrica*)

State Threatened
Salamander Mussel (*Simpsonaias ambigua*)
pondhorn (*Uniomerus tetralasmus*)

This project must not have an impact on native mussels. This applies to both listed and non-listed species, as all species of mussel are protected in Ohio. Per the Ohio Mussel Survey Protocol (2022), all Group 2, 3, and 4 streams (Appendix A) require a mussel survey. Per the Ohio Mussel Survey Protocol, Group 1 streams (Appendix A) and unlisted streams with a watershed of 5 square miles or larger above the point of impact should be assessed using the Reconnaissance Survey for Unionid Mussels (Appendix B) to determine if mussels are present. Mussel surveys may be recommended for these streams as well. Therefore, if in-water work is planned in any stream that meets any of the above criteria, the DOW recommends the applicant provide

information to indicate no mussel impacts will occur. If this is not possible, the DOW recommends a professional malacologist conduct a mussel survey in the project area. If mussels that cannot be avoided are found in the project area, the DOW recommends a professional malacologist collect and relocate the mussels to suitable and similar habitat upstream of the project site. Mussel surveys and any subsequent mussel relocation should be done in accordance with the Ohio Mussel Survey Protocol. If there is no in-water work proposed, impacts to mussels are not likely.

The DOW recommends no in-water work in perennial streams from March 15 through June 30 to reduce impacts to indigenous aquatic species and their habitat. If no in-water work is proposed in a perennial stream, this project is not likely to impact aquatic species.

The project is within the range of the northern harrier (*Circus hudsonius*), a state endangered bird. This is a common migrant and winter species. Nesters are much rarer, although they occasionally breed in large marshes and grasslands. Harriers often nest in loose colonies. The female builds a nest out of sticks on the ground, often on top of a mound. Harriers hunt over grasslands. If this type of habitat will be impacted, construction should be avoided in this habitat during the species' nesting period of April 15 through July 31. If this habitat will not be impacted, this project is not likely to impact this species.

Due to the potential of impacts to federally listed species, as well as to state listed species, we recommend that this project be coordinated with the US Fish & Wildlife Service.

Water Resources: The Division of Water Resources has the following comment.

The local floodplain administrator should be contacted concerning the possible need for any floodplain permits or approvals for this project.

ODNR appreciates the opportunity to provide these comments. Please contact Mike Pettegrew at mike.pettegrew@dnr.ohio.gov if you have questions about these comments or need additional information.

Mike Pettegrew
Environmental Services Administrator

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Ecological Services
4625 Morse Road, Suite 104
Columbus, Ohio 43230
(614) 416-8993 / FAX (614) 416-8994

September 11, 2023

Project Code: 2023-0125820

Dear Anna Findish:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has received your recent correspondence requesting information about the subject proposal. We offer the following comments and recommendations to assist you in minimizing and avoiding adverse impacts to threatened, endangered, and proposed species pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq), as amended (ESA).

Federally Threatened and Endangered Species: The endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) occur throughout the State of Ohio. The Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat may be found wherever suitable habitat occurs unless a presence/absence survey has been performed to document absence. Suitable summer habitat for Indiana bats and northern long-eared bats consists of a wide variety of forested/wooded habitats where they roost, forage, and breed that may also include adjacent and interspersed non-forested habitats such as emergent wetlands and adjacent edges of agricultural fields, woodlots, fallow fields, and pastures. Roost trees for both species include live and standing dead trees ≥3 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) that have any exfoliating bark, cracks, crevices, hollows and/or cavities. These roost trees may be located in forested habitats as well as linear features such as fencerows, riparian forests, and other wooded corridors. Individual trees may be considered suitable habitat when they exhibit the characteristics of a potential roost tree and are located within 1,000 feet of other forested/wooded habitat. Northern long-eared bats have also been observed roosting in human-made structures, such as buildings, barns, bridges, and bat houses; therefore, these structures should also be considered potential summer habitat. In the winter, Indiana bats and northern long-eared bats hibernate in caves, rock crevices and abandoned mines.

Federally Proposed Species: On September 14, 2022, the Service proposed to list the tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*) as endangered under the ESA. The bat faces extinction due to the impacts of white-nose syndrome, a deadly disease affecting cave-dwelling bats across the continent. During spring, summer, and fall, this species roosts primarily among leaf clusters of live or recently dead trees, emerging at dusk to hunt for insects over waterways and forest edges. While white-nose syndrome is by far the most serious threat to the tricolored bat, other threats now have an increased significance due to the dramatic decline in the species' population. These threats include disturbance to bats in roosting, foraging, commuting, and over-wintering habitats. Mortality due to collision with wind turbines, especially during migration, has also been documented across their range. Conservation measures for the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat will also help to conserve the tricolored bat.

Seasonal Tree Clearing for Federally Listed Bat Species: Should the proposed project site contain trees ≥3 inches dbh, we recommend avoiding tree removal wherever possible. If any caves or abandoned mines may be disturbed, further coordination with this office is requested to determine if fall or spring portal surveys are warranted. If no caves or abandoned mines are present and trees ≥3 inches dbh cannot be avoided, we recommend removal of any trees ≥3 inches dbh only occur between October 1 and March 31. Seasonal clearing is recommended to avoid adverse effects to Indiana bats and northern long-eared bats.

If implementation of this seasonal tree cutting recommendation is not possible, a summer presence/absence survey may be conducted for Indiana bats and northern long-eared bats. If Indiana bats and northern long-eared bats are not detected during the survey, then tree clearing may occur at any time of the year. Surveys must be conducted by an approved surveyor and be designed and conducted in coordination with the Ohio Field Office. Surveyors must have a valid federal permit. Please note that in Ohio summer mist net surveys may only be conducted between June 1 and August 15.

Section 7 Coordination: If there is a federal nexus for the project (e.g., federal funding provided, federal permits required to construct), then no tree clearing should occur on any portion of the project area until consultation under section 7 of the ESA, between the Service and the federal action agency, is completed. We recommend the federal action agency submit a determination of effects to this office, relative to the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat, for our review and concurrence. This letter provides technical assistance only and does not serve as a completed section 7 consultation document.

Stream and Wetland Avoidance: Over 90% of the wetlands in Ohio have been drained, filled, or modified by human activities, thus is it important to conserve the functions and values of the remaining wetlands in Ohio (https://epa.ohio.gov/portals/47/facts/ohio_wetlands.pdf). We recommend avoiding and minimizing project impacts to all wetland habitats (e.g., forests, streams, vernal pools) to the maximum extent possible in order to benefit water quality and fish and wildlife habitat. Additionally, natural buffers around streams and wetlands should be preserved to enhance beneficial functions. If streams or wetlands will be impacted, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers should be contacted to determine whether a Clean Water Act section 404 permit is required. Best management practices should be used to minimize erosion, especially on slopes. Disturbed areas should be mulched and revegetated with native plant species. In addition, prevention of non-native, invasive plant establishment is critical in maintaining high quality habitats.

Due to the project type, size, and location, we do not anticipate adverse effects to any other federally endangered, threatened, or proposed species, or proposed or designated critical habitat. Should the project design change, or additional information on listed or proposed species or their critical habitat become available, or if new information reveals effects of the action that were not previously considered, coordination with the Service should be initiated to assess any potential impacts.

Thank you for your efforts to conserve listed species and sensitive habitats in Ohio. We recommend coordinating with the Ohio Department of Natural Resources due to the potential for the proposed project to affect state listed species and/or state lands. Contact Mike Pettegrew, Environmental Services Administrator, at (614) 265-6387 or at mike.pettegrew@dnr.ohio.gov.

If you have questions, or if we can be of further assistance in this matter, please contact our office at (614) 416-8993 or ohio@fws.gov.

Sincerely,

Scott Hicks
Acting Field Office Supervisor

cc: Nathan Reardon, ODNR-DOW
Eileen Wyza, ODNR-DOW

Case No. 24-1043-EL-BLN

Part 2 of 7

Appendix E Wetland Delineation Report

VASSELL – GREEN CHAPEL NORTH PROJECT

DELAWARE AND LICKING COUNTY, OHIO

ECOLOGICAL REPORT

Prepared for:
American Electric Power Ohio Transmission Company
8600 Smiths Mill Road
New Albany, Ohio 43054

Prepared by:

525 Vine Street, Suite 1800
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Project #: 60702685

December 2023

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION 4
2.0 METHODOLOGY 4
2.1 WETLAND DELINEATION 4
2.1.1 WETLAND CLASSIFICATION 5
2.1.2 WETLAND ASSESSMENT 5
2.2 STREAM ASSESSMENT 5
2.2.1 OEPA PRIMARY HEADWATER HABITAT ASSESSMENT 5
2.2.2 OEPA 401 WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION FOR NATIONWIDE PERMIT ELIGIBILITY 6
2.2.3 UPLAND DRAINAGE FEATURES 6
2.3 RARE, THREATENED, AND ENDANGERED SPECIES 7
3.0 RESULTS 7
3.1 WETLAND DELINEATION 8
3.1.1 PRELIMINARY SOILS EVALUATION 8
3.1.2 NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP REVIEW 9
3.1.3 DELINEATED WETLANDS 9
3.2 STREAM DELINATION 12
3.2.1 OEPA STREAM ELIGIBILITY 14
3.3 FEMA 100 YEAR FLOODPLAINS 14
3.4 PONDS 14
3.5 UPLAND DRAINAGE FEATURES 14
3.6 VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES 14
3.7 RARE, THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES AGENCY COORDINATION 15
4.0 SUMMARY 20
5.0 REFERENCES 21

TABLES (in-text)

TABLE 1: SOIL MAP UNITS AND DESCRIPTIONS WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA.....8
TABLE 2: NWI DISPOSTION SUMMARY TABLE WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA.....9
TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF DELINEATED WETLANDS WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA.....11
TABLE 4: SUMMARY OF DELINEATED STREAMS WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA.....13
TABLE 5: SUMMARY OF WATERSHED 401 WQC ELIGIBILITY WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA.....14
TABLE 6: VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA.....15
TABLE 7: ODNR AND USFWS LISTED SPECIES WITHIN THE PROEJCT SURVEY AREA.....17

FIGURES

Number

FIGURE 1	Project Overview
FIGURE 2	Soil Map and National Wetland Inventory Map
FIGURE 3	Wetland Delineation and Stream Assessment Map
FIGURE 4	Stream Eligibility Map
FIGURE 5	Vegetation Communities Assessment Map
FIGURE 6	Desktop Assessment for Winter Bat Habitat

APPENDICES

Number

APPENDIX A	USACE Wetland Data Forms and Photographic Record
APPENDIX B	OEPA Stream Data Forms and Photographic Record
APPENDIX C	Pond Photographic Record
APPENDIX D	Upland Drainage Feature Photographic Record
APPENDIX E	Habitat Photographic Record
APPENDIX F	Agency Correspondence
APPENDIX G	2023 Joint Guidance

1.0 INTRODUCTION

American Electric Power, Ohio Transmission Company (AEP Ohio Transco) is proposing improvements between the existing Vassell Station and a proposed station as part of the Vassell-Green Chapel North Project, herein "Project". The proposed route is approximately 12.6 miles long located in Delaware and Licking Counties, Ohio (OH). The Project survey area associated with this Ecological Report is located within Jersey, Johnstown, and Sunbury, OH United States Geological Survey (USGS) 7.5-minute topographical quadrangles as displayed on the Project Overview (Figure 1).

The purpose of the field survey was to assess the presence of wetlands and possible "waters of the United States" (WOTUS) that occur within the proposed Project survey area. Secondarily, land uses were also recorded to classify and characterize potential habitat for threatened and endangered species. This report will be used to assist AEP Ohio Transco's efforts to identify potential WOTUS as well as threatened and endangered species habitat present within the proposed Project survey area to avoid or minimize impacts during construction activities.

2.0 METHODOLOGY

The field survey was completed for a 300-foot-wide corridor along the proposed transmission line centerline identified as the Project survey area totaling approximately 443-acre. Due to lack of survey permissions, portions of the 300-foot-wide corridor were not surveyed as shown on Figures 2, 3, and 5. Therefore, these areas were excluded from this report and will be provided in a future addendum report. Prior to conducting field surveys, digital United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey data, United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) data, USGS National Hydrography Dataset (NHD), Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 100-year floodplain data, and USGS 7.5-minute topographic maps were reviewed to identify the occurrence and location of potential wetland areas and/or streams.

Field survey activities included recording the physical boundaries of observed water features using sub-meter capable EOS Arrow Global Positioning System (GPS) units in conjunction with the ArcGIS Field Maps application on iPad tablets. The GPS data was imported into ArcMap Geographic Information System (GIS) software, where the data was reviewed, edited for accuracy, and compiled in a format suitable for transfer and use by AEP Ohio Transco. Water features were delineated and assessed based upon the appropriate procedures detailed below. Land uses observed within the Project survey area were assigned a general classification based upon the principal land characteristics and vegetative cover of the location.

2.1 WETLAND DELINEATION

The Project Survey Area was evaluated according to the procedures outlined in the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) *Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual* (Environmental Laboratory,

1987) and *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Midwest Region (Version 2.0)* (USACE, 2010).

During field survey activities, AECOM utilized the routine on-site delineation method described in the 1987 manual and supplement that consisted of a pedestrian site reconnaissance, including identifying the vegetative communities, soils identification, a geomorphologic assessment of hydrology, and notation of disturbance. If a wetland was identified, AECOM completed a USACE Wetland Determination Data Form (USACE Data Form) within each unique wetland habitat to serve as a representative of the wetland hydrology, vegetative community, and soil characteristics. Adjacent to each wetland complex, AECOM completed an additional USACE Data Form as a representative of the upland community.

2.1.1 WETLAND CLASSIFICATION

Wetlands identified in the field were classified based on the naming convention found in *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States* (Cowardin *et al.*, 1979). The unique wetland habitats were classified as palustrine emergent (PEM), palustrine forested (PFO), palustrine unconsolidated bottom (PUB), palustrine scrub-shrub (PSS), or other classifications for some wetlands. Multiple Cowardin classifications may be present where more than one classification's vegetation is dominant (vegetation type covers 30 percent or more of the substrate). Where multiple Cowardin classifications are present, the Cowardin classification of the plants that constitute the uppermost layer of vegetation having 30% or greater coverage is used for the classification.

2.1.2 WETLAND ASSESSMENT

Each delineated wetland was assessed following the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA) *Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands v. 5.0* (ORAM) (Mack, 2001). Wetland assessments utilized the 10-page ORAM form, providing a final Category rating for each wetland.

2.2 STREAM ASSESSMENT

Streams were identified by the presence of a defined bed and bank, and evidence of an ordinary high-water mark (OHWM). The USACE defines the OHWM as "that line on the shore established by the fluctuations of water 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, 2005).

2.2.1 OEPA PRIMARY HEADWATER HABITAT ASSESSMENT

Stream assessments were conducted using the methods described in the OEPA's *Methods for Assessing Habitat in Flowing Waters*: *Using OEPA's Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI)* (Rankin, 2006) and

in the OEPA's *Field Methods for Evaluating Primary Headwater Streams in Ohio* (OEPA, 2020). Streams associated with watershed area less than or equal to 1.0 square mile (259 hectares), and a maximum depth of water pools equal to or less than 15.75 inches were evaluated utilizing the Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index (HHEI) methodology and all other streams assessed using the QHEI methodology. Flow regime (ephemeral, intermittent, perennial) was determined by the appropriate stream assessment score per OEPA manuals (OEPA, 2020) and by AECOM's professional opinion.

Streams assessed in the Project Survey Area were reviewed for existing OEPA Aquatic Life Use Designations per OEPA's Water Quality Standards (OAC Chapter 3745-1). Those without an existing use designation were assigned a provisional aquatic life use designation based upon habitat assessment results (Rankin, 1989; OEPA, 2020).

2.2.2 OEPA 401 WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION FOR NATIONWIDE PERMIT ELIGIBILITY

The OEPA has designated each watershed in the state on based on whether it may be ineligible for coverage under the OEPA's 401 Water Quality Certification (WQC) for Nationwide Permits (OEPA, 2017). Mapping provided by the OEPA illustrates the eligibility of streams in the area to fall under a Nationwide Permit for 401 certification or if an individual state WQC needs to be applied for. Impacts to streams within each watershed would then have eligibility for 401 WQC determined by the watershed category. The three categories are defined as:

Eligible: Streams within the watershed are eligible for coverage under the OEPA's water quality certification for the Nationwide Permits if all other general and regional special terms and conditions are met.

Ineligible: Activities affecting high quality streams and undesignated streams draining directly to high quality streams, as represented in the map, must undergo an individual 401 Water Quality Certification review process.

Possibly Eligible: Additional field screening procedures are required for streams in the watershed to determine appropriate eligibility. Activities affecting undesignated streams within those HUC12 watersheds that do not directly but eventually drain into high quality waters, might be eligible for coverage under the OEPA's 401 Water Quality Certification for Nationwide Permits depending on the results of a field screening assessment. The procedures for determining individual stream eligibility in this scenario are specified in Appendix D "Stream Eligibility Determination Process" of the OEPA Ohio State Water Quality Certification of the 2017 Nationwide Permit Reauthorization.

2.2.3 UPLAND DRAINAGE FEATURES

An upland drainage feature (UDF) is a non-jurisdictional drainage that does not meet the criteria of either a jurisdictional stream or a wetland. A UDF generally lacks an OHWM (USACE, 2005) and are equivalent to

a swale or an erosional feature as described by the USACE: “generally shallow features in the landscape that may convey water across upland areas during and following storm events. Swales usually occur on nearly flat slopes and typically have grass or other low-lying vegetation throughout the swale” (USACE, 2005).

A roadside ditch may also be documented as a UDF if it meets the “not potentially jurisdictional” characterization as described in the Office of Environmental Services *Roadway Ditch Characterization Flowchart* (Ohio Department of Transportation, 2014). This would include a ditch that originates entirely within the roadway right-of-way, has a seasonal flow regime, was not constructed to drain a wetland, and does not have hydrophytic vegetation extending more than an insignificant amount beyond its original configuration.

In addition, UDF’s (including swales, ditches, and other erosional features) are generally not WOTUS except in certain circumstances, such as relocated streams.

2.3 RARE, THREATENED, AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

AECOM conducted a threatened and endangered species review and general field habitat surveys within the Project Survey Area. AECOM submitted requests to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) Office of Real Estate – Environmental Review Section and the USFWS Ohio Ecological Services Field Office soliciting comments on the proposed Project. Agency-identified species of concern and available species-specific information was reviewed to identify the various habitat types that listed species are known to inhabit.

AECOM field ecologists conducted a general habitat survey in conjunction with the stream and wetland field surveys as part of assessing potential impacts to threatened and endangered species. Land uses within the Project survey area were assigned a general classification based upon the principal land characteristics and vegetative cover as observed during the field surveys.

AECOM conducted a desktop assessment of the Project survey area and a quarter-mile buffer around it to identify potentially occurring winter bat hibernaculum that may be present near the Project which is in **Figure 6**. This assessment was conducted by reviewing data on mining activity and karst geology from the ODNR Division of Mineral Resources and USGS websites.

3.0 RESULTS

AECOM ecologists walked the Project survey area to conduct the wetland delineation, stream assessment and habitat survey on June 6 and 7, 14 to 16, 21 to 23, and 26 to 27, September 11 to 15, and 26, October 17 and 18, November 8, and December 1, 5, and 6, 2023. During the delineation within the Project survey area, AECOM delineated a total of 18 wetland complexes (five PEM, eight PFO, four PEM/PFO, and one

PFO/PSS), 13 streams (six perennial, five intermittent, and two ephemeral), and two ponds. The delineated features are discussed in detail in the following section.

3.1 WETLAND DELINEATION

3.1.1 PRELIMINARY SOILS EVALUATION

According to the USDA/NRCS Web Soil Survey, Delaware and Licking Counties have a total of five soil map units identified within the Project survey area for both counties. In Delaware County, one soil map unit was listed as a hydric soil and the rest were identified as containing hydric inclusions. Similarly, Licking County identified one soil map unit as a hydric soil and the rest as containing hydric inclusions. Soils indicated as hydric inclusions are not predominately hydric soils and hydric soils are more likely to be found in topographic settings. **Table 1** below provides a detailed overview of all soil series and soil map units present within the Project survey area. Soil map units located in the Project survey area and vicinity are shown on **Figure 2**.

TABLE 1: SOIL MAP UNITS AND DESCRIPTIONS WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA

Soil Series	Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Description	Topographic Setting	Hydric	Hydric Component (%)
Delaware County					
Bennington	BeA	Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Ground moraines, end moraines	Yes*	Condit 10% Pewamo, low carbonate till 8%
	BeB	Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	End moraines, ground moraines	Yes*	Condit 8% Pewamo, low carbonate till 8%
Centerburg	Cen1B1	Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Ground moraines, end moraines	Yes*	Condit 10% Marengo 8%
	Cen1C2	Centerburg silt loam, 6 to 12 percent slopes, eroded	End moraines, ground moraines	Yes*	Condit 7%
Pewamo	PwA	Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes	Drainageways on till plains, depressions on till plains	Yes	Pewamo 80%, Minster 9%
Licking County					
Bennington	BeA	Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Ground moraines, end moraines	Yes*	Condit 10% Pewamo, low carbonate till 8%
	BeB	Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	End moraines, ground moraines	Yes*	Pewamo, low carbonate till 8% Condit 8%
Centerburg	Cen1B1	Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes	Ground moraines, end moraines	Yes*	Condit 10% Marengo 8%
	Cen1C2	Centerburg silt loam, 6 to 12 percent slopes, eroded	End moraines, ground moraines	Yes*	Condit 7%
Pewamo	Pe	Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes	Drainageways, depressions	Yes	Pewamo-Low carbonate till 80%, Condit 12%

Yes* = Hydric inclusion present

3.1.2 NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP REVIEW

According to NWI data covering the Project location, the Project survey area contains 12 NWI wetlands. The locations of the NWI mapped wetlands in the Project vicinity are shown on **Figure 2**. A summary of NWI-mapped wetlands occurring in the Project survey area and the associated field identified resources is presented in **Table 2**.

TABLE 2: NWI DISPOSTION SUMMARY TABLE WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA

NWI Code	NWI Description	Related Field Inventoried Resource (Wetland ID/Stream ID)	Comments
PEM1C	Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Temporarily Flooded	W-MRK-001 PEM/PFO	Feature was field verified as PEM/PFO wetland.
PEM1C	Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Temporarily Flooded	W-MRK-016 PEM	Feature was field verified as PEM wetland.
PEM1C	Palustrine, Emergent, Persistent, Temporarily Flooded	W-MRK-022 PEM	Feature was field verified as PEM wetland.
PFO1C	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Seasonally Flooded	W-MRK-001 PEM/PFO	Feature was verified as PEM/PFO wetland.
PFO1C	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Seasonally Flooded	W-MRK-005 PFO	Feature was verified as PFO wetland
PFO1C	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Seasonally Flooded	W-MRK-013 PFO	Feature was verified as PFO wetland.
PFO1C	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Seasonally Flooded	W-MRK-017 PFO	Feature was verified as PFO wetland.
PFO1C	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Seasonally Flooded	W-MRK-020 PFO	Feature was verified as PFO wetland.
PFO1C	Palustrine, Forested, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Seasonally Flooded	W-MRK-030 PEM	Feature was verified as PEM wetland.
PSS1C	Palustrine, Scrub-Shrub, Broad-Leaved Deciduous, Seasonally Flooded	W-MRK-030 PEM	Feature was verified as PEM wetland.
PUBFx	Palustrine, Unconsolidated Bottom, Semi permanently Flooded, Excavated	P-MRK-004	Feature was field verified as a pond.
PUBGx	Palustrine, Unconsolidated Bottom, Intermittently Exposed, Excavated	P-MRK-003	Feature was field verified as a pond.

3.1.3 DELINEATED WETLANDS

During the field survey, AECOM identified 18 wetland complexes (five PEM, eight PFO, four PEM/PFO, and one PFO/PSS) within the Project survey area. Nine wetlands were assigned ORAM Category 1, and nine wetlands were assigned Category 2 wetlands within the Project survey area. No Category 3 wetlands were identified within the Project survey area. A summary of the delineated features is provided in **Table 3**. The AECOM delineation boundaries are provided on **Figure 3**.

AECOM has given all wetlands within the Project survey area a provisional determination of non-isolated. Final jurisdictional status can only be determined by the USACE, and AECOM assessments are provisional. The locations and approximate extent of the wetlands identified within the Project survey area is shown on **Figure 3**. The completed data forms and photographs of each wetland are provided in **Appendix A**.

TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF DELINEATED WETLANDS WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA

Wetland ID	Location		Isolated?	Habitat Type	Delineated Area (acre)	ORAM		Nearest Structure # (Existing / Proposed)	Existing Structure # in Wetland	Proposed Structure # in Wetland	Structure Installation Method	Proposed Impacts	
	Latitude	Longitude				Score	Category					Temporary Matting Area (acre)	Permanent Impact Area (acre)
W-CRW-001	40.224988	-82.850404	Yes	PEM	0.210	29	1	63	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-001	40.222487	-82.826070	No	PEM	0.356	39	2	58	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
	40.222258	-82.827372		PFO	3.988				None	58	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-002	40.222414	-82.824598	No	PEM	0.226	39	2	57	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
	40.222070	-82.824641		PFO	0.551				None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-004	40.148161	-82.748641	Yes	PFO	0.367	35	2	17	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-005	40.147472	-82.748273	Yes	PFO	0.034	35	2	17	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-006	40.128403	-82.725013	No	PEM	0.016	23	1	5	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-007	40.128079	-82.725113	No	PEM	0.516	35.5	2	5	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-011	40.187063	-82.776704	Yes	PEM	0.422	12	1	36	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-012	40.215830	-82.813053	Yes	PFO	0.540	26	1	52	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-013	40.214477	-82.813157	Yes	PFO	3.490	26	1	52	None	52	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-014	40.213258	-82.812144	Yes	PFO	0.261	26	1	51	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-016	40.132913	-82.744998	Yes	PEM	0.285	19	1	11	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
	40.132786	-82.745138		PFO	0.223				None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-017	40.140132	-82.749653	Yes	PFO	0.150	35	2	15	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-020	40.221870	-82.818920	Yes	PSS	1.120	31	2	55	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
	40.224070	-82.846010		PFO	0.737				None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-022	40.128340	-82.731160	No	PEM	0.679	15	1	62	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-030	40.192450	-82.781720	Yes	PEM	0.434	45	2	22	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
	40.161560	-82.748835		PFO	4.45				None	22	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-034	40.187063	-82.776704	No	PEM	0.06	14	1	7	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
W-MRK-035	40.215830	-82.813053	No	PFO	0.266	30	2	40	None	40	TBD	TBD	TBD
P-MRK-003	40.124774	-82.719418	No	N/A	0.129	N/A	N/A	2	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
P-MRK-004	40.127664	-82.723867	No	N/A	0.339	N/A	N/A	5	None	None	TBD	TBD	TBD
				Total:	**19.381**							**TBD**	**TBD**

3.2 STREAM DELINATION

During the field survey, AECOM delineated 13 streams (six perennial, five intermittent, and two ephemeral). Of these delineated streams, 7 streams were classified using HHEI evaluations that identified two streams as Class I PHW, three as Class II PHW, and two as Class III PHW as well as one stream was classified using QHEI evaluations with a Poor habitat rating. The remaining five streams had an existing OEPA Aquatic Life Use Designation of Warmwater Habitat (WWH) under Ohio Revised Code (ORC) Chapter 3745-1, which take precedent over any HHEI or QHEI evaluations.

AECOM has provided a provisional determination that all delineated streams within the Project survey area appear to be jurisdictional (i.e., WOTUS), based on their observed or presumed confluence with downstream waters. Final jurisdictional status can only be determined by the USACE, and AECOM assessments are provisional. A summary of the delineated features is provided in **Table 4**. Stream data forms and photographs of each delineated stream resource are provided in **Appendix B**.

TABLE 4: SUMMARY OF DELINEATED STREAMS WTIHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA

Stream ID	Location		Stream Type	Stream Name	Delineated Length (feet)	Bankfull Width (feet)	OHWM Width (feet)	Field Evaluation			Ohio EPA 401 Eligibility	Stream Crossing ?	Proposed Impacts	
	Latitude	Longitude						Method	Score	Category / Rating / OAC Designation			Fill Type	Area (acre)
S-CRW-001	40.22706	-82.85052	Intermittent	UNT to Big Walnut Creek	409	2.5	11	HHEI	75	Class III PHW	Eligible	TBD	TBD	TBD
S-MRK-001	40.22222	-82.82706	Ephemeral	UNT to Big Walnut Creek	218	2.5	1.75	HHEI	13	Class I PHW	Eligible	TBD	TBD	TBD
S-MRK-002	40.20528	-82.78772	Intermittent	UNT to Hoover Reservoir	1,865	6	2.5	HHEI	40	Class II PHW	Eligible	TBD	TBD	TBD
S-MRK-005	40.15291	-82.74847	Perennial	UNT to Duncan Run	990	16	9	QHEI	40	Poor	Eligible	TBD	TBD	TBD
S-MRK-006	40.12718	-82.71824	Intermittent	Kiber Run	469	8	3	CH 3745-1	N/A	Warmwater Habitat	Eligible	TBD	TBD	TBD
S-MRK-007	40.12840	-82.72470	Perennial	Kiber Run	1,327	10	6.5	CH 3745-1	N/A	Warmwater Habitat	Eligible	TBD	TBD	TBD
S-MRK-008	40.12808	-82.72432	Intermittent	UNT to Kiber Run	170	10	6.5	HHEI	37	Class II PHW	Eligible	TBD	TBD	TBD
S-MRK-009-x1	40.13005	-82.737656	Perennial	Duncan Run	1,200	6	11	CH 3745-1	N/A	Warmwater Habitat	Eligible	TBD	TBD	TBD
S-MRK-009-x2	40.128761	-82.731214	Perennial	Duncan Run	1,437	6	11	CH 3745-1	N/A	Warmwater Habitat	Eligible	TBD	TBD	TBD
S-MRK-015	40.20369	-82.77273	Perennial	Duncan Run	409	3.5	2	CH 3745-1	N/A	Warmwater Habitat	Eligible	TBD	TBD	TBD
S-MRK-016	40.13277	-82.74191	Ephemeral	UNT to Duncan Run	74	2	1	HHEI	10	Modified Class I	Eligible	TBD	TBD	TBD
S-MRK-017	40.13478	-82.74848	Intermittent	UNT to Duncan Run	1,395	2	1	HHEI	50	Modified Class II	Eligible	TBD	TBD	TBD
S-MRK-018	40.13621	-82.74888	Perennial	Duncan Run	841	15	6	CH 3745-1	N/A	Warmwater Habitat	Eligible	TBD	TBD	TBD
S-MRK-023	40.22408	-82.84764	Perennial	UNT to Big Walnut Creek	443	6	6	HHEI	55	Class III PHW	Eligible	TBD	TBD	TBD
				Total:	**11,247**									**TBD**

3.2.1 OEPA STREAM ELIGIBILITY

OEPA stream eligibility for 401 WQC mapping was reviewed for the Project survey area. The Project occurs across five watersheds, all of which were designated by 401 WQC eligibility as “eligible” as listed in **Table 5**. The OEPA stream eligibility mapping for the Project survey area is provided on **Figure 4**.

TABLE 5- SUMMARY OF WATERSHED 401 WQC ELIGIBILITY WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA

HUC-12	Watershed	401 WQC Eligibility	Number of Stream Assessments
050600011503	Prairie Run-Big Walnut Creek	Eligible	3
050600011308	Hoover Reservoir-Big Walnut Creek	Eligible	1
050600011303	Rattlesnake Creek	Eligible	0
050600011307	Duncan Run	Eligible	6
050400060301	Headwaters Raccoon Creek	Eligible	3
		Total	**13**

3.3 FEMA 100 YEAR FLOODPLAINS

Mapped FEMA designated 100-year floodplains and floodways are displayed on **Figure 2.** Regulated FEMA 100-year floodplains are located within the Project survey area, but no FEMA regulated floodways are located within the Project survey area (FEMA, 2023). The mapped 100-year floodplains within the Project survey areas are located between Structure 2 to 3, 4 to 11, and 13 to 14 as displayed on **Figure 2**.

3.4 PONDS

During the field survey, AECOM identified two ponds within the Project survey area. The extent of the ponds are displayed on **Figures 2 and 3**. Photographs of all delineated ponds are provided in **Appendix C**.

3.5 UPLAND DRAINAGE FEATURES

During the field survey, AECOM identified 15 upland drainage features within the Project survey area. The extent of the upland drainage features are displayed on **Figures 2 and 3**. Photographs of all delineated upland drainage features are provided in **Appendix D**.

3.6 VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES

AECOM ecologists conducted a general habitat survey in conjunction with the stream and wetland field surveys. As described in **Table 6** below, the Project survey area contained Agriculture Row-Crop, Woodlands, Pasture/Hay Fields, Streams/Wetlands, Urban, Old Field, Landscaped Areas, and Scrub-Shrub Habitat. Vegetative communities are depicted visually on aerial photography in **Figure 5**. Representative photographs of the vegetative communities in the Project survey area are provided as **Appendix E**.

TABLE 6 - VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA

Vegetative Community	Description	Approximate Acreage Within the Project Survey Area	Approximate Percentage Within the Project Survey Area
Agriculture Row-Crop	Agricultural lands being utilized for row-crop production and associated activities, typically devoid of vegetation outside of the target crop and opportunistic/invasive species.	342	77.20
Landscaped Areas	Landscaped areas, including residential properties and commercial properties, were observed within the Project vicinity. These landscaped areas within the Project survey area and adjacent areas are frequently mowed grasses and forbs.	9	2.03
Old Field	Herbaceous cover exists alongside roads, field borders, and abandoned fields within the survey area of the Project in the form of successional old-field communities. These communities are the earliest stages of recolonization by plants following disturbance. This community type is typically short-lived, giving way progressively to shrub and forest communities unless periodically re-disturbed, in which case they remain as old fields. The old-field areas within the study corridors and adjacent areas are infrequently mowed areas of grasses, forbs, and occasional shrubs.	13	2.93
Pasture/Hay Fields	Cattle and/or horse pasture, and hay fields, dominated by seasonally mowed and grazed areas of grasses and forbs.	16	3.61
Scrub-Shrub	Scrub-shrub habitats represent the successional stage between old-field and second growth forest, and often emerge in recently harvested forests responding to the lightness of the remaining canopy. Dominant species consist of herbaceous communities similar to that of old field habitat with 30% or greater coverage of woody species that are not trees (including sapling trees generally <3" dbh and <20' in height).	1	0.23
Streams/Wetlands	Streams and wetlands were observed both within and beyond the survey area for the Project.	20	4.51
Urban	Urban areas are areas developed with residential and commercial land uses, including roads, buildings and parking lots. These areas are generally devoid of significant woody and herbaceous vegetation.	8	1.81
Woodlands (Mixed-Deciduous)	Woodlands (floodplain, upland, successional-mixed, etc) are present along the Project survey area. Woody species dominating these areas included Box elder (Fraxinus pennsylvanica), and Red maple (*Acer rubrum*)	34	7.67
	Totals:	**443**	**100%**

3.7 RARE, THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES AGENCY COORDINATION

Protected Species Agency Consultation –

Initial coordination letters to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) were sent on September 8, 2023, and responses were received by the USFWS on September 11, 2023 and ODNR on October 13, 2023. Copies of the received USFWS and ODNR agency correspondence has been provided as **Appendix F**.

Regarding state and federal listed threatened and endangered species that may occur within the Project vicinity, a total of three species were identified by the USFWS and ten species were identified by the ODNR. Based on the review of these species and the habitat identified within the Project survey area, it is not anticipated that the Project would adversely affect any of the species or their habitats identified within **Table 7**.

Table 7 provides a list of species of concern identified by the agencies as potentially occurring within the vicinity of the Project. Photographs of the habitat within the Project survey area are provided as **Appendix E**.

TABLE 7
ODNR AND USFWS LISTED SPECIES WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA

Common Name (Scientific Name)	State Status	Federal Status	Typical Habitat	Habitat Observed	Avoidance Dates	Agency Comments	Potential Impacts
Mammals							
Indiana Bat (*Myotis sodalis*)	Endangered	Endangered	Summer habitat During spring/summer, this bat species roosts in trees behind loose, exfoliating bark, in crevices and cavities, or in leaves. Hibernaculum(a) During winter, this species hibernates in humid mines, caves, and occasionally man-made structures.	Summer habitat Within the Project survey forested woodlots will be impacted by the Project that contain suitable roosting trees. Hibernaculum(a) No mine openings and/or known caves are located within 0.25 miles of Project area and USFWS did not identify known hibernacula within 5-miles of the Project. However, one surface mine operation was identified within the Project area, which does not provide suitable hibernacula for the species. Field evaluations did not identify any potential hibernaculum(a) within the Project area (2023 Joint Guidance) *.	April 1 – September 30	Summer habitat ODNR and USFWS recommends adherence to Avoidance Dates for Tree Clearing Activities (April 1 – September 30). Hibernaculum(a) The ODNR DOW recommends a desktop habitat assessment to be conducted to identify potential hibernacula within 0.25 miles of the Project area. If habitat assessment finds potential hibernaculum within 0.25 miles, a revised seasonal tree clearing restriction (March 15 to November 15) is recommended (2023 Joint Guidance) *. If absence or no tree cutting or subsurface impacts are proposed, the Project is not likely to impact this species.	Summer habitat Potential summer roosting habitat is present within the Project area and seasonal tree clearing, between October 1 and March 31, is recommended. Hibernaculum(a) No impacts to winter hibernacula were identified due to absence of caves, mines, or portals within 0.25-miles of the Project.
Northern Long-eared Bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*)	Endangered	Endangered	Summer habitat During spring/summer, this bat species roosts in trees behind loose, exfoliating bark, in crevices and cavities, or in leaves. Hibernaculum(a) During winter, this species hibernates in humid mines, caves, and occasionally man-made structures.	Summer habitat Within the Project survey forested woodlots will be impacted by the Project that contain suitable roosting trees. Hibernaculum(a) No mine openings and/or known caves are located within 0.25 miles of Project area and USFWS did not identify known hibernacula within 5-miles of the Project. However, one surface mine operation was identified within the Project area, which does not provide suitable hibernacula for the species. Field evaluations did not identify any potential hibernaculum(a) within the Project area (2023 Joint Guidance) *.	April 1 – September 30	Summer habitat ODNR and USFWS recommends adherence to Avoidance Dates for Tree Clearing Activities (April 1 – September 30). Additionally, the ODNR indicated that there is a known presence of this species within the Project area and summer surveys would not constitute a presence or absence of this species. Hibernaculum(a) The ODNR DOW recommends a desktop habitat assessment to be conducted to identify potential hibernacula within 0.25 miles of the Project area. If habitat assessment finds potential hibernaculum within 0.25 miles, a revised seasonal tree clearing restriction (March 15 to November 15) is recommended (2023 Joint Guidance) *. If absence or no tree cutting or subsurface impacts are proposed, the Project is not likely to impact this species.	Summer habitat Potential summer roosting habitat is present within the Project area and seasonal tree clearing, between October 1 and March 31, is recommended. Additional summer surveys would not constitute presence/absence within the Project area for the Northern long eared bat. Hibernaculum(a) No impacts to winter hibernacula were identified due to absence of caves, mines, or portals within 0.25-miles of the Project.
Little brown bat (*Myotis lucifugus*)	Endangered	NA	Summer habitat During spring/summer, this bat species roosts in trees behind loose, exfoliating bark, in crevices and cavities, or in leaves. Hibernaculum(a) During winter, this species hibernates in humid mines, caves, and occasionally man-made structures.	Summer habitat Within the Project survey forested woodlots will be impacted by the Project that contain suitable roosting trees. Hibernaculum(a) No mine openings and/or known caves are located within 0.25 miles of Project area and USFWS did not identify known hibernacula within 5-miles of the Project. However, one surface mine operation was identified within the Project area, which does not provide suitable hibernacula for the species. Field evaluations did not identify any potential hibernaculum(a) within the Project area (2023 Joint Guidance) *.	April 1 – September 30	Summer habitat ODNR and USFWS recommends adherence to Avoidance Dates for Tree Clearing Activities (April 1 – September 30). Hibernaculum(a) The ODNR DOW recommends a desktop habitat assessment to be conducted to identify potential hibernacula within 0.25 miles of the Project area. If habitat assessment finds potential hibernaculum within 0.25 miles, a revised seasonal tree clearing restriction (March 15 to November 15) is recommended (2023 Joint Guidance) *. If absence or no tree cutting or subsurface impacts are proposed, the Project is not likely to impact this species.	Summer habitat Potential summer roosting habitat is present within the Project area and seasonal tree clearing, between October 1 and March 31, is recommended. Hibernaculum(a) No impacts to winter hibernacula were identified due to absence of caves, mines, or portals within 0.25-miles of the Project.

TABLE 7
ODNR AND USFWS LISTED SPECIES WITHIN THE PROJECT SURVEY AREA

Common Name (Scientific Name)	State Status	Federal Status	Typical Habitat	Habitat Observed	Avoidance Dates	Agency Comments	Potential Impacts
Tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*)	Endangered	Proposed	Summer habitat During spring/summer, this bat species roosts in trees behind loose, exfoliating bark, in crevices and cavities, or in leaves. Hibernaculum(a) During winter, this species hibernates in humid mines, caves, and occasionally man-made structures.	Summer habitat Within the Project survey forested woodlots will be impacted by the Project that contain suitable roosting trees. Hibernaculum(a) No mine openings and/or known caves are located within 0.25 miles of Project area and USFWS did not identify known hibernacula within 5-miles of the Project. However, one surface mine operation was identified within the Project area, which does not provide suitable hibernacula for the species. Field evaluations did not identify any potential hibernaculum(a) within the Project area (2023 Joint Guidance) *.	April 1 – September 30	Summer habitat ODNR and USFWS recommends adherence to Avoidance Dates for Tree Clearing Activities (April 1 – September 30). Hibernaculum(a) The ODNR DOW recommends a desktop habitat assessment to be conducted to identify potential hibernacula within 0.25 miles of the Project area. If habitat assessment finds potential hibernaculum within 0.25 miles, a revised seasonal tree clearing restriction (March 15 to November 15) is recommended (2023 Joint Guidance) *. If absence or no tree cutting or subsurface impacts are proposed, the Project is not likely to impact this species.	Summer habitat Potential summer roosting habitat is present within the Project area and seasonal tree clearing, between October 1 and March 31, is recommended. Hibernaculum(a) No impacts to winter hibernacula were identified due to absence of caves, mines, or portals within 0.25-miles of the Project.
Mussels							
Pondhorn (*Uniomerus tetralasmus*)	Threatened	None	Perennial Streams	Perennial streams present.	March 15 through June 30	The DOW recommends no in-water work in perennial streams from March 15 through June 30 to reduce impacts to indigenous aquatic species and their habitat. If no in-water work is proposed in a perennial stream, this Project is not likely to impact aquatic species.	No in-stream work is anticipated to be required for the Project.
Rabbitsfoot (*Quadrula cylindrica cylindrica*)	Threatened	Threatened	Perennial Streams	Perennial streams present.	March 15 through June 30	The DOW recommends no in-water work in perennial streams from March 15 through June 30 to reduce impacts to indigenous aquatic species and their habitat. If no in-water work is proposed in a perennial stream, this Project is not likely to impact aquatic species.	No in-stream work is anticipated to be required for the Project.
Rayed bean (*Villosa fabalis*)	Endangered	Endangered	Perennial Streams	Perennial streams present.	March 15 through June 30	The DOW recommends no in-water work in perennial streams from March 15 through June 30 to reduce impacts to indigenous aquatic species and their habitat. If no in-water work is proposed in a perennial stream, this Project is not likely to impact aquatic species.	No in-stream work is anticipated to be required for the Project.
Salamander mussel (*Simpsonaias ambigua*)	Threatened	None	Perennial Streams	Perennial streams present.	March 15 through June 30	The DOW recommends no in-water work in perennial streams from March 15 through June 30 to reduce impacts to indigenous aquatic species and their habitat. If no in-water work is proposed in a perennial stream, this Project is not likely to impact aquatic species.	No in-stream work is anticipated to be required for the Project.
Snuffbox (*Epioblasma triquetra*)	Endangered	Endangered	Perennial Streams	Perennial streams present.	March 15 through June 30	The DOW recommends no in-water work in perennial streams from March 15 through June 30 to reduce impacts to indigenous aquatic species and their habitat. If no in-water work is proposed in a perennial stream, this Project is not likely to impact aquatic species.	No in-stream work is anticipated to be required for the Project.
Birds							
Northern harrier (*Circus hudsonius*)	Endangered	None	This species hunts over grasslands and nests can be found in large marshes and grasslands.	Several old field and/or pasture/hay fields > 2 acres in size were identified within the survey area.	April 15 to July 31	Habitat should be avoided during the bird's nesting period between April 15 through July 31. If habitat will not be impacted, this Project will not likely impact species.	No

Protected Species Agency Summary

Based on general observations during the ecological field survey, forested areas were identified within the Project survey area and tree clearing is proposed as part of the Project. The ODNR and the USFWS recommend implementations of seasonal tree clearing between October 1 and March 31 to avoid adverse effects to Indiana bat, northern long-eared bat, little brown bat, and tricolored bat. ODNR confirmed a known presence in the vicinity of the Project area for the northern long-eared bat. If trees must be cut during the summer months, the ODNR recommends that a mist net survey could be completed for the Indiana bat, little brown bat, and the tricolored bat between June 1 and August 15. However, additional summer surveys would not constitute presence/absence within the Project survey area for the northern long-eared bat. If summer tree clearing is needed, additional coordination would be completed with ODNR and the USFWS.

AECOM completed a desktop review for potential hibernaculum in accordance with the 2023 Ohio ODNR DOW and USFWS Joint Guidance for Bat Surveys and Tree Clearing within 0.25-mile of the Project survey area (**Figure 6**). No caves, and/or karst features were identified within a 0.25-miles radius of the Project Area that are anticipated to provide suitable hibernacula for cave-dwelling bats. However, a surface industrials mineral mine operation was within 0.25-mile of the Project survey area (**Figure 6**), based on the available desktop resources, this does not indicate an area which is anticipated to provide suitable hibernacula for cave-dwelling bats. As per ODNR and USFWS guidance, further coordination regarding potential hibernaculum is only necessary if the habitat assessment find potential habitat within 0.25-mile of the Project survey area. Therefore, no further coordination was necessary with either the ODNR and/or USFWS regarding the listed bat species for hibernacula; however, coordination with the ODNR and the USFWS will be necessary for tree clearing outside of the seasonal restriction.

No impacts are anticipated for the mussel species as no in-water work is proposed as part of the Project.

The ODNR has provided guidance that open grasslands and wet meadow marshes of approximately 2 acres should be considered potential nesting habitat for the northern harrier. While the general Project survey area is heavily dominated by agricultural land with interspersed woodlands and residential properties, two old field habitats were identified that warranted further investigations. Based on field and desktop review, the two areas (Vassell Station to Structure 62 and Structure 50 to 51) were identified as large fields that meet the ODNR requirement for size but had limiting factors that would exclude these areas from consideration of potential habitat. For Vassell Station to Structure 62, the area was intermixed with saplings or other woody shrub vegetation that wouldn't permit open flyways or nesting opportunities for the species due to fragmentation of the habitat that promotes predations or the "edge effect". Similar, the open field north of Structure 50 to 51 is enclosed by forested areas and appears to be maintained field from mowing and/or livestock grazing that would not provide suitable vegetation height to support nesting

opportunities for the species. Therefore, no further coordination regarding this listed species is necessary concerning this Project.

4.0 SUMMARY

The ecological field survey of the Project survey area identified a total of 18 wetland complexes (five PEM, eight PFO, four PEM/PFO, and one PFO/PSS). Of the 18 wetlands identified within the Project survey area, nine Category 1 wetlands and nine Category 2 wetlands were identified, boundaries of which are provided on **Figure 3**. Of the 13 streams identified within the Project survey area, 7 streams were classified using HHEI evaluations that identified two streams as Class I PHW, three as Class II PHW, and two as Class III PHW as well as one stream was classified using QHEI evaluations with a Poor habitat rating. The remaining five streams had an existing OEPA Aquatic Life Use Designation of Warmwater Habitat (WWH) under Ohio Revised Code (ORC) Chapter 3745-1, which take precedent over any HHEI or QHEI evaluations.

AECOM has preliminary determined that the assessed streams within the Project survey area appear to be jurisdictional (i.e., WOTUS). The reported results of the ecological survey conducted by AECOM on this Project are limited to the areas within the Project survey area provided on **Figure 3**. Areas that fall outside of the Project survey area were not evaluated in the field and are not included in the reporting of this survey.

Of the ten state and/or federal listed threatened or endangered species within range of the Project survey area, no habitat for any of the listed aquatic or bird species were identified within the Project survey area. However, four bat species were identified as having potential summer roosting habitat and no hibernacula within the Project survey area. If tree clearing cannot be completed during the seasonal tree clearing restriction (October 1 to March 31), further coordination with the ODNR/USFWS is warranted. Additionally, the northern long-eared bat was identified as a known occurrence and additional summary surveys would not constitute a presence/absence for this species.

The field survey results presented herein apply to the existing and reasonably foreseeable site conditions at the time of our assessment. They cannot apply to site changes of which AECOM is unaware and has not had the opportunity to review. Changes in the condition of a property may occur with time due to natural processes or human impacts at the Project site or on adjacent properties. Changes in applicable standards may also occur as a result of legislation or the expansion of knowledge over time. Accordingly, the findings of this report may be invalidated, wholly or in part, by changes beyond the control of AECOM.

5.0 REFERENCES

Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. *Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States.* Office of Biological Services, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.

Environmental Laboratory. 1987. *United States. Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual.* Technical Report Y-87-1, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station: Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Federal Emergency Management Agency. 2008. National Flood Hazard Layer, Delaware & Licking County, Ohio. https://msc.fema.gov/portal Published July 17, 2008.

Mack, John J. 2001. *Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands v. 5.0, User's Manual and Scoring Forms. OEPA Technical Report WET/2001-1*. Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetland Ecology Unit, Columbus, Ohio.

Ohio Department of Transportation. 2014. Roadway Ditch Characterization Flowchart. From: Ecological Manual, April 2014. Office of Environmental Services.

Ohio Division of Wildlife and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) (OH-Field Office). 2023. Joint Guidance for Bat Surveys and Tree Clearing. Published May 2023.

Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA). 2017. Section 401 Water Quality Certification for the 2017 Nationwide Permits. Appendix D Stream Eligibility Determination Process. Effective March 17, 2017. Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, Division of Surface Water, 401 Water Quality Certification and Isolated Wetland Permitting Section, Columbus, Ohio.

OEPA. 2017. 401 Water Quality Certification for the Nationwide Permits Stream Eligibility Web Map (2017 Reissuance). https://data-oepa.opendata.arcgis.com/datasets/401-water-quality-certification-for-nationwide-permits

OEPA. 2020. *Field Methods for Evaluating Primary Headwater Streams in Ohio*. Version 4.1. Ohio EPA Division of Surface Water, Columbus, Ohio. May 2020. 130 pp.

Rankin, Edward T. 1989. T*he Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI*): *Rationale, Methods, and Application*. Ohio EPA Ecological Assessment Section, Division of Surface Water, Columbus, Ohio.

Rankin, Edward T. 2006. *Methods for Assessing Habitat in Flowing Waters: Using the Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index (QHEI)*. OEPA Ecological Assessment Section, Division of Surface Water, Columbus, Ohio.

United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2005. Regulatory Guidance Letter No. 05-05: Guidance on Ordinary High Water Mark Identification.

USACE. 2010. *Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Midwest (Version 2.0)*, ed. J. S. Wakeley, R. W. Lichvar, J. F. Berkowitz, and C. V. Noble. ERDC/EL TR-10-16. Vicksburg, MS: U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center.

USACE. 2020. *National Wetland Plant List*, version 3.5. Engineer Research and Development Center. Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory, Hanover, NH. http://wetland_plants.usace.army.mil/

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). 2023a. National Hydric Soils List. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/use/hydric/. Accessed December 2023.

USDA, NRCS. 2023b. Web Soil Survey (GIS Shapefile). http://websoilsurvey.sc.egov.usda.gov/App/HomePage.htm. Accessed December 2023.

USFWS. 2023. National Wetlands Inventory Geodatabase for Ohio. Available online at http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html. Accessed August 2023.

United States Geological Survey. 2016. National Hydrography Dataset, Ohio Statewide Geodatabase. Published August 2016. Earth Science Information Center, USGS, Reston, VA.

BERKSHIRE TOWNSHIP

TRENTON TOWNSHIP

HARTFORD TOWNSHIP

Galena

Sunbury

Johnstown

DELAWARE COUNTY

LICKING COUNTY

GENOA TOWNSHIP

HARLEM TOWNSHIP

MONROE TOWNSHIP

DELAWARE COUNTY

FRANKLIN COUNTY

BLENDON TOWNSHIP

New Albany

PLAIN TOWNSHIP

JERSEY TOWNSHIP

Jersey

Northeast Columbus

40.22837
-82.852709
Vassell Station

40.121519
-82.719497
Proposed Station



Legend

- Station
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Ohio USGS 7.5' Topographic Quadrangle
- Township Boundary
- County Boundary

3

0 0.5 1 2

Miles

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 1
PROJECT OVERVIEW

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 1 MILE
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig1.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Delineated Intermittent Stream
- Delineated Perennial Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Delineated PEM Wetland
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Cen1B1 - Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Cen1C2 - Centerburg silt loam, 6 to 12 percent slopes, eroded

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 1 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Project Survey Area
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

Cen1B1 - Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 2 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Delineated PEM Wetland
- Delineated PFO Wetland
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

Cen1B1 - Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 3 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Ephemeral Stream
- Delineated PEM Wetland
- Delineated PFO Wetland
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 4 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Delineated PFO Wetland
- Delineated PSS Wetland
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- NFHL 100-Year Floodplain (FEMA)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 5 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Delineated PFO Wetland
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 6 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\v2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated PFO Wetland
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 7 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\IDCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 8 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Upland Data Point
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 9 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Delineated Intermittent Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Project Survey Area
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 10 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Upland Data Point
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Project Survey Area
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 11 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_RouteVassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Delineated PFO Wetland
- Project Survey Area
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 12 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Delineated PEM Wetland
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 13 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DC\SIG\SIArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 14 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DC\SIG\SIVArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- NHD Waterbody (USGS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 15 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DC\SG\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- NHD Waterbody (USGS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 16 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Upland Data Point
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 17 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Cen1B1 - Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Pe - Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes

PwA - Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 18 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated PEM Wetland
- Delineated PFO Wetland
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Cen1B1 - Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Pe - Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 19 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\Vassell\GreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Pe - Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 20 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Delineated Perennial Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Cen1B1 - Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Pe - Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 21 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Delineated PFO Wetland
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Cen1B1 - Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Pe - Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 22 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DC\SGIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Delineated PFO Wetland
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- NFHL 100-Year Floodplain (FEMA)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Cen1B1 - Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Pe - Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 23 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Intermittent Stream
- Delineated Perennial Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Project Survey Area
- NFHL 100-Year Floodplain (FEMA)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Cen1B1 - Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Pe - Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 24 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Intermittent Stream
- Delineated Perennial Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Delineated PEM Wetland
- Delineated PFO Wetland
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- NFHL 100-Year Floodplain (FEMA)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Cen1B1 - Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Pe - Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 25 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Delineated Ephemeral Stream
- Delineated Perennial Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- NHD Waterbody (USGS)
- NFHL 100-Year Floodplain (FEMA)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Cen1C2 - Centerburg silt loam, 6 to 12 percent slopes, eroded

Pe - Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 26 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\l2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Perennial Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Delineated PEM Wetland
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- NFHL 100-Year Floodplain (FEMA)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Pe - Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 27 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DC\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Delineated Intermittent Stream
- Delineated Perennial Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Delineated PEM Wetland
- Delineated PFO Wetland
- Delineated Pond
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- NFHL 100-Year Floodplain (FEMA)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Cen1B1 - Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Pe - Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 28 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Delineated Pond
- Project Survey Area
- NWI Wetland (USFWS)
- HUC 12 (USGS)
- SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)
- Hydric SSURGO Soil Map Unit (NRCS)

Soil Map Unit Description

BeA - Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

BeB - Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Cen1B1 - Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes

Pe - Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 2
SHEET 29 OF 29
SOIL MAP AND
NATIONAL WETLANDS INVENTORY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DC\SGIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig2.mxd

Case No. 24-1043-EL-BLN

Part 3 of 7





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Delineated Intermittent Stream
- Delineated Perennial Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)
- Delineated PEM Wetland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 1 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\IDCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 2 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)
- Delineated PEM Wetland
- Delineated PFO Wetland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 3 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Ephemeral Stream
- Contour (5-Ft)
- Delineated PEM Wetland
- Delineated PFO Wetland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 4 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\Vassell_GreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)
- Delineated PFO Wetland
- Delineated PSS Wetland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 5 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\Vassell_GreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)
- Delineated PFO Wetland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 6 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Contour (5-Ft)
- Delineated PFO Wetland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 7 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Contour (5-Ft)

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 8 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Upland Data Point
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 9 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Project Survey Area
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Delineated Intermittent Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 10 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Upland Data Point
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 11 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DC\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Project Survey Area
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Contour (5-Ft)
- Delineated PFO Wetland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 12 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Project Survey Area
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Contour (5-Ft)
- Delineated PEM Wetland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 13 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Contour (5-Ft)

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 14 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Contour (5-Ft)

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 15 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Contour (5-Ft)

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 16 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Upland Data Point
- Project Survey Area
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Contour (5-Ft)

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 17 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Contour (5-Ft)

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 18 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DC\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Contour (5-Ft)
- Delineated PEM Wetland
- Delineated PFO Wetland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 19 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 20 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\IDCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Delineated Perennial Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 21 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)
- Delineated PFO Wetland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 22 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)
- Delineated PFO Wetland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 23 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Intermittent Stream
- Delineated Perennial Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 24 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Intermittent Stream
- Delineated Perennial Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)
- Delineated PEM Wetland
- Delineated PFO Wetland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 25 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Delineated Ephemeral Stream
- Delineated Perennial Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 26 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Perennial Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)
- Delineated PEM Wetland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 27 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND
STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\Vassell_GreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd





Legend

- Structure
- Wetland Data Point
- Upland Data Point
- Project Survey Area
- Culvert
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Delineated Upland Drainage Feature
- Delineated Intermittent Stream
- Delineated Perennial Stream
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)
- Delineated PEM Wetland
- Delineated PFO Wetland
- Delineated Pond

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 28 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd



Legend

- Structure
- Project Survey Area
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Contour (5-Ft)
- Delineated Pond

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 3
SHEET 29 OF 29
WETLAND DELINEATION AND STREAM ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig3.mxd

OEPA EPA 401 Eligible Little Walnut Creek 050600011305

Prairie Run

OEPA EPA 401 Eligible Perfect Creek-Big Walnut Creek 050600011304

OEPA EPA 401 Eligible Perfect Creek-Big Walnut Creek 050600011304

North Fork Rattlesnake Creek

North Fork Rattlesnake Creek

North Fork Rattlesnake Creek

OEPA EPA 401 Eligible Otter Fork Licking River 050400060101

Little Walnut Creek

Vassell Station
40.22837
-82.852709

Rattlesnake Creek

Otter Fork Licking River

East Fork Rattlesnake Creek

OEPA EPA 401 Eligible Rattlesnake Creek 050600011303

South Fork Rattlesnake Creek

OEPA EPA 401 Eligible Prairie Run-Big Walnut Creek 050600011306

Lobdell Creek

OEPA EPA 401 Eligible Hoover Reservoir-Big Walnut Creek 050600011308

OEPA EPA 401 Eligible Lobdell Creek 050400060302

Big Walnut Creek

Raccoon Creek

OEPA EPA 401 Eligible Bliss Run-Alum Creek 050600011602

OEPA EPA 401 Eligible Duncan Run 050600011307

OEPA EPA 401 Eligible Headwaters Raccoon Creek 050400060301

Duncan Run

Kiber Run

OEPA EPA 401 Possibly Eligible Rocky Fork Creek 050600011501

Rocky Fork Creek

Schleppi Run

Bevelheimer Ditch

OEPA EPA 401 Possibly Eligible Headwaters Blacklick Creek 050600011503

Proposed Station
40.121519
-82.719497

Sugar Run

Blacklick Creek

OEPA EPA 401 Possibly Eligible City of Gahanna-Big Walnut Creek 050600011502

Cornell Run

Cornell Run



Legend

- Station
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- NHD Stream (USGS)
- Project Survey Area

OEPA Eligibility:

- Eligible
- Possibly Eligible

3

0 0.5 1 2

Miles

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 4
STREAM ELIGIBILTY MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 1 MILE
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\Vassell_GreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig4.mxd

Vassell Station
PH-1
PH-2
PH-3
PH-4
PH-5



Legend

-) Station
- (Photo Location
- Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Old Field
- Wetlands/Streams/Ponds
- Urban
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 1 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

(Photo Location

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

Agricultural Row-Crop

Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 2 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

(Photo Location

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

Agricultural Row-Crop

Wetlands/Streams/Ponds

Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 3 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

(Photo Location

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Old Field
- Wetlands/Streams/Ponds
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 4 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

(Photo Location

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Old Field
- Wetlands/Streams/Ponds
- Urban
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 5 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DC\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VasselIGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

(Photo Location

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Wetlands/Streams/Ponds
- Urban
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 6 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES
ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\IDCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

- Photo Location
- Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Pasture/Hay Fields
- Wetlands/Streams/Ponds
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 7 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd

Legend

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

Agricultural Row-Crop

Urban

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 8 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES
ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

(Photo Location

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

Agricultural Row-Crop

Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 9 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES
ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

(Photo Location

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Wetlands/Streams/Ponds
- Urban
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 10 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

(Photo Location

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

Agricultural Row-Crop

Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 11 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES
ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

(Photo Location

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

Agricultural Row-Crop

Wetlands/Streams/Ponds

Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 12 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd





Legend

- (Photo Location
- Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Landscaped
- Old Field
- Pasture/Hay Fields
- Wetlands/Streams/Ponds
- Urban
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 13 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

(Photo Location

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

Agricultural Row-Crop

Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 14 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_RouteVassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

- (Photo Location
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Scrub/Shrub
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 15 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DC\SI\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd





Legend

(Photo Location

Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Scrub/Shrub
- Urban
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 16 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

- Photo Location
- Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Landscaped
- Old Field
- Urban
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 17 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd

Case No. 24-1043-EL-BLN

Part 4 of 7





Legend

(Photo Location

Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Landscaped
- Old Field
- Urban

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 18 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DC\SIG\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd





Legend

- (Photo Location
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Wetlands/Streams/Ponds
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 19 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd

Legend

(Photo Location

Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

Agricultural Row-Crop

Urban

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 20 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

- (Photo Location
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Wetlands/Streams/Ponds
- Urban
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 21 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\IDCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd





Legend

(Photo Location

Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

Agricultural Row-Crop

Wetlands/Streams/Ponds

Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 22 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

(Photo Location

Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

Agricultural Row-Crop

Wetlands/Streams/Ponds

Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 23 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd





Legend

(Photo Location

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

Agricultural Row-Crop

Wetlands/Streams/Ponds

Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 24 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd



Legend

- Photo Location
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Pasture/Hay Fields
- Wetlands/Streams/Ponds
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 25 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd





Legend

- (Photo Location
- Area Not Surveyed due to Landowner Permissions
- Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Pasture/Hay Fields
- Wetlands/Streams/Ponds
- Urban
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 26 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd





Legend

(Photo Location

Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Old Field
- Wetlands/Streams/Ponds
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 27 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd





Legend

- Photo Location
- Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Agricultural Row-Crop
- Landscaped
- Pasture/Hay Fields
- Scrub/Shrub
- Wetlands/Streams/Ponds
- Urban
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 28 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd





Legend

-) Station
- (Photo Location
- Project Survey Area

Vegetative Communities Type

- Landscaped
- Old Field
- Pasture/Hay Fields
- Scrub/Shrub
- Wetlands/Streams/Ponds
- Urban
- Woodland

3

0 100 200 400

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 5
SHEET 29 OF 29
VEGETATIVE COMMUNITIES ASSESSMENT MAP

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 200 FEET
CREATED BY: NB	CHECKED BY: BG
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VassellGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig5.mxd

No karst features and/ or sinkholes are within the extent of the map frame.

Existing
Vassell Station
40.22837, -82.852709

BERKSHIRE TOWNSHIP

TRENTON TOWNSHIP

Sunbury

GENOA TOWNSHIP

HARLEM TOWNSHIP



Legend

- Station
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Quarter Mile Review Area
- Mine - Bedrock Geologic Maps
- Surface Industrial Minerals Mine Operation
- Ohio USGS 7.5' Topographic Quadrangle
- Township Boundary
- County Boundary

3

0 2,000 4,000
Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 6
SHEET 1 OF 3
DESKTOP ASSESSMENT
FOR WINTER BAT HABITAT

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 2,000 FEET
CREATED BY: NAB	CHECKED BY: AF
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VasselGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig6.mxd

No mining features and/or sinkholes are within the extent of the map frame.

HARLEM TOWNSHIP

MONROE TOWNSHIP

Sunbury

Johnstown

DELAWARE COUNTY

LICKING COUNTY



Legend

- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Quarter Mile Review Area
- Karst - Suspect-Field Visited
- Ohio USGS 7.5' Topographic Quadrangle
- Township Boundary
- County Boundary

3

0 2,000 4,000

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 6
SHEET 2 OF 3
DESKTOP ASSESSMENT
FOR WINTER BAT HABITAT

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 2,000 FEET
CREATED BY: NAB	CHECKED BY: AF
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VasselGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig6.mxd

No mining features and/or sinkholes are within the extent of the map frame.

Sunbury

HARLEM TOWNSHIP

DELAWARE COUNTY

LICKING COUNTY

MONROE TOWNSHIP

Johnstown

DELAWARE COUNTY

FRANKLIN COUNTY

PLAIN TOWNSHIP

New Albany

FRANKLIN COUNTY

LICKING COUNTY

JERSEY TOWNSHIP

Jersey

Proposed Station
40.121519,
-82.719497



Legend

- Station
- Vassell - Green Chapel North Route
- Quarter Mile Review Area
- Karst - Field Verified
- Ohio USGS 7.5' Topographic Quadrangle
- Township Boundary
- County Boundary

3

0 2,000 4,000

Feet

AEP OHIO TRANSMISSION COMPANY

Vassell - Green Chapel North Project

FIGURE 6
SHEET 3 OF 3
DESKTOP ASSESSMENT
FOR WINTER BAT HABITAT

DATE: 12/14/2023	1 INCH = 2,000 FEET
CREATED BY: NAB	CHECKED BY: AF
JOB NO.: 60702685	AECOM

Date Saved: 12/14/2023
Document Path: X:\DCS\GIS\ArcMap_GeoDB_Projects\ENV\60702685_AEP_Vassel_GreenChapel_North\2_MXDs\1_WDR\0_North_Route\VasselGreenChapel_North_WDR_Fig6.mxd

APPENDIX A

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS WETLAND DATA FORMS

AND REPRESENTATIVE PHOTOGRAPHS

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 07-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-CRW-001 PEM**

Investigator(s): C.R.Wyse | Section, Township, Range: S | T 4N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 0.0% / 0.0 ° | Lat.: 40.224988 | Long.: -82.850404 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Cen1B1: Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes | NWI classification: N/A

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☑ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ○ No ◉

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
PEM wetland, W-CRW-001, is located between a constructed hill and an upland woods fence row. Deineated by topo and veg. Soils may be disturbed.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	0
	0	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Carex vulpinoidea	20	☑ 27.0%	FACW
2. Scirpus pendulus	15	☑ 20.3%	OBL
3. Poa pratensis	15	☑ 20.3%	FAC
4. Carex stricta	10	☐ 13.5%	OBL
5. Toxicodendron radicans	5	☐ 6.8%	FAC
6. Solidago canadensis	5	☐ 6.8%	FACU
7. Agrimonia eupatoria	3	☐ 4.1%	UPL
8. Acer negundo	1	☑ 1.4%	FAC
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	FAC
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	74	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 4 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 4 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	25	x 1 =	25
FACW species	20	x 2 =	40
FAC species	36	x 3 =	108
FACU species	5	x 4 =	20
UPL species	3	x 5 =	15
Column Totals:	89 (A)		208 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.337

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
See Appendix for the Wetland Delineation Report for representative photographs of the habitat and soil profile.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-CRW-001 PEM**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)	Matrix %	Redox Features Color (moist)	Redox Features %	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-8	10YR 5/3	90	10YR 6/6	10	C	PL	Clay	silty clay
								hard soils prevented examination beyond 8 inches

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☑ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

Hard gravel layer at 8 inches

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☑ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

Source of hydrology was identified as precipitation.Indicatiors included geomorphic position as well as water stained leaves.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 07-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-CRW-001-002-UPL**

Investigator(s): C.R.Wyse | Section, Township, Range: S | T 4N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): flat

Slope: 10.0% / 5.7 ° | Lat.: 40.225237 | Long.: -82.850372 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: BeA, Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: N/A

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐, Soil ☑, or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐, Soil ☐, or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ○ No ◉
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	

Remarks:
Upland point taken upslope on what appears to be constructed berm between delineated W-CRW-001 and W-CRW-002.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	0
	0	= Total Cover		

Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		

Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1. Melilotus officinalis	35	☑	28.0%	FACU
2. Solidago canadensis	30	☑	24.0%	FACU
3. Tridens flavus	25	☑	20.0%	UPL
4. Poa pratensis	15	☐	12.0%	FAC
5. Trifolium pratense	10	☐	8.0%	FACU
6. Heracleum mantegazzianum	5	☐	4.0%	FAC
7.	5	☐	4.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	125	= Total Cover		

Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 3 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	0	x 2 =	0
FAC species	20	x 3 =	60
FACU species	75	x 4 =	300
UPL species	25	x 5 =	125
Column Totals:	120 (A)		485 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 4.042

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☐ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☐ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic veg indicators not met. Photos=5412-5416

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-CRW-001-002-UPL**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)	Matrix %	Redox Features Color (moist)	Redox Features %	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-7	10YR 4/4	90	10YR 5/6	10	C	M	Silty Clay	
7-10	10YR 5/6	75	10YR 4/4	25			Silty Clay	Mixed matrix

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks:

Very dry, could be fill dirt

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

No hydrology present, source=precip

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 14-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-001 PEM**

Investigator(s): MRK, AJH | Section, Township, Range: S | T 4N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.222487 | Long.: -82.82607 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: PEM1C

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
PEM section of a PEM/PFO wetland located within a large depression collecting surface runoff and seasonal flooding. Signs of standing water were observed throughout the wetland. Wetland continues outside current study area.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	0
	0	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Carex vulpinoidea	75	☑ 45.5%	FACW
2. Toxicodendron radicans	20	☑ 12.1%	FAC
3. Microstegium vimineum	20	☑ 12.1%	FAC
4. Panicum virgatum	15	☐ 9.1%	FAC
5. Juncus effusus	15	☐ 9.1%	OBL
6. Typha angustifolia	10	☐ 6.1%	OBL
7. Solidago rugosa	10	☐ 6.1%	FAC
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	165	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 3 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 3 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	25	x 1 =	25
FACW species	75	x 2 =	150
FAC species	65	x 3 =	195
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	165 (A)		370 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.242

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

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

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-001 PEM**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR	3/1	80	10YR	4/6	20	C	M	Silt Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☑ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☑ High Water Table (A2)
- ☑ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☑ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ◉ No ○ Depth (inches): 4

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ◉ No ○ Depth (inches): 2

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff and seasonal flooding.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 14-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-001 PFO**

Investigator(s): MRK, AJH | Section, Township, Range: S | T 4N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.222258 | Long.: -82.827372 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes | NWI classification: PFO1C

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
PFO section of a PEM/PFO wetland located within a large depression collecting surface runoff and seasonal flooding. Signs of standing water were observed throughout the wetland. Wetland continues outside current study area.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1. Acer rubrum	30	☑	50.0%	FAC
2. Acer negundo	20	☑	33.3%	FAC
3. Quercus palustris	10	☐	16.7%	FACW
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	0
	60	= Total Cover		

Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1. Lindera benzoin	30	☑	60.0%	FACW
2. Acer negundo	10	☑	20.0%	FAC
3. Cornus amomum	10	☑	20.0%	FACW
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	50	= Total Cover		

Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1. Dichanthelium clandestinum	75	☑	71.4%	FACW
2. Carex lurida	20	☐	19.0%	OBL
3. Panicum virgatum	10	☐	9.5%	FAC
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
6.	0	☐	0.0%	
7.	0	☐	0.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	105	= Total Cover		

Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 6 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 6 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	20	x 1 =	20
FACW species	125	x 2 =	250
FAC species	70	x 3 =	210
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	215 (A)		480 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.233

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

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

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-001 PFO**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR	3/1	80	10YR	4/6	20	C	M	Silt Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☑ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☑ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff and seasonal flooding.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 14-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-001-002 UPL**

Investigator(s): MRK, AJH | Section, Township, Range: S | T 4N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): convex

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.222459 | Long.: -82.825338 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: N/A

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ○ No ◉
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	

Remarks:
Upland data point for W-MRK-001 and W-MRK-002. Upland data was collected within an agricultural field.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	0
	0	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Zea mays	50	☑ 100.0%	UPL
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	50	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 1 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	0	x 2 =	0
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	50	x 5 =	250
Column Totals:	50 (A)		250 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 5.000

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☐ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☐ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ○ No ◉

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

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-001-002 UPL**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-14	10YR	4/2	100						Silty Clay Loam	
14-16	10YR	4/2	95	10YR	5/6	5	C	M	Silty Clay Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

No source of hydrology was observed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 14-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-002 PEM**

Investigator(s): MRK, AJH | Section, Township, Range: S | T 4N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.222414 | Long.: -82.824598 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: N/A

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
PEM section of a PEM/PFO wetland located within a large depression collecting surface runoff and seasonal flooding. Signs of standing water were observed throughout the wetland. Wetland continues outside current study area.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1. Carex vulpinoidea	50	☑	41.7%	FACW
2. Juncus effusus	20	☐	16.7%	OBL
3. Dichanthelium clandestinum	20	☐	16.7%	FACW
4. Toxicodendron radicans	25	☑	20.8%	FAC
5. Phalaris arundinacea	5	☐	4.2%	FACW
6.	0	☐	0.0%	
7.	0	☐	0.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	120	= Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 2 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 2 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	20	x 1 =	20
FACW species	75	x 2 =	150
FAC species	25	x 3 =	75
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	120 (A)		245 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.042

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

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

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-002 PEM**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR	4/2	90	10YR	5/8	10	C	M	Silty Clay Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☑ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☑ Surface Water (A1)
- ☑ High Water Table (A2)
- ☑ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ◉ No ○ Depth (inches): 1

Water Table Present? Yes ◉ No ○ Depth (inches): 0

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ◉ No ○ Depth (inches): 0

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff and seasonal flooding.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 14-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-002 PFO**

Investigator(s): MRK, AJH | Section, Township, Range: S | T 4N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.22207 | Long.: -82.824641 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: N/A

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
PFO section of a PEM/PFO wetland located within a large depression collecting surface runoff and seasonal flooding. Signs of standing water were observed throughout the wetland. Wetland continues outside current study area.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1. Acer rubrum	25	☑ 35.7%	FAC
2. Quercus palustris	25	☑ 35.7%	FACW
3. Acer saccharinum	15	☑ 21.4%	FACW
4. Carya glabra	5	☐ 7.1%	FACU
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	0
	70	= Total Cover	

Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1. Ulmus rubra	10	☑ 100.0%	FAC
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	10	= Total Cover	

Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Toxicodendron radicans	30	☑ 75.0%	FAC
2. Carex vulpinoidea	10	☑ 25.0%	FACW
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	40	= Total Cover	

Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 6 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 6 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	50	x 2 =	100
FAC species	65	x 3 =	195
FACU species	5	x 4 =	20
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	120 (A)		315 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.625

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

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

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-002 PFO**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR	4/1	75	10YR	4/6	25	C	PL	Silt Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☑ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☑ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff and seasonal flooding.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 15-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: W-MRK-004 PFO

Investigator(s): MRK, AJH | Section, Township, Range: S | T 3N | R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.148161 | Long.: -82.748641 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: N/A

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PFO wetland is located within a forested depression. Depression is collecting surface runoff from the surrounding area and is seasonally inundated. Wetland boundary follows edge of depression.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1. Acer rubrum	30	☑ 100.0%	FAC
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	0
	30	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1. Acer rubrum	20	☑ 66.7%	FAC
2. Ulmus rubra	10	☑ 33.3%	FAC
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	30	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Toxicodendron radicans	10	☑ 66.7%	FAC
2. Glyceria striata	5	☑ 33.3%	OBL
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	15	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 5 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 5 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	5	x 1 =	5
FACW species	0	x 2 =	0
FAC species	70	x 3 =	210
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	75 (A)		215 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.867

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
- ☑ 2 - Dominance Test is > 50%
- ☑ 3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 [1]
- ☐ 4 - Morphological Adaptations [1] (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
- ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation [1] (Explain)

[1] Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

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

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-004 PFO**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-8	10YR	3/1	100							
8-16	10YR	3/1	90	10YR	4/6	10	C	M,PL	Silty Clay Loam	5% oxidized rhizospheres

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains.

[2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☑ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type:

Depth (inches):

Hydric Soil Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

Remarks:

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☑ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☑ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Wetland Hydrology Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff and seasonal flooding.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 15-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: W-MRK-005 PFO

Investigator(s): MRK, AJH | Section, Township, Range: S | T 3N | R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.147472 | Long.: -82.748273 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes | NWI classification: PFO1C

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐, Soil ☐, or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐, Soil ☐, or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PFO wetland is located within a forested depression. Depression is collecting surface runoff from the surrounding area and is seasonally inundated. Wetland boundary follows edge of depression.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1. Acer rubrum	20	☑ 50.0%	FAC
2. Fraxinus pennsylvanica	20	☑ 50.0%	FACW
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	40	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1. Ulmus rubra	10	☑ 100.0%	FAC
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	10	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Glyceria striata	50	☑ 47.6%	OBL
2. Toxicodendron radicans	20	☐ 19.0%	FAC
3. Urtica dioica	25	☑ 23.8%	FACW
4. Impatiens capensis	10	☐ 9.5%	FACW
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	105	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 5 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 5 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	50	x 1 =	50
FACW species	55	x 2 =	110
FAC species	50	x 3 =	150
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	155 (A)		310 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.000

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
- ☑ 2 - Dominance Test is > 50%
- ☑ 3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 [1]
- ☐ 4 - Morphological Adaptations [1] (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
- ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation [1] (Explain)

[1] Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

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

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-005 PFO**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR	4/2	80	10YR	4/6	20	C	M,PL	Silty Clay Loam	10% oxidized rhizospheres

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☑ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type:

Depth (inches):

Hydric Soil Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

Remarks:

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☑ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☑ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Wetland Hydrology Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff and seasonal flooding.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 15-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: W-MRK-004-005 UPL

Investigator(s): MRK, AJH | Section, Township, Range: S | T 3N | R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): flat

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.147817 | Long.: -82.748294 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Centerburg silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes | NWI classification: N/A

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ○ No ◉
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	

Remarks:
Upland data point collected for W-MRK-004 and W-MRK-005. Upland data was collected within a forested area.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1. Acer rubrum	25	☑	35.7%	FAC
2. Fagus grandifolia	25	☑	35.7%	FACU
3. Quercus rubra	20	☑	28.6%	FACU
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	0
	70	= Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1. Lindera benzoin	10	☑	33.3%	FACW
2. Fagus grandifolia	10	☑	33.3%	FACU
3. Acer rubrum	10	☑	33.3%	FAC
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	30	= Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1. Parthenocissus quinquefolia	70	☑	70.0%	FACU
2. Toxicodendron radicans	20	☑	20.0%	FAC
3. Urtica dioica	10	☐	10.0%	FACW
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
6.	0	☐	0.0%	
7.	0	☐	0.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	100	= Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 4 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 8 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 50.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	20	x 2 =	40
FAC species	55	x 3 =	165
FACU species	125	x 4 =	500
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	200 (A)		705 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 3.525

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
- ☐ 2 - Dominance Test is > 50%
- ☐ 3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 [1]
- ☐ 4 - Morphological Adaptations [1] (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
- ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation [1] (Explain)

[1] Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ○ No ◉

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

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-004-005 UPL**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)	Matrix %	Redox Features Color (moist)	Redox Features %	Redox Features Type[1]	Redox Features Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR 4/1	100					Clay Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type:

Depth (inches):

Hydric Soil Present? **Yes** ○ **No** ◉

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Wetland Hydrology Present? **Yes** ○ **No** ◉

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

No source of hydrology was observed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 16-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-006 PEM**

Investigator(s): MRK, AJH | Section, Township, Range: S | T 3N | R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Floodplain | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.128403 | Long.: -82.725013 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: N/A

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ○ No ◉
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PEM wetland is located within a depression on the floodplain of a perennial watercourse. Wetland boundary follows edge of depression and is inundated seasonally. No vegetation within wetland due to inundation.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 1 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	0	x 2 =	0
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	0 (A)		0 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 0.000

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☐ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
No vegetation within depression due to seasonal inundation.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-006 PEM**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR	3/1	75	10YR	3/6	25	C	PL	Silty Clay Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☑ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☑ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☑ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☑ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is seasonal flooding and surface runoff.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 16-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-006-007 UPL**

Investigator(s): MRK, AJH | Section, Township, Range: S | T 3N | R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): flat

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.128181 | Long.: -82.725055 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: N/A

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ○ No ◉
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	

Remarks:
Uupland data point for W-MRK-006 and W-MRK-007. Upland data was collected within a deciduous forest.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1. Acer rubrum	60	☑ 100.0%	FAC
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	60	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1. Acer rubrum	20	☑ 66.7%	FAC
2. Rosa multiflora	10	☑ 33.3%	FACU
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	30	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Parthenocissus quinquefolia	25	☑ 41.7%	FACU
2. Podophyllum peltatum	25	☑ 41.7%	FACU
3. Toxicodendron radicans	10	☐ 16.7%	FAC
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	60	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 2 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 5 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 40.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	0	x 2 =	0
FAC species	90	x 3 =	270
FACU species	60	x 4 =	240
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	150 (A)		510 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 3.400

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☐ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☐ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ○ No ◉

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

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-006-007 UPL**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)	Matrix %	Redox Features Color (moist)	Redox Features %	Redox Features Type[1]	Redox Features Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-14	10YR 4/3	100					Silt Loam	
14-16	10YR 5/3	100					Silty Clay Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

No source of hydrology was observed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 16-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-007 PFO**

Investigator(s): MRK, AJH | Section, Township, Range: S [ ] T 3N R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Floodplain | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.1280789 | Long.: -82.7251133 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: N/A

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes (•) No ( ) (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation [ ], Soil [ ], or Hydrology [ ] significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes (•) No ( )

Are Vegetation [ ], Soil [ ], or Hydrology [ ] naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes (•) No ( )	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes (•) No ( )
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes (•) No ( )	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes (•) No ( )	

Remarks:
This PFO wetland is located on the floodplain of a perennial and intermittent watercourse. Depression is seasonally inundated. Wetland boundary follows edge of depression.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1. Acer rubrum	30	☑	100.0%	FAC
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	30	= Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1. Carpinus caroliniana	30	☑	75.0%	FAC
2. Lindera benzoin	10	☑	25.0%	FACW
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	40	= Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1. Impatiens capensis	50	☑	58.8%	FACW
2. Carex intumescens	25	☑	29.4%	FACW
3. Carex squarrosa	10	☐	11.8%	OBL
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
6.	0	☐	0.0%	
7.	0	☐	0.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	85	= Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 5 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 5 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	10	x 1 =	10
FACW species	85	x 2 =	170
FAC species	60	x 3 =	180
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	155 (A)		360 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.323

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes (•) No ( )

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
No vegetation within depression due to seasonal inundation.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-007 PFO**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-14	10YR	4/1	75	10YR	3/6	25	C	PL	Silty Clay Loam	
14-16	10YR	5/1	75	10YR	5/8	25	C	PL	Silty Clay Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☑ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☑ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is seasonal flooding and surface runoff.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 22-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-011 PEM**

Investigator(s): MRK, RBL | Section, Township, Range: S | T 3N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.1870629 | Long.: -82.7767043 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes | NWI classification: NA

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PEM wetland is located within a depression between a pasture and an agricultural field. Signs of tire ruts were observed throughout the wetland. Depression is collecting surface runoff from the agricultural field to the east.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1. Phalaris arundinacea	90	☑	72.0%	FACW
2. Apocynum cannabinum	20	☐	16.0%	FAC
3. Carex vulpinoidea	10	☐	8.0%	FACW
4. Scirpus atrovirens	5	☐	4.0%	OBL
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
6.	0	☐	0.0%	
7.	0	☐	0.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	125	= Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 1 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 1 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	5	x 1 =	5
FACW species	100	x 2 =	200
FAC species	20	x 3 =	60
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	125 (A)		265 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.120

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☑ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

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

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-011 PEM**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)	Matrix %	Redox Features Color (moist)	Redox Features %	Redox Features Type[1]	Redox Features Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR 4/2	90	10YR 4/6	10	C	PL	Silt Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☑ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 22-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-011 UPL**

Investigator(s): MRK, RBL | Section, Township, Range: S | T 3N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): flat

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.187136 | Long.: -82.776454 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes | NWI classification: NA

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ○ No ◉
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	

Remarks:
Upland data point for W-MRK-011. Upland data was collected within an agricultural field.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Zea mays	100	☑ 100.0%	UPL
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	100	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 1 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	0	x 2 =	0
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	100	x 5 =	500
Column Totals:	100 (A)		500 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 5.000

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☐ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☐ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Corn has been recently planted.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-011 UPL**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)	Matrix %	Redox Features Color (moist)	Redox Features %	Redox Features Type[1]	Redox Features Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR 5/3	90	10YR 4/6	10	C	M	Silty Clay Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

No source of hydrology was observed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 26-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-012 PFO**

Investigator(s): MRK, TW | Section, Township, Range: S | T 3N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.21583 | Long.: -82.813053 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes | NWI classification: NA

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PFO wetland is located in a forested depression that is collecting surface runoff from the surrounding area. Depression is seasonally inundated.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1. Acer saccharinum	50	☑ 100.0%	FACW
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	0
	50	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1. Lindera benzoin	20	☑ 66.7%	FACW
2. Acer saccharinum	10	☑ 33.3%	FACW
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	30	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Carex intumescens	30	☑ 37.5%	FACW
2. Arisaema triphyllum	20	☑ 25.0%	FACW
3. Toxicodendron radicans	20	☑ 25.0%	FAC
4. Impatiens capensis	10	☐ 12.5%	FACW
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	80	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1. Toxicodendron radicans	10	☑ 100.0%	FAC
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	10	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 7 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 7 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	140	x 2 =	280
FAC species	30	x 3 =	90
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	170 (A)		370 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.176

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Areas of sparse vegetation within the depression due to seasonal inundation.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-012 PFO**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)	Matrix %	Redox Features Color (moist)	Redox Features %	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR 3/1	90	10YR 4/6	10	C	M,PL	Silt Loam	5% oxidized rhizospheres

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☑ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☑ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☑ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☑ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is seasonal flooding and surface runoff.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 26-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-012-013 UPL**

Investigator(s): MRK, TW | Section, Township, Range: S | T 3N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): flat

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.215353 | Long.: -82.813401 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes | NWI classification: NA

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ○ No ◉
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	

Remarks:
Upland data point collected for W-MRK-012 and W-MRK-013. Upland was collected within a agricultural field.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Glycine max	75	☑ 100.0%	UPL
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	75	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 1 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	0	x 2 =	0
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	75	x 5 =	375
Column Totals:	75 (A)		375 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 5.000

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☐ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☐ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ○ No ◉

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

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-012-013 UPL**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)	%	Redox Features Color (moist)	%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-12	10YR 3/3	100					Silty Clay Loam	
12-16	10YR 4/3	75	10YR 4/6	25	C	M	Silty Clay Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks:

No hydric soil indicators present

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

No source of hydrology was observed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 26-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-013 PFO**

Investigator(s): MRK, TW | Section, Township, Range: S | T 3N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.213912 | Long.: -82.813384 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes | NWI classification: PFO1C

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PFO wetland is located in a forested depression that is collecting surface runoff from the surrounding area. Depression is seasonally inundated.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1. Acer saccharinum	70	☑ 100.0%	FACW
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	0
	70	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1. Lindera benzoin	10	☑ 100.0%	FACW
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	10	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Acer saccharinum	70	☑ 100.0%	FACW
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	70	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1. Toxicodendron radicans	10	☑ 100.0%	FAC
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	10	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 4 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 4 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	150	x 2 =	300
FAC species	10	x 3 =	30
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	160 (A)		330 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.063

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Small silver maple saplings covering the ground surface. Areas of sparse vegetation within the depression due to seasonal inundation.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-013 PFO**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	7.5YR	2.5/1	90	10YR	4/6	10	C	M	Silty Clay Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☑ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☑ High Water Table (A2)
- ☑ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☑ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☑ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ◉ No ○ Depth (inches): 4

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ◉ No ○ Depth (inches): 2

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is seasonal flooding and surface runoff.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 27-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-016 PEM**

Investigator(s): MRK, TW | Section, Township, Range: S | T 3N | R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.132939 | Long.: -82.745182 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pe; Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: PEM1C

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PEM wetland is located in a depression at the edge of an agricultural field. Depression is collecting surface runoff which drains to the south. Wetland continues outside of the current study area.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	0
	0	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Typha angustifolia	25	☑ 20.0%	OBL
2. Phalaris arundinacea	50	☑ 40.0%	FACW
3. Persicaria pensylvanica	20	☐ 16.0%	FACW
4. Xanthium strumarium	30	☑ 24.0%	FAC
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	125	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 3 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 3 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	25	x 1 =	25
FACW species	70	x 2 =	140
FAC species	30	x 3 =	90
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	125 (A)		255 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.040

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation extends into agricultural field.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-016 PEM**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)	Matrix %	Redox Features Color (moist)	Redox Features %	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR 3/1	90	10YR 3/6	10	C	M,PL	Silt Loam	5% oxidized rhizospheres

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☑ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is seasonal flooding and surface runoff.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 14-Sep-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-016 PFO**

Investigator(s): MRK, KRS | Section, Township, Range: S 25 T 3N R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.13284 | Long.: -82.74541 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pe : Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: PEM1C

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PFO section of a PEM/PFO wetland complex is located in a depression that is collecting surface runoff. Water drains from the main section of the wetland which is PEM into the PFO edge. The wetland boundary follows edge of depression.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1. Quercus palustris	40	☑	100.0%	FACW
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	40	= Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1. Quercus palustris	5	☑	50.0%	FACW
2. Quercus macrocarpa	5	☑	50.0%	FAC
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	10	= Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1. Phalaris arundinacea	30	☑	100.0%	FACW
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
6.	0	☐	0.0%	
7.	0	☐	0.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	30	= Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 4 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 4 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	75	x 2 =	150
FAC species	5	x 3 =	15
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	80 (A)		165 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.063

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation indicators are present.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-016 PFO**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)	Matrix %	Redox Features Color (moist)	Redox Features %	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR 3/1	80	10YR 4/6	20	C	M,PL	Silty Clay Loam	10% oxidized rhizospheres

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☑ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

Hydric soil indicator is present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☑ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff. Several primary and secondary hydrology indicators are present.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 27-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-016 UPL**

Investigator(s): MRK, TW | Section, Township, Range: S [ ] T 3N R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): flat

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.133206 | Long.: -82.745064 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: BeB; Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes | NWI classification: NA

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ○ No ◉
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	

Remarks:
Upland data point for W-MRK-016. Upland data was collected within an agricultural field.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Glycine max	75	☑ 100.0%	UPL
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	75	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 1 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	0	x 2 =	0
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	75	x 5 =	375
Column Totals:	75 (A)		375 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 5.000

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☐ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☐ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Field is currently planted with soybean.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-016 UPL**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)	Matrix %	Redox Features Color (moist)	Redox Features %	Redox Features Type[1]	Redox Features Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-10	10YR 3/3	100					Silt Loam	
10-16	10YR 5/3	100					Silt Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks:

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

No source of hydrology was observed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 27-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: W-MRK-017 PFO

Investigator(s): MRK, TW | Section, Township, Range: S | T 3N | R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): flat

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.140428 | Long.: -82.749103 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: BeB: Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes | NWI classification: PFO1C

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐, Soil ☐, or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐, Soil ☐, or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PFO wetland is located within a forested depression that is collecting surface runoff. Wetland is seasonally inundated with water based on water stained leaves and debris drift deposits.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1. Acer saccharinum	25	☑	50.0%	FACW
2. Quercus bicolor	25	☑	50.0%	FACW
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	50	= Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1. Ulmus rubra	10	☑	100.0%	FAC
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	10	= Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
6.	0	☐	0.0%	
7.	0	☐	0.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 3 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 3 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	50	x 2 =	100
FAC species	10	x 3 =	30
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	60 (A)		130 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.167

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
- ☑ 2 - Dominance Test is > 50%
- ☑ 3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 [1]
- ☐ 4 - Morphological Adaptations [1] (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
- ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation [1] (Explain)

[1] Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

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

Sparse herb stratum due to seasonal inundation.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-017 PFO**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR	3/1	75	10YR	4/6	25	C	M,PL	Silty Clay Loam	10% oxidized rhizospheres

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☑ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

Remarks:

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☑ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☑ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☑ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☑ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is seasonal flooding and surface runoff.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel City/County: Licking Sampling Date: 27-Jun-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP State: OH Sampling Point: W-MRK-017-018 UPL

Investigator(s): MRK, TW Section, Township, Range: S T 3N R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat Local relief (concave, convex, none): flat

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° Lat.: 40.14077 Long.: -82.748993 Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: BeB: Bennington silt loam, 2 to 6 percent slopes NWI classification: NA

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ○ No ◉
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	

Remarks:
Upland data point for W-MRK-017 and W-MRK-018. Upland data was collected within an agricultural field.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0		= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0		= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1. Zea mays	100	☑	100.0%	UPL
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
6.	0	☐	0.0%	
7.	0	☐	0.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	100		= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0		= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 1 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	0	x 2 =	0
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	100	x 5 =	500
Column Totals:	100 (A)		500 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 5.000

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
- ☐ 2 - Dominance Test is > 50%
- ☐ 3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 [1]
- ☐ 4 - Morphological Adaptations [1] (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
- ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation [1] (Explain)

[1] Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Field is currently planted with corn.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-017-018 UPL**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-12	10YR	5/3	100						Silty Clay Loam	
12-16	10YR	5/4	100						Silty Clay Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? **Yes** ○ **No** ◉

Remarks:

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? **Yes** ○ **No** ◉

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

No source of hydrology was observed.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 12-Sep-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-020 PFO**

Investigator(s): MRK, KRS | Section, Township, Range: S | T 4N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.22163 | Long.: -82.81790 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: PwA : Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes | NWI classification: None

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PFO section of a PSS/PFO wetland complex is located within a depression adjacent to the existing transmission line right-of-way. Surface water runoff drains off the ROW and into a forested area. Wetland boundary follows edge of depression.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1. Acer saccharinum	35	☑	58.3%	FACW
2. Acer rubrum	25	☑	41.7%	FAC
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	0
	60	= Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1. Acer rubrum	10	☑	50.0%	FAC
2. Ulmus rubra	10	☑	50.0%	FAC
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	20	= Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
6.	0	☐	0.0%	
7.	0	☐	0.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 4 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 4 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	35	x 2 =	70
FAC species	45	x 3 =	135
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	80 (A)		205 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.563

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation indicators are present.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-020 PFO**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	2.5Y	2.5/1	90	10YR	3/6	10	C	PL	Silty Clay Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☑ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

Hydric soil indicator is present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☑ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☑ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff. Several primary and secondary hydrology indicators are present.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 12-Sep-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-020 PSS**

Investigator(s): MRK, KRS | Section, Township, Range: S | T 4N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.22187 | Long.: -82.81892 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: BeA : Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification:

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PSS section of a PSS/PFO wetland complex is located within a depression on the existing transmission line right-of-way. Surface water runoff drains off the ROW and into a forested area. Wetland boundary follows edge of depression.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	0
	0	= Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1. Cornus amomum	25	☑	38.5%	FACW
2. Acer saccharinum	25	☑	38.5%	FACW
3. Rubus allegheniensis	10	☐	15.4%	FACU
4. Salix nigra	5	☐	7.7%	OBL
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	65	= Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1. Agrimonia parviflora	50	☑	34.5%	FACW
2. Solidago canadensis	30	☑	20.7%	FACU
3. Juncus effusus	25	☐	17.2%	OBL
4. Dichanthelium clandestinum	20	☐	13.8%	FACW
5. Impatiens capensis	10	☐	6.9%	FACW
6. Scirpus cyperinus	10	☐	6.9%	OBL
7.	0	☐	0.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	145	= Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 3 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 4 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 75.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	40	x 1 =	40
FACW species	130	x 2 =	260
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	40	x 4 =	160
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	210 (A)		460 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.190

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation indicators are present.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-020 PSS**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR	4/2	80	10YR	5/6	20	C	M,PL	Silty Clay Loam	10% oxidized rhizospheres

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☑ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

Hydric soil indicator is present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff. Several secondary and primary hydrology indicators are present.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 12-Sep-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-020 UPL**

Investigator(s): MRK, KRS | Section, Township, Range: S | T 4N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): flat

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.22173 | Long.: -82.82000 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: BeA : Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: NA

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ○ No ◉
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	

Remarks:
Upland data point for W-MRK-020. Upland data was collected between a forested area and agricultural field.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1. Quercus rubra	20	☑	66.7%	FACU
2. Quercus macrocarpa	10	☑	33.3%	FAC
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	0
	30	= Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1. Zea mays	50	☑	100.0%	UPL
2.		☑	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
6.	0	☐	0.0%	
7.	0	☐	0.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	50	= Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1. Toxicodendron radicans	50	☐	100.0%	FAC
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	50	= Total Cover		

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 2 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 4 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 50.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	0	x 2 =	0
FAC species	60	x 3 =	180
FACU species	20	x 4 =	80
UPL species	50	x 5 =	250
Column Totals:	130 (A)		510 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 3.923

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☐ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☐ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation indicators are not present.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-020 UPL**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)	Matrix %	Redox Features Color (moist)	Redox Features %	Redox Features Type[1]	Redox Features Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	2.5Y 5/2	100					Silt Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks:

Hydric soil indicators are not present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

No source of hydrology was observed. No hydrology indicators are present.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 11-Sep-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-022 PEM**

Investigator(s): MRK, KRS | Section, Township, Range: S | T 4N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.22407 | Long.: -82.84601 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: PwA : Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes | NWI classification: None

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PEM wetland is located within a depression on the existing transmission line right-of-way. Depression is receiving surface runoff from the surrounding are and is also seasonally flooded by a watercourse.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Phalaris arundinacea	100	☑ 100.0%	FACW
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	100	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 1 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 1 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	100	x 2 =	200
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	100 (A)		200 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.000

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☑ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation indicators are present.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-022 PEM**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR	3/2	80	7.5YR	4/4	20	C	PL	Silty Clay Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☑ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

Hydric soil indicator is present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is seasonal flooding and surface runoff. Hydrology indicators are present.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Delaware | Sampling Date: 11-Sep-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-022 UPL**

Investigator(s): MRK, KRS | Section, Township, Range: S | T 4N | R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.22423 | Long.: -82.84698 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: PwA : Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes | NWI classification: PEM1C

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ○ No ◉
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	

Remarks:
Upland data point for W-MRK-022. Upland data was collected within an area dominated by Phalaris arundinacea, but hydrology and hydric soils are absent.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1. Phalaris arundinacea	100	☑	76.9%	FACW
2. Cirsium arvense	20	☐	15.4%	FACU
3. Phytolacca americana	10	☐	7.7%	FACU
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
6.	0	☐	0.0%	
7.	0	☐	0.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	130	= Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 1 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 1 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	100	x 2 =	200
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	30	x 4 =	120
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	130 (A)		320 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.462

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☑ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☐ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation indicators are present.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-022 UPL**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)	Matrix %	Redox Features Color (moist)	Redox Features %	Redox Features Type[1]	Redox Features Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR 3/2	100					Silt Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks:

Hydric soil indicators are not present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

No source of hydrology was observed. One secondary hydrology indicator was present, criteria not met.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 13-Sep-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: W-MRK-030 PEM

Investigator(s): MRK, KRS | Section, Township, Range: S 15 T 3N R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.16174 | Long.: -82.74871 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pe : Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: None

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PEM section of a PEM/PFO wetland complex is located in a depression between two separate PFO sections. Surface runoff drains out of the PFO section to the south, flows into the PEM, and flows north into another PFO section.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Scirpus atrovirens	50	☑ 33.3%	OBL
2. Scirpus cyperinus	15	☐ 10.0%	OBL
3. Impatiens capensis	15	☐ 10.0%	FACW
4. Eupatorium perfoliatum	25	☑ 16.7%	OBL
5. Ambrosia artemisiifolia	20	☑ 13.3%	FACU
6. Persicaria sagittata	10	☐ 6.7%	OBL
7. Juncus effusus	10	☐ 6.7%	OBL
8. Phalaris arundinacea	5	☐ 3.3%	FACW
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	150	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 2 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 3 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 66.7% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	110	x 1 =	110
FACW species	20	x 2 =	40
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	20	x 4 =	80
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	150 (A)		230 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 1.533

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
- ☑ 2 - Dominance Test is > 50%
- ☑ 3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 [1]
- ☐ 4 - Morphological Adaptations [1] (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
- ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation [1] (Explain)

[1] Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation indicators are present.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-030 PEM**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR	2/1	80	10YR	3/6	20	C	M,PL	Silty Clay Loam	5% oxidized rhizospheres

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☑ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type:

Depth (inches):

Hydric Soil Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

Remarks:

Hydric soil indicator is present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Wetland Hydrology Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff. Primary and secondary hydrology indicators present.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 13-Sep-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: W-MRK-030 PFO

Investigator(s): MRK, KRS | Section, Township, Range: S 15 T 3N R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.16161 | Long.: -82.74894 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pe : Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: None

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PFO section of a PEM/PFO wetland complex is located in a depression surrounding a PEM section. Surface runoff drains out of the PFO section to the south, flows into the PEM, and flows north into another PFO section.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1. Acer rubrum	30	☑	50.0%	FAC
2. Acer saccharinum	30	☑	50.0%	FACW
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	60	= Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1. Ulmus rubra	25	☑	45.5%	FAC
2. Acer rubrum	25	☑	45.5%	FAC
3. Lindera benzoin	5	☐	9.1%	FACW
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	55	= Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1. Toxicodendron radicans	50	☑	55.6%	FAC
2. Urtica dioica	5	☐	5.6%	FACW
3. Impatiens capensis	15	☐	16.7%	FACW
4. Carex intumescens	20	☑	22.2%	FACW
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
6.	0	☐	0.0%	
7.	0	☐	0.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	90	= Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 6 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 6 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	75	x 2 =	150
FAC species	130	x 3 =	390
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	205 (A)		540 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.634

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
- ☑ 2 - Dominance Test is > 50%
- ☑ 3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 [1]
- ☐ 4 - Morphological Adaptations [1] (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
- ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation [1] (Explain)

[1] Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation indicators are present.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-030 PFO**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR	2/1	80	10YR	3/6	20	C	M,PL	Silty Clay Loam	5% oxidized rhizospheres

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☑ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

Remarks:

Hydric soil indicator is present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 13-Sep-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: W-MRK-030 UPL

Investigator(s): MRK, KRS | Section, Township, Range: S 15 T 3N R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): flat

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.16054 | Long.: -82.74862 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pe : Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: None

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ○ No ◉

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☑ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland? Yes ○ No ◉
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	

Remarks:
Upland data point for W-MRK-030. Upland data was collected within an agriculotural field next to the forest edge.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Zea mays	100	☑ 83.3%	UPL
2. Xanthium strumarium	10	☐ 8.3%	FAC
3. Cyperus esculentus	10	☐ 8.3%	FACW
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	120	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 1 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	10	x 2 =	20
FAC species	10	x 3 =	30
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	100	x 5 =	500
Column Totals:	120 (A)		550 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 4.583

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ 1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation
- ☐ 2 - Dominance Test is > 50%
- ☐ 3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0 [1]
- ☐ 4 - Morphological Adaptations [1] (Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)
- ☐ Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation [1] (Explain)

[1] Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation indicators are not present.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-030 UPL**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR	5/1	35							
	10YR	4/1	35	10YR	5/8	30	C	M	Silty Clay Loam	25% mixed rock

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☑ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type:

Depth (inches):

Hydric Soil Present? **Yes** ◉ **No** ○

Remarks:

Soils are mixed due to agricultural practices. Hydric soil indicator is present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☑ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Wetland Hydrology Present? **Yes** ○ **No** ◉

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

No source of hydrology was observed, agricultural field is likely wet during a short period in the wet season. One secondary hydrology indicator present, criteria not met.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 15-Sep-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-034 PEM**

Investigator(s): MRK, KRS | Section, Township, Range: S 24 T 3N R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.12834 | Long.: -82.73116 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pe : Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: None

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PEM wetland is located in a small depression at the edge of an agricultural field. A pond located just outside of the study area may have a leaking berm that contributes to the hydrology. The wetland boundary follows edge of depression.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1. Salix nigra	2	☐ 100.0%	OBL
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	0
	2	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Cyperus esculentus	50	☑ 31.3%	FACW
2. Impatiens capensis	50	☑ 31.3%	FACW
3. Epilobium coloratum	20	☐ 12.5%	OBL
4. Phalaris arundinacea	15	☐ 9.4%	FACW
5. Carex lurida	10	☐ 6.3%	OBL
6. Echinochloa crusgalli	10	☐ 6.3%	FACU
7. Rumex crispus	5	☐ 3.1%	FAC
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	160	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 2 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 2 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	32	x 1 =	32
FACW species	115	x 2 =	230
FAC species	5	x 3 =	15
FACU species	10	x 4 =	40
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	162 (A)		317 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 1.957

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☑ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation indicators are present.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-034 PEM**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR	3/1	90	7.5YR	4/6	10	C	PL	Silty Clay Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2]Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☑ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type:

Depth (inches):

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

Hydric soil indicator is present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff and seeps from a pond berm. Several primary and secondary hydrology indicators are present.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 15-Sep-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **W-MRK-034 UPL**

Investigator(s): MRK, KRS | Section, Township, Range: S 24 T 3N R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): flat

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.12841 | Long.: -82.73109 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pe : Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: NA

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ○ No ◉
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	

Remarks:
Upland data point for W-MRK-034. Upland data was collected within an agricultural field.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1. Glycine max	100	☑	80.0%	UPL
2. Glechoma hederacea	25	☑	20.0%	FACU
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
6.	0	☐	0.0%	
7.	0	☐	0.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	125	= Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 2 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	0	x 2 =	0
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	25	x 4 =	100
UPL species	100	x 5 =	500
Column Totals:	125	(A)	600 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 4.800

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☐ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☐ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation indicators are absent.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-034 UPL**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR	3/2	50	10YR	3/6	50			Silt Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks:

Hydric soil indicators are absent.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

No source of hydrology was observed. No hydrology indicators are present.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel City/County: Delaware Sampling Date: 26-Sep-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP State: OH Sampling Point: **W-MRK-035 PFO**

Investigator(s): MRK, KRS Section, Township, Range: S T 3N R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° Lat.: 40.19245 Long.: -82.78172 Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: PwA : Pewamo silty clay loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes NWI classification: None

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This PFO wetland is located within a forested depression that is collecting surface runoff from the surrounding area. Water drains to an agricultural swale outside of the study area. The wetland boundary follows edge of depression.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1. Acer rubrum	25	☑ 50.0%	FAC
2. Acer saccharinum	25	☑ 50.0%	FACW
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	50	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1. Carya ovata	10	☑ 50.0%	FACU
2. Lindera benzoin	10	☑ 50.0%	FACW
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	20	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Toxicodendron radicans	40	☑ 80.0%	FAC
2. Parthenocissus quinquefolia	10	☑ 20.0%	FACU
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	50	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 4 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 6 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 66.7% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	35	x 2 =	70
FAC species	65	x 3 =	195
FACU species	20	x 4 =	80
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	120 (A)		345 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 2.875

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation indicators are present.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-035 PFO**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	10YR	4/1	80	10YR	3/6	20	C	M,PL	Silt Loam	10% oxidized rhizospheres

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☑ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

Hydric soil indicator is present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☑ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☑ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☑ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches): _____

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff. Several primary and secondary hydrology indicators are present.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel City/County: Delaware Sampling Date: 26-Sep-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP State: OH Sampling Point: **W-MRK-035 UPL**

Investigator(s): MRK, KRS Section, Township, Range: S T 3N R 16W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat Local relief (concave, convex, none): flat

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° Lat.: 40.192265 Long.: -82.781877 Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: BeA : Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes NWI classification: None

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☑ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ○ No ◉

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ○ No ◉
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ○ No ◉	

Remarks:
Upland data point for W-MRK-035. Upland data was collected within an agricultural field.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species?	Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
3.	0	☐	0.0%	
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)				
1. Zea mays	100	☑	83.3%	UPL
2. Setaria pumila	10	☐	8.3%	FAC
3. Toxicodendron radicans	10	☐	8.3%	FAC
4.	0	☐	0.0%	
5.	0	☐	0.0%	
6.	0	☐	0.0%	
7.	0	☐	0.0%	
8.	0	☐	0.0%	
9.	0	☐	0.0%	
10.	0	☐	0.0%	
	120	= Total Cover		
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)				
1.	0	☐	0.0%	
2.	0	☐	0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover		

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 1 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 0.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	0	x 1 =	0
FACW species	0	x 2 =	0
FAC species	20	x 3 =	60
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	100	x 5 =	500
Column Totals:	120 (A)		560 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 4.667

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☐ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☐ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation indicators are absent.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **W-MRK-035 UPL**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)	Matrix %	Redox Features Color (moist)	Redox Features %	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-12	10YR 5/2	100					Silt Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type:

Depth (inches):

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Remarks:

Shovel refusal at 12 inches due to soils compacted by agricultural activity. Hydric soil indicators are absent.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☐ Surface Water (A1)
- ☐ High Water Table (A2)
- ☐ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☐ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☐ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☐ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☐ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☐ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Water Table Present? Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ○ No ◉ Depth (inches):

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ○ No ◉

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

No source of hydrology was observed. Hydrology indicators are absent.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 15-Sep-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **Pond-MRK-003**

Investigator(s): MRK, KRS | Section, Township, Range: S 23 T 3N R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.12477 | Long.: -82.71945 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: Pe : Pewamo silty clay loam, low carbonate till, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification: PUBGx

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This open water pond is located within a residential property. Pond collects surface runoff. Pond water level is extremely low currently due to seasonal conditions.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1. Typha angustifolia	25	☑ 62.5%	OBL
2. Phalaris arundinacea	15	☑ 37.5%	FACW
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	40	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 2 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 2 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 100.0% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	25	x 1 =	25
FACW species	15	x 2 =	30
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	40 (A)		55 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 1.375

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☑ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☑ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation is scattered throughout areas of the pond that are now seasonally dry.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **Pond-MRK-003**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)		%	Redox Features Color (moist)		%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks
0-16	2.5Y	4/1	80	10YR	4/6	20	C	M	Silty Clay Loam	

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☑ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type:

Depth (inches):

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

Hydric soil indicator is present.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☑ Surface Water (A1)
- ☑ High Water Table (A2)
- ☑ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☑ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☑ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☑ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☑ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present?	Yes ◉	No ○	Depth (inches):	12
Water Table Present?	Yes ◉	No ○	Depth (inches):	0
Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe)	Yes ◉	No ○	Depth (inches):	0

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff. Several primary and secondary hydrology indicators are present.

WETLAND DETERMINATION DATA FORM - Midwest Region

Project/Site: Vassell-Green Chapel | City/County: Licking | Sampling Date: 15-Sep-23

Applicant/Owner: AEP | State: OH | Sampling Point: **Pond-MRK-004**

Investigator(s): MRK, KRS | Section, Township, Range: S 24 T 3N R 15W

Landform (hillslope, terrace, etc.): Flat | Local relief (concave, convex, none): concave

Slope: 1.0% / 0.6 ° | Lat.: 40.12768 | Long.: -82.72389 | Datum: NAD83

Soil Map Unit Name: BeA : Bennington silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes | NWI classification:

Are climatic/hydrologic conditions on the site typical for this time of year? Yes ◉ No ○ (If no, explain in Remarks.)

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ significantly disturbed? Are "Normal Circumstances" present? Yes ◉ No ○

Are Vegetation ☐ , Soil ☐ , or Hydrology ☐ naturally problematic? (If needed, explain any answers in Remarks.)

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

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	**Is the Sampled Area within a Wetland?** Yes ◉ No ○
Hydric Soil Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	
Wetland Hydrology Present?	Yes ◉ No ○	

Remarks:
This open water pond is located within a residential property. Pond collects surface runoff and water from spring seeps.

VEGETATION - Use scientific names of plants.

	Absolute % Cover	Dominant Species? Rel.Strat. Cover	Indicator Status
Tree Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	
Sapling/Shrub Stratum (Plot size: 15' radius)			
1. Salix nigra	5	☑ 100.0%	OBL
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	5	= Total Cover	
Herb Stratum (Plot size: 5' radius)			
1.	25	☑ 62.5%	
2.	15	☑ 37.5%	
3.	0	☐ 0.0%	
4.	0	☐ 0.0%	
5.	0	☐ 0.0%	
6.	0	☐ 0.0%	
7.	0	☐ 0.0%	
8.	0	☐ 0.0%	
9.	0	☐ 0.0%	
10.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	40	= Total Cover	
Woody Vine Stratum (Plot size: 30' radius)			
1.	0	☐ 0.0%	
2.	0	☐ 0.0%	
	0	= Total Cover	

Dominance Test worksheet:

Number of Dominant Species That are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 1 (A)

Total Number of Dominant Species Across All Strata: 3 (B)

Percent of dominant Species That Are OBL, FACW, or FAC: 33.3% (A/B)

Prevalence Index worksheet:

Total % Cover of:		Multiply by:	
OBL species	5	x 1 =	5
FACW species	0	x 2 =	0
FAC species	0	x 3 =	0
FACU species	0	x 4 =	0
UPL species	0	x 5 =	0
Column Totals:	5 (A)		5 (B)

Prevalence Index = B/A = 1.000

Hydrophytic Vegetation Indicators:

- ☐ **1 - Rapid Test for Hydrophytic Vegetation**
- ☐ **2 - Dominance Test is > 50%**
- ☑ **3 - Prevalence Index is ≤3.0** [1]
- ☐ **4 - Morphological Adaptations** [1] **(Provide supporting data in Remarks or on a separate sheet)**
- ☐ **Problematic Hydrophytic Vegetation** [1] **(Explain)**

[1] **Indicators of hydric soil and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.**

Hydrophytic Vegetation Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks: (Include photo numbers here or on a separate sheet.)
Hydrophytic vegetation is limited to the pond edge. Area is mowed around the pond.

*Indicator suffix = National status or professional decision assigned because Regional status not defined by FWS.

SOIL

Sampling Point: **Pond-MRK-004**

Profile Description: (Describe to the depth needed to document the indicator or confirm the absence of indicators.)

Depth (inches)	Matrix Color (moist)	%	Redox Features Color (moist)	%	Type[1]	Loc[2]	Texture	Remarks

[1] Type: C=Concentration, D=Depletion, RM=Reduced Matrix, CS=Covered or Coated Sand Grains. [2] Location: PL=Pore Lining. M=Matrix.

Hydric Soil Indicators:

- ☐ Histosol (A1)
- ☐ Histic Epipedon (A2)
- ☐ Black Histic (A3)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide (A4)
- ☐ Stratified Layers (A5)
- ☐ 2 cm Muck (A10)
- ☐ Depleted Below Dark Surface (A11)
- ☐ Thick Dark Surface (A12)
- ☐ Sandy Muck Mineral (S1)
- ☐ 5 cm Mucky Peat or Peat (S3)
- ☐ Sandy Gleyed Matrix (S4)
- ☐ Sandy Redox (S5)
- ☐ Stripped Matrix (S6)
- ☐ Loamy Mucky Mineral (F1)
- ☐ Loamy Gleyed Matrix (F2)
- ☐ Depleted Matrix (F3)
- ☐ Redox Dark Surface (F6)
- ☐ Depleted Dark Surface (F7)
- ☐ Redox Depressions (F8)

Indicators for Problematic Hydric Soils [3]:

- ☐ Coast Prairie Redox (A16)
- ☐ Dark Surface (S7)
- ☐ Iron Manganese Masses (F12)
- ☐ Very Shallow Dark Surface (TF12)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

[3] Indicators of hydrophytic vegetation and wetland hydrology must be present, unless disturbed or problematic.

Restrictive Layer (if observed):

Type: _____

Depth (inches): _____

Hydric Soil Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Remarks:

Soil pit was not sampled due to deep surface water. Hydric soils are assumed due to year round inundation.

HYDROLOGY

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators (minimum of one is required; check all that apply)

- ☑ Surface Water (A1)
- ☑ High Water Table (A2)
- ☑ Saturation (A3)
- ☐ Water Marks (B1)
- ☐ Sediment Deposits (B2)
- ☐ Drift Deposits (B3)
- ☐ Algal Mat or Crust (B4)
- ☐ Iron Deposits (B5)
- ☑ Inundation Visible on Aerial Imagery (B7)
- ☑ Sparsely Vegetated Concave Surface (B8)
- ☐ Water-Stained Leaves (B9)
- ☑ Aquatic Fauna (B13)
- ☐ True Aquatic Plants (B14)
- ☐ Hydrogen Sulfide Odor (C1)
- ☐ Oxidized Rhizospheres on Living Roots (C3)
- ☐ Presence of Reduced Iron (C4)
- ☐ Recent Iron Reduction in Tilled Soils (C6)
- ☐ Thin Muck Surface (C7)
- ☐ Gauge or Well Data (D9)
- ☐ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Secondary Indicators (minimum of two required)

- ☐ Surface Soil Cracks (B6)
- ☐ Drainage Patterns (B10)
- ☐ Dry Season Water Table (C2)
- ☐ Crayfish Burrows (C8)
- ☐ Saturation Visible on Aerial Imagery (C9)
- ☐ Stunted or Stressed Plants (D1)
- ☑ Geomorphic Position (D2)
- ☑ FAC-Neutral Test (D5)

Field Observations:

Surface Water Present? Yes ◉ No ○ Depth (inches): 72

Water Table Present? Yes ◉ No ○ Depth (inches): 0

Saturation Present? (includes capillary fringe) Yes ◉ No ○ Depth (inches): 0

Wetland Hydrology Present? Yes ◉ No ○

Describe Recorded Data (stream gauge, monitoring well, aerial photos, previous inspections), if available:

NA

Remarks:

The source of hydrology is surface runoff and spring seeps. Several primary and secondary hydrology indicators are present.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information	
Name:	**Cameron Wyse**
Date:	**6/7/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**525 Vine St., Ste. 1800, Cincinnati, OH 45202**
Phone Number:	**(859) 227-5211**
e-mail address:	Cameron.Wyse@AECOM.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-CRW-001**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PEM**
HGM Class(es):	**Deppressional**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.

Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.225059, -82.850404**
USGS Quad Name:	**Sunbury**
County:	**Deleware**
Township:	**Trenton**
Section and Subsection:	**4N 16W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**50600011306**
Site Visit:	**6/7/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**N/A**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-CRW-001		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	0.21	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	0.21

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.



Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

PEM wetlands on either side of constructed berm. Delineated by topo and veg. Hydro source=precip

Final score:	29	Category:	1

Wetland ID:	W-CRW-001

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.		X
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-CRW-001

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	***NO** Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	***NO** Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	***NO** Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	***NO** Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	***NO** Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	***NO** Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	***NO** Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	***NO** Go to Question 8b

Wetland ID:	W-CRW-001

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	*NO Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	*NO Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	*NO Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	*NO Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	*NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	*NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	*NO Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	*NO Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-CRW-001

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-CRW-001

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	CRW, RBL	Date:	6/7/2023

Field ID:

W-CRW-001

Delineated acres:	0.21
Total acres:	0.21

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

1.0 / 1.0 (max 6 pts / subtotal)

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [ ] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [ ] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [ ] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [x] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [ ] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

7.0 / 8.0 (max 14 pts. / subtotal)

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [x] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [ ] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [ ] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [ ] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [x] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [ ] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

Metric 3. Hydrology.

6.0 / 14.0 (max 30 pts. / subtotal)

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [ ] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [ ] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [ ] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [ ] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [ ] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [x] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [ ] Recovered (7)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [x] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

10.0 / 24.0 (max 20 pts. / subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [x] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [ ] Good (5)
- [x] Moderately good (4)
- [ ] Fair (3)
- [ ] Poor to fair (2)
- [ ] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [ ] Recovered (6)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [x] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [ ] clearcutting
- [ ] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [x] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [ ] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

24.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-CRW-001

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	CRW, RBL	Date:	6/7/2023

Field ID:
W-CRW-001

24.0
subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. | **24.0** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

5.0 max 20pts. | **29.0** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [2] Emergent
- [ ] Shrub
- [ ] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.
Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [ ] Moderate (3)
- [ ] Moderately low (2)
- [x] Low (1)
- [ ] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [ ] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [ ] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [ ] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [x] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [1] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [ ] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [ ] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [ ] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

29.0	**TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**
1	**Category**

Wetland ID:	W-CRW-001

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	1		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	7		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	6		
	Metric 4. Habitat	10		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	5		
	TOTAL SCORE	29		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-CRW-001

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	NO	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	YES Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	***NO**	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	***NO** Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	***Category 1**	Category 2	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information

Name:	**MRK, AJH**
Date:	**6/14/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street, 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	mathhew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-001, W-MRK-002**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PEM/PFO**
HGM Class(es):	**Depressed**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.



Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.222487, -82.82607 and 40.222414, -82.824598**
USGS Quad Name:	**Jersey**
County:	**Delaware**
Township:	**Trenton**
Section and Subsection:	**4N 16W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**Prairie Run-Big Walnut Creek 050600011306**
Site Visit:	**6/14/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-MRK-001, W-MRK-002		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	7.55	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	8.33

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.



Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

PEM/PFO wetland located within a large depression collecting surface runoff and seasonal flooding. Signs of standing water were observed throughout the wetland. Wetland continues outside current study area.

Final score:	39	Category:	Modified 2

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-001, W-MRK-002

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.		X
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-001, W-MRK-002

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	*NO Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	*NO Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	*NO Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	*NO Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	*NO Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	*NO Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	*NO Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	*NO Go to Question 8b

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-001, W-MRK-002

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	***NO** Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	***NO** Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	NO Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	***NO** Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	***NO** Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-001, W-MRK-002

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-001, W-MRK-002

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, AJH	Date:	6/14/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-001 PEM/PFO, W-MRK-002 PEM/PFO

Delineated acres:	8.33
Total acres:	35.00

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

5.0 (max 6 pts) | **5.0** (subtotal)

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [x] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [ ] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [ ] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [ ] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [ ] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

2.0 (max 14 pts.) | **7.0** (subtotal)

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [ ] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [x] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [ ] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [ ] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [ ] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [x] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

Metric 3. Hydrology.

14.0 (max 30 pts.) | **21.0** (subtotal)

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [x] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [ ] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [x] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [ ] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [ ] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [x] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [x] Recovered (7)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [x] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [x] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

14.0 (max 20 pts.) | **35.0** (subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [x] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [x] Good (5)
- [ ] Moderately good (4)
- [ ] Fair (3)
- [ ] Poor to fair (2)
- [ ] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [x] Recovered (6)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [x] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [x] clearcutting
- [ ] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [x] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [ ] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

35.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-001, W-MRK-002

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, AJH	Date:	6/14/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-001 PEM/PFO, W-MRK-002 PEM/PFO

35.0
subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. **35.0** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

4.0 max 20pts. **39.0** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [2] Emergent
- [ ] Shrub
- [2] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.

Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [x] Moderate (3)
- [ ] Moderately low (2)
- [ ] Low (1)
- [ ] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer

Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [x] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [ ] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [ ] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [ ] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [0] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [1] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [1] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [0] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

39.0 **TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**

Modified 2 **Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-001, W-MRK-002

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	5		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	2		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	14		
	Metric 4. Habitat	14		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	4		
	TOTAL SCORE	39		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-001, W-MRK-002

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	YES Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	***NO**	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	NO	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	***NO** Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	Category 1	***Category 2**	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information	
Name:	**MRK, AJH**
Date:	**6/15/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street, 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	mathhew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-004**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PFO**
HGM Class(es):	**Depressional**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.



Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.148161, -82.748641**
USGS Quad Name:	**Jersey**
County:	**Licking**
Township:	**Monroe**
Section and Subsection:	**3N 15W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**Duncan Run 050600011307**
Site Visit:	**6/15/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-MRK-004		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	0.37	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	0.37

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.

Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

PFO wetland is located within a forested depression. Depression is collecting surface runoff from the surrounding area and is seasonally inundated. Wetland boundary follows edge of depression.

Final score:	35	Category:	Modified 2

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-004

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.		X
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-004

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	***NO** Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	***NO** Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	***NO** Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	***NO** Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	***NO** Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	***NO** Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	***NO** Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	***NO** Go to Question 8b

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-004

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	***NO** Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	***NO** Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	NO Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	***NO** Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	***NO** Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-004

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-004

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, AJH	Date:	6/15/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-004 PFO

Delineated acres:	0.37
Total acres:	0.37

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

2.0 (max 6 pts) | 2.0 (subtotal)

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [ ] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [ ] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [x] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [ ] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [ ] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

6.0 (max 14 pts.) | 8.0 (subtotal)

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [ ] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [x] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [ ] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [x] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [ ] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [ ] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

Metric 3. Hydrology.

12.0 (max 30 pts.) | 20.0 (subtotal)

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [ ] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [ ] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [x] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [ ] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [x] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [ ] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [x] Recovered (7)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [ ] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

12.0 (max 20 pts.) | 32.0 (subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [x] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [ ] Good (5)
- [ ] Moderately good (4)
- [x] Fair (3)
- [ ] Poor to fair (2)
- [ ] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [x] Recovered (6)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [ ] clearcutting
- [x] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [ ] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [x] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

32.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-004

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, AJH	Date:	6/15/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-004 PFO

32.0
subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. **32.0** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

3.0 max 20pts. **35.0** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [ ] Emergent
- [ ] Shrub
- [1] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.
Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [ ] Moderate (3)
- [ ] Moderately low (2)
- [x] Low (1)
- [ ] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [ ] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [x] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [ ] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [ ] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [0] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [1] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [1] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [0] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

35.0 **TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**

Modified 2 **Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-004

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	2		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	6		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	12		
	Metric 4. Habitat	12		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	3		
	TOTAL SCORE	35		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-004

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	YES Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	***NO**	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	NO	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	***NO** Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	Category 1	***Category 2**	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information

Name:	**MRK, AJH**
Date:	**6/15/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street, 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	mathhew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-005**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PFO**
HGM Class(es):	**Depressional**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.



Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.147472, -82.748273**
USGS Quad Name:	**Jersey**
County:	**Licking**
Township:	**Monroe**
Section and Subsection:	**3N 15W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**Duncan Run 050600011307**
Site Visit:	**6/15/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-MRK-005		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	0.03	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	0.03

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.

Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

This PFO wetland is located within a forested depression. Depression is collecting surface runoff from the surrounding area and is seasonally inundated. Wetland boundary follows edge of depression.

Final score:	35	Category:	Modified 2

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-005

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.		X
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-005

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	***NO** Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	***NO** Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	***NO** Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	***NO** Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	***NO** Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	***NO** Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	***NO** Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	***NO** Go to Question 8b

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-005

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	***NO** Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	***NO** Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	NO Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	***NO** Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	***NO** Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-005

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-005

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, AJH	Date:	6/15/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-005 PFO

Delineated acres:	0,03
Total acres:	0.35

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

2.0 (max 6 pts) | 2.0 (subtotal)

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [ ] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [ ] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [x] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [ ] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [ ] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

6.0 (max 14 pts.) | 8.0 (subtotal)

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [ ] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [x] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [ ] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [x] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [ ] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [ ] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

Metric 3. Hydrology.

12.0 (max 30 pts.) | 20.0 (subtotal)

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [ ] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [ ] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [x] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [ ] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [x] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [ ] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [x] Recovered (7)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [ ] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

12.0 (max 20 pts.) | 32.0 (subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [x] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [ ] Good (5)
- [ ] Moderately good (4)
- [x] Fair (3)
- [ ] Poor to fair (2)
- [ ] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [x] Recovered (6)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [ ] clearcutting
- [x] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [ ] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [x] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

32.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-005

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, AJH	Date:	6/15/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-005 PFO

32.0 subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. **32.0** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

3.0 max 20pts. **35.0** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [ ] Emergent
- [ ] Shrub
- [1] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.

Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [ ] Moderate (3)
- [ ] Moderately low (2)
- [x] Low (1)
- [ ] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer

Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [ ] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [x] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [ ] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [ ] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [0] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [1] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [1] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [0] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

35.0 **TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**

Modified 2 **Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-005

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	2		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	6		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	12		
	Metric 4. Habitat	12		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	3		
	TOTAL SCORE	35		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-005

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	YES Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	***NO**	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	NO	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	***NO** Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	Category 1	***Category 2**	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information	
Name:	**MRK, AJH**
Date:	**6/16/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street, 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	mathhew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-006**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**Depressional**
HGM Class(es):	**PEM**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.



Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.128403, -82.725013**
USGS Quad Name:	**Jersey**
County:	**Licking**
Township:	**Monroe**
Section and Subsection:	**3N 15W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**Headwaters Raccoon Creek 050400060301**
Site Visit:	**6/16/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-MRK-006		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	0.02	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	0.02

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.



Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

This PEM wetland is located within a depression on the floodplain of a perennial watercourse. Wetland boundary follows edge of depression and is inundated seasonally. No vegetation within wetland due to inundation.

Final score:	23	Category:	1

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-006

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.		X
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-006

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	***NO** Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	***NO** Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	***NO** Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	***NO** Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	***NO** Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	***NO** Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	***NO** Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	***NO** Go to Question 8b

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-006

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	***NO** Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	***NO** Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	NO Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	***NO** Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	***NO** Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-006

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-006

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, AJH	Date:	6/16/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-006 PEM

Delineated acres:	0.02
Total acres:	0.02

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

0.0 / 0.0 (max 6 pts / subtotal)

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [ ] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [ ] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [ ] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [ ] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [x] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

4.0 / 4.0 (max 14 pts. / subtotal)

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [ ] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [x] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [ ] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [ ] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [x] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [ ] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

Metric 3. Hydrology.

10.0 / 14.0 (max 30 pts. / subtotal)

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [ ] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [x] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [x] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [ ] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [ ] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [x] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [ ] Recovered (7)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [x] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [ ] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

6.0 / 20.0 (max 20 pts. / subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [ ] Recovered (3)
- [x] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [ ] Good (5)
- [ ] Moderately good (4)
- [ ] Fair (3)
- [ ] Poor to fair (2)
- [x] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [ ] Recovered (6)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [ ] clearcutting
- [x] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [ ] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [x] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

20.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-006

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, AJH	Date:	6/16/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-006 PEM

20.0
subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. **20.0** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

3.0 max 20pts. **23.0** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [1] Emergent
- [ ] Shrub
- [ ] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.
Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [ ] Moderate (3)
- [ ] Moderately low (2)
- [ ] Low (1)
- [x] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [ ] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [ ] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [ ] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [x] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [0] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [0] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [1] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [0] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

23.0	**TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**
1	**Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-006

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	0		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	4		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	10		
	Metric 4. Habitat	6		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	3		
	TOTAL SCORE	23		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-006

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	NO	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	YES Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	***NO**	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	***NO** Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	***Category 1**	Category 2	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information	
Name:	**MRK, AJH**
Date:	**6/16/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street, 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	mathhew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-007**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**Depressional**
HGM Class(es):	**PFO**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.



Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.1280789, -82.7251133**
USGS Quad Name:	**Jersey**
County:	**Licking**
Township:	**Monroe**
Section and Subsection:	**3N 15W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**Headwaters Raccoon Creek 050400060301**
Site Visit:	**6/16/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-MRK-007		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	0.30	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	2.00

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.



Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

This PFO wetland is located on the floodplain of a perennial and intermittent watercourse. Depression is seasonally inundated. Wetland boundary follows edge of depression.

Final score:	35.5	Category:	Modified 2

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-007

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.		X
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-007

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	*NO Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	*NO Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	*NO Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	*NO Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	*NO Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	*NO Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	*NO Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	*NO Go to Question 8b

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-007

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	***NO** Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	***NO** Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	NO Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	***NO** Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	***NO** Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-007

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-007

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, AJH	Date:	6/16/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-007 PFO

Delineated acres:	0.30
Total acres:	2.00

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

2.0 (max 6 pts) **2.0** (subtotal)

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [ ] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [ ] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [x] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [ ] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [ ] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

6.0 (max 14 pts.) **8.0** (subtotal)

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [ ] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [x] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [ ] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [x] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [ ] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [ ] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

Metric 3. Hydrology.

15.0 (max 30 pts.) **23.0** (subtotal)

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [ ] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [x] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [x] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [ ] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [x] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [ ] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [x] Recovered (7)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [ ] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

9.5 (max 20 pts.) **32.5** (subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [x] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [ ] Good (5)
- [ ] Moderately good (4)
- [ ] Fair (3)
- [x] Poor to fair (2)
- [ ] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [x] Recovered (6)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [ ] clearcutting
- [x] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [ ] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [x] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

32.5 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-007

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, AJH	Date:	6/16/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-007 PFO

32.5 subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. **32.5** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

3.0 max 20pts. **35.5** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [ ] Emergent
- [ ] Shrub
- [1] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.

Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [ ] Moderate (3)
- [ ] Moderately low (2)
- [x] Low (1)
- [ ] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [ ] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [x] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [ ] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [ ] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [0] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [1] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [1] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [0] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

35.5	**TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**
Modified 2	**Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-007

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	2		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	6		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	15		
	Metric 4. Habitat	9.5		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	3		
	TOTAL SCORE	35.5		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-007

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	YES Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	***NO**	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	NO	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	***NO** Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	Category 1	***Category 2**	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information

Name:	**MRK, RBL**
Date:	**6/22/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street, 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	mathhew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-011**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PEM**
HGM Class(es):	**Depressional**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.



Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.1870629, -82.7767043**
USGS Quad Name:	**Jersey**
County:	**Delaware**
Township:	**Harlem**
Section and Subsection:	**T3N R16W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**Hoover Reservoir-Big Walnut Creek 050600011308**
Site Visit:	**6/22/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-MRK-011		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	0.40	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	0.70

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.



Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

This PEM wetland is located within a depression between a pasture and an agricultural field. Signs of tire ruts were observed throughout the wetland. Depression is collecting surface runoff from the agricultural field to the east.

Final score:	12	Category:	1

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-011

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.		X
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-011

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	*NO Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	*NO Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	*NO Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	*NO Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	*NO Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	*NO Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	*NO Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	*NO Go to Question 8b

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-011

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	***NO** Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	***NO** Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	NO Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	***NO** Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	***NO** Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-011

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-011

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, RBL	Date:	6/22/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-011 PEM

Delineated acres:	0.40
Total acres:	0.70

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

2.0 (max 6 pts) | 2.0 (subtotal)

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [ ] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [ ] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [x] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [ ] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [ ] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

1.0 (max 14 pts.) | 3.0 (subtotal)

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [ ] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [ ] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [x] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [ ] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [ ] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [x] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

Metric 3. Hydrology.

7.0 (max 30 pts.) | 10.0 (subtotal)

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [ ] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [ ] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [x] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [ ] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [ ] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [x] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [ ] Recovered (7)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [x] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

6.0 (max 20 pts.) | 16.0 (subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [ ] Recovered (3)
- [x] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [ ] Good (5)
- [ ] Moderately good (4)
- [ ] Fair (3)
- [ ] Poor to fair (2)
- [x] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [ ] Recovered (6)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [x] clearcutting
- [x] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [ ] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [x] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

16.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-011

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, RBL	Date:	6/22/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-011 PEM

16.0
subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. **16.0** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

-4.0 max 20pts. **12.0** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [1] Emergent
- [ ] Shrub
- [ ] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.
Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [ ] Moderate (3)
- [ ] Moderately low (2)
- [ ] Low (1)
- [x] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [x] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [ ] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [ ] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [ ] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [0] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [0] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [0] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [0] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

12.0 **TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**

1 **Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-011

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	2		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	1		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	7		
	Metric 4. Habitat	6		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	-4		
	TOTAL SCORE	12		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-011

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	NO	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	YES Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	***NO**	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	***NO** Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	***Category 1**	Category 2	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information

Name:	**MRK, TW**
Date:	**6/26/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street, 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	mathhew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-012, W-MRK-013**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PFO**
HGM Class(es):	**Depressional**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.



Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.21583, -82.813053 and 40.213912, -82.813384**
USGS Quad Name:	**Jersey**
County:	**Delaware**
Township:	**Trenton**
Section and Subsection:	**T3N R16W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**Hoover Reservoir-Big Walnut Creek 050600011308**
Site Visit:	**6/26/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-MRK-012, W-MRK-013		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	1.88	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	4.53

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.



Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

W-MRK-012 and W-MRK-013: These PFO wetlands are located in a forested depression that is collecting surface runoff from the surrounding area. Depression is seasonally inundated.

Final score:	26	Category:	1

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-012, W-MRK-013

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.		X
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-012, W-MRK-013

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	*NO Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	*NO Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	*NO Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	*NO Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	*NO Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	*NO Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	*NO Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	*NO Go to Question 8b

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-012, W-MRK-013

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	***NO** Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	***NO** Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	NO Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	***NO** Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	***NO** Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-012, W-MRK-013

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-012, W-MRK-013

Site:	AEP Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, TW	Date:	6/26/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-012 PFO, W-MRK-013 PFO

Delineated acres:	1.88
Total acres:	4.53

3.0 / 3.0 Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

max 6 pts — subtotal

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [ ] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [x] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [ ] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [ ] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [ ] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

2.0 / 5.0 Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

max 14 pts. — subtotal

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [ ] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [x] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [ ] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [ ] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [ ] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [x] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

0.0 / 5.0 Metric 3. Hydrology.

max 30 pts. — subtotal

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [ ] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [ ] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [ ] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [x] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [ ] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [ ] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [x] Recovered (7)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [x] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [ ] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

12.0 / 17.0 Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

max 20 pts. — subtotal

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [x] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [ ] Good (5)
- [ ] Moderately good (4)
- [x] Fair (3)
- [ ] Poor to fair (2)
- [ ] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [x] Recovered (6)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [ ] clearcutting
- [x] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [ ] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [x] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

17.0 subtotal this page

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-012, W-MRK-013

Site:	AEP Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, TW	Date:	6/26/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-012 PFO, W-MRK-013 PFO

17.0 subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. | **17.0** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

9.0 max 20pts. | **26.0** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [ ] Emergent
- [ ] Shrub
- [2] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.

Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [ ] Moderate (3)
- [x] Moderately low (2)
- [ ] Low (1)
- [ ] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [ ] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [ ] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [x] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [ ] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [0] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [2] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [1] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [2] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

26.0 TOTAL (Max 100 pts)

1 Category

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-012, W-MRK-013

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	3		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	2		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	0		
	Metric 4. Habitat	12		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	9		
	TOTAL SCORE	26		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-012, W-MRK-013

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	NO	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	YES Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	***NO**	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	***NO** Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	***Category 1**	Category 2	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information	
Name:	**MRK, TW**
Date:	**6/26/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street, 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	mathhew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-014**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PFO**
HGM Class(es):	**Depressional**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.



Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.213178, -82.812136**
USGS Quad Name:	**Jersey**
County:	**Delaware**
Township:	**Trenton**
Section and Subsection:	**T3N R16W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**Hoover Reservoir-Big Walnut Creek 050600011308**
Site Visit:	**6/26/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-MRK-014		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	0.26	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	0.40

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.



Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

This PFO wetland is located in a forested depression that is directing surface runoff down a small hillside. Water drains down the hillside and dissipates into an agricultural field. Wetland boundary follows edge of depression.

Final score:	26	Category:	1

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-014

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.		X
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-014

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	*NO Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	*NO Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	*NO Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	*NO Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	*NO Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	*NO Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	*NO Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	*NO Go to Question 8b

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-014

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	***NO** Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	***NO** Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	NO Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	***NO** Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	***NO** Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-014

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-014

Site:	AEP Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, TW	Date:	6/26/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-014 PFO

Delineated acres:	0.26
Total acres:	0.40

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

2.0 (max 6 pts) | 2.0 (subtotal)

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [ ] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [ ] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [x] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [ ] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [ ] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

2.0 (max 14 pts.) | 4.0 (subtotal)

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [ ] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [x] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [ ] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [ ] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [ ] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [x] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

Metric 3. Hydrology.

11.0 (max 30 pts.) | 15.0 (subtotal)

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [ ] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [ ] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [ ] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [x] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [ ] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [x] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [x] Recovered (7)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [ ] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

8.0 (max 20 pts.) | 23.0 (subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [x] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [ ] Good (5)
- [ ] Moderately good (4)
- [ ] Fair (3)
- [x] Poor to fair (2)
- [ ] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [ ] Recovered (6)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [ ] clearcutting
- [x] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [ ] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [x] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

23.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-014

Site:	AEP Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, TW	Date:	6/26/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-014 PFO

23.0 subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. | **23.0** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

3.0 max 20pts. | **26.0** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [ ] Emergent
- [ ] Shrub
- [1] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.
Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [ ] Moderate (3)
- [ ] Moderately low (2)
- [x] Low (1)
- [ ] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [ ] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [ ] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [x] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [ ] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [0] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [0] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [1] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [0] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

26.0	**TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**
1	**Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-014

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	2		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	2		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	11		
	Metric 4. Habitat	8		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	3		
	TOTAL SCORE	26		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-014

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	NO	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	YES Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	***NO**	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	***NO** Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	***Category 1**	Category 2	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information	
Name:	**MRK, TW**
Date:	**6/27/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street, 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	matthew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-016**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PEM/PFO**
HGM Class(es):	**Depressional**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.



Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.132939, -82.745182**
USGS Quad Name:	**Johnstown**
County:	**Licking**
Township:	**3N**
Section and Subsection:	**15W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**HUC12- 050600011307 Duncan Run**
Site Visit:	**6/27/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-MRK-016		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	0.27	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	1.80

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.

Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

This PEM wetland is located in a depression at the edge of an agricultural field. Depression is collecting surface runoff which drains to the south. Wetland continues outside of the current study area.

Final score:	19	Category:	1

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-016

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.		X
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-016

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	*NO Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	*NO Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	*NO Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	*NO Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	*NO Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	*NO Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	*NO Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	*NO Go to Question 8b

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-016

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	*NO Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	*NO Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	*NO Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	*NO Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	*NO Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	*NO Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-016

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-016

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, TW	Date:	6/27/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-016 PEM/PFO

Delineated acres:	0.27
Total acres:	1.80

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

2.0 (max 6 pts) | 2.0 (subtotal)

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [ ] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [ ] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [x] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [ ] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [ ] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

3.0 (max 14 pts.) | 5.0 (subtotal)

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [ ] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [ ] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [x] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [ ] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [x] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [ ] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

Metric 3. Hydrology.

8.0 (max 30 pts.) | 13.0 (subtotal)

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [ ] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [ ] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [x] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [ ] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [x] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [ ] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [ ] Recovered (7)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [x] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [ ] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

8.0 (max 20 pts.) | 21.0 (subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [ ] Recovered (3)
- [x] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [ ] Good (5)
- [ ] Moderately good (4)
- [x] Fair (3)
- [ ] Poor to fair (2)
- [ ] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [ ] Recovered (6)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [ ] clearcutting
- [ ] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [ ] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [x] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

21.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-016

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, TW	Date:	6/27/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-016 PEM/PFO

21.0
subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. | **21.0** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

-2.0 max 20pts. | **19.0** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [1] Emergent
- [ ] Shrub
- [1] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.
Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [ ] Moderate (3)
- [ ] Moderately low (2)
- [x] Low (1)
- [ ] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [x] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [ ] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [ ] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [ ] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [0] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [0] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [0] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [0] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

19.0 **TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**

1 **Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-016

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	2		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	3		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	8		
	Metric 4. Habitat	8		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	-2		
	TOTAL SCORE	19		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-016

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	NO	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	YES Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	***NO**	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	***NO** Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	***Category 1**	Category 2	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information

Name:	**MRK, TW**
Date:	**6/27/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street, 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	matthew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-017**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PFO**
HGM Class(es):	**Depressional**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.



Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.140428, -82.749103**
USGS Quad Name:	**Johnstown**
County:	**Licking**
Township:	**3N**
Section and Subsection:	**15W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**HUC12- 050600011307 Duncan Run**
Site Visit:	**6/27/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-MRK-017		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	0.15	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	0.15

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.



Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

This PFO wetland is located within a forested depression that is collecting surface runoff. Wetland is seasonally inundated with water based on water stained leaves and debris drift deposits.

Final score:	35	Category:	Modified 2

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-017

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.		X
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-017

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	***NO** Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	***NO** Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	***NO** Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	***NO** Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	***NO** Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	***NO** Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	***NO** Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	***NO** Go to Question 8b

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-017

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	***NO** Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	***NO** Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	***NO** Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	***NO** Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	***NO** Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	***NO** Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-017

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-017

Site:	AEP Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, TW	Date:	6/27/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-017 PFO

Delineated acres:	0.15
Total acres:	0.15

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

1.0 / 1.0 (max 6 pts / subtotal)

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [ ] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [ ] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [ ] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [x] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [ ] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

6.0 / 7.0 (max 14 pts. / subtotal)

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [ ] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [x] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [ ] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [x] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [ ] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [ ] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

Metric 3. Hydrology.

12.0 / 19.0 (max 30 pts. / subtotal)

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [ ] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [ ] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [x] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [ ] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [x] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [ ] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [x] Recovered (7)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [x] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [ ] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

12.0 / 31.0 (max 20 pts. / subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [x] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [ ] Good (5)
- [ ] Moderately good (4)
- [x] Fair (3)
- [ ] Poor to fair (2)
- [ ] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [x] Recovered (6)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [ ] clearcutting
- [x] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [ ] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [x] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

31.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-017

Site:	AEP Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, TW	Date:	6/27/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-017 PFO

31.0 subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. | **31.0** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

4.0 max 20pts. | **35.0** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [ ] Emergent
- [ ] Shrub
- [1] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.

Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [ ] Moderate (3)
- [ ] Moderately low (2)
- [ ] Low (1)
- [x] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer

Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [ ] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [ ] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [ ] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [x] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [0] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [1] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [1] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [0] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

35.0 **TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**

Modified 2 **Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-017

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	**1**		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	**6**		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	**12**		
	Metric 4. Habitat	**12**		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	**0**		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	**4**		
	TOTAL SCORE	**35**		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-017

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	YES Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	***NO**	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	NO	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	***NO** Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	Category 1	***Category 2**	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information	
Name:	**MRK, KRS**
Date:	**9/12/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street, 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	matthew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-020**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PSS/PFO**
HGM Class(es):	**DEPRESSION**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.

Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**PFO: 40.22163, -82.81790 and PSS: 40.22187, -82.81892**
USGS Quad Name:	**Sunbury**
County:	**Delaware**
Township:	**Trenton**
Section and Subsection:	**T4N R16W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**050600011502 - Hoover Reservoir-Big Walnut Creek**
Site Visit:	**9/12/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-MRK-020		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	1.90	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	2.50

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.



Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

PSS/PFO wetland complex is located within a depression on the existing transmission line right-of-way. Surface water runoff drains off the ROW and into a forested area. Wetland boundary follows edge of depression.

Final score:	35	Category:	Modified 2

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-020

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.	X	
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-020

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	***NO** Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	***NO** Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	***NO** Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	***NO** Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	***NO** Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	***NO** Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	***NO** Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	***NO** Go to Question 8b

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

11/26/2024 4:16:26 PM

in

Case No(s). 24-1043-EL-BLN

Summary: Application Letter of Notificationfor the Vassell –GreChapel 345 kV Transmission Line Adjustment No. 2 Project Part 1 of 2 electronically filed by Hector Garcia-Santana on behalf of AEP Ohio Transmission Company, Inc..

Case No. 24-1043-EL-BLN

Part 5 of 7

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-020

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	***NO** Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	***NO** Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	NO Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	***NO** Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	***NO** Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-020

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-020

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, KRS	Date:	9/12/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-020 PSS/PFO

Delineated acres:	1.90
Total acres:	2.50

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

2.0 (max 6 pts) | 2.0 (subtotal)

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [ ] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [ ] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [x] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [ ] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [ ] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

4.0 (max 14 pts.) | 6.0 (subtotal)

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [ ] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [x] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [ ] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [ ] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [x] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [ ] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

Metric 3. Hydrology.

11.0 (max 30 pts.) | 17.0 (subtotal)

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [ ] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [ ] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [ ] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [x] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [ ] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [x] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [x] Recovered (7)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [x] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

9.0 (max 20 pts.) | 26.0 (subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [x] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [ ] Good (5)
- [ ] Moderately good (4)
- [x] Fair (3)
- [ ] Poor to fair (2)
- [ ] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [ ] Recovered (6)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [x] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [x] clearcutting
- [x] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [x] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [ ] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

26.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-020

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, KRS	Date:	9/12/2023

Field ID:
W-MRK-020 PSS/PFO

26.0
subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. **26.0** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

9.0 max 20pts. **35.0** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [1] Emergent
- [1] Shrub
- [1] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.
Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [x] Moderate (3)
- [ ] Moderately low (2)
- [ ] Low (1)
- [ ] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [ ] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [ ] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [ ] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [x] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [0] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [1] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [1] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [0] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

35.0 **TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**
Modified 2 **Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-020

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	2		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	4		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	11		
	Metric 4. Habitat	9		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	9		
	TOTAL SCORE	35		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-020

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	YES Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	***NO**	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	NO	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	NO Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	Category 1	***Category 2**	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information

Name:	**MRK, KRS**
Date:	**9/11/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street, 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	matthew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-022**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PEM**
HGM Class(es):	**DEPRESSION**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.



Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.22407, -82.84601**
USGS Quad Name:	**Sunbury**
County:	**Delaware**
Township:	**Trenton**
Section and Subsection:	**T4N R16W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**050600011308 - Prairie Run-Big Walnut Creek**
Site Visit:	**9/11/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-MRK-022		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	0.68	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	2.00

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.



Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

This PEM wetland is located within a depression on the existing transmission line right-of-way. Depression is receiving surface runoff from the surrounding are and is also seasonally flooded by a watecourse.

Final score:	15	Category:	1

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-022

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.	X	
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-022

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	***NO** Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	***NO** Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	***NO** Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	***NO** Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	***NO** Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	***NO** Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	***NO** Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	***NO** Go to Question 8b

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-022

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	***NO** Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	***NO** Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	NO Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	***NO** Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	***NO** Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-022

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-022

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, KRS	Date:	9/11/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-022 PEM

Delineated acres:	0.68
Total acres:	2.00

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

2.0 (max 6 pts) | 2.0 (subtotal)

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [ ] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [ ] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [x] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [ ] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [ ] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

3.0 (max 14 pts.) | 5.0 (subtotal)

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [ ] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [ ] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [x] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [ ] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [x] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [ ] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

Metric 3. Hydrology.

7.0 (max 30 pts.) | 12.0 (subtotal)

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [ ] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [ ] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [ ] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [x] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [ ] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [x] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [ ] Recovered (7)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [ ] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

7.0 (max 20 pts.) | 19.0 (subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [x] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [ ] Good (5)
- [ ] Moderately good (4)
- [ ] Fair (3)
- [ ] Poor to fair (2)
- [x] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [ ] Recovered (6)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [x] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [x] clearcutting
- [ ] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [x] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [ ] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

19.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-022

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, KRS	Date:	9/11/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-022 PEM

19.0
subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. **19.0** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

-4.0 max 20pts. **15.0** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [1] Emergent
- [ ] Shrub
- [ ] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.

Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [ ] Moderate (3)
- [ ] Moderately low (2)
- [ ] Low (1)
- [x] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer

Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [x] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [ ] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [ ] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [ ] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [0] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [0] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [0] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [0] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

15.0 **TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**

1 **Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-022

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	2		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	3		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	7		
	Metric 4. Habitat	7		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	-4		
	TOTAL SCORE	15		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-022

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	NO	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	YES Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	***NO**	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	NO Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	***Category 1**	Category 2	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information

Name:	**MRK, KRS**
Date:	**9/13/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street, 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	matthew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-030**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PEM/PFO**
HGM Class(es):	**DEPRESSION**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.



Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**PEM: 40.16174, -82.74871 and PFO: 40.16161, -82.74894**
USGS Quad Name:	**Johnstown**
County:	**Licking**
Township:	**Monroe**
Section and Subsection:	**S15 T3N R15W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**050600011307 - Duncan Run**
Site Visit:	**9/13/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-MRK-030		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	4.90	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	<10 acres

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.



Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

This PFO section of a PEM/PFO wetland complex is located in a depression surrounding a PEM section. Surface runoff drains out of the PFO section to the south, flows into the PEM, and flows north into another PFO section.

Final score:	45	Category:	2

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-030

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.	X	
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-030

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	***NO** Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	***NO** Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	***NO** Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	***NO** Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	***NO** Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	***NO** Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	***NO** Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	***NO** Go to Question 8b

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-030

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	***NO** Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	***NO** Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	NO Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	***NO** Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	***NO** Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-030

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-030

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, KRS	Date:	9/13/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-030 PEM/PFO

Delineated acres:	4.90
Total acres:	<10 acres

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

3.0 (max 6 pts) | 3.0 (subtotal)

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [ ] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [x] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [ ] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [ ] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [ ] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

6.0 (max 14 pts.) | 9.0 (subtotal)

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [ ] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [x] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [ ] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [x] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [ ] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [ ] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

Metric 3. Hydrology.

12.0 (max 30 pts.) | 21.0 (subtotal)

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [ ] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [ ] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [ ] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [x] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [x] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [ ] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [x] Recovered (7)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [x] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

12.0 (max 20 pts.) | 33.0 (subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [x] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [ ] Good (5)
- [ ] Moderately good (4)
- [x] Fair (3)
- [ ] Poor to fair (2)
- [ ] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [x] Recovered (6)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [x] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [x] clearcutting
- [ ] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [ ] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [x] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

33.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-030

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, KRS	Date:	9/13/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-030 PEM/PFO

33.0 subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. **33.0** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

12.0 max 20pts. **45.0** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [1] Emergent
- [ ] Shrub
- [2] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.

Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [x] Moderate (3)
- [ ] Moderately low (2)
- [ ] Low (1)
- [ ] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer

Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [ ] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [ ] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [ ] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [x] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [0] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [2] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [1] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [2] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

45.0 **TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**

2 **Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-030

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	3		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	6		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	12		
	Metric 4. Habitat	12		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	12		
	TOTAL SCORE	45		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-030

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	NO	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	YES Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	***NO**	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	NO Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	Category 1	***Category 2**	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information

Name:	**MRK, KRS**
Date:	**9/15/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street, 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	matthew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-034**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PEM**
HGM Class(es):	**DEPRESSION**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.



Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.12834, -82.73116**
USGS Quad Name:	**Johnstown**
County:	**Licking**
Township:	**Monroe**
Section and Subsection:	**S24 T3N R15W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**050600011307 - Duncan Run**
Site Visit:	**9/15/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-MRK-034		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	0.05	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	0.05

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.



Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

This PEM wetland is located in a small depression at the edge of an agricultural field. A pond located just outside of the study area may have a leaking berm that contributes to the hydrology. The wetland boundary follows edge of depression.

Final score:	14	Category:	1

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-034

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.	X	
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-034

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	*NO Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	*NO Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	*NO Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	*NO Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	*NO Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	*NO Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	*NO Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	*NO Go to Question 8b

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-034

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	***NO** Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	***NO** Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	NO Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	***NO** Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	***NO** Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-034

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-034

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, KRS	Date:	9/15/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-034 PEM

Delineated acres:	0.05
Total acres:	0.05

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

0.0 (max 6 pts) | 0.0 (subtotal)

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [ ] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [ ] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [ ] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [ ] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [x] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

1.0 (max 14 pts.) | 1.0 (subtotal)

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [ ] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [ ] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [x] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [ ] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [ ] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [x] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

Metric 3. Hydrology.

7.0 (max 30 pts.) | 8.0 (subtotal)

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [ ] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [ ] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [ ] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [x] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [ ] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [x] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [ ] Recovered (7)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [ ] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [x] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

6.0 (max 20 pts.) | 14.0 (subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [ ] Recovered (3)
- [x] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [ ] Good (5)
- [ ] Moderately good (4)
- [ ] Fair (3)
- [ ] Poor to fair (2)
- [x] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [ ] Recovered (6)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [x] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [x] clearcutting
- [ ] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [ ] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [x] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [x] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

14.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-034

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, KRS	Date:	9/15/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-034 PEM

14.0
subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. **14.0** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

0.0 max 20pts. **14.0** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [1] Emergent
- [ ] Shrub
- [ ] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.

Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [ ] Moderate (3)
- [ ] Moderately low (2)
- [ ] Low (1)
- [x] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer

Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [ ] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [x] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [ ] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [ ] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.

Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [0] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [0] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [0] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [0] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

14.0	**TOTAL (Max 100 pts)**
1	**Category**

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-034

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	0		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	1		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	7		
	Metric 4. Habitat	6		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	0		
	TOTAL SCORE	14		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-034

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	NO	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	YES Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	***NO**	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	NO Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	***Category 1**	Category 2	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

Version 5.0	**Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands 10 Page Form for Wetland Categorization**
	Background Information Scoring **Boundary Worksheet Narrative Rating** **Field Form Quantitative Rating** **ORAM Summary Worksheet** **Wetland Categorization Worksheet** Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water Final: February 1, 2001

Instructions

The investigator is *STRONGLY URGED* to read the Manual for Using the Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands for further elaboration and discussion of the questions below prior to using the rating forms.

The Narrative Rating is designed to categorize a wetland or to provide alerts to the Rater based on the presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as presence or possible presence of threatened or endangered species. The presence or proximity of such species is often an indicator of the quality and lack of disturbance of the wetland being evaluated. In addition, it is designed to categorize certain wetlands as very low quality (Category 1) or very high quality (Category 3) regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating. In addition, the Narrative Rating also alerts the investigator that a particular wetland may be a Category 3 wetland, again, regardless of the wetland's score on the Quantitative Rating.

It is *VERY IMPORTANT* to properly and thoroughly answer each of the questions in the ORAM in order to properly categorize a wetland. To properly answer all the questions, the boundaries of the wetland being assessed must be correctly identified. Refer to Scoring Boundary worksheet and the User's Manual for a discussion of how to determine the "scoring boundaries." In some instances, the scoring boundaries may differ from the "jurisdictional boundaries."

Refer to the most recent ORAM Score Calibration Report for the scoring breakpoints between wetland categories. The most recent version of this document is posted on Ohio EPA's Division of Surface Water web page at: http://www.epa.ohio.gov/dsw/wetlands/WetlandEcologySection.aspx

Background Information

Name:	**MRK, KRS**
Date:	**9/26/2023**
Affiliation:	**AECOM**
Address:	**707 Grant Street, 5th Floor, Pittsburgh, PA 15219**
Phone Number:	**814-516-1130**
e-mail address:	matthew.kline@aecom.com
Name of Wetland:	**W-MRK-035**
Vegetation Communit(ies):	**PFO**
HGM Class(es):	**DEPRESSION**

Location of Wetland: include map, address, north arrow, landmarks, distances, roads, etc.

Lat/Long or UTM Coordinate:	**40.19245, -82.78172**
USGS Quad Name:	**Sunbury**
County:	**Delaware**
Township:	**Harlem**
Section and Subsection:	**T3N R16W**
Hydrologic Unit Code:	**050600011502 - Hoover Reservoir-Big Walnut Creek**
Site Visit:	**9/26/2023**
National Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Ohio Wetland Inventory Map:	**See Figure 2**
Soil Survey:	**See Figure 2**
Delineation report/map:	**See Figure 3**

Name of Wetland:	W-MRK-035		
Wetland Size (delineated acres):	0.27	Wetland Size (Estimated total acres):	0.27

Sketch: Include north arrow, relationship with other surface waters, vegetation zones, etc.

Comments, Narrative Discussion, Justification of Category Changes:

This PFO wetland is located within a forested depression that is collecting surface runoff from the surrounding area. Water drains to an agricultural swale outside of the study area. The wetland boundary follows edge of depression.

Final score:	30	Category:	1 or 2 Gray Zone

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-035

Scoring Boundary Worksheet

INSTRUCTIONS. The initial step in completing the ORAM is to identify the "scoring boundaries" of the wetland being rated. In many instances this determination will be relatively easy and the scoring boundaries will coincide with the "jurisdictional boundaries." For example, the scoring boundary of an isolated cattail marsh located in the middle of a farm field will likely be the same as that wetland's jurisdictional boundaries. In other instances, however, the scoring boundary will not be as easily determined. Wetlands that are small or isolated from other surface waters often form large contiguous areas or heterogeneous complexes of wetland and upland. In separating wetlands for scoring purposes, the hydrologic regime of the wetland is the main criterion that should be used. Boundaries between contiguous or connected wetlands should be established where the volume, flow, or velocity of water moving through the wetland changes significantly. Areas with a high degree of hydrologic interaction should be scored as a single wetland. In determining a wetland's scoring boundaries, use the guidelines in the ORAM Manual Section 5.0. In certain instances, it may be difficult to establish the scoring boundary for the wetland being rated. These problem situations include wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, wetlands divided by artificial boundaries like property fences, roads, or railroad embankments, wetlands that are contiguous with streams, lakes, or rivers, and estuarine or coastal wetlands. These situations are discussed below, however, it is recommended that Rater contact Ohio EPA, Division of Surface Water, 401/Wetlands Section if there are additional questions or a need for further clarification of the appropriate scoring boundaries of a particular wetland.

#	Steps in properly establishing scoring boundaries	done?	not applicable
Step 1	Identify the wetland area of interest. This may be the site of a proposed impact, a reference site, conservation site, etc.	X	
Step 2	Identify the locations where there is physical evidence that hydrology changes rapidly. Such evidence includes both natural and human- induced changes including, constrictions caused by berms or dikes, points where the water velocity changes rapidly at rapids or falls, points where significant inflows occur at the confluence of rivers, or other factors that may restrict hydrologic interaction between the wetlands or parts of a single wetland.	X	
Step 3	Delineate the boundary of the wetland to be rated such that all areas of interest that are contiguous to and within the areas where the hydrology does not change significantly, i.e. areas that have a high degree of hydrologic interaction are included within the scoring boundary.	X	
Step 4	Determine if artificial boundaries, such as property lines, state lines, roads, railroad embankments, etc., are present. These should not be used to establish scoring boundaries unless they coincide with areas where the hydrologic regime changes.	X	
Step 5	In all instances, the Rater may enlarge the minimum scoring boundaries discussed here to score together wetlands that could be scored separately.	X	
Step 6	Consult ORAM Manual Section 5.0 for how to establish scoring boundaries for wetlands that form a patchwork on the landscape, divided by artificial boundaries, contiguous to streams, lakes or rivers, or for dual classifications.		X

End of Scoring Boundary Determination. Begin Narrative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-035

Narrative Rating

INSTRUCTIONS. Answer each of the following questions. Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 should be answered based on information obtained from the site visit or the literature and by submitting a Data Services Request to the Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Division of Natural Areas and Preserves, Natural Heritage Data Services, 1889 Fountain Square Court, Building F-1, Columbus, Ohio 43224, 614-265-6453 (phone), 614-265-3096 (fax), http://www.dnr.state.oh.us/dnap . The remaining questions are designed to be answered primarily by the results of the site visit. Refer to the User's Manual for descriptions of these wetland types. Note: "Critical habitat" is legally defined in the Endangered Species Act and is the geographic area containing physical or biological features essential to the conservation of a listed species or as an area that may require special management considerations or protection. The Rater should contact the Region 3 Headquarters or the Columbus Ecological Services Office for updates as to whether critical habitat has been designated for other federally listed threatened or endangered species. "Documented" means the wetland is listed in the appropriate State of Ohio database.

#	Question	Circle one	
1	**Critical Habitat.** Is the wetland in a township, section, or subsection of a United States Geological Survey 7.5 minute Quadrangle that has been designated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as "critical habitat" for any threatened or endangered plant or animal species? Note: as of January 1, 2001, of the federally listed endangered or threatened species which can be found in Ohio, the Indiana Bat has had critical habitat designated (50 CFR 17.95(a)) and the piping plover has had critical habitat proposed (65 FR 41812 July 6, 2000).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 2	***NO** Go to Question 2
2	**Threatened or Endangered Species.** Is the wetland known to contain an individual of, or documented occurrences of federal or state-listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 3	***NO** Go to Question 3
3	**Documented High Quality Wetland.** Is the wetland on record in Natural Heritage Database as a high quality wetland?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 4	***NO** Go to Question 4
4	**Significant Breeding or Concentration Area.** Does the wetland contain documented regionally significant breeding or nonbreeding waterfowl, neotropical songbird, or shorebird concentration areas?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 5	***NO** Go to Question 5
5	**Category 1 Wetlands.** Is the wetland less than 0.5 hectares (1 acre) in size and **hydrologically isolated** and either 1) comprised of vegetation that is dominated (greater than eighty per cent areal cover) by *Phalaris arundinacea, Lythrum salicaria,* or *Phragmites australis* , or 2) an acidic pond created or excavated on mined lands that has little or no vegetation?	YES Wetland is a Category 1 wetland Go to Question 6	***NO** Go to Question 6
6	**Bogs.** Is the wetland a peat-accumulating wetland that 1) has no significant inflows or outflows, 2) supports acidophilic mosses, particularly *Sphagnum* spp., 3) the acidophilic mosses have >30% cover, 4) at least one species from Table 1 is present, and 5) the cover of invasive species (see Table 1) is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 7	***NO** Go to Question 7
7	**Fens.** Is the wetland a carbon accumulating (peat, muck) wetland that is saturated during most of the year, primarily by a discharge of free flowing, mineral rich, ground water with a circumneutral ph (5.5-9.0) and with one or more plant species listed in Table 1 and the cover of invasive species listed in Table 1 is <25%?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 8a	***NO** Go to Question 8a
8a	**"Old Growth Forest."** Is the wetland a forested wetland and is the forest characterized by, but not limited to, the following characteristics: overstory canopy trees of great age (exceeding at least 50% of a projected maximum attainable age for a species); little or no evidence of human-caused understory disturbance during the past 80 to 100 years; an all-aged structure and multilayered canopies; aggregations of canopy trees interspersed with canopy gaps; and significant numbers of standing dead snags and downed logs?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 8b	***NO** Go to Question 8b

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-035

8b	**Mature forested wetlands**. Is the wetland a forested wetland with 50% or more of the cover of upper forest canopy consisting of deciduous trees with large diameters at breast height (dbh), generally diameters greater than 45cm (17.7in) dbh?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status. Go to Question 9a	***NO** Go to Question 9a
9a	**Lake Erie coastal and tributary wetlands**. Is the wetland located at an elevation less than 575 feet on the USGS map, adjacent to this elevation, or along a tributary to Lake Erie that is accessible to fish?	YES Go to Question 9b	***NO** Go to Question 10
9b	Does the wetland's hydrology result from measures designed to prevent erosion and the loss of aquatic plants, i.e. the wetland is partially hydrologically restricted from Lake Erie due to lakeward or landward dikes or other hydrological controls?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9c
9c	Are Lake Erie water levels the wetland's primary hydrological influence, i.e. the wetland is hydrologically unrestricted (no lakeward or upland border alterations), or the wetland can be characterized as an "estuarine" wetland with lake and river influenced hydrology. These include sandbar deposition wetlands, estuarine wetlands, river mouth wetlands, or those dominated by submersed aquatic vegetation.	YES Go to Question 9d	NO Go to Question 10
9d	Does the wetland have a predominance of native species within its vegetation communities, although non-native or disturbance tolerant native species can also be present?	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 9e
9e	Does the wetland have a predominance of non-native or disturbance tolerant native plant species within its vegetation communities?	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Go to Question 10	NO Go to Question 10
10	**Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings)** Is the wetland located in Lucas, Fulton, Henry, or Wood Counties and can the wetland be characterized by the following description: the wetland has a sandy substrate with interspersed organic matter, a water table often within several inches of the surface, and often with a dominance of the gramineous vegetation listed in Table 1 (woody species may also be present). The Ohio Department of Natural Resources Division of Natural Areas and Preserves can provide assistance in confirming this type of wetland and its quality.	YES Wetland is a Category 3 wetland. Go to Question 11	***NO** Go to Question 11
11	**Relict Wet Prairies**. Is the wetland a relict wet prairie community dominated by some or all of the species in Table 1. Extensive prairies were formerly located in the Darby Plains (Madison and Union Counties), Sandusky Plains (Wyandot, Crawford, and Marion Counties), northwest Ohio (e.g. Erie, Huron, Lucas, Wood Counties), and portions of western Ohio Counties (e.g. Darke, Mercer, Miami, Montgomery, Van Wert etc.).	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status Complete Quantitative Rating	***NO** Complete Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-035

Table 1. Characteristic plant species.

invasive/exotic spp	fen species	bog species	oak opening species	wet prairie species
Lythrum salicaria	*Zygadenus elegans var. glaucus*	*Calla palustris*	*Carex cryptolepis*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*
Myriophyllum spicatum	*Cacalia plantaginea*	*Carex atlantica var. capillacea*	*Carex lasiocarpa*	*Calamogrostis stricta*
Najas minor	*Carex flava*	*Carex echinata*	*Carex stricta*	*Carex atherodes*
Phalaris arundinacea	*Carex sterilis*	*Carex oligosperma*	*Cladium mariscoides*	*Carex buxbaumii*
Phragmites australis	*Carex stricta*	*Carex trisperma*	*Calamagrostis stricta*	*Carex pellita*
Potamogeton crispus	*Deschampsia caespitosa*	*Chamaedaphne calyculata*	*Calamagrostis canadensis*	*Carex sartwellii*
Ranunculus ficaria	*Eleocharis rostellata*	*Decodon verticillatus*	*Quercus palustris*	*Gentiana andrewsii*
Rhamnus frangula	*Eriophorum viridicarinatum*	*Eriophorum virginicum*		*Helianthus grosseserratus*
Typha angustifolia	*Gentianopsis spp.*	*Larix laricina*		*Liatris spicata*
Typha xglauca	*Lobelia kalmii*	*Nemopanthus mucronatus*		*Lysimachia quadriflora*
	Parnassia glauca	*Schechzeria palustris*		*Lythrum alatum*
	Potentilla fruticosa	*Sphagnum spp.*		*Pycnanthemum virginianum*
	Rhamnus alnifolia	*Vaccinium macrocarpon*		*Silphium terebinthinaceum*
	Rhynchospora capillacea	*Vaccinium corymbosum*		*Sorghastrum nutans*
	Salix candida	*Vaccinium oxycoccos*		*Spartina pectinata*
	Salix myricoides	*Woodwardia virginica*		*Solidago riddellii*
	Salix serissima	*Xyris difformis*		
	Solidago ohioensis			
	Tofieldia glutinosa			
	Triglochin maritimum			
	Triglochin palustre			

End of Narrative Rating. Begin Quantitative Rating on next page.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-035

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, KRS	Date:	9/26/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-035 PFO

Delineated acres:	0.27
Total acres:	0.27

Metric 1. Wetland Area (size).

1.0 (max 6 pts) | 1.0 (subtotal)

Select one size class and assign score.

- [ ] >50 acres (>20.2ha) (6 pts)
- [ ] 25 to <50 acres (10.1 to <20.2ha) (5 pts)
- [ ] 10 to <25 acres (4 to <10.1ha) (4 pts)
- [ ] 3 to <10 acres (1.2 to <4ha) (3 pts)
- [ ] 0.3 to <3 acres (0.12 to <1.2ha) (2pts)
- [x] 0.1 to <0.3 acres (0.04 to <0.12ha) (1 pt)
- [ ] <0.1 acres (0.04ha) (0 pts)

Metric 2. Upland buffers and surrounding land use.

4.0 (max 14 pts.) | 5.0 (subtotal)

2a. Calculate average buffer width. Select only one and assign score. Do not double check.

- [ ] WIDE. Buffers average 50m (164ft) or more around wetland perimeter (7)
- [ ] MEDIUM. Buffers average 25m to <50m (82 to <164ft) around wetland perimeter (4)
- [x] NARROW. Buffers average 10m to <25m (32ft to <82ft) around wetland perimeter (1)
- [ ] VERY NARROW. Buffers average <10m (<32ft) around wetland perimeter (0)

2b. Intensity of surrounding land use. Select one or double check and average.

- [ ] VERY LOW. 2nd growth or older forest, prairie, savannah, wildlife area, etc. (7)
- [ ] LOW. Old field (>10 years), shrubland, young second growth forest. (5)
- [x] MODERATELY HIGH. Residential, fenced pasture, park, conservation tillage, new fallow field. (3)
- [ ] HIGH. Urban, industrial, open pasture, row cropping, mining, construction. (1)

Metric 3. Hydrology.

12.0 (max 30 pts.) | 17.0 (subtotal)

3a. Sources of Water. Score all that apply.

- [ ] High pH groundwater (5)
- [ ] Other groundwater (3)
- [x] Precipitation (1)
- [ ] Seasonal/Intermittent surface water (3)
- [ ] Perennial surface water (lake or stream) (5)

3b. Connectivity. Score all that apply.

- [ ] 100 year floodplain (1)
- [ ] Between stream/lake and other human use (1)
- [ ] Part of wetland/upland (e.g. forest), complex (1)
- [x] Part of riparian or upland corridor (1)

3c. Maximum water depth. Select one.

- [ ] >0.7 (27.6in) (3)
- [ ] 0.4 to 0.7m (15.7 to 27.6in) (2)
- [x] <0.4m (<15.7in) (1)

3d. Duration inundation/saturation. Score one or dbl check.

- [ ] Semi- to permanently inundated/saturated (4)
- [ ] Regularly inundated/saturated (3)
- [x] Seasonally inundated (2)
- [ ] Seasonally saturated in upper 30cm (12in) (1)

3e. Modifications to natural hydrologic regime. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (12)
- [x] Recovered (7)
- [ ] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] ditch
- [x] tile
- [ ] dike
- [ ] weir
- [ ] stormwater input
- [ ] point source (nonstormwater)
- [ ] filling/grading
- [ ] road bed/RR track
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] Other:

Metric 4. Habitat Alteration and Development.

8.0 (max 20 pts.) | 25.0 (subtotal)

4a. Substrate disturbance. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (4)
- [x] Recovered (3)
- [ ] Recovering (2)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

4b. Habitat development. Select only one and assign score.

- [ ] Excellent (7)
- [ ] Very good (6)
- [ ] Good (5)
- [ ] Moderately good (4)
- [ ] Fair (3)
- [x] Poor to fair (2)
- [ ] Poor (1)

4c. Habitat alteration. Score one or double check and average.

- [ ] None or none apparent (9)
- [ ] Recovered (6)
- [x] Recovering (3)
- [ ] Recent or no recovery (1)

Check all disturbances observed

- [ ] mowing
- [ ] grazing
- [ ] clearcutting
- [x] selective cutting
- [ ] woody debris removal
- [ ] toxic pollutants
- [ ] shrub/sapling removal
- [ ] herbaceous/aquatic bed removal
- [x] sedimentation
- [ ] dredging
- [ ] farming
- [ ] nutrient enrichment

25.0 (subtotal this page)

ORAM v. 5.0 Field Form Quantitative Rating

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-035

Site:	Vassell-Green Chapel	Rater(s):	MRK, KRS	Date:	9/26/2023

Field ID:

W-MRK-035 PFO

25.0
subtotal this page

0.0 max 10 pts. | **25.0** subtotal

Metric 5. Special Wetlands.

Check all that apply and score as indicated.

- [ ] Bog (10)
- [ ] Fen (10)
- [ ] Old growth forest (10)
- [ ] Mature forested wetland (5)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-unrestricted hydrology (10)
- [ ] Lake Erie coastal/tributary wetland-restricted hydrology (5)
- [ ] Lake Plain Sand Prairies (Oak Openings) (10)
- [ ] Relict Wet Praires (10)
- [ ] Known occurrence state/federal threatened or endangered species (10)
- [ ] Significant migratory songbird/water fowl habitat or usage (10)
- [ ] Category 1 Wetland. See Question 5 Qualitative Rating (-10)

5.0 max 20pts. | **30.0** subtotal

Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography.

6a. Wetland Vegetation Communities.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [ ] Aquatic bed
- [ ] Emergent
- [ ] Shrub
- [1] Forest
- [ ] Mudflats
- [ ] Open water
- [ ] Other_____

6b. horizontal (plan view) Interspersion.
Select only one.

- [ ] High (5)
- [ ] Moderately high(4)
- [ ] Moderate (3)
- [ ] Moderately low (2)
- [ ] Low (1)
- [x] None (0)

6c. Coverage of invasive plants. Refer Table 1 ORAM long form for list. Add or deduct points for coverage

- [ ] Extensive >75% cover (-5)
- [ ] Moderate 25-75% cover (-3)
- [ ] Sparse 5-25% cover (-1)
- [ ] Nearly absent <5% cover (0)
- [x] Absent (1)

6d. Microtopography.
Score all present using 0 to 3 scale.

- [0] Vegetated hummucks/tussucks
- [1] Coarse woody debris >15cm (6in)
- [1] Standing dead >25cm (10in) dbh
- [1] Amphibian breeding pools

Vegetation Community Cover Scale

0	Absent or comprises <0.1ha (0.2471 acres) contiguous area
1	Present and either comprises small part of wetland's 1 vegetation and is of moderate quality, or comprises a significant part but is of low quality
2	Present and either comprises significant part of wetland's 2 vegetation and is of moderate quality or comprises a small part and is of high quality
3	Present and comprises significant part, or more, of wetland's 3 vegetation and is of high quality

Narrative Description of Vegetation Quality

Low spp diversity and/or predominance of nonnative or low disturbance tolerant native species
Native spp are dominant component of the vegetation, mod although nonnative and/or disturbance tolerant native spp can also be present, and species diversity moderate to moderately high, but generallyw/o presence of rare threatened or endangered spp to
A predominance of native species, with nonnative spp high and/or disturbance tolerant native spp absent or virtually absent, and high spp diversity and often, but not always, the presence of rare, threatened, or endangered spp

Mudflat and Open Water Class Quality

0	Absent <0.1ha (0.247 acres)
1	Low 0.1 to <1ha (0.247 to 2.47 acres)
2	Moderate 1 to <4ha (2.47 to 9.88 acres)
3	High 4ha (9.88 acres) or more

Microtopography Cover Scale

0	Absent
1	Present very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality
2	Present in moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality
3	Present in moderate or greater amounts and of highest quality

30.0 TOTAL (Max 100 pts)

1 or 2 Gray Zone Category

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-035

ORAM Summary Worksheet

		Circle answer or insert score		Result
Narrative Rating	Question 1 Critical Habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 2. Threatened or Endangered Species	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 3. High Quality Natural Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 4. Significant bird habitat	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 5. Category 1 Wetlands	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 1.
	Question 6. Bogs	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 7. Fens	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8a. Old Growth Forest	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3.
	Question 8b. Mature Forested Wetland	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9b. Lake Erie Wetlands - Restricted	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 9d. Lake Erie Wetlands – Unrestricted with native plants	YES	NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 9e. Lake Erie Wetlands - Unrestricted with invasive plants	YES	NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
	Question 10. Oak Openings	YES	*NO	If yes, Category 3
	Question 11. Relict Wet Prairies	YES	*NO	If yes, evaluate for Category 3; may also be 1 or 2.
Quantitative Rating	Metric 1. Size	1		
	Metric 2. Buffers and surrounding land use	4		
	Metric 3. Hydrology	12		
	Metric 4. Habitat	8		
	Metric 5. Special Wetland Communities	0		
	Metric 6. Plant communities, interspersion, microtopography	5		
	TOTAL SCORE	30		Category based on score breakpoints

Complete Wetland Categorization Worksheet.

Wetland ID:	W-MRK-035

Wetland Categorization Worksheet

Choices	Circle one		Evaluation of Categorization Result of ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8a, 9d, 10	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 3 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *less* than the Category 2 scoring threshold (*excluding* gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been over- categorized by the ORAM
Did you answer "Yes" to any of the following questions: Narrative Rating Nos. 1, 8b, 9b, 9e, 11	YES Wetland should be evaluated for possible Category 3 status	***NO**	Evaluate the wetland using the 1) narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and 2) the quantitative rating score. If the wetland is determined to be a Category 3 wetland using either of these, it should be categorized as a Category 3 wetland. Detailed biological and/or functional assessments may also be used to determine the wetland's category.
Did you answer "Yes" to Narrative Rating No. 5	YES Wetland is categorized as a Category 1 wetland	***NO**	Is quantitative rating score *greater* than the Category 2 scoring threshold *(including* any gray zone)? If yes, reevaluate the category of the wetland using the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) and biological and/or functional assessments to determine if the wetland has been under-categorized by the ORAM
Does the quantitative score fall within the scoring range of a Category 1, 2, or 3 wetland?	YES Wetland is assigned to the appropriate category based on the scoring range	***NO**	If the score of the wetland is located within the scoring range for a particular category, the wetland should be assigned to that category. In all instances however, the narrative criteria described in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C) can be used to clarify or change a categorization based on a quantitative score.
Does the quantitative score fall with the *"gray zone"* for Category 1 or 2 or Category 2 or 3 wetlands?	***YES** Wetland is assigned to the higher of the two categories or assigned to a category based on detailed assessments and the narrative criteria	NO	Rater has the option of assigning the wetland to the higher of the two categories or to assign a category based on the results of a nonrapid wetland assessment method, e.g. functional assessment, biological assessment, etc, and a consideration of the narrative criteria in OAC rule 3745-1- 54(C).
Does the wetland otherwise exhibit *moderate OR superior* hydrologic OR habitat, OR recreational functions AND the wetland was *not* categorized as a Category 2 wetland (in the case of moderate functions) or a Category 3 wetland (in the case of superior functions) by this method?	YES Wetland was undercategorized by this method. A written justification for recategorization should be provided on Background Information Form	NO Wetland is assigned to category as determined by the ORAM.	A wetland may be undercategorized using this method, but still exhibit one or more superior functions, e.g. a wetland's biotic communities may be degraded by human activities, but the wetland may still exhibit superior hydrologic functions because of its type, landscape position, size, local or regional significance, etc. In this circumstance, the narrative criteria in OAC Rule 3745-1-54(C)(2) and (3) are controlling, and the under-categorization should be corrected. A written justification with supporting reasons or information for this determination should be provided.

Final Category

Choose one	Category 1	***Category 2**	Category 3	

End of Ohio Rapid Assessment Method for Wetlands.

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-CRW-001 **Date:** June 7, 2023 **Description:** Wetland Data Point PEM Facing North	

W-CRW-001 **Date:** June 7, 2023 **Description:** Wetland Data Point PEM Facing East	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-CRW-001

Date:

June 7, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing South

W-CRW-001

Date:

June 7, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing West

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-CRW-001	
Date: June 7, 2023	
Description: Wetland Data Point PEM Facing Soil	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-001	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

Date:

June 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing North

W-MRK-001

Date:

June 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing East

W-MRK-001

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

Date:

June 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing South

W-MRK-001

Date:

June 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing West

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-001

Date:

June 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing Soil

W-MRK-001

Date:

June 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing North

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-001

Date:

June 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing East

W-MRK-001

Date:

June 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing South

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-001

Date:

June 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing West

W-MRK-001

Date:

June 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing Soil

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-002
Date: June 14, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PEM Facing North

W-MRK-002
Date: June 14, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PEM Facing East

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-002
Date: June 14, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PEM Facing South

W-MRK-002
Date: June 14, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PEM Facing West

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-002
Date: June 14, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PEM Facing Soil

W-MRK-002
Date: June 14, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing North

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-002
Date: June 14, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing East

W-MRK-002
Date: June 14, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing South

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-002

Date:

June 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing West

W-MRK-002

Date:

June 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing Soil

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-004

Date:

June 15, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing North

W-MRK-004

Date:

June 15, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing East

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-004
Date: June 15, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing South

W-MRK-004
Date: June 15, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing West

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-004

Date:

June 15, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing Soil

W-MRK-005

Date:

June 15, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing North

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-005 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Wetland Data Point PFO Facing East	

W-MRK-005 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Wetland Data Point PFO Facing South	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-005
Date: June 15, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing West

W-MRK-005
Date: June 15, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing Soil

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-006

Date:

June 16, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing North

W-MRK-006

Date:

June 16, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing East

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-006
Date: June 16, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PEM Facing South

W-MRK-006
Date: June 16, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PEM Facing West

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-006

Date:

June 16, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing Soil

W-MRK-007

Date:

June 16, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing North

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-007

Date:

June 16, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing East

W-MRK-007

Date:

June 16, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing South

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-007

Date:

June 16, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing West

W-MRK-007

Date:

June 16, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing Soil

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-011
Date: June 22, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PEM Facing North

W-MRK-011
Date: June 22, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PEM Facing East

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-011
Date: June 22, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PEM Facing South

W-MRK-011
Date: June 22, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PEM Facing West

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-011
Date: June 22, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PEM Facing Soil

W-MRK-012
Date: June 26, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing North

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-012
Date: June 26, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing East

W-MRK-012
Date: June 26, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing South

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-012

Date:

June 26, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing West

W-MRK-012

Date:

June 26, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing Soil

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-013
Date: June 26, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing North

W-MRK-013
Date: June 26, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing East

W-MRK-013

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

Date:

June 26, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing South

W-MRK-013

Date:

June 26, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing West

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-013 **Date:** June 26, 2023 **Description:** Wetland Data Point PFO Facing Soil	

W-MRK-014 **Date:** June 26, 2023 **Description:** Wetland Data Point PFO Facing North	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-014

Date:

June 26, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing East

W-MRK-014

Date:

June 26, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing South

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-014
Date: June 26, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing West

W-MRK-014
Date: June 26, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing Soil

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-016	
Date: June 27, 2023	
Description: Wetland Data Point PEM Facing North	

W-MRK-016	
Date: June 27, 2023	
Description: Wetland Data Point PEM Facing East	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-016

Date:

June 27, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing South

W-MRK-016

Date:

June 27, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing West

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-016 **Date:** June 27, 2023 **Description:** Wetland Data Point PEM Facing Soil	

W-MRK-016 **Date:** September 14, 2023 **Description:** Wetland Data Point PFO Facing North	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-016

Date:

September 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing East

W-MRK-016

Date:

September 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing South

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-016

Date:

September 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing West

W-MRK-016

Date:

September 14, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing Soil

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-017

Date:

June 27, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing North

W-MRK-017

Date:

June 27, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing East

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-017

Date:

June 27, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing South

W-MRK-017

Date:

June 27, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing West

Case No. 24-1043-EL-BLN

Part 6 of 7

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-017	
Date: June 27, 2023	
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing Soil	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-020	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

Date:

September 12, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing North

W-MRK-020

Date:

September 12, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing East

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-020

Date:

September 12, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing South

W-MRK-020

Date:

September 12, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing West

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-020
Date: September 12, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing Soil

W-MRK-020
Date: September 12, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PSS Facing North

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-020
Date: September 12, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PSS Facing East

W-MRK-020
Date: September 12, 2023
Description: Wetland Data Point PSS Facing South

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-020

Date:

September 12, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PSS

Facing West

W-MRK-020

Date:

September 12, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PSS

Facing Soil

W-MRK-022

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

Date:

September 11, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing North

W-MRK-022

Date:

September 11, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing East

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-022

Date:

September 11, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing South

W-MRK-022

Date:

September 11, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing West

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-022

Date:

September 11, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing Soil

W-MRK-030

Date:

September 13, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing North

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-030

Date:

September 13, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing East

W-MRK-030

Date:

September 13, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing South

W-MRK-030

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

Date:

September 13, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing West

W-MRK-030

Date:

September 13, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing Soil

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-030

Date:

September 13, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing North

W-MRK-030

Date:

September 13, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing East

W-MRK-030

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

Date:

September 13, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing South

W-MRK-030

Date:

September 13, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing West

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-030	
Date: September 13, 2023	
Description: Wetland Data Point PFO Facing Soil	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-034	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

Date:

September 15, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing North

W-MRK-034

Date:

September 15, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing East

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-034

Date:

September 15, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing South

W-MRK-034

Date:

September 15, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing West

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-034

Date:

September 15, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PEM

Facing Soil

W-MRK-035

Date:

September 26, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing North

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-035

Date:

September 26, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing East

W-MRK-035

Date:

September 26, 2023

Description:

Wetland Data Point

PFO

Facing South

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

Wetland Data Point Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell – Green Chapel North Project	60702685

W-MRK-035
Date:
September 26, 2023
Description:
Wetland Data Point
PFO
Facing West

W-MRK-035
Date:
September 26, 2023
Description:
Wetland Data Point
PFO
Facing Soil

APPENDIX B

OEPA STREAM DATA FORMS / DELINEATED FEATURES PHOTOGRAPHS

S-CRW-001 INT

Class III PHW

Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index Field Form

HHEI Score (sum of metrics 1+2+3) **75**

SITE NAME/LOCATION: Vassell-Green Chapel

SITE NUMBER: NA | RIVER BASIN: 05060001/Upper Sc | DRAINAGE AREA (mi²): 0.10

LENGTH OF STREAM REACH (ft): 200 | LAT.: 40.22706 | LONG.: -82.85053 | RIVER CODE: NA | RIVER MILE: NA

DATE: 06/07/23 | SCORER: CRW, RBL | COMMENTS:

NOTE: Complete All Items On This Form - Refer to "Field Evaluation Manual for Ohio's PHWH Streams" for Instructions

STREAM CHANNEL MODIFICATIONS: ☐ NONE / NATURAL CHANNEL ☑ RECOVERED ☐ RECOVERING ☐ RECENT OR NO RECOVERY

pREVIOULSY Channelized stream within forested area drains out of study area.

1. SUBSTRATE (Estimate percent of every type of substrate present. Check *ONLY* two predominant substrate *TYPE* boxes (Max of 32). Add total number of significant substrate types found (Max of 8). Final metric score is sum of boxes A & B.

TYPE		PERCENT	TYPE		PERCENT
☐	BLDR SLABS [16 pts]	0	☑	SILT [3 pt]	12
☐	BOULDER (>256 mm) [16 pts]	5	☐	LEAF PACK/WOODY DEBRIS [3 pts]	3
☐	BEDROCK [16 pt]	0	☐	FINE DETRITUS [3 pts]	0
☑	COBBLE (65-256 mm) [12 pts]	70	☐	CLAY or HARDPAN [0 pt]	0
☐	GRAVEL (2-64 mm) [9 pts]	10	☐	MUCK [0 pts]	0
☐	SAND (<2 mm) [6 pts]	0	☐	ARTIFICIAL [3 pts]	0

Total of Percentages of Bldr Slabs, Boulder, Cobble, Bedrock: 75 **(A)** | Substrate Percentage Check | **(B)**

SCORE OF TWO MOST PREDOMINATE SUBSTRATE TYPES: 15 **TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBSTRATE TYPES:** 5

HHEI Metric Points

Substrate Max = 40

20

A + B

2. Maximum Pool Depth ***(Measure the maximum pool depth within the 61 meter (200 ft)*** evaluation reach at the time of evaluation. Avoid plunge pools from road culverts or storm water pipes) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐	> 30 centimeters [20 pts]	☐	> 5 cm - 10 cm [15 pts]
☐	> 22.5 - 30 cm [30 pts]	☐	< 5 cm [5 pts]
☑	> 10 - 22.5 cm [25 pts]	☐	NO WATER OR MOIST CHANNEL [0 pts]

COMMENTS: 7 inches **MAXIMUM POOL DEPTH** (Inches): 7.00

Pool Depth Max = 30

25

3. BANK FULL WIDTH (Measured as the average of 3-4 measurements) **(Check *ONLY* one box):**

☑	> 4.0 meters (> 13') [30 pts]	☐	> 1.0 m - 1.5 m (> 3' 3" - 4' 8") [15 pts]
☐	> 3.0 m - 4.0 m (> 9' 7" - 13') [25 pts]	☐	≤ 1.0 m (<=3' 3") [5 pts]
☐	> 1.5 m - 3.0 m (> 9' 7" - 4' 8") [20 pts]		

COMMENTS: OHW=143"x10" BF=157"x16" **AVERAGE BANKFULL WIDTH** (Feet): 2.50

Bankfull Width Max=30

30

This information must also be completed

RIPARIAN ZONE AND FLOODPLAIN QUALITY ☆NOTE: River Left (L) and Right (R) as looking downstream☆

RIPARIAN WIDTH (Per Bank) L	R	FLOODPLAIN QUALITY (Most Predominant per Bank) L	R		L	R	
☐	☐	Wide >10m	☐	☐	Mature Forest, Wetland	☐	☐	Conservation Tillage
☐	☑	Moderate 5-10m	☑	☑	Immature Forest, Shrub or Old Field	☐	☐	Urban or Industrial
☑	☐	Narrow <5m	☐	☐	Residential, Park, New Field	☐	☐	Open Pasture, Row Crop
☐	☐	None	☐	☐	Fenced Pasture	☐	☐	Mining or Construction

COMMENTS:

FLOW REGIME *(At Time of Evaluation)* (Check *ONLY* one box):

☑ Stream Flowing
☐ Subsurface flow with isolated pools (Interstitial)
☐ Moist Channel, isolated pools, no flow (Intermittent)
☐ Dry channel, no water (Ephemeral)

COMMENTS:

SINUOSITY (Number of bends per 61 m (200 ft) of channel) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐ None	☐ 1.0	☑ 2.0	☐ 3.0
☐ 0.5	☐ 1.5	☐ 2.5	☐ >3

STREAM GRADIENT ESTIMATE

☐ Flat (0.5 ft/100 ft) ☐ Flat to Moderate ☑ Moderate (2 ft/100 ft) ☐ Moderate to Severe ☐ Severe (10 ft/100 ft)

ADDITIONAL STREAM INFORMATION (This Information Must Also be Completed):

QHEI PERFORMED? - ☐ Yes ☑ No QHEI Score _____ (If Yes, Attach Completed QHEI Form)

DOWNSTREAM DESIGNATED USE(S)

☑ WWH Name: **Big Walnut Creek: 05060001000137** Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ CWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ EWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

MAPPING: ATTACH COPIES OF MAPS, INCLUDING THE ENTIRE WATERSHED AREA. CLEARLY MARK THE SITE LOCATION

USGS Quadrangle Name: **Sunbury** NRCS Soil Map Page: _____ NRCS Soil Map Stream Order _____

County: **Delaware** Township / City: **Trenton**

MISCELLANEOUS

Base Flow Conditions? (Y/N): **Y** Date of last precipitation: **06/06/23** Quantity: **0.50**

Photograph Information: **Upstream, downstream, substrate**

Elevated Turbidity? (Y/N): **N** Canopy (% open): **15** **Overall Stability of BOTH Stream Banks (check one)**: Stable ☑ Moderately Stable ☐ Unstable ☐

Were samples collected for water chemistry? (Y/N): **N** (Note lab sample no. or id. and attach results) Lab Number: _____

Field Measures: Temp (°C) _____ Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l) _____ pH (S.U.) _____ Conductivity (µmhos/cm) _____

Is the sampling reach representative of the stream (Y/N) **Y** If not, please explain: _____

Additional comments/description of pollution impacts: _____

Construction runoff and sedimentation

BIOTIC EVALUATION

Performed? (Y/N): **Y** (If Yes, Record all observations. Voucher collections optional. NOTE: all voucher samples must be labeled with the site ID number. Include appropriate field data sheets from the Primary Headwater Habitat Assessment Manual)

Fish Observed? (Y/N) **Y** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Salamanders Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Frogs or Tadpoles Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Aquatic Macroinvertebrates Observed? (Y/N) **Y** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Comments Regarding Biology: _____

Creek chubs and smaller minnows. Stone flies, mayflies, and caddis flies

DRAWING AND NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF STREAM REACH (This must be completed):

Include important landmarks and other features of interest for site evaluation and a narrative description of the stream's location

FLOW →

Save as pdf Reset Form

Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index Field Form

HHEI Score (sum of metrics 1+2+3) **13**

SITE NAME/LOCATION: Vassell-Green Chapel

SITE NUMBER: NA | RIVER BASIN: | DRAINAGE AREA (mi²): 0.07

LENGTH OF STREAM REACH (ft): 200 | LAT.: 40.22223 | LONG.: -82.82707 | RIVER CODE: NA | RIVER MILE: NA

DATE: 06/14/23 | SCORER: MRK, AJH | COMMENTS:

NOTE: Complete All Items On This Form - Refer to "Field Evaluation Manual for Ohio's PHWH Streams" for Instructions

STREAM CHANNEL MODIFICATIONS: ☐ NONE / NATURAL CHANNEL ☑ RECOVERED ☐ RECOVERING ☐ RECENT OR NO RECOVERY

Channelized swale in forested area drains to W-MRK-001.

1. SUBSTRATE (Estimate percent of every type of substrate present. Check *ONLY* two predominant substrate *TYPE* boxes (Max of 32). Add total number of significant substrate types found (Max of 8). Final metric score is sum of boxes A & B.

TYPE		PERCENT	TYPE		PERCENT
☐	BLDR SLABS [16 pts]	0	☐	SILT [3 pt]	25
☐	BOULDER (>256 mm) [16 pts]	0	☑	LEAF PACK/WOODY DEBRIS [3 pts]	75
☐	BEDROCK [16 pt]	0	☐	FINE DETRITUS [3 pts]	0
☐	COBBLE (65-256 mm) [12 pts]	0	☐	CLAY or HARDPAN [0 pt]	0
☐	GRAVEL (2-64 mm) [9 pts]	0	☐	MUCK [0 pts]	0
☐	SAND (<2 mm) [6 pts]	0	☐	ARTIFICIAL [3 pts]	0

Total of Percentages of Bldr Slabs, Boulder, Cobble, Bedrock: 0 **(A)** | Substrate Percentage Check | **(B)**

SCORE OF TWO MOST PREDOMINATE SUBSTRATE TYPES: 6 **TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBSTRATE TYPES:** 2

HHEI Metric Points

Substrate Max = 40

8

A + B

2. Maximum Pool Depth ***(Measure the maximum pool depth within the 61 meter (200 ft)*** evaluation reach at the time of evaluation. Avoid plunge pools from road culverts or storm water pipes) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐	> 30 centimeters [20 pts]	☐	> 5 cm - 10 cm [15 pts]
☐	> 22.5 - 30 cm [30 pts]	☐	< 5 cm [5 pts]
☐	> 10 - 22.5 cm [25 pts]	☑	NO WATER OR MOIST CHANNEL [0 pts]

COMMENTS: **MAXIMUM POOL DEPTH** (Inches): 0.00

Pool Depth Max = 30

0

3. BANK FULL WIDTH (Measured as the average of 3-4 measurements) **(Check *ONLY* one box):**

☐	> 4.0 meters (> 13') [30 pts]	☐	> 1.0 m - 1.5 m (> 3' 3" - 4' 8") [15 pts]
☐	> 3.0 m - 4.0 m (> 9' 7" - 13') [25 pts]	☑	≤ 1.0 m (<=3' 3") [5 pts]
☐	> 1.5 m - 3.0 m (> 9' 7" - 4' 8") [20 pts]		

COMMENTS: **AVERAGE BANKFULL WIDTH** (Feet): 2.50

Bankfull Width Max=30

5

This information must also be completed

RIPARIAN ZONE AND FLOODPLAIN QUALITY ☆NOTE: River Left (L) and Right (R) as looking downstream☆

RIPARIAN WIDTH (Per Bank) L	R	FLOODPLAIN QUALITY (Most Predominant per Bank) L	R		L	R	
☐	☐	Wide >10m	☐	☐	Mature Forest, Wetland	☐	☐	Conservation Tillage
☑	☑	Moderate 5-10m	☑	☑	Immature Forest, Shrub or Old Field	☐	☐	Urban or Industrial
☐	☐	Narrow <5m	☐	☐	Residential, Park, New Field	☐	☐	Open Pasture, Row Crop
☐	☐	None	☐	☐	Fenced Pasture	☐	☐	Mining or Construction

COMMENTS:

FLOW REGIME *(At Time of Evaluation)* (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐ Stream Flowing
☐ Subsurface flow with isolated pools (Interstitial)
☑ Moist Channel, isolated pools, no flow (Intermittent)
☐ Dry channel, no water (Ephemeral)

COMMENTS:

SINUOSITY (Number of bends per 61 m (200 ft) of channel) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☑	None	☐	1.0	☐	2.0	☐	3.0
☐	0.5	☐	1.5	☐	2.5	☐	>3

STREAM GRADIENT ESTIMATE

☑ Flat (0.5 ft/100 ft) ☐ Flat to Moderate ☐ Moderate (2 ft/100 ft) ☐ Moderate to Severe ☐ Severe (10 ft/100 ft)

ADDITIONAL STREAM INFORMATION (This Information Must Also be Completed):

QHEI PERFORMED? - ☐ Yes ☑ No QHEI Score _____ (If Yes, Attach Completed QHEI Form)

DOWNSTREAM DESIGNATED USE(S)

☑ WWH Name: **Prairie Run-Big Walnut Creek: 050600011306** Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ CWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ EWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

MAPPING: ATTACH COPIES OF MAPS, INCLUDING THE ENTIRE WATERSHED AREA. CLEARLY MARK THE SITE LOCATION

USGS Quadrangle Name: **Jersey** NRCS Soil Map Page: _____ NRCS Soil Map Stream Order _____

County: **Delaware** Township / City: **Trenton**

MISCELLANEOUS

Base Flow Conditions? (Y/N): **Y** Date of last precipitation: **06/13/23** Quantity: **0.50**

Photograph Information: **Upstream, downstream, substrate**

Elevated Turbidity? (Y/N): **N** Canopy (% open): _____ **Overall Stability of BOTH Stream Banks (check one)**: Stable ☑ Moderately Stable ☐ Unstable ☐

Were samples collected for water chemistry? (Y/N): **N** (Note lab sample no. or id. and attach results) Lab Number: _____

Field Measures: Temp (°C) _____ Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l) _____ pH (S.U.) _____ Conductivity (µmhos/cm) _____

Is the sampling reach representative of the stream (Y/N) **Y** If not, please explain: _____

Additional comments/description of pollution impacts: **Agricultural runoff and sedimentation**

BIOTIC EVALUATION

Performed? (Y/N): **Y** (If Yes, Record all observations. Voucher collections optional. NOTE: all voucher samples must be labeled with the site ID number. Include appropriate field data sheets from the Primary Headwater Habitat Assessment Manual)

Fish Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Salamanders Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Frogs or Tadpoles Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Aquatic Macroinvertebrates Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Comments Regarding Biology: _____

DRAWING AND NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF STREAM REACH (This must be completed):

Include important landmarks and other features of interest for site evaluation and a narrative description of the stream's location

FLOW →



Save as pdf Reset Form

S-MRK-002 INT

Class II PHW

Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index Field Form

HHEI Score (sum of metrics 1+2+3) **40**

SITE NAME/LOCATION: Vassell-Green Chapel

SITE NUMBER: NA | RIVER BASIN: | DRAINAGE AREA (mi²): 0.06

LENGTH OF STREAM REACH (ft): 250 | LAT.: 40.20528 | LONG.: -82.78773 | RIVER CODE: NA | RIVER MILE: NA

DATE: 06/14/23 | SCORER: MRK, AJH | COMMENTS:

NOTE: Complete All Items On This Form - Refer to "Field Evaluation Manual for Ohio's PHWH Streams" for Instructions

STREAM CHANNEL MODIFICATIONS: ☐ NONE / NATURAL CHANNEL ☐ RECOVERED ☑ RECOVERING ☐ RECENT OR NO RECOVERY

Crosses agricultural field and channel growing hydrophytic vegetation.

1. SUBSTRATE (Estimate percent of every type of substrate present. Check *ONLY* two predominant substrate *TYPE* boxes (Max of 32). Add total number of significant substrate types found (Max of 8). Final metric score is sum of boxes A & B.

TYPE		PERCENT	TYPE		PERCENT
☐	BLDR SLABS [16 pts]	0	☑	SILT [3 pt]	70
☐	BOULDER (>256 mm) [16 pts]	0	☐	LEAF PACK/WOODY DEBRIS [3 pts]	0
☐	BEDROCK [16 pt]	0	☐	FINE DETRITUS [3 pts]	0
☐	COBBLE (65-256 mm) [12 pts]	0	☑	CLAY or HARDPAN [0 pt]	30
☐	GRAVEL (2-64 mm) [9 pts]	0	☐	MUCK [0 pts]	0
☐	SAND (<2 mm) [6 pts]	0	☐	ARTIFICIAL [3 pts]	0

Total of Percentages of Bldr Slabs, Boulder, Cobble, Bedrock: 0 **(A)** | Substrate Percentage Check | **(B)**

SCORE OF TWO MOST PREDOMINATE SUBSTRATE TYPES: 3 **TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBSTRATE TYPES:** 2

HHEI Metric Points

Substrate Max = 40

5

A + B

2. Maximum Pool Depth ***(Measure the maximum pool depth within the 61 meter (200 ft)*** evaluation reach at the time of evaluation. Avoid plunge pools from road culverts or storm water pipes) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐	> 30 centimeters [20 pts]	☑	> 5 cm - 10 cm [15 pts]
☐	> 22.5 - 30 cm [30 pts]	☐	< 5 cm [5 pts]
☐	> 10 - 22.5 cm [25 pts]	☐	NO WATER OR MOIST CHANNEL [0 pts]

COMMENTS: **MAXIMUM POOL DEPTH** (Inches): 3.00

Pool Depth Max = 30

15

3. BANK FULL WIDTH (Measured as the average of 3-4 measurements) **(Check *ONLY* one box):**

☐	> 4.0 meters (> 13') [30 pts]	☐	> 1.0 m - 1.5 m (> 3' 3" - 4' 8") [15 pts]
☐	> 3.0 m - 4.0 m (> 9' 7" - 13') [25 pts]	☐	≤ 1.0 m (<=3' 3") [5 pts]
☑	> 1.5 m - 3.0 m (> 9' 7" - 4' 8") [20 pts]		

COMMENTS: **AVERAGE BANKFULL WIDTH** (Feet): 6.00

Bankfull Width Max=30

20

This information must also be completed

RIPARIAN ZONE AND FLOODPLAIN QUALITY ☆NOTE: River Left (L) and Right (R) as looking downstream☆

RIPARIAN WIDTH (Per Bank) L	R	FLOODPLAIN QUALITY (Most Predominant per Bank) L	R		L	R	
☐	☐	Wide >10m	☐	☐	Mature Forest, Wetland	☐	☐	Conservation Tillage
☑	☑	Moderate 5-10m	☐	☐	Immature Forest, Shrub or Old Field	☐	☐	Urban or Industrial
☐	☐	Narrow <5m	☐	☐	Residential, Park, New Field	☑	☑	Open Pasture, Row Crop
☐	☐	None	☐	☐	Fenced Pasture	☐	☐	Mining or Construction

COMMENTS:

FLOW REGIME *(At Time of Evaluation)* (Check *ONLY* one box):

☑	Stream Flowing	☐	Moist Channel, isolated pools, no flow (Intermittent)
☐	Subsurface flow with isolated pools (Interstitial)	☐	Dry channel, no water (Ephemeral)

COMMENTS:

SINUOSITY (Number of bends per 61 m (200 ft) of channel) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐	None	☑	1.0	☐	2.0	☐	3.0
☐	0.5	☐	1.5	☐	2.5	☐	>3

STREAM GRADIENT ESTIMATE

☑ Flat (0.5 ft/100 ft) ☐ Flat to Moderate ☐ Moderate (2 ft/100 ft) ☐ Moderate to Severe ☐ Severe (10 ft/100 ft)

ADDITIONAL STREAM INFORMATION (This Information Must Also be Completed):

QHEI PERFORMED? - ☐ Yes ☑ No QHEI Score _____ (If Yes, Attach Completed QHEI Form)

DOWNSTREAM DESIGNATED USE(S)

☑ WWH Name: **Hoover Reservoir-Big Walnut Creek 050600011502** Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ CWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ EWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

MAPPING: ATTACH COPIES OF MAPS, INCLUDING THE ENTIRE WATERSHED AREA. CLEARLY MARK THE SITE LOCATION

USGS Quadrangle Name: **Jersey** NRCS Soil Map Page: _____ NRCS Soil Map Stream Order _____

County: **Delaware** Township / City: **Trenton**

MISCELLANEOUS

Base Flow Conditions? (Y/N): **Y** Date of last precipitation: **06/13/23** Quantity: **0.50**

Photograph Information: **Upstream, downstream, substrate**

Elevated Turbidity? (Y/N): **N** Canopy (% open): _____ **Overall Stability of BOTH Stream Banks (check one)**: Stable ☑ Moderately Stable ☐ Unstable ☐

Were samples collected for water chemistry? (Y/N): **N** (Note lab sample no. or id. and attach results) Lab Number: _____

Field Measures: Temp (°C) _____ Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l) _____ pH (S.U.) _____ Conductivity (µmhos/cm) _____

Is the sampling reach representative of the stream (Y/N) **Y** If not, please explain: _____

Additional comments/description of pollution impacts: **Agricultural runoff and sedimentation**

BIOTIC EVALUATION

Performed? (Y/N): **Y** (If Yes, Record all observations. Voucher collections optional. NOTE: all voucher samples must be labeled with the site ID number. Include appropriate field data sheets from the Primary Headwater Habitat Assessment Manual)

Fish Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Salamanders Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Frogs or Tadpoles Observed? (Y/N) **Y** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Aquatic Macroinvertebrates Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Comments Regarding Biology: **Frogs observed**

DRAWING AND NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF STREAM REACH (This must be completed):

Include important landmarks and other features of interest for site evaluation and a narrative description of the stream's location

FLOW →



Save as pdf Reset Form

S-MRK-005 PER

Rating - Poor

Ohio EPA Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index and Use Assessment Field Sheet

QHEI Score: 40

Stream & Location: UNT to Duncan Run **RM:** _ _ _._ **Date:** 6-15-23

AEP Vassell-Green Chapel

Scorers Full Name & Affiliation: MRK, AJH/AECOM

River Code:_ _ _- _ _ _- _ _ _ **STORET #:**_ _ _ _ _ _ **Lat./ Long.:** (NAD 83 - decimal °) 40.152913, -82.748472 **Office verified location** ☐

1] SUBSTRATE

Check **ONLY Two** substrate *TYPE BOXES*; estimate % or note every type present

Check ONE (*Or 2 & average*)

BEST TYPES	POOL	RIFFLE	OTHER TYPES	POOL	RIFFLE
☐ ☐ BLDR /SLABS [10]			☐ ☐ HARDPAN [4]		
☐ ☐ BOULDER [9]			☑ ☐ DETRITUS [3]	40	
☐ ☐ COBBLE [8]			☐ ☐ MUCK [2]		
☐ ☐ GRAVEL [7]			☑ ☐ SILT [2]	60	
☐ ☐ SAND [6]			☐ ☐ ARTIFICIAL [0]		
☐ ☐ BEDROCK [5]					

(Score natural substrates; ignore sludge from point-sources)

NUMBER OF BEST TYPES: ☐ 4 or more [2] ☑ 3 or less [0]

ORIGIN
- ☐ LIMESTONE [1]
- ☐ TILLS [1]
- ☑ WETLANDS [0]
- ☐ HARDPAN [0]
- ☐ SANDSTONE [0]
- ☐ RIP/RAP [0]
- ☐ LACUSTURINE [0]
- ☐ SHALE [-1]
- ☐ COAL FINES [-2]

QUALITY

SILT
- ☑ HEAVY [-2]
- ☐ MODERATE [-1]
- ☐ NORMAL [0]
- ☐ FREE [1]

EMBEDDEDNESS
- ☑ EXTENSIVE [-2]
- ☐ MODERATE [-1]
- ☐ NORMAL [0]
- ☐ NONE [1]

Substrate 1 *Maximum 20*

Comments

Heavy siltation

2] INSTREAM COVER

Indicate presence 0 to 3: **0**-Absent; **1**-Very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality; **2**-Moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality; **3**-Highest quality in moderate or greater amounts (e.g., very large boulders in deep or fast water, large diameter log that is stable, well developed rootwad in deep / fast water, or deep, well-defined, functional pools.

1 UNDERCUT BANKS [1]	___ POOLS > 70cm [2]	___ OXBOWS, BACKWATERS [1]
1 OVERHANGING VEGETATION [1]	___ ROOTWADS [1]	___ AQUATIC MACROPHYTES [1]
___ SHALLOWS (IN SLOW WATER) [1]	___ BOULDERS [1]	1 LOGS OR WOODY DEBRIS [1]
1 ROOTMATS [1]		

AMOUNT

Check ONE (*Or 2 & average*)
- ☐ EXTENSIVE >75% [11]
- ☑ MODERATE 25-75% [7]
- ☐ SPARSE 5-<25% [3]
- ☐ NEARLY ABSENT <5% [1]

Comments

Cover 11 *Maximum 20*

3] CHANNEL MORPHOLOGY

Check ONE in each category (*Or 2 & average*)

SINUOSITY
- ☐ HIGH [4]
- ☑ MODERATE [3]
- ☐ LOW [2]
- ☐ NONE [1]

DEVELOPMENT
- ☐ EXCELLENT [7]
- ☑ GOOD [5]
- ☐ FAIR [3]
- ☐ POOR [1]

CHANNELIZATION
- ☐ NONE [6]
- ☑ RECOVERED [4]
- ☐ RECOVERING [3]
- ☐ RECENT OR NO RECOVERY [1]

STABILITY
- ☐ HIGH [3]
- ☑ MODERATE [2]
- ☐ LOW [1]

Comments

Channel 14 *Maximum 20*

4] BANK EROSION AND RIPARIAN ZONE

Check **ONE** in each category for *EACH BANK* (*Or 2 per bank & average*)

River right looking downstream

EROSION L	EROSION R	
☐	☐	NONE / LITTLE [3]
☑	☑	MODERATE [2]
☐	☐	HEAVY / SEVERE [1]

RIPARIAN WIDTH L	RIPARIAN WIDTH R	
☐	☐	WIDE > 50m [4]
☐	☐	MODERATE 10-50m [3]
☐	☐	NARROW 5-10m [2]
☑	☑	VERY NARROW < 5m [1]
☐	☐	NONE [0]

FLOOD PLAIN QUALITY L	FLOOD PLAIN QUALITY R	
☐	☐	FOREST, SWAMP [3]
☐	☐	SHRUB OR OLD FIELD [2]
☐	☐	RESIDENTIAL, PARK, NEW FIELD [1]
☐	☐	FENCED PASTURE [1]
☑	☑	OPEN PASTURE, ROWCROP [0]

L	R	
☐	☐	CONSERVATION TILLAGE [1]
☐	☐	URBAN OR INDUSTRIAL [0]
☐	☐	MINING / CONSTRUCTION [0]

Indicate predominant land use(s) past 100m riparian.

Comments

Agricultural fields north and south of forested riparian area.

Riparian 3 *Maximum 10*

5] POOL / GLIDE AND RIFFLE / RUN QUALITY

MAXIMUM DEPTH

Check **ONE** (*ONLY!*)
- ☐ > 1m [6]
- ☐ 0.7-<1m [4]
- ☐ 0.4-<0.7m [2]
- ☑ 0.2-<0.4m [1]
- ☐ < 0.2m [0]

CHANNEL WIDTH

Check ONE (*Or 2 & average*)
- ☐ POOL WIDTH > RIFFLE WIDTH [2]
- ☑ POOL WIDTH = RIFFLE WIDTH [1]
- ☐ POOL WIDTH > RIFFLE WIDTH [0]

CURRENT VELOCITY

Check ALL that apply
- ☐ TORRENTIAL [-1]
- ☐ VERY FAST [1]
- ☐ FAST [1]
- ☐ MODERATE [1]
- ☑ SLOW [1]
- ☐ INTERSTITIAL [-1]
- ☐ INTERMITTENT [-2]
- ☐ EDDIES [1]

Indicate for reach - pools and riffles.

Recreation Potential
Primary Contact
Secondary Contact
(circle one and comment on back)

Comments

Pool / Current 3 *Maximum 12*

Indicate for functional riffles; Best areas must be large enough to support a population of riffle-obligate species: Check ONE (*Or 2 & average*). ☐ NO RIFFLE [metric=0]

RIFFLE DEPTH
- ☑ BEST AREAS > 10cm [2]
- ☐ BEST AREAS 5-10cm [1]
- ☐ BEST AREAS < 5cm [metric=0]

RUN DEPTH
- ☐ MAXIMUM > 50cm [2]
- ☑ MAXIMUM < 50cm [1]

RIFFLE / RUN SUBSTRATE
- ☐ STABLE (e.g., Cobble, Boulder) [2]
- ☐ MOD. STABLE (e.g., Large Gravel) [1]
- ☑ UNSTABLE (e.g., Fine Gravel, Sand) [0]

RIFFLE / RUN EMBEDDEDNESS
- ☐ NONE [2]
- ☐ LOW [1]
- ☐ MODERATE [0]
- ☑ EXTENSIVE [-1]

Comments

Riffle / Run 2 *Maximum 8*

6] GRADIENT

DRAINAGE AREA (1.34 mi²)

ft/mi)
- ☐ VERY LOW - LOW [2-4]
- ☑ MODERATE [6-10]
- ☐ HIGH - VERY HIGH [10-6]

%POOL: **%GLIDE:** **%RUN:** 100 **%RIFFLE:**

Gradient 6 *Maximum 10*

A] SAMPLED REACH

Check ALL that apply

Comment RE: Reach consistency/ Is reach typical of steam?*, Recreation/* Observed - Inferred, *Other/* Sampling observations, Concerns, Access directions, etc.

METHOD

- ☐ BOAT
- ☐ WADE
- ☐ L. LINE
- ☑ OTHER

STAGE

1st -sample pass-	2nd
☐ HIGH	☐
☐ UP	☐
☑ NORMAL	☐
☐ LOW	☐
☐ DRY	☐

DISTANCE

- ☐ 0.5 Km
- ☐ 0.2 Km
- ☐ 0.15 Km
- ☐ 0.12 Km
- ☐ OTHER

200 feet

CLARITY

1st --sample pass--	2nd
☑ < 20 cm	☐
☐ 20-<40 cm	☐
☐ 40-70 cm	☐
☐ > 70 cm/ CTB	☐
☐ SECCHI DEPTH	☐

CANOPY

- ☐ > 85%- OPEN
- ☐ 55%-<85%
- ☐ 30%-<55%
- ☑ 10%-<30%
- ☐ <10%- CLOSED

1st pass 2nd _____ cm

1st pass _____ cm

C] REC

B] AESTHETIC

- ☐ NUISANCE ALGAE
- ☐ INVASIVE MACROPHYTES
- ☐ EXCESS TURBIDITY
- ☐ DISCOLORATION
- ☐ FOAM / SCUM
- ☐ OIL SHEEN
- ☑ TRASH / LITTER
- ☐ NUISANCE ODOR
- ☐ SLUDGE DEPOSITS
- ☐ CSOs/SSOs/OUTFALLS

ION AREA DEPTH

POOL: ☐ >100ft² ☐ >3ft

D] MAINTENANCE

Circle some & *COMMENT*

PUBLIC / PRIVATE / BOTH / NA
ACTIVE / HISTORIC / BOTH / NA
YOUNG-SUCCESSION-OLD
SPRAY / SNAG / REMOVED
MODIFIED / DIPPED OUT / NA
LEVEED / ONE SIDED
RELOCATED / CUTOFFS
MOVING-BEDLOAD-STABLE
ARMOURED / SLUMPS
ISLANDS / SCOURED
IMPOUNDED / DESICCATED
FLOOD CONTROL / DRAINAGE

E] ISSUES

WWTP / CSO / NPDES / INDUSTRY
HARDENED / URBAN / DIRT&GRIME
CONTAMINATED / LANDFILL
BMPs-CONSTRUCTION-SEDIMENT
LOGGING / IRRIGATION / COOLING
BANK / EROSION / SURFACE
FALSE BANK / MANURE / LAGOON
WASH H_20 / TILE / H_20 TABLE
ACID / MINE / QUARRY / FLOW
NATURAL / WETLAND / STAGNANT
PARK / GOLF / LAWN / HOME
ATMOSPHERE / DATA PAUCITY

F] MEASUREMENTS

- $\bar{x}$ width 9'
- $\bar{x}$ depth
- max. depth 12"
- $\bar{x}$ bankfull width 16'
- bankfull $\bar{x}$ depth 6'
- W/D ratio
- bankfull max. depth
- floodprone x^2 width
- entrench. ratio

Le *Tree:*

Stream Drawing:

S-MRK-006 INT

Class II PHW

Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index Field Form

HHEI Score (sum of metrics 1+2+3) **31**

SITE NAME/LOCATION: Vassell-Green Chapel

SITE NUMBER: NA | RIVER BASIN: | DRAINAGE AREA (mi²): 0.62

LENGTH OF STREAM REACH (ft): 250 | LAT.: 40.12718 | LONG.: -82.71825 | RIVER CODE: NA | RIVER MILE: NA

DATE: 06/16/23 | SCORER: MRK, AJH | COMMENTS:

NOTE: Complete All Items On This Form - Refer to "Field Evaluation Manual for Ohio's PHWH Streams" for Instructions

STREAM CHANNEL MODIFICATIONS: ☐ NONE / NATURAL CHANNEL ☐ RECOVERED ☑ RECOVERING ☐ RECENT OR NO RECOVERY

Located in an active cattle pasture.

1. SUBSTRATE (Estimate percent of every type of substrate present. Check *ONLY* two predominant substrate *TYPE* boxes (Max of 32). Add total number of significant substrate types found (Max of 8). Final metric score is sum of boxes A & B.

TYPE		PERCENT	TYPE		PERCENT
☐	BLDR SLABS [16 pts]	0	☑	SILT [3 pt]	70
☐	BOULDER (>256 mm) [16 pts]	0	☐	LEAF PACK/WOODY DEBRIS [3 pts]	0
☐	BEDROCK [16 pt]	0	☐	FINE DETRITUS [3 pts]	10
☐	COBBLE (65-256 mm) [12 pts]	0	☑	CLAY or HARDPAN [0 pt]	20
☐	GRAVEL (2-64 mm) [9 pts]	0	☐	MUCK [0 pts]	0
☐	SAND (<2 mm) [6 pts]	0	☐	ARTIFICIAL [3 pts]	0

Total of Percentages of Bldr Slabs, Boulder, Cobble, Bedrock: 0 **(A)** | Substrate Percentage Check | **(B)**

SCORE OF TWO MOST PREDOMINATE SUBSTRATE TYPES: 3 **TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBSTRATE TYPES:** 3

HHEI Metric Points

Substrate Max = 40: 6

A + B

2. Maximum Pool Depth ***(Measure the maximum pool depth within the 61 meter (200 ft)*** evaluation reach at the time of evaluation. Avoid plunge pools from road culverts or storm water pipes) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐	> 30 centimeters [20 pts]	☐	> 5 cm - 10 cm [15 pts]
☐	> 22.5 - 30 cm [30 pts]	☑	< 5 cm [5 pts]
☐	> 10 - 22.5 cm [25 pts]	☐	NO WATER OR MOIST CHANNEL [0 pts]

COMMENTS: **MAXIMUM POOL DEPTH** (Inches): 2.00

Pool Depth Max = 30: 5

3. BANK FULL WIDTH (Measured as the average of 3-4 measurements) **(Check *ONLY* one box):**

☐	> 4.0 meters (> 13') [30 pts]	☐	> 1.0 m - 1.5 m (> 3' 3" - 4' 8") [15 pts]
☐	> 3.0 m - 4.0 m (> 9' 7" - 13') [25 pts]	☐	≤ 1.0 m (<=3' 3") [5 pts]
☑	> 1.5 m - 3.0 m (> 9' 7" - 4' 8") [20 pts]		

COMMENTS: **AVERAGE BANKFULL WIDTH** (Feet): 8.00

Bankfull Width Max=30: 20

This information must also be completed

RIPARIAN ZONE AND FLOODPLAIN QUALITY ☆NOTE: River Left (L) and Right (R) as looking downstream☆

RIPARIAN WIDTH (Per Bank) L	R	FLOODPLAIN QUALITY (Most Predominant per Bank) L	R		L	R	
☐	☐	Wide >10m	☐	☐	Mature Forest, Wetland	☐	☐	Conservation Tillage
☐	☐	Moderate 5-10m	☐	☐	Immature Forest, Shrub or Old Field	☐	☐	Urban or Industrial
☐	☐	Narrow <5m	☐	☐	Residential, Park, New Field	☐	☐	Open Pasture, Row Crop
☑	☑	None	☑	☑	Fenced Pasture	☐	☐	Mining or Construction

COMMENTS:

FLOW REGIME *(At Time of Evaluation)* (Check *ONLY* one box):

☑ Stream Flowing
☐ Subsurface flow with isolated pools (Interstitial)
☐ Moist Channel, isolated pools, no flow (Intermittent)
☐ Dry channel, no water (Ephemeral)

COMMENTS:

SINUOSITY (Number of bends per 61 m (200 ft) of channel) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☑ None	☐ 1.0	☐ 2.0	☐ 3.0
☐ 0.5	☐ 1.5	☐ 2.5	☐ >3

STREAM GRADIENT ESTIMATE

☑ Flat (0.5 ft/100 ft) ☐ Flat to Moderate ☐ Moderate (2 ft/100 ft) ☐ Moderate to Severe ☐ Severe (10 ft/100 ft)

ADDITIONAL STREAM INFORMATION (This Information Must Also be Completed):

QHEI PERFORMED? - ☐ Yes ☑ No QHEI Score _____ (If Yes, Attach Completed QHEI Form)

DOWNSTREAM DESIGNATED USE(S)

☑ WWH Name: **Headwaters Raccoon Creek 050400060301** Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ CWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ EWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

MAPPING: ATTACH COPIES OF MAPS, INCLUDING THE ENTIRE WATERSHED AREA. CLEARLY MARK THE SITE LOCATION

USGS Quadrangle Name: **Jersey** NRCS Soil Map Page: _____ NRCS Soil Map Stream Order _____

County: **Licking** Township / City: **Monroe**

MISCELLANEOUS

Base Flow Conditions? (Y/N): **Y** Date of last precipitation: **06/16/23** Quantity: **0.25**

Photograph Information: **Upstream, downstream, substrate**

Elevated Turbidity? (Y/N): **N** Canopy (% open): **50** **Overall Stability of BOTH Stream Banks (check one)**: Stable ☐ Moderately Stable ☑ Unstable ☐

Were samples collected for water chemistry? (Y/N): **N** (Note lab sample no. or id. and attach results) Lab Number: _____

Field Measures: Temp (°C) _____ Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l) _____ pH (S.U.) _____ Conductivity (µmhos/cm) _____

Is the sampling reach representative of the stream (Y/N) **Y** If not, please explain: _____

Additional comments/description of pollution impacts: **Cattle movement and agriculture runoff**

BIOTIC EVALUATION

Performed? (Y/N): **Y** (If Yes, Record all observations. Voucher collections optional. NOTE: all voucher samples must be labeled with the site ID number. Include appropriate field data sheets from the Primary Headwater Habitat Assessment Manual)

Fish Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Salamanders Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Frogs or Tadpoles Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Aquatic Macroinvertebrates Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Comments Regarding Biology: _____

DRAWING AND NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF STREAM REACH (This must be completed):

Include important landmarks and other features of interest for site evaluation and a narrative description of the stream's location

FLOW →



Save as pdf Reset Form

Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index Field Form

HHEI Score (sum of metrics 1+2+3) **61**

SITE NAME/LOCATION: Vassell-Green Chapel

SITE NUMBER: NA | RIVER BASIN: | DRAINAGE AREA (mi²): 0.71

LENGTH OF STREAM REACH (ft): 250 | LAT.: 40.12841 | LONG.: -82.72470 | RIVER CODE: NA | RIVER MILE: NA

DATE: 06/16/23 | SCORER: MRK, AJH | COMMENTS:

NOTE: Complete All Items On This Form - Refer to "Field Evaluation Manual for Ohio's PHWH Streams" for Instructions

STREAM CHANNEL MODIFICATIONS: ☐ NONE / NATURAL CHANNEL ☑ RECOVERED ☐ RECOVERING ☐ RECENT OR NO RECOVERY

Located in a forested strip of land adjacent to agricultural.

1. SUBSTRATE (Estimate percent of every type of substrate present. Check *ONLY* two predominant substrate *TYPE* boxes (Max of 32). Add total number of significant substrate types found (Max of 8). Final metric score is sum of boxes A & B.

TYPE		PERCENT	TYPE		PERCENT
☐	BLDR SLABS [16 pts]	0	☑	SILT [3 pt]	50
☐	BOULDER (>256 mm) [16 pts]	0	☐	LEAF PACK/WOODY DEBRIS [3 pts]	0
☐	BEDROCK [16 pt]	0	☐	FINE DETRITUS [3 pts]	15
☐	COBBLE (65-256 mm) [12 pts]	15	☐	CLAY or HARDPAN [0 pt]	0
☑	GRAVEL (2-64 mm) [9 pts]	20	☐	MUCK [0 pts]	0
☐	SAND (<2 mm) [6 pts]	0	☐	ARTIFICIAL [3 pts]	0

Total of Percentages of Bldr Slabs, Boulder, Cobble, Bedrock: 15 (A) | Substrate Percentage Check | (B)

SCORE OF TWO MOST PREDOMINATE SUBSTRATE TYPES: 12 **TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBSTRATE TYPES:** 4

HHEI Metric Points

Substrate Max = 40

16

A + B

2. Maximum Pool Depth ***(Measure the maximum pool depth within the 61 meter (200 ft)*** evaluation reach at the time of evaluation. Avoid plunge pools from road culverts or storm water pipes) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐	> 30 centimeters [20 pts]	☑	> 5 cm - 10 cm [15 pts]
☐	> 22.5 - 30 cm [30 pts]	☐	< 5 cm [5 pts]
☐	> 10 - 22.5 cm [25 pts]	☐	NO WATER OR MOIST CHANNEL [0 pts]

COMMENTS: **MAXIMUM POOL DEPTH** (Inches): 3.00

Pool Depth Max = 30

15

3. BANK FULL WIDTH (Measured as the average of 3-4 measurements) **(Check *ONLY* one box):**

☑	> 4.0 meters (> 13') [30 pts]	☐	> 1.0 m - 1.5 m (> 3' 3" - 4' 8") [15 pts]
☐	> 3.0 m - 4.0 m (> 9' 7" - 13') [25 pts]	☐	≤ 1.0 m (<=3' 3") [5 pts]
☐	> 1.5 m - 3.0 m (> 9' 7" - 4' 8") [20 pts]		

COMMENTS: **AVERAGE BANKFULL WIDTH** (Feet): 16.00

Bankfull Width Max=30

30

This information must also be completed

RIPARIAN ZONE AND FLOODPLAIN QUALITY ☆NOTE: River Left (L) and Right (R) as looking downstream☆

RIPARIAN WIDTH (Per Bank) L	R	FLOODPLAIN QUALITY (Most Predominant per Bank) L	R		L	R	
☐	☐	Wide >10m	☐	☐	Mature Forest, Wetland	☐	☐	Conservation Tillage
☑	☐	Moderate 5-10m	☑	☐	Immature Forest, Shrub or Old Field	☐	☐	Urban or Industrial
☐	☑	Narrow <5m	☐	☑	Residential, Park, New Field	☐	☐	Open Pasture, Row Crop
☐	☐	None	☐	☐	Fenced Pasture	☐	☐	Mining or Construction

COMMENTS:

FLOW REGIME *(At Time of Evaluation)* (Check *ONLY* one box):

☑ Stream Flowing
☐ Subsurface flow with isolated pools (Interstitial)
☐ Moist Channel, isolated pools, no flow (Intermittent)
☐ Dry channel, no water (Ephemeral)

COMMENTS:

SINUOSITY (Number of bends per 61 m (200 ft) of channel) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐	None	☑	1.0	☐	2.0	☐	3.0
☐	0.5	☐	1.5	☐	2.5	☐	>3

STREAM GRADIENT ESTIMATE

☑ Flat (0.5 ft/100 ft) ☐ Flat to Moderate ☐ Moderate (2 ft/100 ft) ☐ Moderate to Severe ☐ Severe (10 ft/100 ft)

ADDITIONAL STREAM INFORMATION (This Information Must Also be Completed):

QHEI PERFORMED? - ☐ Yes ☑ No QHEI Score _____ (If Yes, Attach Completed QHEI Form)

DOWNSTREAM DESIGNATED USE(S)

☑ WWH Name: **Headwaters Raccoon Creek 050400060301** Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ CWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ EWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

MAPPING: ATTACH COPIES OF MAPS, INCLUDING THE ENTIRE WATERSHED AREA. CLEARLY MARK THE SITE LOCATION

USGS Quadrangle Name: **Jersey** NRCS Soil Map Page: _____ NRCS Soil Map Stream Order _____

County: **Licking** Township / City: **Monroe**

MISCELLANEOUS

Base Flow Conditions? (Y/N): **Y** Date of last precipitation: **06/16/23** Quantity: **0.25**

Photograph Information: **Upstream, downstream, substrate**

Elevated Turbidity? (Y/N): **N** Canopy (% open): **50** **Overall Stability of BOTH Stream Banks (check one)**: Stable ☐ Moderately Stable ☑ Unstable ☐

Were samples collected for water chemistry? (Y/N): **N** (Note lab sample no. or id. and attach results) Lab Number: _____

Field Measures: Temp (°C) _____ Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l) _____ pH (S.U.) _____ Conductivity (µmhos/cm) _____

Is the sampling reach representative of the stream (Y/N) **Y** If not, please explain: _____

Additional comments/description of pollution impacts: _____

Agriculture runoff

BIOTIC EVALUATION

Performed? (Y/N): **Y** (If Yes, Record all observations. Voucher collections optional. NOTE: all voucher samples must be labeled with the site ID number. Include appropriate field data sheets from the Primary Headwater Habitat Assessment Manual)

Fish Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Salamanders Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Frogs or Tadpoles Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Aquatic Macroinvertebrates Observed? (Y/N) **Y** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Comments Regarding Biology: _____

Ephemeroptera observed

DRAWING AND NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF STREAM REACH (This must be completed):

Include important landmarks and other features of interest for site evaluation and a narrative description of the stream's location

FLOW ➔



Save as pdf Reset Form

Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index Field Form

HHEI Score (sum of metrics 1+2+3) **37**

SITE NAME/LOCATION: Vassell-Green Chapel

SITE NUMBER: NA | RIVER BASIN: | DRAINAGE AREA (mi²): 0.01

LENGTH OF STREAM REACH (ft): 77 | LAT.: 40.12809 | LONG.: -82.72432 | RIVER CODE: NA | RIVER MILE: NA

DATE: 06/16/23 | SCORER: MRK, AJH | COMMENTS:

NOTE: Complete All Items On This Form - Refer to "Field Evaluation Manual for Ohio's PHWH Streams" for Instructions

STREAM CHANNEL MODIFICATIONS: ☐ NONE / NATURAL CHANNEL ☑ RECOVERED ☐ RECOVERING ☐ RECENT OR NO RECOVERY

Located in a forested riparian area

1. SUBSTRATE (Estimate percent of every type of substrate present. Check *ONLY* two predominant substrate *TYPE* boxes (Max of 32). Add total number of significant substrate types found (Max of 8). Final metric score is sum of boxes A & B.

TYPE		PERCENT	TYPE		PERCENT
☐	BLDR SLABS [16 pts]	0	☑	SILT [3 pt]	30
☐	BOULDER (>256 mm) [16 pts]	0	☐	LEAF PACK/WOODY DEBRIS [3 pts]	0
☐	BEDROCK [16 pt]	0	☐	FINE DETRITUS [3 pts]	10
☐	COBBLE (65-256 mm) [12 pts]	35	☑	CLAY or HARDPAN [0 pt]	0
☐	GRAVEL (2-64 mm) [9 pts]	25	☐	MUCK [0 pts]	0
☐	SAND (<2 mm) [6 pts]	0	☐	ARTIFICIAL [3 pts]	0

Total of Percentages of Bldr Slabs, Boulder, Cobble, Bedrock: 35 **(A)** | Substrate Percentage Check | **(B)**

SCORE OF TWO MOST PREDOMINATE SUBSTRATE TYPES: 3 **TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBSTRATE TYPES:** 4

HHEI Metric Points

Substrate Max = 40

7

A + B

2. Maximum Pool Depth ***(Measure the maximum pool depth within the 61 meter (200 ft)*** evaluation reach at the time of evaluation. Avoid plunge pools from road culverts or storm water pipes) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐	> 30 centimeters [20 pts]	☐	> 5 cm - 10 cm [15 pts]
☐	> 22.5 - 30 cm [30 pts]	☑	< 5 cm [5 pts]
☐	> 10 - 22.5 cm [25 pts]	☐	NO WATER OR MOIST CHANNEL [0 pts]

COMMENTS: **MAXIMUM POOL DEPTH** (Inches): 1.00

Pool Depth Max = 30

5

3. BANK FULL WIDTH (Measured as the average of 3-4 measurements) **(Check *ONLY* one box):**

☐	> 4.0 meters (> 13') [30 pts]	☐	> 1.0 m - 1.5 m (> 3' 3" - 4' 8") [15 pts]
☑	> 3.0 m - 4.0 m (> 9' 7" - 13') [25 pts]	☐	≤ 1.0 m (<=3' 3") [5 pts]
☐	> 1.5 m - 3.0 m (> 9' 7" - 4' 8") [20 pts]		

COMMENTS: **AVERAGE BANKFULL WIDTH** (Feet): 10.00

Bankfull Width Max=30

25

This information must also be completed

RIPARIAN ZONE AND FLOODPLAIN QUALITY ☆NOTE: River Left (L) and Right (R) as looking downstream☆

RIPARIAN WIDTH (Per Bank) L	R	FLOODPLAIN QUALITY (Most Predominant per Bank) L	R		L	R	
☐	☐	Wide >10m	☐	☐	Mature Forest, Wetland	☐	☐	Conservation Tillage
☑	☑	Moderate 5-10m	☑	☑	Immature Forest, Shrub or Old Field	☐	☐	Urban or Industrial
☐	☐	Narrow <5m	☐	☐	Residential, Park, New Field	☐	☐	Open Pasture, Row Crop
☐	☐	None	☐	☐	Fenced Pasture	☐	☐	Mining or Construction

COMMENTS:

FLOW REGIME *(At Time of Evaluation)* (Check *ONLY* one box):

☑ Stream Flowing
☐ Subsurface flow with isolated pools (Interstitial)
☐ Moist Channel, isolated pools, no flow (Intermittent)
☐ Dry channel, no water (Ephemeral)

COMMENTS:

SINUOSITY (Number of bends per 61 m (200 ft) of channel) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐	None	☑	1.0	☐	2.0	☐	3.0
☐	0.5	☐	1.5	☐	2.5	☐	>3

STREAM GRADIENT ESTIMATE

☑ Flat (0.5 ft/100 ft) ☐ Flat to Moderate ☐ Moderate (2 ft/100 ft) ☐ Moderate to Severe ☐ Severe (10 ft/100 ft)

ADDITIONAL STREAM INFORMATION (This Information Must Also be Completed):

QHEI PERFORMED? - ☐ Yes ☑ No QHEI Score _____ (If Yes, Attach Completed QHEI Form)

DOWNSTREAM DESIGNATED USE(S)

☑ WWH Name: **Headwaters Raccoon Creek 050400060301** Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ CWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ EWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

MAPPING: ATTACH COPIES OF MAPS, INCLUDING THE ENTIRE WATERSHED AREA. CLEARLY MARK THE SITE LOCATION

USGS Quadrangle Name: **Jersey** NRCS Soil Map Page: _____ NRCS Soil Map Stream Order _____

County: **Licking** Township / City: **Monroe**

MISCELLANEOUS

Base Flow Conditions? (Y/N): **Y** Date of last precipitation: **06/16/23** Quantity: **0.25**

Photograph Information: **Upstream, downstream, substrate**

Elevated Turbidity? (Y/N): **N** Canopy (% open): **25** **Overall Stability of BOTH Stream Banks (check one)**: Stable ☐ Moderately Stable ☑ Unstable ☐

Were samples collected for water chemistry? (Y/N): **N** (Note lab sample no. or id. and attach results) Lab Number: _____

Field Measures: Temp (°C) _____ Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l) _____ pH (S.U.) _____ Conductivity (µmhos/cm) _____

Is the sampling reach representative of the stream (Y/N) **Y** If not, please explain: _____

Additional comments/description of pollution impacts: **Agriculture runoff**

BIOTIC EVALUATION

Performed? (Y/N): **Y** (If Yes, Record all observations. Voucher collections optional. NOTE: all voucher samples must be labeled with the site ID number. Include appropriate field data sheets from the Primary Headwater Habitat Assessment Manual)

Fish Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Salamanders Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Frogs or Tadpoles Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Aquatic Macroinvertebrates Observed? (Y/N) **Y** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Comments Regarding Biology: **Ephemeroptera observed**

DRAWING AND NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF STREAM REACH (This must be completed):

Include important landmarks and other features of interest for site evaluation and a narrative description of the stream's location

FLOW →



Save as pdf Reset Form

Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index Field Form

HHEI Score (sum of metrics 1+2+3) **69**

SITE NAME/LOCATION **Vassell-Green Chapel**

SITE NUMBER **NA** RIVER BASIN _____ DRAINAGE AREA (mi²) **1.54**

LENGTH OF STREAM REACH (ft) **250** LAT. **40.12950** LONG. **-82.73466** RIVER CODE **NA** RIVER MILE **NA**

DATE **06/16/23** SCORER **MRK, AJH** COMMENTS _____

NOTE: Complete All Items On This Form - Refer to "Field Evaluation Manual for Ohio's PHWH Streams" for Instructions

STREAM CHANNEL MODIFICATIONS: ☐ NONE / NATURAL CHANNEL ☐ RECOVERED ☑ RECOVERING ☐ RECENT OR NO RECOVERY

Perennial watercourse is located within an agricultural swale.

1. SUBSTRATE (Estimate percent of every type of substrate present. Check *ONLY* two predominant substrate *TYPE* boxes (Max of 32). Add total number of significant substrate types found (Max of 8). Final metric score is sum of boxes A & B.

TYPE		PERCENT	TYPE		PERCENT
☐	BLDR SLABS [16 pts]	0	☑	SILT [3 pt]	70
☐	BOULDER (>256 mm) [16 pts]	0	☐	LEAF PACK/WOODY DEBRIS [3 pts]	0
☐	BEDROCK [16 pt]	0	☐	FINE DETRITUS [3 pts]	10
☑	COBBLE (65-256 mm) [12 pts]	15	☐	CLAY or HARDPAN [0 pt]	0
☐	GRAVEL (2-64 mm) [9 pts]	5	☐	MUCK [0 pts]	0
☐	SAND (<2 mm) [6 pts]	0	☐	ARTIFICIAL [3 pts]	0

Total of Percentages of Bldr Slabs, Boulder, Cobble, Bedrock **15** (A) Substrate Percentage Check (B)

SCORE OF TWO MOST PREDOMINATE SUBSTRATE TYPES: **15** **TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBSTRATE TYPES:** **4**

HHEI Metric Points

Substrate Max = 40

19

A + B

2. Maximum Pool Depth ***(Measure the maximum pool depth within the 61 meter (200 ft)*** evaluation reach at the time of evaluation. Avoid plunge pools from road culverts or storm water pipes) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐	> 30 centimeters [20 pts]	☐	> 5 cm - 10 cm [15 pts]
☐	> 22.5 - 30 cm [30 pts]	☐	< 5 cm [5 pts]
☑	> 10 - 22.5 cm [25 pts]	☐	NO WATER OR MOIST CHANNEL [0 pts]

COMMENTS _____ **MAXIMUM POOL DEPTH** (Inches): **4.00**

Pool Depth Max = 30

25

3. BANK FULL WIDTH (Measured as the average of 3-4 measurements) **(Check *ONLY* one box):**

☐	> 4.0 meters (> 13') [30 pts]	☐	> 1.0 m - 1.5 m (> 3' 3" - 4' 8") [15 pts]
☑	> 3.0 m - 4.0 m (> 9' 7" - 13') [25 pts]	☐	≤ 1.0 m (<=3' 3") [5 pts]
☐	> 1.5 m - 3.0 m (> 9' 7" - 4' 8") [20 pts]		

COMMENTS _____ **AVERAGE BANKFULL WIDTH** (Feet): **11.00**

Bankfull Width Max=30

25

This information must also be completed

RIPARIAN ZONE AND FLOODPLAIN QUALITY ☆NOTE: River Left (L) and Right (R) as looking downstream☆

RIPARIAN WIDTH (Per Bank) L	R	FLOODPLAIN QUALITY (Most Predominant per Bank) L	R		L	R	
☐	☐	Wide >10m	☐	☐	Mature Forest, Wetland	☐	☐	Conservation Tillage
☐	☐	Moderate 5-10m	☐	☐	Immature Forest, Shrub or Old Field	☐	☐	Urban or Industrial
☐	☐	Narrow <5m	☐	☐	Residential, Park, New Field	☑	☑	Open Pasture, Row Crop
☑	☑	None	☐	☐	Fenced Pasture	☐	☐	Mining or Construction

COMMENTS _____

FLOW REGIME *(At Time of Evaluation)* (Check *ONLY* one box):

☑ Stream Flowing
☐ Subsurface flow with isolated pools (Interstitial)
☐ Moist Channel, isolated pools, no flow (Intermittent)
☐ Dry channel, no water (Ephemeral)

COMMENTS _____

SINUOSITY (Number of bends per 61 m (200 ft) of channel) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐	None	☐	1.0	☐	2.0	☐	3.0
☐	0.5	☑	1.5	☐	2.5	☐	>3

STREAM GRADIENT ESTIMATE

☑ Flat (0.5 ft/100 ft) ☐ Flat to Moderate ☐ Moderate (2 ft/100 ft) ☐ Moderate to Severe ☐ Severe (10 ft/100 ft)

ADDITIONAL STREAM INFORMATION (This Information Must Also be Completed):

QHEI PERFORMED? - ☐ Yes ☑ No QHEI Score _____ (If Yes, Attach Completed QHEI Form)

DOWNSTREAM DESIGNATED USE(S)

☑ WWH Name: **Duncan Run 050600011307** Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ CWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ EWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

MAPPING: ATTACH COPIES OF MAPS, INCLUDING THE ENTIRE WATERSHED AREA. CLEARLY MARK THE SITE LOCATION

USGS Quadrangle Name: **Jersey** NRCS Soil Map Page: _____ NRCS Soil Map Stream Order _____

County: **Licking** Township / City: **Monroe**

MISCELLANEOUS

Base Flow Conditions? (Y/N): **Y** Date of last precipitation: **06/16/23** Quantity: **0.25**

Photograph Information: **Upstream, downstream, substrate**

Elevated Turbidity? (Y/N): **N** Canopy (% open): **100** **Overall Stability of BOTH Stream Banks (check one)**: Stable ☐ Moderately Stable ☑ Unstable ☐

Were samples collected for water chemistry? (Y/N): **N** (Note lab sample no. or id. and attach results) Lab Number: _____

Field Measures: Temp (°C) _____ Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l) _____ pH (S.U.) _____ Conductivity (µmhos/cm) _____

Is the sampling reach representative of the stream (Y/N) **Y** If not, please explain: _____

Additional comments/description of pollution impacts: _____

Agriculture runoff

BIOTIC EVALUATION

Performed? (Y/N): **Y** (If Yes, Record all observations. Voucher collections optional. NOTE: all voucher samples must be labeled with the site ID number. Include appropriate field data sheets from the Primary Headwater Habitat Assessment Manual)

Fish Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Salamanders Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Frogs or Tadpoles Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Aquatic Macroinvertebrates Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Comments Regarding Biology: _____

DRAWING AND NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF STREAM REACH (This must be completed):

Include important landmarks and other features of interest for site evaluation and a narrative description of the stream's location

FLOW →



Save as pdf Reset Form

Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index Field Form

HHEI Score (sum of metrics 1+2+3) **37**

SITE NAME/LOCATION **AEP Vassell-Green Chapel**

SITE NUMBER **NA** RIVER BASIN _____ DRAINAGE AREA (mi²) **3.74**

LENGTH OF STREAM REACH (ft) **123** LAT. **40.20370** LONG. **-82.77274** RIVER CODE **NA** RIVER MILE **NA**

DATE **06/23/23** SCORER **MRK, RBL** COMMENTS _____

NOTE: Complete All Items On This Form - Refer to "Field Evaluation Manual for Ohio's PHWH Streams" for Instructions

STREAM CHANNEL MODIFICATIONS: ☐ NONE / NATURAL CHANNEL ☐ RECOVERED ☑ RECOVERING ☐ RECENT OR NO RECOVERY

Channelized through a residential property

1. SUBSTRATE (Estimate percent of every type of substrate present. Check *ONLY* two predominant substrate *TYPE* boxes (Max of 32). Add total number of significant substrate types found (Max of 8). Final metric score is sum of boxes A & B.

TYPE		PERCENT	TYPE		PERCENT
☐	BLDR SLABS [16 pts]	0	☑	SILT [3 pt]	45
☐	BOULDER (>256 mm) [16 pts]	0	☐	LEAF PACK/WOODY DEBRIS [3 pts]	0
☐	BEDROCK [16 pt]	0	☐	FINE DETRITUS [3 pts]	10
☐	COBBLE (65-256 mm) [12 pts]	15	☐	CLAY or HARDPAN [0 pt]	0
☑	GRAVEL (2-64 mm) [9 pts]	20	☐	MUCK [0 pts]	0
☐	SAND (<2 mm) [6 pts]	10	☐	ARTIFICIAL [3 pts]	0

Total of Percentages of Bldr Slabs, Boulder, Cobble, Bedrock **15** (A) Substrate Percentage Check (B)

SCORE OF TWO MOST PREDOMINATE SUBSTRATE TYPES: **12** **TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBSTRATE TYPES:** **5**

HHEI Metric Points

Substrate Max = 40

17

A + B

2. Maximum Pool Depth ***(Measure the maximum pool depth within the 61 meter (200 ft)*** evaluation reach at the time of evaluation. Avoid plunge pools from road culverts or storm water pipes) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐	> 30 centimeters [20 pts]	☐	> 5 cm - 10 cm [15 pts]
☐	> 22.5 - 30 cm [30 pts]	☑	< 5 cm [5 pts]
☐	> 10 - 22.5 cm [25 pts]	☐	NO WATER OR MOIST CHANNEL [0 pts]

COMMENTS _____ **MAXIMUM POOL DEPTH** (Inches): **2.00**

Pool Depth Max = 30

5

3. BANK FULL WIDTH (Measured as the average of 3-4 measurements) **(Check *ONLY* one box):**

☐	> 4.0 meters (> 13') [30 pts]	☑	> 1.0 m - 1.5 m (> 3' 3" - 4' 8") [15 pts]
☐	> 3.0 m - 4.0 m (> 9' 7" - 13') [25 pts]	☐	≤ 1.0 m (<=3' 3") [5 pts]
☐	> 1.5 m - 3.0 m (> 9' 7" - 4' 8") [20 pts]		

COMMENTS _____ **AVERAGE BANKFULL WIDTH** (Feet): **3.50**

Bankfull Width Max=30

15

This information must also be completed

RIPARIAN ZONE AND FLOODPLAIN QUALITY ☆NOTE: River Left (L) and Right (R) as looking downstream☆

RIPARIAN WIDTH L	R	(Per Bank)	FLOODPLAIN QUALITY L	R	(Most Predominant per Bank)	L	R	
☐	☐	Wide >10m	☐	☐	Mature Forest, Wetland	☐	☐	Conservation Tillage
☐	☐	Moderate 5-10m	☐	☐	Immature Forest, Shrub or Old Field	☐	☐	Urban or Industrial
☑	☑	Narrow <5m	☑	☑	Residential, Park, New Field	☐	☐	Open Pasture, Row Crop
☐	☐	None	☐	☐	Fenced Pasture	☐	☐	Mining or Construction

COMMENTS _____

FLOW REGIME *(At Time of Evaluation)* (Check *ONLY* one box):

☑ Stream Flowing
☐ Subsurface flow with isolated pools (Interstitial)
☐ Moist Channel, isolated pools, no flow (Intermittent)
☐ Dry channel, no water (Ephemeral)

COMMENTS _____

SINUOSITY (Number of bends per 61 m (200 ft) of channel) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☑	None	☐	1.0	☐	2.0	☐	3.0
☐	0.5	☐	1.5	☐	2.5	☐	>3

STREAM GRADIENT ESTIMATE

☐ Flat (0.5 ft/100 ft) ☑ Flat to Moderate ☐ Moderate (2 ft/100 ft) ☐ Moderate to Severe ☐ Severe (10 ft/100 ft)

ADDITIONAL STREAM INFORMATION (This Information Must Also be Completed):

QHEI PERFORMED? - ☐ Yes ☑ No QHEI Score _____ (If Yes, Attach Completed QHEI Form)

DOWNSTREAM DESIGNATED USE(S)

☑ WWH Name: **UNT to Rattlesnake Creek** Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ CWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ EWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

MAPPING: ATTACH COPIES OF MAPS, INCLUDING THE ENTIRE WATERSHED AREA. CLEARLY MARK THE SITE LOCATION

USGS Quadrangle Name: **Jersey** NRCS Soil Map Page: _____ NRCS Soil Map Stream Order _____

County: **Delaware** Township / City: **Trenton**

MISCELLANEOUS

Base Flow Conditions? (Y/N): **Y** Date of last precipitation: **06/23/23** Quantity: **0.25**

Photograph Information: **Upstream, downstream, substrate**

Elevated Turbidity? (Y/N): **N** Canopy (% open): **50** **Overall Stability of BOTH Stream Banks (check one)**: Stable ☐ Moderately Stable ☑ Unstable ☐

Were samples collected for water chemistry? (Y/N): **N** (Note lab sample no. or id. and attach results) Lab Number: _____

Field Measures: Temp (°C) _____ Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l) _____ pH (S.U.) _____ Conductivity (µmhos/cm) _____

Is the sampling reach representative of the stream (Y/N) **Y** If not, please explain: _____

Additional comments/description of pollution impacts: _____

BIOTIC EVALUATION

Performed? (Y/N): **Y** (If Yes, Record all observations. Voucher collections optional. NOTE: all voucher samples must be labeled with the site ID number. Include appropriate field data sheets from the Primary Headwater Habitat Assessment Manual)

Fish Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Salamanders Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Frogs or Tadpoles Observed? (Y/N) **Y** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Aquatic Macroinvertebrates Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Comments Regarding Biology: _____

DRAWING AND NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF STREAM REACH (This must be completed):

Include important landmarks and other features of interest for site evaluation and a narrative description of the stream's location

FLOW →



Save as pdf Reset Form

S-MRK-016 EPH

Modified Class I

Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index Field Form

HHEI Score (sum of metrics 1+2+3) **10**

SITE NAME/LOCATION: Vassell-Green Chapel / Licking Co., OH

SITE NUMBER: NA | RIVER BASIN: Duncan Run | DRAINAGE AREA (mi²): 0.01

LENGTH OF STREAM REACH (ft): 75 | LAT.: 40.13278 | LONG.: -82.74192 | RIVER CODE: NA | RIVER MILE: NA

DATE: 06/27/23 | SCORER: MRK, TW | COMMENTS:

NOTE: Complete All Items On This Form - Refer to "Field Evaluation Manual for Ohio's PHWH Streams" for Instructions

STREAM CHANNEL MODIFICATIONS: ☐ NONE / NATURAL CHANNEL ☐ RECOVERED ☑ RECOVERING ☐ RECENT OR NO RECOVERY

Channelized swale, drains agricultural field surface runoff

1. SUBSTRATE (Estimate percent of every type of substrate present. Check *ONLY* two predominant substrate *TYPE* boxes (Max of 32). Add total number of significant substrate types found (Max of 8). Final metric score is sum of boxes A & B.

TYPE		PERCENT	TYPE		PERCENT
☐	BLDR SLABS [16 pts]	0	☑	SILT [3 pt]	60
☐	BOULDER (>256 mm) [16 pts]	0	☐	LEAF PACK/WOODY DEBRIS [3 pts]	0
☐	BEDROCK [16 pt]	0	☐	FINE DETRITUS [3 pts]	0
☐	COBBLE (65-256 mm) [12 pts]	0	☑	CLAY or HARDPAN [0 pt]	40
☐	GRAVEL (2-64 mm) [9 pts]	0	☐	MUCK [0 pts]	0
☐	SAND (<2 mm) [6 pts]	0	☐	ARTIFICIAL [3 pts]	0

Total of Percentages of Bldr Slabs, Boulder, Cobble, Bedrock: 0 **(A)** | Substrate Percentage Check | **(B)**

SCORE OF TWO MOST PREDOMINATE SUBSTRATE TYPES: 3 **TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBSTRATE TYPES:** 2

HHEI Metric Points

Substrate Max = 40

5

A + B

2. Maximum Pool Depth ***(Measure the maximum pool depth within the 61 meter (200 ft)*** evaluation reach at the time of evaluation. Avoid plunge pools from road culverts or storm water pipes) (Check *ONLY* one box):

- ☐ > 30 centimeters [20 pts]
- ☐ > 22.5 - 30 cm [30 pts]
- ☐ > 10 - 22.5 cm [25 pts]
- ☐ > 5 cm - 10 cm [15 pts]
- ☐ < 5 cm [5 pts]
- ☑ NO WATER OR MOIST CHANNEL [0 pts]

COMMENTS **MAXIMUM POOL DEPTH** (Inches): 0.00

Pool Depth Max = 30

0

3. BANK FULL WIDTH (Measured as the average of 3-4 measurements) **(Check *ONLY* one box):**

- ☐ > 4.0 meters (> 13') [30 pts]
- ☐ > 3.0 m - 4.0 m (> 9' 7" - 13') [25 pts]
- ☐ > 1.5 m - 3.0 m (> 9' 7" - 4' 8") [20 pts]
- ☐ > 1.0 m - 1.5 m (> 3' 3" - 4' 8") [15 pts]
- ☑ ≤ 1.0 m (<=3' 3") [5 pts]

COMMENTS **AVERAGE BANKFULL WIDTH** (Feet): 2.00

Bankfull Width Max=30

5

This information must also be completed

RIPARIAN ZONE AND FLOODPLAIN QUALITY ☆NOTE: River Left (L) and Right (R) as looking downstream☆

RIPARIAN WIDTH (Per Bank) L R	FLOODPLAIN QUALITY (Most Predominant per Bank) L R	
☐ ☐ Wide >10m	☐ ☐ Mature Forest, Wetland	☐ ☐ Conservation Tillage
☐ ☐ Moderate 5-10m	☑ ☑ Immature Forest, Shrub or Old Field	☐ ☐ Urban or Industrial
☐ ☐ Narrow <5m	☐ ☐ Residential, Park, New Field	☐ ☐ Open Pasture, Row Crop
☐ ☐ None	☐ ☐ Fenced Pasture	☐ ☐ Mining or Construction

COMMENTS:

FLOW REGIME *(At Time of Evaluation)* (Check *ONLY* one box):

- ☐ Stream Flowing
- ☐ Subsurface flow with isolated pools (Interstitial)
- ☑ Moist Channel, isolated pools, no flow (Intermittent)
- ☐ Dry channel, no water (Ephemeral)

COMMENTS:

SINUOSITY (Number of bends per 61 m (200 ft) of channel) (Check *ONLY* one box):

- ☑ None
- ☐ 0.5
- ☐ 1.0
- ☐ 1.5
- ☐ 2.0
- ☐ 2.5
- ☐ 3.0
- ☐ >3

STREAM GRADIENT ESTIMATE

☑ Flat (0.5 ft/100 ft) ☐ Flat to Moderate ☐ Moderate (2 ft/100 ft) ☐ Moderate to Severe ☐ Severe (10 ft/100 ft)

ADDITIONAL STREAM INFORMATION (This Information Must Also be Completed):

QHEI PERFORMED? - ☐ Yes ☑ No QHEI Score _____ (If Yes, Attach Completed QHEI Form)

DOWNSTREAM DESIGNATED USE(S)

☑ WWH Name: **HUC12- 050600011307 Duncan Run** Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ CWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ EWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

MAPPING: ATTACH COPIES OF MAPS, INCLUDING THE ENTIRE WATERSHED AREA. CLEARLY MARK THE SITE LOCATION

USGS Quadrangle Name: **Johnstown** NRCS Soil Map Page: _____ NRCS Soil Map Stream Order _____

County: **Licking** Township / City: **3N, 15W**

MISCELLANEOUS

Base Flow Conditions? (Y/N): **Y** Date of last precipitation: **06/26/23** Quantity: **0.10**

Photograph Information: **Upstream, downstream, substrate**

Elevated Turbidity? (Y/N): **N** Canopy (% open): **60** **Overall Stability of BOTH Stream Banks (check one)**: Stable ☐ Moderately Stable ☑ Unstable ☐

Were samples collected for water chemistry? (Y/N): **N** (Note lab sample no. or id. and attach results) Lab Number: _____

Field Measures: Temp (°C) _____ Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l) _____ pH (S.U.) _____ Conductivity (µmhos/cm) _____

Is the sampling reach representative of the stream (Y/N) **Y** If not, please explain: _____

Additional comments/description of pollution impacts: _____

BIOTIC EVALUATION

Performed? (Y/N): **Y** (If Yes, Record all observations. Voucher collections optional. NOTE: all voucher samples must be labeled with the site ID number. Include appropriate field data sheets from the Primary Headwater Habitat Assessment Manual)

Fish Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Salamanders Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Frogs or Tadpoles Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Aquatic Macroinvertebrates Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Comments Regarding Biology: _____

DRAWING AND NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF STREAM REACH (This must be completed):

Include important landmarks and other features of interest for site evaluation and a narrative description of the stream's location

FLOW →



Save as pdf Reset Form

S-MRK-017 INT

Mod. Class II

Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index Field Form

HHEI Score (sum of metrics 1+2+3) **50**

SITE NAME/LOCATION: AEP Vassell-Green Chapel

SITE NUMBER: NA | RIVER BASIN: Duncan Run | DRAINAGE AREA (mi²): 0.50

LENGTH OF STREAM REACH (ft): 1,400 | LAT.: 40.13478 | LONG.: -82.74849 | RIVER CODE: NA | RIVER MILE: NA

DATE: 06/27/23 | SCORER: MRK, TW | COMMENTS:

NOTE: Complete All Items On This Form - Refer to "Field Evaluation Manual for Ohio's PHWH Streams" for Instructions

STREAM CHANNEL MODIFICATIONS: ☐ NONE / NATURAL CHANNEL ☐ RECOVERED ☑ RECOVERING ☐ RECENT OR NO RECOVERY

Agricultural swale

1. SUBSTRATE (Estimate percent of every type of substrate present. Check *ONLY* two predominant substrate *TYPE* boxes (Max of 32). Add total number of significant substrate types found (Max of 8). Final metric score is sum of boxes A & B.

TYPE		PERCENT	TYPE		PERCENT
☐	BLDR SLABS [16 pts]	0	☑	SILT [3 pt]	60
☐	BOULDER (>256 mm) [16 pts]	0	☐	LEAF PACK/WOODY DEBRIS [3 pts]	0
☐	BEDROCK [16 pt]	0	☐	FINE DETRITUS [3 pts]	0
☐	COBBLE (65-256 mm) [12 pts]	0	☑	CLAY or HARDPAN [0 pt]	40
☐	GRAVEL (2-64 mm) [9 pts]	0	☐	MUCK [0 pts]	0
☐	SAND (<2 mm) [6 pts]	0	☐	ARTIFICIAL [3 pts]	0

Total of Percentages of Bldr Slabs, Boulder, Cobble, Bedrock: 0 **(A)** | Substrate Percentage Check | **(B)**

SCORE OF TWO MOST PREDOMINATE SUBSTRATE TYPES: 3 **TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBSTRATE TYPES:** 2

HHEI Metric Points

Substrate Max = 40

5

A + B

2. Maximum Pool Depth ***(Measure the maximum pool depth within the 61 meter (200 ft)*** evaluation reach at the time of evaluation. Avoid plunge pools from road culverts or storm water pipes) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐	> 30 centimeters [20 pts]	☑	> 5 cm - 10 cm [15 pts]
☐	> 22.5 - 30 cm [30 pts]	☐	< 5 cm [5 pts]
☐	> 10 - 22.5 cm [25 pts]	☐	NO WATER OR MOIST CHANNEL [0 pts]

COMMENTS: **MAXIMUM POOL DEPTH** (Inches): 3.00

Pool Depth Max = 30

15

3. BANK FULL WIDTH (Measured as the average of 3-4 measurements) **(Check *ONLY* one box):**

☑	> 4.0 meters (> 13') [30 pts]	☐	> 1.0 m - 1.5 m (> 3' 3" - 4' 8") [15 pts]
☐	> 3.0 m - 4.0 m (> 9' 7" - 13') [25 pts]	☐	≤ 1.0 m (<=3' 3") [5 pts]
☐	> 1.5 m - 3.0 m (> 9' 7" - 4' 8") [20 pts]		

COMMENTS: **AVERAGE BANKFULL WIDTH** (Feet): 15.00

Bankfull Width Max=30

30

This information must also be completed

RIPARIAN ZONE AND FLOODPLAIN QUALITY ☆NOTE: River Left (L) and Right (R) as looking downstream☆

RIPARIAN WIDTH (Per Bank) L	R	FLOODPLAIN QUALITY (Most Predominant per Bank) L	R		L	R	
☐	☐	Wide >10m	☐	☐	Mature Forest, Wetland	☐	☐	Conservation Tillage
☐	☐	Moderate 5-10m	☐	☐	Immature Forest, Shrub or Old Field	☐	☐	Urban or Industrial
☐	☐	Narrow <5m	☐	☐	Residential, Park, New Field	☑	☑	Open Pasture, Row Crop
☐	☐	None	☐	☐	Fenced Pasture	☐	☐	Mining or Construction

COMMENTS:

FLOW REGIME *(At Time of Evaluation)* (Check *ONLY* one box):

☑ Stream Flowing
☐ Subsurface flow with isolated pools (Interstitial)
☐ Moist Channel, isolated pools, no flow (Intermittent)
☐ Dry channel, no water (Ephemeral)

COMMENTS:

SINUOSITY (Number of bends per 61 m (200 ft) of channel) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☑ None ☐ 0.5 ☐ 1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ >3

STREAM GRADIENT ESTIMATE

☑ Flat (0.5 ft/100 ft) ☐ Flat to Moderate ☐ Moderate (2 ft/100 ft) ☐ Moderate to Severe ☐ Severe (10 ft/100 ft)

ADDITIONAL STREAM INFORMATION (This Information Must Also be Completed):

QHEI PERFORMED? - ☐ Yes ☑ No QHEI Score _____ (If Yes, Attach Completed QHEI Form)

DOWNSTREAM DESIGNATED USE(S)

☑ WWH Name: **HUC12- 050600011307 Duncan Run** Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ CWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ EWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

MAPPING: ATTACH COPIES OF MAPS, INCLUDING THE ENTIRE WATERSHED AREA. CLEARLY MARK THE SITE LOCATION

USGS Quadrangle Name: **Johnstown** NRCS Soil Map Page: _____ NRCS Soil Map Stream Order _____

County: **Licking** Township / City: **3N, 15W**

MISCELLANEOUS

Base Flow Conditions? (Y/N): **Y** Date of last precipitation: **06/26/23** Quantity: **0.10**

Photograph Information: **Upstream, downstream, substrate**

Elevated Turbidity? (Y/N): **N** Canopy (% open): **100** **Overall Stability of BOTH Stream Banks (check one)**: Stable ☑ Moderately Stable ☐ Unstable ☐

Were samples collected for water chemistry? (Y/N): **N** (Note lab sample no. or id. and attach results) Lab Number: _____

Field Measures: Temp (°C) _____ Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l) _____ pH (S.U.) _____ Conductivity (µmhos/cm) _____

Is the sampling reach representative of the stream (Y/N) **Y** If not, please explain: _____

Additional comments/description of pollution impacts: _____

BIOTIC EVALUATION

Performed? (Y/N): **Y** (If Yes, Record all observations. Voucher collections optional. NOTE: all voucher samples must be labeled with the site ID number. Include appropriate field data sheets from the Primary Headwater Habitat Assessment Manual)

Fish Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Salamanders Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Frogs or Tadpoles Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Aquatic Macroinvertebrates Observed? (Y/N) **Y** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Comments Regarding Biology: **Crawfish burrows observed**

DRAWING AND NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF STREAM REACH (This must be completed):

Include important landmarks and other features of interest for site evaluation and a narrative description of the stream's location

FLOW →



Save as pdf Reset Form

S-MRK-018 PER

Rating Fair

Qualitative Habitat Evaluation Index and Use Assessment Field Sheet

QHEI Score: 49

Stream & Location: Duncan Run, Licking Co., OH **RM:** _ _ _._ **Date:** 6-27-23

Scorers Full Name & Affiliation: MRK, TW/AECOM

River Code:_ _ _-_ _ _-_ _ _ **STORET #:**_ _ _ _ _ _ **Lat./ Long.:** (NAD 83 - decimal °) **Office verified location** ☐

1] SUBSTRATE

Check **ONLY Two** substrate *TYPE BOXES*; estimate % or note every type present

BEST TYPES	POOL	RIFFLE	OTHER TYPES	POOL	RIFFLE
☐ ☐ BLDR /SLABS [10]			☐ ☐ HARDPAN [4]		
☐ ☐ BOULDER [9]			☐ ☐ DETRITUS [3]		
☐ ☑ COBBLE [8]	25	25	☐ ☐ MUCK [2]		
☐ ☐ GRAVEL [7]	20	20	☑ ☐ SILT [2]	40	40
☐ ☐ SAND [6]	15	15	☐ ☐ ARTIFICIAL [0]		
☐ ☐ BEDROCK [5]					

(Score natural substrates; ignore sludge from point-sources)

NUMBER OF BEST TYPES: ☐ 4 or more [2] ☐ 3 or less [0]

Check ONE (*Or 2 & average*)

ORIGIN
- ☐ LIMESTONE [1]
- ☐ TILLS [1]
- ☑ WETLANDS [0]
- ☐ HARDPAN [0]
- ☐ SANDSTONE [0]
- ☐ RIP/RAP [0]
- ☐ LACUSTURINE [0]
- ☐ SHALE [-1]
- ☐ COAL FINES [-2]

SILT / EMBEDDEDNESS

QUALITY
- ☐ HEAVY [-2]
- ☑ MODERATE [-1]
- ☐ NORMAL [0]
- ☐ FREE [1]
- ☐ EXTENSIVE [-2]
- ☑ MODERATE [-1]
- ☐ NORMAL [0]
- ☐ NONE [1]

Comments

Substrate 8 *Maximum 20*

2] INSTREAM COVER

Indicate presence 0 to 3: **0**-Absent; **1**-Very small amounts or if more common of marginal quality; **2**-Moderate amounts, but not of highest quality or in small amounts of highest quality; **3**-Highest quality in moderate or greater amounts (e.g., very large boulders in deep or fast water, large diameter log that is stable, well developed rootwad in deep / fast water, or deep, well-defined, functional pools.

1 UNDERCUT BANKS [1]	___ POOLS > 70cm [2]	___ OXBOWS, BACKWATERS [1]
1 OVERHANGING VEGETATION [1]	___ ROOTWADS [1]	___ AQUATIC MACROPHYTES [1]
___ SHALLOWS (IN SLOW WATER) [1]	___ BOULDERS [1]	___ LOGS OR WOODY DEBRIS [1]
___ ROOTMATS [1]		

AMOUNT

Check ONE (*Or 2 & average*)
- ☐ EXTENSIVE >75% [11]
- ☑ MODERATE 25-75% [7]
- ☐ SPARSE 5-<25% [3]
- ☐ NEARLY ABSENT <5% [1]

Comments

Cover *Maximum 20* 9

3] CHANNEL MORPHOLOGY

Check ONE in each category (*Or 2 & average*)

SINUOSITY
- ☐ HIGH [4]
- ☑ MODERATE [3]
- ☐ LOW [2]
- ☐ NONE [1]

DEVELOPMENT
- ☐ EXCELLENT [7]
- ☑ GOOD [5]
- ☐ FAIR [3]
- ☐ POOR [1]

CHANNELIZATION
- ☐ NONE [6]
- ☑ RECOVERED [4]
- ☐ RECOVERING [3]
- ☐ RECENT OR NO RECOVERY [1]

STABILITY
- ☐ HIGH [3]
- ☑ MODERATE [2]
- ☐ LOW [1]

Comments

Channel *Maximum 20* 14

4] BANK EROSION AND RIPARIAN ZONE

Check **ONE** in each category for *EACH BANK* (*Or 2 per bank & average*)

River right looking downstream

EROSION L	EROSION R	
☐	☐	NONE / LITTLE [3]
☑	☑	MODERATE [2]
☐	☐	HEAVY / SEVERE [1]

RIPARIAN WIDTH L	RIPARIAN WIDTH R	
☐	☐	WIDE > 50m [4]
☐	☐	MODERATE 10-50m [3]
☐	☐	NARROW 5-10m [2]
☐	☐	VERY NARROW < 5m [1]
☑	☑	NONE [0]

FLOOD PLAIN QUALITY L	FLOOD PLAIN QUALITY R	
☐	☐	FOREST, SWAMP [3]
☐	☐	SHRUB OR OLD FIELD [2]
☐	☐	RESIDENTIAL, PARK, NEW FIELD [1]
☐	☐	FENCED PASTURE [1]
☑	☑	OPEN PASTURE, ROWCROP [0]

☐	☐	CONSERVATION TILLAGE [1]
☐	☐	URBAN OR INDUSTRIAL [0]
☐	☐	MINING / CONSTRUCTION [0]

Indicate predominant land use(s) past 100m riparian.

Comments

Riparian *Maximum 10* 2

5] POOL / GLIDE AND RIFFLE / RUN QUALITY

MAXIMUM DEPTH

Check **ONE** (*ONLY!*)
- ☐ > 1m [6]
- ☐ 0.7-<1m [4]
- ☐ 0.4-<0.7m [2]
- ☐ 0.2-<0.4m [1]
- ☑ < 0.2m [0]

CHANNEL WIDTH

Check ONE (*Or 2 & average*)
- ☑ POOL WIDTH > RIFFLE WIDTH [2]
- ☐ POOL WIDTH = RIFFLE WIDTH [1]
- ☐ POOL WIDTH > RIFFLE WIDTH [0]

CURRENT VELOCITY

Check ALL that apply
- ☐ TORRENTIAL [-1]
- ☐ VERY FAST [1]
- ☐ FAST [1]
- ☑ MODERATE [1]
- ☐ SLOW [1]
- ☐ INTERSTITIAL [-1]
- ☐ INTERMITTENT [-2]
- ☑ EDDIES [1]

Indicate for reach - pools and riffles.

Recreation Potential
Primary Contact
Secondary Contact
(circle one and comment on back)

Comments

Pool / Current *Maximum 12* 4

Indicate for functional riffles; Best areas must be large enough to support a population of riffle-obligate species: Check ONE (*Or 2 & average*). ☐ NO RIFFLE [metric=0]

RIFFLE DEPTH
- ☐ BEST AREAS > 10cm [2]
- ☐ BEST AREAS 5-10cm [1]
- ☑ BEST AREAS < 5cm [metric=0]

RUN DEPTH
- ☐ MAXIMUM > 50cm [2]
- ☑ MAXIMUM < 50cm [1]

RIFFLE / RUN SUBSTRATE
- ☐ STABLE (e.g., Cobble, Boulder) [2]
- ☑ MOD. STABLE (e.g., Large Gravel) [1]
- ☐ UNSTABLE (e.g., Fine Gravel, Sand) [0]

RIFFLE / RUN EMBEDDEDNESS
- ☐ NONE [2]
- ☐ LOW [1]
- ☑ MODERATE [0]
- ☐ EXTENSIVE [-1]

Comments

Riffle / Run *Maximum 8* 2

6] GRADIENT

DRAINAGE AREA (44 mi²)

ft/mi)
- ☐ VERY LOW - LOW [2-4]
- ☑ MODERATE [6-10]
- ☐ HIGH - VERY HIGH [10-6]

%POOL: 10 **%GLIDE:** **%RUN:** 70 **%RIFFLE:** 20

Gradient *Maximum 10* 6

A] SAMPLED REACH

Check ALL that apply

Comment RE: Reach consistency/ Is reach typical of steam?*, Recreation/* Observed - Inferred, *Other/* Sampling observations, Concerns, Access directions, etc.

METHOD

- ☐ BOAT
- ☐ WADE
- ☐ L. LINE
- ☑ OTHER

STAGE

1st -sample pass-	2nd
☐ HIGH	☐
☐ UP	☐
☑ NORMAL	☐
☐ LOW	☐
☐ DRY	☐

DISTANCE

- ☐ 0.5 Km
- ☐ 0.2 Km
- ☐ 0.15 Km
- ☐ 0.12 Km
- ☐ OTHER

200 feet

CLARITY

1st --sample pass--	2nd
☐ < 20 cm	☐
☐ 20-<40 cm	☐
☐ 40-70 cm	☐
☐ > 70 cm/ CTB	☐
☐ SECCHI DEPTH	☐

CANOPY

- ☑ > 85%- OPEN
- ☐ 55%-<85%
- ☐ 30%-<55%
- ☐ 10%-<30%
- ☐ <10%- CLOSED

1st pass 2nd _____ cm

1st _____ cm

C] REC

B] AESTHETIC

- ☑ NUISANCE ALGAE
- ☐ INVASIVE MACROPHYTES
- ☐ EXCESS TURBIDITY
- ☐ DISCOLORATION
- ☐ FOAM / SCUM
- ☐ OIL SHEEN
- ☐ TRASH / LITTER
- ☐ NUISANCE ODOR
- ☐ SLUDGE DEPOSITS
- ☐ CSOs/SSOs/OUTFALLS

ION AREA DEPTH

POOL: ☐ >100ft² ☐ >3ft

D] MAINTENANCE

Circle some & *COMMENT*

PUBLIC / PRIVATE / BOTH / NA
ACTIVE / HISTORIC / BOTH / NA
YOUNG-SUCCESSION-OLD
SPRAY / SNAG / REMOVED
MODIFIED / DIPPED OUT / NA
LEVEED / ONE SIDED
RELOCATED / CUTOFFS
MOVING-BEDLOAD-STABLE
ARMOURED / SLUMPS
ISLANDS / SCOURED
IMPOUNDED / DESICCATED
FLOOD CONTROL / DRAINAGE

E] ISSUES

WWTP / CSO / NPDES / INDUSTRY
HARDENED / URBAN / DIRT&GRIME
CONTAMINATED / LANDFILL
BMPs-CONSTRUCTION-SEDIMENT
LOGGING / IRRIGATION / COOLING
BANK / EROSION / SURFACE
FALSE BANK / MANURE / LAGOON
WASH H_20 / TILE / H_20 TABLE
ACID / MINE / QUARRY / FLOW
NATURAL / WETLAND / STAGNANT
PARK / GOLF / LAWN / HOME
ATMOSPHERE / DATA PAUCITY

F] MEASUREMENTS

- $\bar{x}$ width 7'
- $\bar{x}$ depth 4"
- max. depth
- $\bar{x}$ bankfull width 15'
- bankfull $\bar{x}$ depth 7'
- W/D ratio
- bankfull max. depth
- floodprone x^2 width
- entrench. ratio

Le *Tree:*

Stream Drawing:



Headwater Habitat Evaluation Index Field Form

HHEI Score (sum of metrics 1+2+3) **55**

SITE NAME/LOCATION: Vassell-Green Chapel

SITE NUMBER: NA | RIVER BASIN: Scioto | DRAINAGE AREA (mi²): 0.60

LENGTH OF STREAM REACH (ft): | LAT.: 40.22408 | LONG.: -82.84764 | RIVER CODE: NA | RIVER MILE: NA

DATE: 09/11/23 | SCORER: MRK, KRS | COMMENTS: Perennial Stream

NOTE: Complete All Items On This Form - Refer to "Field Evaluation Manual for Ohio's PHWH Streams" for Instructions

STREAM CHANNEL MODIFICATIONS: ☐ NONE / NATURAL CHANNEL ☑ RECOVERED ☐ RECOVERING ☐ RECENT OR NO RECOVERY

1. SUBSTRATE (Estimate percent of every type of substrate present. Check *ONLY* two predominant substrate *TYPE* boxes (Max of 32). Add total number of significant substrate types found (Max of 8). Final metric score is sum of boxes A & B.

TYPE		PERCENT	TYPE		PERCENT
☐	BLDR SLABS [16 pts]	0	☐	SILT [3 pt]	25
☐	BOULDER (>256 mm) [16 pts]	0	☐	LEAF PACK/WOODY DEBRIS [3 pts]	15
☐	BEDROCK [16 pt]	0	☐	FINE DETRITUS [3 pts]	0
☑	COBBLE (65-256 mm) [12 pts]	35	☐	CLAY or HARDPAN [0 pt]	0
☐	GRAVEL (2-64 mm) [9 pts]	10	☐	MUCK [0 pts]	0
☐	SAND (<2 mm) [6 pts]	15	☐	ARTIFICIAL [3 pts]	0

Total of Percentages of Bldr Slabs, Boulder, Cobble, Bedrock: 35 **(A)** | Substrate Percentage Check | **(B)**

SCORE OF TWO MOST PREDOMINATE SUBSTRATE TYPES: 15 **TOTAL NUMBER OF SUBSTRATE TYPES:** 5

HHEI Metric Points

Substrate Max = 40

20

A + B

2. Maximum Pool Depth ***(Measure the maximum pool depth within the 61 meter (200 ft)*** evaluation reach at the time of evaluation. Avoid plunge pools from road culverts or storm water pipes) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐	> 30 centimeters [20 pts]	☑	> 5 cm - 10 cm [15 pts]
☐	> 22.5 - 30 cm [30 pts]	☐	< 5 cm [5 pts]
☐	> 10 - 22.5 cm [25 pts]	☐	NO WATER OR MOIST CHANNEL [0 pts]

COMMENTS: **MAXIMUM POOL DEPTH** (Inches): 2.00

Pool Depth Max = 30

15

3. BANK FULL WIDTH (Measured as the average of 3-4 measurements) **(Check *ONLY* one box):**

☐	> 4.0 meters (> 13') [30 pts]	☐	> 1.0 m - 1.5 m (> 3' 3" - 4' 8") [15 pts]
☐	> 3.0 m - 4.0 m (> 9' 7" - 13') [25 pts]	☐	≤ 1.0 m (<=3' 3") [5 pts]
☑	> 1.5 m - 3.0 m (> 9' 7" - 4' 8") [20 pts]		

COMMENTS: BF = 6'w x 3.25'd **AVERAGE BANKFULL WIDTH** (Feet): 6.00

Bankfull Width Max=30

20

This information must also be completed

RIPARIAN ZONE AND FLOODPLAIN QUALITY ☆NOTE: River Left (L) and Right (R) as looking downstream☆

RIPARIAN WIDTH (Per Bank) L	R	FLOODPLAIN QUALITY (Most Predominant per Bank) L	R		L	R	
☐	☐	Wide >10m	☐	☐	Mature Forest, Wetland	☐	☐	Conservation Tillage
☑	☑	Moderate 5-10m	☑	☐	Immature Forest, Shrub or Old Field	☐	☐	Urban or Industrial
☐	☐	Narrow <5m	☐	☑	Residential, Park, New Field	☐	☐	Open Pasture, Row Crop
☐	☐	None	☐	☐	Fenced Pasture	☐	☐	Mining or Construction

COMMENTS:

FLOW REGIME *(At Time of Evaluation)* (Check *ONLY* one box):

☑ Stream Flowing
☐ Subsurface flow with isolated pools (Interstitial)
☐ Moist Channel, isolated pools, no flow (Intermittent)
☐ Dry channel, no water (Ephemeral)

COMMENTS:

SINUOSITY (Number of bends per 61 m (200 ft) of channel) (Check *ONLY* one box):

☐ None	☐ 1.0	☑ 2.0	☐ 3.0
☐ 0.5	☐ 1.5	☐ 2.5	☐ >3

STREAM GRADIENT ESTIMATE

☐ Flat (0.5 ft/100 ft) ☑ Flat to Moderate ☐ Moderate (2 ft/100 ft) ☐ Moderate to Severe ☐ Severe (10 ft/100 ft)

ADDITIONAL STREAM INFORMATION (This Information Must Also be Completed):

QHEI PERFORMED? - ☐ Yes ☑ No QHEI Score _____ (If Yes, Attach Completed QHEI Form)

DOWNSTREAM DESIGNATED USE(S)

☑ WWH Name: **Big Walnut Creek** Distance from Evaluated Stream **1.20**

☐ CWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

☐ EWH Name: _____ Distance from Evaluated Stream _____

MAPPING: ATTACH COPIES OF MAPS, INCLUDING THE ENTIRE WATERSHED AREA. CLEARLY MARK THE SITE LOCATION

USGS Quadrangle Name: **Sunbury** NRCS Soil Map Page: _____ NRCS Soil Map Stream Order _____

County: **Delaware** Township / City: **Trenton**

MISCELLANEOUS

Base Flow Conditions? (Y/N): **Y** Date of last precipitation: **09/10/23** Quantity: **0.10**

Photograph Information: **Upstream, downstream, substrate**

Elevated Turbidity? (Y/N): **N** Canopy (% open): **10** **Overall Stability of BOTH Stream Banks (check one)**: Stable ☐ Moderately Stable ☑ Unstable ☐

Were samples collected for water chemistry? (Y/N): **N** (Note lab sample no. or id. and attach results) Lab Number: _____

Field Measures: Temp (°C) _____ Dissolved Oxygen (mg/l) _____ pH (S.U.) _____ Conductivity (µmhos/cm) _____

Is the sampling reach representative of the stream (Y/N) **Y** If not, please explain: _____

Additional comments/description of pollution impacts: _____

BIOTIC EVALUATION

Performed? (Y/N): **Y** (If Yes, Record all observations. Voucher collections optional. NOTE: all voucher samples must be labeled with the site ID number. Include appropriate field data sheets from the Primary Headwater Habitat Assessment Manual)

Fish Observed? (Y/N) **Y** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Salamanders Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Frogs or Tadpoles Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N** Aquatic Macroinvertebrates Observed? (Y/N) **N** Voucher? (Y/N) **N**

Comments Regarding Biology: **Fish were observed.**

DRAWING AND NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF STREAM REACH (This must be completed):

Include important landmarks and other features of interest for site evaluation and a narrative description of the stream's location

FLOW →



Save as pdf Reset Form

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Streams Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-CRW-001 **Date:** June 7, 2023 **Description:** Intermittent Stream Facing Upstream	

S-CRW-001 **Date:** June 7, 2023 **Description:** Intermittent Stream Facing Downstream	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-CRW-001 **Date:** June 7, 2023 **Description:** Intermittent Stream Facing Substrate	

S-MRK-001 **Date:** June 14, 2023 **Description:** Ephemeral Stream Facing Upstream	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Streams Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-001 **Date:** June 14, 2023 **Description:** Ephemeral Stream Facing Downstream	

S-MRK-001 **Date:** June 14, 2023 **Description:** Ephemeral Stream Facing Substrate	

Client Name:	**Site Location:**	**Project No.**
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-002
Date: June 14, 2023
Description: Intermittent Stream Facing Upstream

S-MRK-002
Date: June 14, 2023
Description: Intermittent Stream Facing Downstream

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Streams Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-002

Date:

June 14, 2023

Description:

Intermittent Stream

Facing Substrate

S-MRK-005

Date:

June 15, 2023

Description:

Perennial Stream

Facing Upstream

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-005
Date: June 15, 2023
Description: Perennial Stream Facing Downstream

S-MRK-005
Date: June 15, 2023
Description: Perennial Stream Facing Substrate

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Streams Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-006 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Intermittent Stream Facing Upstream	

S-MRK-006 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Intermittent Stream Facing Downstream	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-006 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Intermittent Stream Facing Substrate	

S-MRK-007 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Perennial Stream Facing Upstream	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-007	
Date: June 16, 2023	
Description: Perennial Stream Facing Downstream	

S-MRK-007	
Date: June 16, 2023	
Description: Perennial Stream Facing Substrate	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-008 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Intermittent Stream Facing Upstream	

S-MRK-008 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Intermittent Stream Facing Downstream	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-008 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Intermittent Stream Facing Substrate	

S-MRK-009 x1 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Perennial Stream Facing Upstream	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-009 x1 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Perennial Stream Facing Downstream	

S-MRK-009 x1 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Perennial Stream Facing Substrate	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-009 x2 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Perennial Stream Facing Upstream	

S-MRK-009 x2 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Perennial Stream Facing Downstream	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-009 x2	
Date: June 16, 2023	
Description: Perennial Stream Facing Substrate	

S-MRK-015	
Date: June 23, 2023	
Description: Perennial Stream Facing Upstream	

Client Name:	**Site Location:**	**Project No.**
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-015
Date:
September 23, 2023
Description:
Perennial Stream
Facing Downstream

S-MRK-015
Date:
September 23, 2023
Description:
Perennial Stream
Facing Substrate

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Streams Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-016

Date:

June 27, 2023

Description:

Ephemeral Stream

Facing Upstream

S-MRK-016

Date:

June 27, 2023

Description:

Ephemeral Stream

Facing Downstream

S-MRK-016 **Date:** June 27, 2023 **Description:** Ephemeral Stream Facing Substrate	

S-MRK-017 **Date:** June 27, 2023 **Description:** Intermittent Stream Facing Upstream	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-017 **Date:** June 27, 2023 **Description:** Intermittent Stream Facing Downstream	

S-MRK-017 **Date:** June 27, 2023 **Description:** Intermittent Stream Facing Substrate	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-018	
Date: June 27, 2023	
Description: Perennial Stream Facing Upstream	

S-MRK-018	
Date: June 27, 2023	
Description: Perennial Stream Facing Downstream	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-018 **Date:** June 27, 2023 **Description:** Perennial Stream Facing Substrate	

S-MRK-019 **Date:** June 27, 2023 **Description:** Perennial Stream Facing Upstream	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-019
Date: June 27, 2023
Description: Perennial Stream Facing Downstream

S-MRK-019
Date: June 27, 2023
Description: Perennial Stream Facing Substrate

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

S-MRK-023
Date: September 11, 2023
Description: Perennial Stream Facing Upstream

S-MRK-023
Date: September 11, 2023
Description: Perennial Stream Facing Downstream

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	**PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD** **Streams Photograph Record**	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

S-MRK-023 **Date:** September 11, 2023 **Description:** Perennial Stream Facing Substrate	

APPENDIX C

POND PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Ponds Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

Pond-MRK-003 **Date:** September 15, 2023 **Description:** Pond Facing North	

Pond-MRK-004 **Date:** September 15, 2023 **Description:** Pond Facing East	

APPENDIX D

UPLAND DRAINAGE FEATURE PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Upland Drainage Feature (UDF) Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

UDF-CRW-002 **Date:** June 7, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Upstream	

UDF-CRW-002 **Date:** June 7, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Downstream	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Upland Drainage Feature (UDF) Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

UDF-CRW-002 **Date:** June 7, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

UDF-MRK-001 **Date:** June 14, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing East	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	**PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD** **Upland Drainage Feature (UDF)** **Photograph Record**	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

UDF-MRK-001 **Date:** June 14, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing West	

UDF-MRK-001 **Date:** June 14, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Upland Drainage Feature (UDF) Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

UDF-MRK-004	
Date: June 15, 2023	
Description: Upland Drainage Feature Facing East	

UDF-MRK-004	
Date: June 15, 2023	
Description: Upland Drainage Feature Facing West	

Case No. 24-1043-EL-BLN

Part 7 of 7

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Upland Drainage Feature (UDF) Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

UDF-MRK-004	
Date: June 15, 2023	
Description: Upland Drainage Feature Facing East	

UDF-MRK-004	
Date: June 15, 2023	
Description: Upland Drainage Feature Facing West	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	**PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD** **Upland Drainage Feature (UDF)** **Photograph Record**	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

UDF-MRK-004 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

UDF-MRK-005 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing East	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	**PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD** **Upland Drainage Feature (UDF)** **Photograph Record**	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

UDF-MRK-005 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing West	

UDF-MRK-005 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD Upland Drainage Feature (UDF) Photograph Record	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

UDF-MRK-006 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing North	

UDF-MRK-006 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing South	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	**PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD** **Upland Drainage Feature (UDF)** **Photograph Record**	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

UDF-MRK-006 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

UDF-MRK-007 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Northwest	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	**PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD** **Upland Drainage Feature (UDF)** **Photograph Record**	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

UDF-MRK-007 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Southeast	

UDF-MRK-007 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Upland Drainage Feature (UDF) Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

UDF-MRK-009 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing North	

UDF-MRK-009 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing South	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	**PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD** **Upland Drainage Feature (UDF)** **Photograph Record**	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

UDF-MRK-009 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

UDF-MRK-010 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing East	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	**PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD** **Upland Drainage Feature (UDF)** **Photograph Record**	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

UDF-MRK-010 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing West	

UDF-MRK-010 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	**PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD** **Upland Drainage Feature (UDF)** **Photograph Record**	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

UDF-MRK-011 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing East	

UDF-MRK-011 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing West	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	**PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD** **Upland Drainage Feature (UDF)** **Photograph Record**	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

UDF-MRK-011 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

UDF-MRK-019 **Date:** June 22, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing North	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	**PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD** **Upland Drainage Feature (UDF)** **Photograph Record**	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

UDF-MRK-019 **Date:** June 22, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing South	

UDF-MRK-019 **Date:** June 22, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	**PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD** **Upland Drainage Feature (UDF)** **Photograph Record**	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

UDF-MRK-020 **Date:** June 26, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing East	

UDF-MRK-020 **Date:** June 26, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing West	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	**PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD** **Upland Drainage Feature (UDF)** **Photograph Record**	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

UDF-MRK-020 **Date:** June 26, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

UDF-MRK-027 **Date:** September 14, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Northeast	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	**PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD** **Upland Drainage Feature (UDF)** **Photograph Record**	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

UDF-MRK-027 **Date:** September 14, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Southwest	

UDF-MRK-027 **Date:** September 14, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Upland Drainage Feature (UDF) Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

UDF-MRK-028

Date:

September 15, 2023

Description:

Upland Drainage Feature

Facing North

UDF-MRK-028

Date:

September 15, 2023

Description:

Upland Drainage Feature

Facing South

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Upland Drainage Feature (UDF) Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

UDF-MRK-028 **Date:** September 15, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

UDF-MRK-029 **Date:** September 26, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing North	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Upland Drainage Feature (UDF) Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

UDF-MRK-029 **Date:** September 26, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing South	

UDF-MRK-029 **Date:** September 26, 2023 **Description:** Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Upland Drainage Feature (UDF) Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

UDF-MRK-030

Date:

September 26, 2023

Description:

Upland Drainage Feature

Facing North

UDF-MRK-030

Date:

September 26, 2023

Description:

Upland Drainage Feature

Facing South

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.	**PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD** **Upland Drainage Feature (UDF)** **Photograph Record**	
Client Name: AEP	**Site Location:** Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	**Project No.** 60702685

UDF-MRK-030	
Date: September 26, 2023	
Description: Upland Drainage Feature Facing Substrate	

APPENDIX E

HABITAT PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Habitat Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-1

Date:

June 7, 2023

Description:

Old Field

Facing North

PH-2

Date:

June 7, 2023

Description:

Woodlands

Facing North

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-3 **Date:** June 7, 2023 **Description:** Old field Facing North	

PH-4 **Date:** September 11, 2023 **Description:** Old field Facing North	

PH-5 **Date:** September 11, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-6 **Date:** September 11, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-7 **Date:** June 14, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-8 **Date:** June 14, 2023 **Description:** Woodlands - Deciduous Facing North	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-9 **Date:** June 14, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-10 **Date:** September 12, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-11 **Date:** September 12, 2023 **Description:** Old field Facing North	

PH-12 **Date:** September 12, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-13 **Date:** September 12, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-14 **Date:** September 12, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-15 **Date:** September 12, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-16 **Date:** December 06, 2023 **Description:** Pond/Stream/Wetland Facing North	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-17 **Date:** December 06, 2023 **Description:** Agricultural Row-Crop Facing North	

PH-18 **Date:** June 14, 2023 **Description:** Woodland-Deciduous Facing North	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-19 **Date:** June 22, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-20 **Date:** June 14, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing South	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-21 **Date:** June 14, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-22 **Date:** June 14, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing East	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-23 **Date:** June 14, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-24 **Date:** September 26, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-25 **Date:** June 26, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-26 **Date:** December 06, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-27 **Date:** June 26, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-28 **Date:** September 26, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-29 **Date:** September 26, 2023 **Description:** Landscaped Facing North	

PH-30 **Date:** June 22, 2023 **Description:** Old Field Facing North	

PH-31

Date:

June 22, 2023

Description:

Agriculture

Facing North

PH-32

Date:

June 22, 2023

Description:

Agriculture

Facing North

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-33 **Date:** June 22, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-34 **Date:** June 26, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-35 **Date:** June 14, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-36 **Date:** September 13, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing East	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-37 **Date:** June 21, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing East	

PH-38 **Date:** December 1, 2023 **Description:** Woodlands Facing North	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-39 **Date:** December 1, 2023 **Description:** Agricultural Row-Crop Facing North	

PH-40 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing East	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-41 **Date:** September 13, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing East	

PH-42 **Date:** September 13, 2023 **Description:** Woodlands Facing East	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-43 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing East	

PH-44 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing East	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-45 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-46 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Woodland–Deciduous Facing East	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-47 **Date:** June 15, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing East	

PH-48 **Date:** June 27, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing East	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-49 **Date:** June 27, 2023 **Description:** Woodlands Facing East	

PH-50 **Date:** June 27, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing East	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-51 **Date:** June 27, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing South	

PH-52 **Date:** June 27, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing East	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-53 **Date:** June 27, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing East	

PH-54 **Date:** June 27, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-55 **Date:** June 27, 2023 **Description:** Pasture Facing North	

PH-56 **Date:** September 14, 2023 **Description:** Wetland Facing North	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-57 **Date:** September 14, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-58 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing East	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-59 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-60 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-61 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-62 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Woodland - Deciduous Facing North	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-63 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Agriculture Facing North	

PH-64 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Pasture Facing North	

AECOM Imagine it. Delivered.

PHOTOGRAPHIC RECORD
Habitat Photograph Record

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-65 **Date:** September 15, 2023 **Description:** Pasture Facing North	

PH-66 **Date:** September 15, 2023 **Description:** Woodland Facing East	

Client Name:	Site Location:	Project No.
AEP	Vassell - Green Chapel North Project	60702685

PH-67 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Landscaped Facing North	

PH-68 **Date:** June 16, 2023 **Description:** Old field Facing North	

APPENDIX F

AGENCY CORRESPONDENCE

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Ecological Services
4625 Morse Road, Suite 104
Columbus, Ohio 43230
(614) 416-8993 / FAX (614) 416-8994

September 11, 2023

Project Code: 2023-0125820

Dear Anna Findish:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has received your recent correspondence requesting information about the subject proposal. We offer the following comments and recommendations to assist you in minimizing and avoiding adverse impacts to threatened, endangered, and proposed species pursuant to the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq), as amended (ESA).

Federally Threatened and Endangered Species: The endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) occur throughout the State of Ohio. The Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat may be found wherever suitable habitat occurs unless a presence/absence survey has been performed to document absence. Suitable summer habitat for Indiana bats and northern long-eared bats consists of a wide variety of forested/wooded habitats where they roost, forage, and breed that may also include adjacent and interspersed non-forested habitats such as emergent wetlands and adjacent edges of agricultural fields, woodlots, fallow fields, and pastures. Roost trees for both species include live and standing dead trees ≥3 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) that have any exfoliating bark, cracks, crevices, hollows and/or cavities. These roost trees may be located in forested habitats as well as linear features such as fencerows, riparian forests, and other wooded corridors. Individual trees may be considered suitable habitat when they exhibit the characteristics of a potential roost tree and are located within 1,000 feet of other forested/wooded habitat. Northern long-eared bats have also been observed roosting in human-made structures, such as buildings, barns, bridges, and bat houses; therefore, these structures should also be considered potential summer habitat. In the winter, Indiana bats and northern long-eared bats hibernate in caves, rock crevices and abandoned mines.

Federally Proposed Species: On September 14, 2022, the Service proposed to list the tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*) as endangered under the ESA. The bat faces extinction due to the impacts of white-nose syndrome, a deadly disease affecting cave-dwelling bats across the continent. During spring, summer, and fall, this species roosts primarily among leaf clusters of live or recently dead trees, emerging at dusk to hunt for insects over waterways and forest edges. While white-nose syndrome is by far the most serious threat to the tricolored bat, other threats now have an increased significance due to the dramatic decline in the species' population. These threats include disturbance to bats in roosting, foraging, commuting, and over-wintering habitats. Mortality due to collision with wind turbines, especially during migration, has also been documented across their range. Conservation measures for the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat will also help to conserve the tricolored bat.

Seasonal Tree Clearing for Federally Listed Bat Species: Should the proposed project site contain trees ≥3 inches dbh, we recommend avoiding tree removal wherever possible. If any caves or abandoned mines may be disturbed, further coordination with this office is requested to determine if fall or spring portal surveys are warranted. If no caves or abandoned mines are present and trees ≥3 inches dbh cannot be avoided, we recommend removal of any trees ≥3 inches dbh only occur between October 1 and March 31. Seasonal clearing is recommended to avoid adverse effects to Indiana bats and northern long-eared bats.

If implementation of this seasonal tree cutting recommendation is not possible, a summer presence/absence survey may be conducted for Indiana bats and northern long-eared bats. If Indiana bats and northern long-eared bats are not detected during the survey, then tree clearing may occur at any time of the year. Surveys must be conducted by an approved surveyor and be designed and conducted in coordination with the Ohio Field Office. Surveyors must have a valid federal permit. Please note that in Ohio summer mist net surveys may only be conducted between June 1 and August 15.

Section 7 Coordination: If there is a federal nexus for the project (e.g., federal funding provided, federal permits required to construct), then no tree clearing should occur on any portion of the project area until consultation under section 7 of the ESA, between the Service and the federal action agency, is completed. We recommend the federal action agency submit a determination of effects to this office, relative to the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat, for our review and concurrence. This letter provides technical assistance only and does not serve as a completed section 7 consultation document.

Stream and Wetland Avoidance: Over 90% of the wetlands in Ohio have been drained, filled, or modified by human activities, thus is it important to conserve the functions and values of the remaining wetlands in Ohio (https://epa.ohio.gov/portals/47/facts/ohio_wetlands.pdf). We recommend avoiding and minimizing project impacts to all wetland habitats (e.g., forests, streams, vernal pools) to the maximum extent possible in order to benefit water quality and fish and wildlife habitat. Additionally, natural buffers around streams and wetlands should be preserved to enhance beneficial functions. If streams or wetlands will be impacted, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers should be contacted to determine whether a Clean Water Act section 404 permit is required. Best management practices should be used to minimize erosion, especially on slopes. Disturbed areas should be mulched and revegetated with native plant species. In addition, prevention of non-native, invasive plant establishment is critical in maintaining high quality habitats.

Due to the project type, size, and location, we do not anticipate adverse effects to any other federally endangered, threatened, or proposed species, or proposed or designated critical habitat. Should the project design change, or additional information on listed or proposed species or their critical habitat become available, or if new information reveals effects of the action that were not previously considered, coordination with the Service should be initiated to assess any potential impacts.

Thank you for your efforts to conserve listed species and sensitive habitats in Ohio. We recommend coordinating with the Ohio Department of Natural Resources due to the potential for the proposed project to affect state listed species and/or state lands. Contact Mike Pettegrew, Environmental Services Administrator, at (614) 265-6387 or at mike.pettegrew@dnr.ohio.gov.

If you have questions, or if we can be of further assistance in this matter, please contact our office at (614) 416-8993 or ohio@fws.gov.

Sincerely,

Scott Hicks
Acting Field Office Supervisor

cc: Nathan Reardon, ODNR-DOW
Eileen Wyza, ODNR-DOW

Office of Real Estate
Tara Paciorek, Chief
2045 Morse Road – Bldg. E-2
Columbus, OH 43229
Phone: (614) 265-6661
Fax: (614) 267-4764

October 13, 2023

Anna Findish
AECOM
707 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219

Re: 23-1066; AEP Vassell - Green Chapel North Enhancement

Project: The proposed project involves the implementation of improvements between the existing Vassell Station and a proposed station (approximately 12.4 miles).

Location: The proposed project is located in Berkshire, Trenton, and Harlem townships, Delaware County, and Monroe and Jersey townships, Licking County, Ohio.

The Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) has completed a review of the above referenced project. These comments were generated by an inter-disciplinary review within the Department. These comments have been prepared under the authority of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (48 Stat. 401, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.), the National Environmental Policy Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, Ohio Revised Code and other applicable laws and regulations. These comments are also based on ODNR's experience as the state natural resource management agency and do not supersede or replace the regulatory authority of any local, state, or federal agency nor relieve the applicant of the obligation to comply with any local, state, or federal laws or regulations.

Natural Heritage Database: A review of the Ohio Natural Heritage Database indicates there are no records of state or federally listed plants or animals within one mile of the specified project area. Records searched date from 1980.

Please note that Ohio has not been completely surveyed and we rely on receiving information from many sources. Therefore, a lack of records for any particular area is not a statement that rare species or unique features are absent from that area.

Fish and Wildlife: The Division of Wildlife (DOW) has the following comments.

The DOW recommends that impacts to streams, wetlands and other water resources be avoided and minimized to the fullest extent possible, and that Best Management Practices be utilized to minimize erosion and sedimentation.

The portion of the project south of Duncan Plains Road is within the vicinity of records for the northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), a state endangered and federally endangered species. Because presence of state endangered bat species has been established in this area, summer tree cutting is not recommended, and additional summer surveys would not constitute presence/absence in the area. However, limited summer tree cutting inside this buffer may be

acceptable after further consultation with DOW (contact Eileen Wyza at Eileen.Wyza@dnr.ohio.gov).

In addition, the entire state of Ohio is within the range of the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), a state endangered and federally endangered species, the northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), a state endangered and federally endangered species, the little brown bat (*Myotis lucifugus*), a state endangered species, and the tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*), a state endangered species. During the spring and summer (April 1 through September 30), these bat species predominately roost in trees behind loose, exfoliating bark, in crevices and cavities, or in the leaves. The DOW recommends tree cutting only occur from October 1 through March 31, conserving trees with loose, shaggy bark and/or crevices, holes, or cavities, as well as trees with DBH ≥ 20 if possible. However, if trees are present within this area, (outside of the area delineated above) and trees must be cut during the summer months, the DOW recommends a mist net survey or acoustic survey be conducted from June 1 through August 15, prior to any cutting. Mist net and acoustic surveys should be conducted in accordance with the most recent version of the "*OHIO DIVISION OF WILDLIFE GUIDANCE FOR BAT SURVEYS AND TREE CLEARING*". If state listed bats are documented, DOW recommends cutting only occur from October 1 through March 31. However, limited summer tree cutting may be acceptable after consultation with the DOW.

The DOW also recommends that a desktop habitat assessment is conducted, followed by a field assessment if needed, to determine if a potential hibernaculum is present within the project area. Direction on how to conduct habitat assessments can be found in the current USFWS "*RANGE-WIDE INDIANA BAT & NORTHERN LONG-EARED BAT SURVEY GUIDELINES*." If a habitat assessment finds that a potential hibernaculum is present within 0.25 miles of the project area, please send this information to Eileen Wyza, for project recommendations. If a potential or known hibernaculum is found, the DOW recommends a 0.25-mile tree cutting and subsurface disturbance buffer around the hibernaculum entrance, however, limited summer or winter tree cutting may be acceptable after consultation with the DOW. If no tree cutting or subsurface impacts to a hibernaculum are proposed, this project is not likely to impact these species.

This project is within the range of the following listed mussel species.
Federally Endangered
rayed bean (*Villosa fabalis*)
snuffbox (*Epioblasma triquetra*)

Federally Threatened
rabbitsfoot (*Quadrula cylindrica cylindrica*)

State Threatened
Salamander Mussel (*Simpsonaias ambigua*)
pondhorn (*Uniomerus tetralasmus*)

This project must not have an impact on native mussels. This applies to both listed and non-listed species, as all species of mussel are protected in Ohio. Per the Ohio Mussel Survey Protocol (2022), all Group 2, 3, and 4 streams (Appendix A) require a mussel survey. Per the Ohio Mussel Survey Protocol, Group 1 streams (Appendix A) and unlisted streams with a watershed of 5 square miles or larger above the point of impact should be assessed using the Reconnaissance Survey for Unionid Mussels (Appendix B) to determine if mussels are present. Mussel surveys may be recommended for these streams as well. Therefore, if in-water work is planned in any stream that meets any of the above criteria, the DOW recommends the applicant provide

information to indicate no mussel impacts will occur. If this is not possible, the DOW recommends a professional malacologist conduct a mussel survey in the project area. If mussels that cannot be avoided are found in the project area, the DOW recommends a professional malacologist collect and relocate the mussels to suitable and similar habitat upstream of the project site. Mussel surveys and any subsequent mussel relocation should be done in accordance with the Ohio Mussel Survey Protocol. If there is no in-water work proposed, impacts to mussels are not likely.

The DOW recommends no in-water work in perennial streams from March 15 through June 30 to reduce impacts to indigenous aquatic species and their habitat. If no in-water work is proposed in a perennial stream, this project is not likely to impact aquatic species.

The project is within the range of the northern harrier (*Circus hudsonius*), a state endangered bird. This is a common migrant and winter species. Nesters are much rarer, although they occasionally breed in large marshes and grasslands. Harriers often nest in loose colonies. The female builds a nest out of sticks on the ground, often on top of a mound. Harriers hunt over grasslands. If this type of habitat will be impacted, construction should be avoided in this habitat during the species' nesting period of April 15 through July 31. If this habitat will not be impacted, this project is not likely to impact this species.

Due to the potential of impacts to federally listed species, as well as to state listed species, we recommend that this project be coordinated with the US Fish & Wildlife Service.

Water Resources: The Division of Water Resources has the following comment.

The local floodplain administrator should be contacted concerning the possible need for any floodplain permits or approvals for this project.

ODNR appreciates the opportunity to provide these comments. Please contact Mike Pettegrew at mike.pettegrew@dnr.ohio.gov if you have questions about these comments or need additional information.

Mike Pettegrew
Environmental Services Administrator

APPENDIX G

2023 JOINT GUIDANCE

OHIO DIVISION OF WILDLIFE AND U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE (OH-FIELD OFFICE) JOINT GUIDANCE FOR BAT SURVEYS AND TREE CLEARING MAY 2023

This document has been updated with new state guidance for the 2023 field season.

This guidance applies to state recommendations only. Contact the USFWS to determine if federal consultation is also necessary to comply with federal law.

Agency Contacts:

ODNR-DOW Permit Coordinator: Wildlife.Permits@dnr.ohio.gov, (614) 265-6315
ODNR-DOW Bat Survey Coordinator: Eileen Wyza, Eileen.Wyza@dnr.ohio.gov, (614) 265-6764
USFWS OHFO Endangered Species: Angela Boyer, angela_boyer@fws.gov, (614) 416-8993, ext.122

Covid-19 Guidance:

Surveyors should follow all covid protocols put in place by their agency. All surveyors should wear masks when handling bats and anyone exhibiting symptoms of covid-19 should not participate in bat surveys.

Ohio Mist-net Surveys:

This document serves as guidance for bat mist netting activities in Ohio and does not supersede any requirements listed on your permits or facility certificate. All permit conditions must be strictly adhered to for permits to be valid and for renewal of permits beyond the existing year.

Due to the presence of White-nose Syndrome (WNS), mist-netting in Ohio must be conducted between June 1 and August 15 unless stated otherwise in your state permit. The ODNR Division of Wildlife (ODNR-DOW) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Ohio Field Office (OHFO) have determined that delaying netting activities until June 1 will provide additional recovery time for bats affected by WNS. For presence/probable absence surveys, netting will not be accepted outside of the June 1 - August 15 timeframe.

To assess project areas for presence or probable absence of the state and federally listed Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) during summer residency, the USFWS developed the USFWS Range-wide Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat Summer Survey Guidelines (March 2023). This protocol, **with minor modifications referenced below**, can also be used in Ohio for the 2023 field season and includes surveying for the state-listed little brown bat (*Myotis lucifugus*) and tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*).

According to the updated federal range-wide guidelines, presence/probable absence net surveys for northern long-eared bats shall incorporate either 10 net nights per square 0.5 kilometer (123 acres) of project area, or four net nights per kilometer for linear projects. Presence/probable absence net surveys for Indiana bats shall incorporate six net nights per square 0.5 kilometer (123 acres) of project area, or two net nights per kilometer for linear

projects. If a project area is eligible for a presence/probable absence survey for both Indiana bats and northern long-eared bats, following the northern long-eared bat level of effort will qualify as a presence/ probable absence survey for both species. However, if a project area is eligible for a presence/absence survey for both species, following the Indiana bat level of effort will not qualify the survey for a northern long-eared bat presence/ probable absence survey. Please note that the USFWS Range-wide Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat Summer Survey Guidelines (March 2023) requires that a minimum of two (2) biologists (e.g., one permitted and one technician) must be on-site for every four (4) net-sets being operated. Exceptions to on-site minimum staffing levels may be allowed under extenuating circumstances, provided written justification is included in the proposed survey study plan and subsequently approved by the OHFO and ODOW.

Due to the reclassification of the northern long-eared bat on March 31, 2023, the previous northern long-eared bat 4(d) rule has been nullified. There is a new online tool in the USFWS's Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) website that allows project proponents to utilize a determination key (Dkey) for the northern long-eared bat. **The Dkey cannot be used to replace consultation with ODNR-DOW.** Project proponents should coordinate directly with the ODNR-DOW and the OHFO for project technical assistance for all federally listed species, including the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat.

The tricolored bat is listed as endangered by ODNR-DOW. Additionally, the USFWS published a proposed rule to list the tri-colored bat as endangered on September 14, 2022. The USFWS is scheduled to publish a final rule on the tricolored bat's status by the end of September 2023 which could affect future project development. Therefore, in anticipation of this listing we recommend that project proponents coordinate with the OHFO in addition to ODNR-DOW to determine if the project could benefit from formal coordination with USFWS for tricolored bat. The USFWS Range-wide Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat Summer Survey Guidelines (March 2023) allows presence/absence surveys for the tricolored bat that use the northern long-eared bat level of effort.

Exception for Ohio mist-net surveys: All presence/absence surveys conducted for state listed bat species (Indiana, northern long-eared, little brown, tricolored) should follow the maximum net nights set forth in the federal guidance to be considered valid by ODNR-DOW. Any modifications to this position will be communicated at the time of the site authorization approval.

Ohio Acoustic Surveys:

Acoustic bat surveys for presence/absence will be accepted by ODNR-DOW for the 2023 season. Surveys should follow guidelines laid out in the USFWS Range-wide Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat Summer Survey Guidelines (March 2023) with the following exceptions:

- Ohio survey dates are June 1 – August 15, 2022
- After conducting automated analyses using one or more of the currently available 'approved' acoustic bat ID programs[1], qualitative analysis (i.e., manual vetting) of any calls recorded from state-endangered species (*M. sodalis, M. septentrionalis*[2]*, M. lucifugus*[2]*,* and *P. subflavus*[2]) must be completed.
- **All presence/absence acoustic surveys conducted for state listed bat species (Indiana, northern long-eared, little brown, tricolored) should follow the maximum acoustic nights set forth in the federal guidance to be considered valid by ODNR-DOW. Any modifications to this position will be communicated at the time of the site authorization approval.**

At a minimum, for each detector site/night a program considered presence of state-listed bats likely, review all files (including no IDs) from that site/night. If more than one acoustic bat ID program is used, qualitative analysis must also include a comparison of the results of each program by site and night.

[1] https://www.fws.gov/media/indiana-bat-summer-survey-guidance

[2] State listing as endangered effective July 1, 2020

Combined Mist-netting and Acoustic Surveys:
ODNR-DOW will accept the USFWS pilot survey option of combining mist-netting and acoustic surveys for traditional survey sites (e.g., 123-acre area) detailed in Appendix I of the USFWS Range-wide Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat Summer Survey Guidelines (2023). All presence/absence combined mist-net and acoustic surveys conducted for state listed bat species should follow the maximum level of effort set forth by the federal guidance to be considered valid by ODNR-DOW. Any modifications to this position will be communicated at the time of the site authorization approval.

Before Field Season:

- Anyone surveying bats using mist-nets in the state of Ohio must obtain a federal permit as well as a state scientific collection permit. The federal permit should include both the Indiana bat and the northern long-eared bat.
- Your ODNR-DOW permit consists of two documents: a Scientific Collector (Wild Animal) Permit and an endangered species letter signed by the Chief of the Division of Wildlife (in addition to your federal permit). Both ODNR-DOW documents must be obtained prior to field work and kept with you and any sub-permittees during field work.

During Field Season:

- Prior to initiation of field work (a minimum of two weeks in advance), permittees must provide proposed mist netting plans to USFWS and ODNR-DOW in the form of an e-mail letter to the USFWS OHFO and copy to the ODNR-DOW Bat Survey Coordinator. Plans must be reviewed and approved by USFWS OHFO and ODNR-DOW before ANY surveys take place. Study plans must specify objectives, location details, dates of proposed work, and all other relevant details. **Study plans must also include a USFWS Project Code. Project Codes can only be obtained by requesting an official species list through the USFWS's Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) website (https://ipac.ecosphere.fws.gov/).** When handling bats, you must strictly adhere to the current WNS Decontamination Protocol (current version can be found at https://www.whitenosesyndrome.org/topics/decontamination). Clothing, boots, gear, and equipment should all be thoroughly decontaminated between nights, as well as between netting sites.
- Request bat bands at least two weeks in advance of needing them. Bat bands can be obtained by e-mailing the ODNR-DOW Bat Survey Coordinator with how many bands are needed, current permit number, sizes, and a mailing address. Bands will not be issued until your permits are valid. We have two sizes of bands—2.4 mm and 4.2 mm. The 2.4 mm split metal bat ring made of aluminum alloy is suitable for banding small bats. This band must be placed on all captured Indiana, northern long-eared, little brown, and tricolored bats. The larger 4.2 mm band is suitable for silver-haired (*Lasionycteris noctivagans*), big brown (*Eptesicus fuscus*), and hoary (*Lasiurus cinereus*) bats. You must band all Indiana, northern long-eared, little brown, and tricolored bats with ODNR-DOW bands; therefore, you should not be in the field without the 2.4 mm sized band.
- Only individuals who are named on the ODNR-DOW endangered species letter portion of the permit and on the corresponding federal bat permit may conduct and oversee mist-net surveys. Trained assistants may work on permitted bat activities under the direct and on-site supervision of a named permittee. All bat IDs must be verified by a named permittee. If an Indiana bat and/or northern long-eared bat is captured, the permittee shall notify the USFWS and the ODNR-DOW Bat Survey Coordinator referenced above within 48 hours via email. If a little brown bat or tricolored bat is captured, notify the ODNR-DOW Bat Survey Coordinator only within 48 hours via email. Reports of listed bat captures should include specific information such as spatial location of capture, band information, radio-transmitter frequency information, sex, reproductive status, and age of individual.
- For presence/absence surveys, ODNR-DOW requires all female and juvenile state endangered and threatened bat species (Indiana, northern long-eared, little brown, and tricolored bat) be radio-tracked if

caught, in accordance with methods outlined in Appendix D of USFWS 2022 Range-wide Indiana Bat Summer Survey Guidelines.

• If you are taking any biological samples (tissue, fur, blood, etc.), this must be specifically authorized in your state and federal permits and noted in your survey proposal.

After Field Season:

By March 15, you must submit your final ODNR-DOW report(s) from the previous summer. You are not required to fill out the ODNR-DOW Wildlife Diversity Bat Excel Spreadsheet; instead, please forward your USFWS Midwestern US Spreadsheet (found here: https://www.fws.gov/media/bat-reporting-spreadsheets-2020-2021) to the ODNR-DOW Bat Survey Coordinator and ODNR-DOW Permit Coordinator and include your state permit number along with an electronic copy of the project report. Electronic summaries emailed during the field season are NOT considered as full compliance of this reporting requirement.

Ohio Environmental Review Recommendations for projects involving disturbance near potential/known bat hibernacula (cliffs, caves, mines) or tree cutting:

Step 1: Coordinate with Ohio Division of Wildlife (DOW) regarding existing records for state-listed endangered bat summer and/or winter occurrence information. Potential hibernacula found during a habitat assessment must address possible suitability for Indiana bats, northern long-eared bats, tricolored bats, and little brown bats.

If project site contains a known bat hibernaculum(a) –

- For state-listed endangered species other than the Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat, a recommendation of 0.25-mile tree cutting buffer around all known entrances to protect existing conditions at the hibernaculum(a). The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) should be contacted for guidance on projects occurring within 5 miles of known or potential Indiana bat and/or northern long-eared bat hibernacula. If the project involves subsurface disturbance, consultation with DOW is required.
- Limited tree cutting may be permitted within the buffer. Coordinate with DOW.

If a project site does not contain known bat hibernaculum(a)

- Conduct a desktop habitat assessment of the project area. Tools such as the ODNR Mines of Ohio Viewer, Karst Interactive Map, topographic maps, aerial photos, historical records, etc. should be used to determine if there are any potential caves, mines, karst features, rock ledges, or other features that may serve as potential hibernacula.
  - If no such features are found, proceed to Step 2.
  - If potential hibernacula are found during the desktop assessment:
    - Assume bats are using these hibernacula and refrain from clearing trees from March 15-November 15

-Or-

- Conduct a field habitat assessment to determine if a potential hibernaculum(a) is present within the action area. We encourage impacts to ledges and rock outcroppings be avoided. If impacts cannot be avoided, features should be evaluated for potential roosting characteristics such as recesses, overhangs, and crevices.
- **NOTE**: The USFWS Range-wide Indiana Bat Guidelines, Appendix H, contains instructions for completing a habitat assessment, but only includes criteria for Indiana bat hibernacula.

Step 2: When conducted, a presence/absence survey must follow current DOW guidelines.

Step 3: If a state-listed endangered bat is captured or recorded during the survey:

- Recommendation of no summer tree cutting, or limited cutting following guidelines detailed below, within 5 miles (or 2.5 miles for tricolored bats) of the capture site if a roost is not located.
- Recommendation of no summer tree cutting, or limited cutting following guidelines detailed below, within 2.5 miles of a roost tree if located.

If no state-listed endangered bat is captured or recorded during the survey:

- Summer tree cutting may proceed for 5 years before a new survey is needed under state guidance.

Limited summer tree cutting guidance for bats that are only state-listed endangered: Limited tree cutting in summer may be permitted after consultation with DOW, but clearing trees with the following characteristics should be avoided unless they pose a hazard: dead or live trees of any size with loose, shaggy bark; crevices, holes, or cavities; clusters of dead leaves; live trees of any species with DBH ≥ 20".

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

When does the ODNR-DOW Bat Survey protocol have to be used?

This protocol should be used anytime Indiana bat, northern long-eared bat, little brown bat, or tricolored bat summer presence/probable absence surveys are conducted in the state of Ohio.

How many detector nights are required for presence/probable absence acoustic surveys?

As described in the current USFWS Range-wide Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat Summer Survey Guidelines:

Level of effort for all state-listed endangered bat species including Indiana bat and northern long-eared bats: Follow maximum detector nights as outlined in the federal guidance (for northern long-eared bat).

Northern Long-eared Bat Level of Effort:
Linear projects: a minimum of 4 detector nights per km (0.6 miles) of suitable summer habitat
Non-linear projects: a minimum of 14 detector nights per 123 acres (0.5 km^2) of suitable summer habitat.
At least 2 detector locations per 123 acre "site" shall be sampled until at least 8 detector nights has been completed over the course of at least 2 calendar nights (may be consecutive). For example:
- 4 detectors for 3 nights and 1 detector for 2 nights each (can sample the same location or move within the site)
- 2 detectors for 7 nights each (can sample the same location or move within the site)
- 1 detector for 14 nights (must sample at least 2 locations and move within the site – we recommend evenly distributing LOE among locations)

Indiana Bat Level of Effort:
Linear projects: a minimum of 4 detector nights per km (0.6 miles) of suitable summer habitat
Non-linear projects: a minimum of 10 detector nights per 123 acres (0.5 km^2) of suitable summer habitat.
At least 2 detector locations per 123 acre "site" shall be sampled until at least 8 detector nights has been completed over the course of at least 2 calendar nights (may be consecutive). For example:
- 5 detectors for 2 nights each (can sample the same location or move within the site)
- 2 detectors for 5 nights each (can sample the same location or move within the site)
- 1 detector for 10 nights (must sample at least 2 locations and move within the site – we recommend evenly distributing LOE among locations)

How many net surveys are required for presence/probable absence?

Level of effort for all state-listed endangered bat species including Indiana bat and northern long-eared bats: Follow maximum net nights as outlined in the federal guidance (for northern long-eared bat).

Net surveys for northern long-eared bat presence/probable absence shall incorporate, at a minimum, either 10 net nights per square 0.5 kilometer (123 acres) of project area, or four net nights per kilometer for linear projects. For linear projects, there must be at least one net night of survey on two different nights (minimum of two nights). This does not allow for two net nights on a single night for surveys.

Net surveys for Indiana bat presence/probable absence shall incorporate, at a minimum, either six net nights net nights per square 0.5 kilometer (123 acres) of project area, or two net nights per kilometer for linear projects. For linear projects, there must be at least one net night of survey on two different nights (minimum of two nights). This

does not allow for two net nights on a single night for surveys.

How long are the results of the surveys valid for an assessment of an area?

Mist-net or acoustic surveys documenting probable absence of state-listed endangered bats are valid for five years.

When can acoustic or net surveys occur in Ohio?

In Ohio, acoustic or net surveys may only be conducted from June 1 through August 15 unless indicated otherwise in your state permit. Any surveys outside of the June 1 - August 15 timeframe cannot be used in Ohio to assess the presence/probable absence of state-listed bats.

Can a presence/probable absence survey be conducted within a known Indiana bat and/or northern long-eared bat capture/detection buffer?

Surveys generally cannot be used to document presence/probable absence of state-listed endangered bats where presence of the species has already been confirmed by prior surveys.

What if a project is proposing to clear trees between April 1 and September 30 when bats may be present but no bat records exist in the project area?

Any Ohio project that is not within a known bat record buffer, and tree clearing between April 1 and September 31 is being proposed, may have a presence/probable absence survey conducted between June 1 and August 15 following the range-wide guidance. If a presence/probable absence survey is not performed, presence of listed bats is assumed.

How does take of northern long-eared bats differ from Indiana bats?

Under Ohio law, there is no exemption for take of any listed bat species.

Where do I get bands?

If you need bands, email the ODNR-DOW Bat Survey Coordinator at least two weeks in advance with your current ODNR permit number, how many bands in each size (2.4 and 4.2 mm) you will need this season, and a current address to ship the bands.

Do I have to band every bat?
No, currently this is optional. However, you are required as per your state permit to band all Indiana, northern long-eared, little brown, and tricolored bats.

This foregoing document was electronically filed with the Public Utilities

Commission of Ohio Docketing Information System on

11/26/2024 4:20:06 PM

in

Case No(s). 24-1043-EL-BLN

Summary: Application Letter of Notification for the Vassell – Green Chapel 345 kV Transmission Line Adjustment No. 2 Project. Part 2 of 2. electronically filed by Hector Garcia-Santana on behalf of AEP Ohio Transmission Company, Inc..